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Abstract

This paper presents the techniques used for the compilation of the data-flow synchronous language SIGNAL. The key feature of the compiler is that it performs formal calculus on systems of boolean equations. The originality of the implementation of the compiler lies in the use of a tree structure to solve the equations.

1 Introduction

Traditionally, real-time systems have been programmed in imperative asynchronous languages like ADA, OCCAM or C together with some operating system facilities. But these tools are not satisfactory as there is considerable need of provably correct software and as systems become more and more complex.

To remedy the insufficiencies of the current tools, the synchronous paradigm has been proposed and developed in[4]. Its main hypothesis is that a) operators react instantaneously with their inputs (computations have zero duration), b) time is just a succession of events (no explicit reference to a notion of physical time). The validity of the synchrony assumption is thoroughly discussed in [5]. Let us point out briefly, some advantages a programmer can get from this simplifying hypothesis.

The assumption that an operator (e.g an adder) computes its outputs simultaneously with the occurrences of its inputs is a very useful approximation in many fields. As an example in the field of hardware synthesis, logic gates are supposed to compute their outputs synchronously in the first approximation. It makes the design of a circuit simple. Then, propagation time is taken into account and the maximum clock frequency allowed is calculated. Such a separation between pure functionality and execution time is now possible in software with synchronous languages: the programmer specifies a functionality of the program, and the compiler of a synchronous language handles execution time on a particular target processor.

The second assumption of the synchronous paradigm (no physical time) provides the programmer with a framework in which he/she can handle uniformly real-time constraints. As a matter of fact, real-time constraints are not always expressed in terms of milli- or micro-seconds. The statement “the train must stop within 30 meters” is a real-time constraint just as “the train must stop within 30 seconds”. In a framework like ADA which possesses a notion of time only in terms of seconds (and not in terms of meters), those constraints will not be handled with similar programs. Hence the usefulness of the second synchrony hypothesis.

Four languages are built upon this synchronous paradigm: they differ mostly in the programming style they offer. ESTEREL[7] is an imperative synchronous language. SIGNAL[6] and LUSTRE[11] are data-flow languages. Finally in ARGOS[21], systems are specified with parallel and hierarchical automata. A summary of the synchronous approach can be found in [14].

This paper presents the techniques used in the compilation of the SIGNAL language which is a data-flow language. In this language, systems are specified with equations over synchronized streams. The declarative style of SIGNAL provides the programmer with the nice high-level constructs needed to describe a real-time system in terms of operators network, differential/difference equations. But, the higher the level of the language, the bigger the challenge to construct a compiler able to generate efficient executable code by using a “reasonable” amount of computing resources (memory, cpu-time).

SIGNAL’s compilation is based on an abstract interpretation of each statement as a system of boolean equations. These equations express the synchronizations in the program. The compiler solves a system of boolean equations for each program in order to a) check the consistency of the synchronizations,
and, b) generate efficient code (silicon[3], sequential[20], parallel[9]).

In this paper, we mainly report the techniques used to analyze the boolean equations. In Section 2 we present the language SIGNAL: the basic objects, the boolean equations and the dependency graph associated to each SIGNAL program. Section 3 puts the emphasis on the system of boolean equations and introduces a hierarchical representation for it. Finally we conclude with some experimental results which demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach.

2 The SIGNAL language

In this section, we present the basic objects of the language. We use sequences to describe the semantics of the statements. See [6] for more details on formal semantics of SIGNAL.

2.1 Signals and clocks

Signals. A signal X is a sequence \((X_t)_{t \in I}\) of values chosen in a domain \(D\) (the type of the signal). Integer, boolean, real are examples of signal types. The time index \(I\) is a totally ordered set of instants. We are interested in a discrete time model. So, instants are taken in a denumerable set. At any given instant \(t\), a signal may be present or absent depending on whether or not, the instant under consideration belongs to \(I\); a signal carries a value only when it is present.

Clocks. The set of instants at which a signal is present is its clock. So, the clock of a signal \((X_t)_{t \in I}\) is its time index \(I\). Two signals always present at the same instants are said to be synchronous: they have the same clock. Thus, the clock of a signal \(X\) is the equivalence class of \(X\) for the synchrony relation; in that sense it is denoted \(\tilde{X}\).

Notation. Following [8], the set theoretic operators for clocks, which are sets, are denoted \(\land\) (intersection), \(\lor\) (union) and \(\setminus\) (set difference). We use \(\langle\text{op}\rangle\) to denote one of the three operators.

2.2 The kernel of SIGNAL

A statement in SIGNAL is an equation on signals; it is called a process. We give here the kernel operators; the full language features other operators which can be rewritten in terms of these kernel operators.

Functional expressions. The operators (e.g \(+, -, \ast, \text{and}\)) defined on basic data types (e.g booleans, integers) are canonically extended to sequences and consequently to signals. Let \(f\) be such an operator of arity \(n\) and let \((X_{1t})_{t \in I}, \ldots, (X_{nt})_{t \in I}\) be \(n\) sequences with the same time index \(I\). The equation

\[ \forall t \in I, Y_t = f(X_{1t}, \ldots, X_{nt}) \]

is written in SIGNAL (see Figure 1).

The signals involved in that equation are required to have the same time index \(I\): they must be synchronous. Thus, the definition of the signal \(\tilde{X}\) implies the following equation on the clocks:

\[ \tilde{Y} = \tilde{X}_1 = \ldots = \tilde{X}_n \]

Reference to past values. We reference past values of a — discrete — signal with the “\(\text{S}\)” operator. The SIGNAL process

\[ ZX := X \text{ S} 1 \text{ init } v_0 \]

is the representation of the following equation on the sequences \((X_t)_{t \in I}\) and \((ZX_t)_{t \in I}\) defined on the same index \(I\):

\[ \forall t \in I, ZX_t = X_{t-1} \text{ and } ZX_1 = v_0 \]

Here again, \(ZX\) is by definition synchronous with \(X\): \(\tilde{ZX} = \tilde{X}\). A timing diagram for this operator is depicted on Figure 2.

Downsampling. Given a signal \(U\) and a boolean-valued signal \(C\) (sometimes termed condition), the process

\[ X := U \text{ when } C \]

defines the signal \(X\) which carries the same value as \(U\) when both \(U\) and \(C\) are present, and, \(C\) carries the value \(true\). Before giving a formal definition of \(X\), let us introduce some notions we will use frequently. We denote:

\[ [C] = \text{ the set of instants at which } C \text{ carries the value } true \]

\[ [\neg C] = \text{ the set of instants at which } C \text{ carries the value } false \]

When a boolean-valued signal occurs, it carries either the value \(true\) or the value \(false\). So the pair \([C], [\neg C]\) defines a partition of \(\tilde{C}\) (the clock of \(C\)). This can be represented by:

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ [C] \lor [\neg C] \} &= \tilde{C} \\
[ C ] \land [\neg C] &= \emptyset
\end{align*}
\]

where \(\emptyset\) denotes the null clock, the empty set of instants. With this notation, the signal \(X := U \text{ when } C\) is the sequence such that:

\[
\begin{align*}
\forall t \in \tilde{X}, X_t &= U_t \\
(X_t)_{t \in \tilde{X}} \text{ can be viewed as a subsequence of } (U_t)_{t \in \tilde{U}}.
\end{align*}
\]

Deterministic merge. Given two signals \(U\) and \(V\), the process

\[ X := U \text{ default } V \]

defines the signal which carries the same value as \(U\) when \(U\) is present, or the same value as \(V\) when \(U\) is absent. It is
absent when both $U$ and $V$ are absent. It merges the flows $U$ and $V$ and puts a priority on $U$. A timing diagram is depicted on Figure 4. More formally:

$$\begin{align*}
\forall t \in \tilde{U}, & \quad X_t = U_t \\
\forall t \in \tilde{V} \setminus \tilde{U}, & \quad X_t = V_t
\end{align*}$$

$X_t$ is well defined for all $t \in \tilde{X}$, since any instant in $\tilde{X}$ belongs either to $\tilde{U}$ or to $\tilde{V} \setminus \tilde{U}$.

Composition of processes. The elementary processes we have presented till now may be composed with the commutative and associative operator "$\square "$.

$$X := U \text{ when } C$$

For more details, see [17].

2.4 System of boolean equations

It appears clearly that a system of boolean equations lies under each SIGNAL process. We hinted that during the presentation of the kernel of SIGNAL. We recapitulate these equations in Table 1.

At this stage, the main difference between SIGNAL and the classical data-flow languages [16] [25] is that in SIGNAL we manipulate synchronized data-flow by means of clocks. The main purpose of synchronized data-flow is that all the synchronizations (expressed in terms of equations over clocks) should be completely handled at compile time. For more details, see [17].
2.5 Conditional dependency graph

A data dependency is associated with each process. A process is compiled into a graph representing the dependencies between signals. The edge $X \rightarrow Y$ connecting $X$ and $Y$ means that at each instant of the clock $k$, $Y$’s value depends on $X$’s value. Such a graph is constructed from the elementary processes as shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>process</th>
<th>dependency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X := f(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$</td>
<td>$\forall i = 1 \ldots n, X_i \xrightarrow{\hat{X}} X$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ZX := X$</td>
<td>no dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X := U$ whenC</td>
<td>$U \xrightarrow{\hat{X}} X$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X := U$ defaultV</td>
<td>$U \xrightarrow{\hat{\bar{V}}} \bar{V} \xrightarrow{\hat{V}} V$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For each condition $C$</td>
<td>$C \xrightarrow{\bar{C}} [C]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For each signal $X$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} \xrightarrow{\hat{X}} X$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: From SIGNAL operators to a conditional dependency graph

2.6 Description of the generated code

Sequential code generation from the conditional dependency graph follows a very simple scheme thoroughly described in [19]. Each signal is implemented by a variable. Since a signal carries a value only when it is present (i.e. it’s clock is present), in the generated code, access (read or write) to the variable that implements a signal is guarded by a test on the presence of the signal. Moreover, the assignment of the value of a variable to another variable is guarded by the clock that labels the dependency between the two variables.

As an example, consider the process $X := U$ defaultV. The signal $X$ merges the signals $U$ and $V$ with a priority to $U$. The dependency graph of that process is

$U \xrightarrow{\hat{U}} X \leftarrow \hat{V} \bar{U} \xrightarrow{\hat{V}} V$

and the code generated is:

if \( \text{present}(\bar{X}) \) then
  if \( \text{present}(\bar{U}) \) then
    $X := U$
  endif
  if \( \text{present}(\bar{V} \setminus \bar{U}) \) then
    $X := V$
  endif
endif

In that piece of code, we write \( \text{if } \text{present}(\bar{U}) \) to test if the instant under consideration belongs to the clock $\bar{U}$. In the following paragraphs we will detail how the compiler implements the test of a clock’s presence.

3 Solving the system of boolean equations

3.1 Resolution: the needs

The goal of the compiler is to check the consistency of the synchronizations expressed by the system of equations and to generate executable code for various architectures [3, 20]. From the conditional dependency graph and the code generation scheme, we can figure out what the needs are in terms of resolution.

The dependency, $\bar{X} \xrightarrow{\hat{X}} X$ requires that, at any given instant, before the value of a signal $X$ is computed, a test be made on the presence/absence of $X$; that is, the presence/absence of its clock $\bar{X}$. So there is a need for a resolution method that will allow to efficiently check at run-time the presence of all the clocks which are related by a system of equations. The choice made in the SIGNAL compiler is to transform the system of equations into a list of explicit definitions; that is, the compiler identifies in the system a set of clock variables (the free variables) in terms of which the other clocks are expressed. This explicitization is achieved by means of triangularization; that is, a transformation of the system of equations into a set of equalities of the form $k_i = k_{i_1} \langle op \rangle k_{i_2}$ such that the clock-to-clock dependency graph (the edges $k_{i_1} \xrightarrow{\hat{k_i_1}} k_i \leftarrow k_{i_2}$) be an acyclic graph (a partial order). So, the presence/absence of $k_i$ at run-time, can be quickly deduced from the presence/absence
of \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) where \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) are subterms which the compiler tries to share with other clocks in order to yield efficient code.

Not only does a triangularization compute the order in which clocks must be evaluated, but it also exhibits the free variables of the system. It is important that the free variables be determined because they are the ones that the environment of the real-time system must provide as inputs to the program. So, if they were not statically computed, there would be a need for tests at run-time to check the consistency of the inputs; that overhead would make efficiency more difficult to achieve.

The problem of transforming a system of boolean equations into an explicit system is NP-hard [12]. So the algorithm implemented in the compiler does not seek completeness. It is rather a heuristic aimed at fast compilation of commonly encountered systems of equations. Hence some correct SIGNAL programs may be rejected because the compiler fails to produce the explicit form of their clock equations. Currently, the triangularization is carried out in the compiler through an arborescent representation of the equations. Before going into details on the representation, we give the main ideas of the strategy that lies under it.

**3.2 Strategy of resolution**

A triangular system of equations is progressively constructed from the original system (see Table 1). An equation of the form \( k = k_1<op>k_2 \) is oriented (we note \( k := k_1<op>k_2 \)) in order to consider the clock formula \( k_1<op>k_2 \) as the definition of the clock variable \( k \). During this process, an orientation of some equations may not be trivially possible. There are two reasons for that.

1. The equation under consideration is of the form \( k = k_1<op>k_2 \) but there is already a definition of the variable \( k \). In this case, a rewriting can be performed to verify that the formula \( k_1<op>k_2 \) is equivalent to the previous definition of \( k \).

2. It is an equation of the form \( k = k_1<op>k_2 \) but an orientation would induce a cycle in the clock-to-clock dependency graph. In this case, an attempt can be made to rewrite the formula \( k_1<op>k_2 \) and break the cycle.

Note that an equation of the form \( k_1<op>k_2 = h_1<op>h_2 \) can be brought to the two previous cases by the insertion of a new variable \( h \) and by writing \( h = k_1<op>k_2 \) and \( h = h_1<op>h_2 \): first orient the equations and then prove the equivalence.

At the end of this process the program is said to be temporally incorrect if there are some equations whose orientation induces a cycle or if there are some non-proved equalities. Hence a canonical rewriting system is needed to check the equivalence of two clock formulas (which are boolean formulas).

Although this strategy cannot triangularize an arbitrary system of equations, it is very efficient in compiling common SIGNAL programs that implement realistic systems.

**3.3 Example**

We give in this section, an example of SIGNAL program. The purpose of this example is to illustrate the kind of rewriting the compiler has to perform. The reader interested in realistic programs written in SIGNAL is referred to [2] for the programming of a production cell controller, and to [18] for a speech processing system.

Consider a SIGNAL program called \textsc{process.alarm} which must compute a boolean-valued signal \textsc{alarm} from 3 boolean-valued signals (say sensors) \textsc{brake}, \textsc{stop.ok}, \textsc{limit.reached}. Here is an informal specification of the behavior:

- the sensor \textsc{brake} is true if the brakes of the train are activated;
- \textsc{stop.ok} is true if the train is stopped;
- \textsc{limit.reached} is true if the train goes beyond some limit it should not normally surpass;
- \textsc{alarm} must be true if the train has not stopped before the limit.

A possible implementation of \textsc{process.alarm} is the following SIGNAL equation

\[
\textsc{alarm} ::= \textsc{brake and limit.reached and (not stop.ok)}
\]

In that equation, all the signals are required to have the same clock (\textsc{alarm = brake and limit.reached and (not stop.ok)}). This means that at each instant (a reaction of the program), all the sensors are sampled and the value of \textsc{alarm} is computed.

Let us imagine a more sophisticated version of that program: a sensor is sampled only when its value is necessary. We can think of this as an improvement made by a programmer in order to reduce the communications with the execution environment of the program. The sensors \textsc{limit.reached} and \textsc{stop.ok} need to be sampled only during a braking action. And the sensor \textsc{brake} needs to be sampled only when no braking is going on. So, we introduce a state variable \textsc{braking.state} as shown of figure 5.

Let us now focus on the clock equations that lies under this program. If we denote for short \( C_1 \), \textsc{braking.next.state} by \( C' \), \textsc{brake} by \( D \), \textsc{stop.ok} by \( C_1 \), \textsc{limit.reached} by \( C_2 \) and \textsc{alarm} by \( C_3 \) we have:

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{C} & = \tilde{C'} \\
\tilde{C'} & = [D] \lor [C_1] \lor \tilde{C} \\
[C_1] & = \tilde{C}_1 \lor \tilde{C}_2 \\
[\neg C_1] & = \tilde{D} \\
\tilde{C}_3 & = \tilde{C}_1 \lor \tilde{C}_2
\end{align*}
\]
Lines (1), (3), (4) and (5) specify equalities of variables. For such equations, we choose one variable which will replace the others when they are referenced. By replacing $\hat{C}$ by $\hat{C}$ in (2) we have:

$$
\begin{align*}
\hat{C}' &= \hat{C} \\
\hat{C}_1 &= [C] \\
\hat{C}_2 &= [C] \\
\hat{C}_3 &= [C] \\
\hat{D} &= [\neg C] \\
\hat{C} &= [D] \lor [C_1] \lor \hat{C}
\end{align*}
(6)
$$

All the equations of the system can be trivially oriented from right to left except for equation (6). Indeed, the variable $\hat{C}$ appears in both sides of the equation; so, an orientation would induce a cycle. To break that cycle, let us use the extra knowledge (not apparent in the system) we have about boolean valued signals: the clock $[C_1]$ is included in $\hat{C}_1$; this is mainly due to the fact that $([C_1], [\neg C_1])$ is a partition of the clock $\hat{C}_1$. Similarly $[C] \subseteq \hat{C}$. Since $\hat{C}_1 = [C]$ we have $[C_1] \subseteq \hat{C}$ and consequently $[C] \lor \hat{C}$ can be rewritten into $\hat{C}$. A similar argument shows that $[D] \subseteq \hat{D} = [\neg C] \subseteq \hat{C}$ and $[D] \lor \hat{C} = \hat{C}$. Then the formula $[D] \lor [C_1] \lor \hat{C}$ can be rewritten into $\hat{C}$. Finally the equation (6) becomes $\hat{C} = \hat{C}$ which is trivially true and deleted from the system. In order to obtain the triangular form of the system of equations, the compiler must perform rewriting in respect to the inclusion relation among clocks. That is why a special tree representation has been introduced in the compiler to represent efficiently part of this inclusion relation. Note that in the previous example, the variable $\hat{C}$ cannot be computed by an expression in the program: it is a free variable exhibited by the compilation. This means that the execution environment must provide it as an input to the program. This can be rephrased as: “the specification does not determine the pace at which the sensors must be sampled”. Should they be sampled every meter or every milli-second, it is a choice of the environment; it is not a real feature of the alarm functionality.

### 3.4 Hierarchical representation of the equations

To meet the requirements presented above, an arborescent organization of the formulas has been defined in [8]. It speeds up the rewriting and it captures the triangularity of the system of equations. We present here the main ideas.

#### Partition tree.

Consider the boolean-valued signal $C$ of the previous example and its clock $\hat{C}$. According to the properties described in the previous sections, the pair $([C], [\neg C])$ is a partition of $\hat{C}$. Such a partition is represented by the tree in Figure 6. Since any clock can be partitioned by a condition, this basic tree can grow as its nodes are partitioned. Figure 7 represents the partition tree of the example PROCESS_ALARM of the previous section. In such a tree, an edge between a parent node and a child node captures the inclusion of the child in its parent. The root may be an arbitrary formula but the internal nodes are partitions.

#### Forest of clocks.

As any clock formula can be partitioned, the formulas originating from a SIGNAL program can be grouped into partition trees; this set of trees is called a forest of clocks. Within this forest, some trees may be one-node trees; these are clocks that have not been partitioned in the original SIGNAL program.

#### Fusion of clock trees.

In the forest of clocks, let $T$ and $T'$ be 2 trees with roots $r$ and $k$ such that a) $k$ be defined by a formula $k_1 < op > k_2$, b) $k_1$ and $k_2$ belong to the tree $T$; which means that the operands of the root $k$ are in the tree $T$. We carry out a fusion of $T'$ into $T$ by inserting $k$ into the tree $T$ as depicted in Figure 8. In Figure 8 we point out a particular node $h$ of the tree $T$. $h$ is the branching of the nodes $k_1$ and $k_2$; it is the first common ancestor of the 2 nodes. $T'$ is now a subtree of the merge tree $T''$. The fusion of 2 partition trees yields a more general tree we call clock tree.

The main idea of the insertion of the formula $k_1 < op > k_2$ is that it is inserted under the branching of its operands, at the “right hand side”. This insertion procedure has two interesting features: a) it preserves the triangularity of the system of equations, b) it optimizes the code generated by nesting if-then-else control structures.

#### Triangularity preservation.

During a depth first search (dfs) of the tree $T''$ “from left to right”, the nodes $k_1$ and $k_2$ are visited before the node $k = k_1 < op > k_2$; it means that the
ordering that makes the system be triangular is embodied in the tree.

**Code optimization.** A partition tree can be viewed as the representation of an inclusion relation. In a partition tree, a node is included in its parent. And more generally, a node is included in its ancestors.

In Figure 8 the clock \( k = k_1<op>k_2 \) is included in the clock \( h \). As a matter of fact, \( h \) being an ancestor of both \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \), we have \( k_1 \subseteq h \) and \( k_2 \subseteq h \). Consequently all of the 3 formulas \( k_1 \lor k_2 \), \( k_1 \land k_2 \) and \( k_1 \setminus k_2 \) — denoted \( k_1<op>k_2 \) — are included in \( h \). That is, the clock tree resulting from a fusion of 2 trees represents an inclusion relation. On the example `PROCESS_ALARM`, we have shown the usefulness of the inclusion relation for the rewriting. Now let us show how it can help in optimizing the code generated.

The nesting of *if-then-else* structures for code optimization is based on the remark that, if \( h \) and \( k \) are 2 clocks such that \( h \subseteq k \), then for an instant \( t \), the following implication holds:

\[
t \not\in k \implies t \not\in h.
\]

In other words, if the test \( t \in k \) fails, there is no need to test if \( t \in h \). Thus, code generation can take advantage of the inclusion relation between clocks. For example in Figure 9, code \( a \) is more efficient than code \( b \). As reported in [19] this kind of improvement can yield a code which runs 300% faster for some `SIGNAL` programs.

**Arborescent resolution**

We give here in three steps the algorithm of resolution.

1. Take a tree \( T' \) in the forest and attempt to rewrite its root \( k \) in a way that will make the operands of \( k \) belong to the same tree \( T \). If this succeeds, the root formula of \( T' \) can be inserted into \( T \) as described in 3.4 without disturbing the triangularity of \( T \).
code a.
if present(k) then
do-something-k
  if present(h) then
    do-something-h
  endif
endif

code b.
if present(k) then
do-something-k
endif
if present(h) then
do-something-h
endif

Figure 9: Nesting if-then-else control structures

2. Realize the fusion of $T$ and $T'$ to yield a tree $T''$ as described above.

After the fusion of $T$ and $T'$, a formula which had one operand in $T$ and the other one in $T'$ now has its 2 operands in the tree $T''$. So, the fusion of $T$ and $T'$ may lead to more fusions; that is the purpose of step 3.

3. Do step 1 and step 2 till the rewriting rules of step 1 no longer apply.

Step 1 is implemented using a notion of $p$-depth resolution thoroughly presented in [8]. To put it roughly, the user of the compiler can set an integer parameter $p$; this parameter is the maximum depth of the syntactic trees of the formulas manipulated during the rewriting. Setting a limit to the formulas, solves the duration and termination problems commonly encountered in rewriting systems. Step 2 is a simple tree manipulation. It raises though a question of canonicity that we illustrate on the following example.

Example. Consider again the tree in Figure 7 (redrawn in Figure 10 without some nodes which are not relevant for the current context) and consider the formulas $k_1$ and $k_2$ which are roots of some trees (not drawn). $k_1$ and $k_2$ are defined respectively by $[C_1] \lor [D]$ and $[C_2] \lor [\neg D]$. Recall that the main idea of the fusion of a tree $T'$ into a tree $T$ is that root $r'$ of $T'$ is inserted into $T$ under the branching of its operands. Following that idea, the insertion of $k_1$ and $k_2$ yields the tree depicted in Figure 11. Now consider the formula $k = k_1 \land k_2$. The same argument would trivially place $k$ as a child of $r$ (see Figure 12). But $k$ can be rewritten into another expression. Applying axioms of boolean algebra and using the inclusion relations embodied in clock trees allow to rewrite $k$ as $[C_1] \land [C_2]$. The branching of $[C_1]$ and $[C_2]$ being $[C]$, $k$ can be placed under $[C]$ (see Figure 12). As the code generation is based on if-then-else nesting, the insertion of $k$ under $[C]$ yields much more efficient code.

Canonical factorization. The previous example shows that it is important to insert a formula under the deepest possible parent. So we developed an insertion algorithm which optimizes the depth. Our algorithm has an important feature: among the potential parents of the formula, it chooses the one with the greatest depth; and we show in [1] that such
a parent is unique. That feature makes our tree structure a canonical form. The algorithm is not detailed here but the main concepts are given below:

- a BDD (Binary Decision Diagram [10]) is associated to each clock; thus the tree of clocks is transformed into a tree of BDDs;
- the problem of finding a parent for a formula is reformulated as factorizing a boolean function;
- factorizations are carried out by taking advantage of the specific properties of our tree.

As reported in [15] for LUSTRE and in [22] for the ESTEREL synchronous language, the efficiency of the code generated can be improved by the production of a partially explored automaton: that is, the compiler may pick some boolean variables and simulate statically their evolution. This static simulation yields a bigger automaton than the one of the single-loop style. But in this case, the set of equations evaluated at each reaction is smaller since the simulated boolean variables need not be computed any longer. So the code is bigger and runs faster. The problem with this style of generation is that, in the worst case, the automaton grows exponentially with the number of simulated boolean variables. Hence the need of heuristics to cleverly select the variables to be simulated.

4 Related work

The effort to generate code from a data-flow synchronous language has also been undertaken for the LUSTRE language. The compilation of LUSTRE produces an automaton; it offers as an option, a trade-off between response time and size of generated code.

The automaton may be a one-state and one-transition automaton. The transition is fired at each reaction of the program. It is labelled with a set of equations to be evaluated in order to compute the outputs. This style is termed single-loop code generation scheme. SIGNAL’s compilation produces the same kind of automaton. The major difference is that in SIGNAL, the code generated is improved by the nesting of if-then-else control structures which has been made possible by our clock inclusion tree. To our knowledge no such hierarchical inclusion information has been used in LUSTRE to improve the code generated.

5 Conclusion

In this paper we have presented the data-flow oriented language SIGNAL and we have given an overview of the boolean techniques used for its compilation. These techniques have been successfully implemented and we give here some experimental results.

Figure 13 shows the amount of computing resources required for the compilation of sample SIGNAL programs. To show the effectiveness of our arborescent representation, we compare three representations of boolean systems of equations.

- Tree and BDD (T&BDD): a tree structure together with a BDD canonical form as presented earlier in this paper.
- BDD characteristic function: the whole system of equations is represented by a single BDD; a system of equations over \( n \) boolean variables can be viewed as a subset of \( \{0, 1\}^n \). Hence it can be given a representation in
the form of a characteristic function. This representation of subsets of \( \{0, 1\}^n \) is very common in the field of hardware verification and silicon compilation [13, 24]. To solve exactly boolean equations, there is a complete algorithm which runs polynomially in the size of this \( \text{BDD} \) (see [12]). In order to justify our non-complete algorithm, we show that very often in practical cases, this \( \text{BDD} \) is too big to be computed.

- **\( \text{BDD characteristic function after T&BDD} \):** the original system of equations is transformed by a \( \text{T&BDD} \) into a tree (which is still a system of equations); then a \( \text{BDD} \) characteristic function is constructed. The difference between this system and the original one, is that some variables may be (and very often are) eliminated due to their equivalence with other variables. So, the triangularized system has less variables.

The representations are compared in terms of memory (number of \( \text{BDD} \) nodes) and time (Unix user-time). The measures are conducted on a SUN4/Sparc10 with 64MB main memory. Manipulations of \( \text{BDDs} \) use a UC Berkeley \( \text{BDD} \) package [23].

For the experimentation we set a 200MB virtual memory limit and a 40mn cpu time limit.

As it is shown on the table 13, most of the measures that involve a characteristic function were unable to compute within the resource limits. It appears clearly that characteristic functions are impractical.
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