Restructuring and Destructuring

Martin Ward

Reader in Software Engineering

martin@gkc.org.uk

Software Technology Research Lab De Montfort University

Restructuring Transformations

An unstructured program (action system) can be made more structured using these transformations:

- Expand Call: Replace an action call by a copy of the action body
- Substitute and Delete: Apply Expand_Call to all the calls of the selected action, and then delete the action (provided the action does not call itself!)
- Remove Recursion in Action: In a regular action system, an action which calls itself can be transformed into an action which does not call itself by introducing loops
- Floop to While: a suitable Floop can be transformed directly to a while loop. In the general case, a flag may be needed.

Restructuring Transformations

- Merge Calls in Action: Attempt to merge two or more calls to the same action into a single call
- Delete Rest: In a regular action system, no action call can return, so all the rest of the statements after an action call can be deleted
- Delete Item: An action which is never called is "dead code" and can be deleted
- Simplify Action System: Applys the above transformations to simplify an action system as much as possible
- Simplify Item: An action system containing a single action can be converted to a loop

The next few slides illustrate each of these transformations.

Expand Call

 $\begin{array}{ll} \mbox{inhere} &\equiv \mbox{inhere}(\mbox{ var }); \begin{tabular}{ll} \mbox{call more} &= \mbox{end} \\ \mbox{more} &\equiv \mbox{if} \mbox{ $m=1$} \\ \mbox{then $p:=$ number}[i]; \mbox{ line}:=\mbox{line} \mbox{ $+$ ", " $+$ p fi;} \\ \mbox{last}:=\mbox{item}[i]; \mbox{ call l end} \\ \end{array}$

Expand Call

```
 \begin{array}{ll} \mbox{inhere} &\equiv \mbox{inhere}(\mbox{ var }); \begin{tabular}{ll} \mbox{call more} &= \mbox{end} \\ \mbox{more} &\equiv \mbox{if} \mbox{ } m = 1 \\ \mbox{then } p := \mbox{number}[i]; \mbox{ line} := \mbox{line} \mbox{+ ", " + } p \mbox{ fi}; \\ \mbox{last} := \mbox{item}[i]; \mbox{ call } l \mbox{ end} \\ \end{tabular}
```

becomes:

```
 \begin{array}{ll} \mbox{inhere} &\equiv \mbox{inhere}(\mbox{ var }); \\ \mbox{if } m=1 \\ \mbox{then } p:=\mbox{number}[i]; \mbox{ line}:=\mbox{line} + ", " + p \mbox{ fi}; \\ \mbox{last}:=\mbox{item}[i]; \mbox{ call } l \mbox{ end} \\ \mbox{more} &\equiv \mbox{if } m=1 \\ \mbox{then } p:=\mbox{number}[i]; \mbox{ line}:=\mbox{line} + ", " + p \mbox{ fi}; \\ \mbox{last}:=\mbox{item}[i]; \mbox{ call } l \mbox{ end} \\ \end{array}
```

If this was the only call to more, then the action can be deleted.

Substitute and Delete

If an action does not call itself, then Substitute_and_Delete applies Expand_Call to each call of the action, and then deletes the action.

```
more \equiv if m = 1 then p := number[i];
line := line + ", " + p fi;
last := item[i];
i := i + 1;
if i = (n + 1) then call alldone fi;
p_1( var );
call more end
```

```
more \equiv if m = 1 then p := number[i];
line := line + ", " + p fi;
last := item[i];
i := i + 1;
if i = (n + 1) then call alldone fi;
p_1( var );
call more end
```

```
more \equiv do if m = 1 then p := \text{number}[i];
line := line ++ '', '' ++ p fi;
last := item[i];
i := i + 1;
if i = (n + 1) then call alldone fi;
p_1( var ) od end
```

Sometimes a double loop is needed.

```
more \equiv i := i + 1;

if i < n + 1 then call more

elsif B1?(i) then p_1( var )

elsif B2?(i) then call more fi;

p_3( var );

call alldone end
```

Sometimes a double loop is needed.

```
more \equiv i := i + 1;

if i < n + 1 then call more

elsif B1?(i) then p_1( var )

elsif B2?(i) then call more fi;

p_3( var );

call alldone end
```

```
more \equiv do do i := i + 1;

if i < n + 1 then exit

elsif B1?(i) then p_1( var )

elsif B2?(i) then exit fi;

p_3( var );

call alldone od od end
```

Take Outside Loop

do if
$$X = 1$$
 then $Y := 1; X := 0$; exit(2)
elsif $X = 2$
then $Y := 1; X := 0$; exit(2)
else $X := X - Y$ fi od

Take Outside Loop

do if
$$X = 1$$
 then $Y := 1; X := 0$; exit(2
elsif $X = 2$
then $Y := 1; X := 0$; exit(2)
else $X := X - Y$ fi od

```
do do if X = 1 then exit(1)
elsif X = 2
then exit(1)
else X := X - Y fi od;
Y := 1; X := 0; exit(1) od
```

Double To Single Loop

```
do do i := i + 1;

if i < n + 1 then exit

elsif B1?(i) then p_1( var ); exit(2)

elsif B2?(i) then exit

else exit(2) fi od od
```

Double To Single Loop

```
do do i := i + 1;
if i < n + 1 then exit
elsif B1?(i) then p_1( var ); exit(2)
elsif B2?(i) then exit
else exit(2) fi od od
```

```
do i := i + 1;

if i < n + 1 then skip

elsif B1?(i) then p_1( var ); exit

elsif B2?(i) then skip

else exit fi od
```

do i := i + 1;if i < n + 1 then skip elsif B1?(i) then p_1(var); exit elsif B2?(i) then skip else exit fi od

```
do i := i + 1;
   if i < n+1 then skip
   elsif B1?(i) then p_1(var); exit
   elsif B2?(i) then skip
                else exit fi od
becomes:
fl_flag1 := 0;
while fl_flag1 = 0 do
  i := (i+1);
  if i < (n+1) then fl_flag1 := 0
  elsif B1?(i) then p_1(var); fl_flag1 := 1
  elsif B2?(i) then fl_flag1 := 0
                else fl_flag1 := 1 fi od;
```

Simpler loop: do i := (i + 1);if $(n + 1) \leq i \wedge B1?(i)$ then exit(1) elsif $(n + 1) \leq i \wedge \neg B2?(i)$ then exit(1) elsif i < (n + 1)then skip fi od;

Simpler loop: do i := (i + 1);if $(n + 1) \leq i \wedge B1?(i)$ then exit(1) elsif $(n + 1) \leq i \wedge \neg B2?(i)$ then exit(1) elsif i < (n + 1)then skip fi od;

becomes:

$$\begin{split} &i:=(i+1);\\ &\text{while } \neg \mathsf{B1?}(i) \ \land \ \mathsf{B2?}(i) \ \lor \ i < (n+1) \ \mathbf{do}\\ &i:=(i+1) \ \mathbf{od}; \end{split}$$

Note that the statement i := i + 1 had to be copied.

Merge Calls in Action

```
K \equiv if item[i] \neq last
then !P write(line var os);
line := "";
m := 0;
inhere(var);
call more fi;
call more end
```

Merge the two calls into one:

Merge Calls in Action

```
K \equiv if item[i] \neq last
then !P write(line var os);
line := "";
m := 0;
inhere(var);
call more fi;
call more end
```

Merge the two calls into one: $K \equiv if item[i] \neq last$ then !P write(line var os); line := ""; m := 0;inhere(var) fi; Call more end

Delete Rest

In a **regular** action system, any statements immediately following a **call** can be deleted.

Similarly, any statements following an **exit** can be deleted.

x := y; call A; x := x + 1

becomes:

x := y; call A

Simplify Item

If a regular action system contains a single action, then there can only be two types of call:

- Calls to the action itself
- \checkmark Calls to the terminating action (Z)

The action system is replaced by a double loop:

- Calls to the action itself are replaced by exit
- \checkmark Calls to Z are replaced by exit(2)

In simple cases, the double loop may be converted to a single loop, or eliminated altogether (if there are no calls to the action itself).

Assembler Migration

An Intel assembler program to compute a GCD:

.model small .code mov ax,12 mov bx,8 compare: cmp ax,bx theend je ja greater sub bx,ax jmp compare greater: sub ax, bx jmp compare theend: nop

end

WSL Translation

```
var \langle flag_z := 0, flag_c := 0 \rangle:
   actions A_S_start :
   A_S_start \equiv ax := 12;
                 bx := 8;
                 call compare end
   compare \equiv if ax = bx then flag_z := 1 else flag_z := 0 fi;
                if ax < bx then flag_c := 1 else flag_c := 0 fi;
                 if flag_z = 1 then call theend fi;
                 if flag_z = 0 \wedge \text{flag_c} = 0
                   then call greater fi;
                 if bx = ax then flag_z := 1 else flag_z := 0 fi;
                 if bx < ax then flag_c := 1 else flag_c := 0 fi;
                 bx := bx - ax;
                 call compare;
                 call greater end
   greater \equiv if ax = bx then flag_z := 1 else flag_z := 0 fi;
               if ax < bx then flag_c := 1 else flag_c := 0 fi;
               ax := ax - bx;
               call compare;
               call theend end
   theend \equiv call Z end endactions end
```

Flag Removal

```
actions A S start :
A_S_start \equiv ax := 12;
              bx := 8;
              call compare end
compare \equiv if ax = bx
               then if ax < bx
                        then call theend
                        else call theend fi
                else if ax \ge bx
                       then call greater fi fi;
             bx := (bx - ax);
             call compare;
             call greater end
greater \equiv ax := (ax - bx);
            call compare;
           call theend end
theend \equiv call Z end endactions
```

Collapse Action System

Simplify

ax := 12; bx := 8;while $ax \neq bx$ do if $ax \ge bx$ then ax := ax - bxelse bx := bx - ax fi od

Program Metrics

Metric	Raw WSL	Flags	Collapse	Simplify
Statements	36	18	10	6
Expressions	40	14	14	12
McCabe	9	4	4	3
Control/Data	Flow 45	23	14	12
Branch–Loop	8	9	1	1
Structural	242	143	58	40

Destructuring Transformations

A *restructuring transformation* changes the structure of a program without changing the sequence of state changes which occur during the execution of the program.

Such a transformation preserves the *operational semantics* of the program.

For example:

if B then S_1 else S_2 fi

is equivalent to:

if $\neg B$ then S_2 else S_1 fi

Destructuring Transformations

Assignment merging is *not* a restructuring transformation:

 $x := e_1; x := e_2$

is equivalent to:

$$x := e_2[e_1/x]$$

For example:

$$x := 2 * x; \ x := x + 1$$

is equivalent to:

$$x := 2 * x + 1$$

The first program has two state changes, but the second has only one, so these are not *operationally* equivalent.

Destructuring Transformations

One method to prove the correctness of a proposed restructuring transformation:

- 1. Convert the first program to a regular action system with no structured statements
- 2. Convert the second program to a regular action system with no structured statements
- 3. Transform the two action systems to a common format

This can sometimes be easier than trying to transform one program directly into the other.

Convert to an Action System

Any program **S** is equivalent to the regular action system: **actions** start :

start \equiv **S**; call Z end endactions

Now, process structured statements in ${\bf S}$ from the top down, adding new actions to the action system as required.

Destructuring A Sequence

Suppose we have an action containing a sequence of statements:

 $A_0 \equiv \mathbf{S}_1; \, \mathbf{S}_2; \, \ldots; \, \mathbf{S}_n; \, \mathbf{call} \, B \, \mathbf{end}$

This is equivalent to the set of actions:

 $A_0 \equiv S_1$; call A_1 end $A_1 \equiv S_2$; call A_2 end $A_{n-1} \equiv S_n$; call B end

Destructuring a Conditional

 $A_0 \equiv \text{if } \mathbf{B}_1 \text{ then } \mathbf{S}_1$ elsif $\mathbf{B}_2 \text{ then } \mathbf{S}_2$ elsif \dots else \mathbf{S}_n fi; call B end

This is equivalent to:

- $A_0 \equiv$ if B_1 then call A_1 elsif B_2 then call A_2 elsif ... else call A_n fi end
- $A_1 \equiv \mathbf{S}_1$; call B end

 $A_n \equiv \mathbf{S}_n$; call B end

. . .

Destructuring a While Loop

 $A_0 \equiv$ while **B** do **S** od; call B end

This is equivalent to:

 $A_0 \equiv \text{if B then call } A_1 \text{ else call } B \text{ fi end}$

 $A_1 \equiv \mathbf{S}; \text{ call } A_0 \text{ end}$

To destructure an Floop, first absorb the following **call** into the loop:

 $A_0 \equiv \text{do S od}; \text{ call } B \text{ end}$

is transformed to:

 $A_0 \equiv \text{do S}' \text{ od end}$

where S' is S with each exit(n) with terminal value 1 replaced by call B (i.e. every exit which could terminate the loop).

In other words, any **exit** which can terminate the outermost loop is replaced by **call** B.

Then replace the loop with a **call** to the action:

 $A_0 \equiv \mathbf{S}'; \text{ call } A_0 \text{ end}$

This is the opposite of Remove_Recursion_In_Action.

```
An example:
A_0 \equiv \mathbf{do} \text{ inhere}(\mathbf{var});
            do if m = 1
                  then p := \text{number}[i]; line := line ++ ", " ++ p fi;
                last := item[i]; i := (i + 1);
                if i = (n+1)
                  then !P write(line var os); exit(2)
                                                            fi;
                m := 1;
                if item[i] \neq last
                  then !P write(line var os);
                         line := ''';
                         m := 0;
                         exit(1) fi od od;
        call Z end
```

Absorb the call:

```
A_0 \equiv \mathbf{do} \text{ inhere}(\mathbf{var});
            do if m = 1
                   then p := \text{number}[i]; line := line ++ ", " ++ p fi;
                last := item[i]; i := (i + 1);
                if i = (n+1)
                   then !P write(line var os); call Z fi;
                m := 1;
                if item[i] \neq last
                   then !P write(line var os);
                         line := '"';
                         m := 0;
                         exit(1) fi od od end
```

Remove the loop:

```
A_0 \equiv \text{inhere}(\text{ var });
        do if m = 1
               then p := \text{number}[i]; line := \text{line} + \text{``, `'} + p fi;
            last := item[i]; i := (i + 1);
            if i = (n+1)
               then !P write(line var os); call Z fi;
            m := 1;
            if item[i] \neq last
               then !P write(line var os);
                      line := ''';
                      m := 0;
                      exit(1) fi od;
        call A_0 end
```

Processing the inner loop.

Process the sequence and then absorb the **call**:

```
A_0 \equiv \text{inhere}(\text{ var }); \text{ call } A_1 \text{ end}
A_1 \equiv \text{do if } m = 1
                then p := \text{number}[i]; line := line ++ ", " ++ p fi;
             last := item[i]; i := (i + 1);
             if i = (n+1)
                then !P write(line var os); call Z fi;
             m := 1;
             if item[i] \neq last
                then !P write(line var os);
                       line := ''';
                       m := 0;
                       call A_0 | fi od end
```

Processing the inner loop. Remove the loop:

```
A_0 \equiv \text{inhere}(\text{ var }); \text{ call } A_1 \text{ end}
A_1 \equiv \text{if } m = 1
           then p := \text{number}[i]; line := line ++ ", " ++ p fi;
         last := item[i]; i := (i + 1);
         if i = (n+1)
           then !P write(line var os); call Z fi;
        m := 1;
         if item[i] \neq last
           then !P write(line var os);
                  line := '"';
                  m := 0;
                  call A_0 fi;
         call A_1 end
```

Loop Inversion

Some transformations can be proved correct by converting both programs to action systems and analysing the action systems using Expand_Call (and its inverse), case analysis, renaming etc.

For example, to prove that P_1 :

```
do S<sub>1</sub>;
    if B then exit fi;
    S<sub>2</sub> od
```

is equivalent to P_2 :

 $S_1;$ while $\neg B$ do

 $S_2;$ S_1 od

where \mathbf{S}_1 and \mathbf{S}_2 are both *proper sequences*.

Loop Inversion

 P_2 translates to this action system:

actions A_0 :

 $A_0 \equiv \mathbf{S}_1$; call A_1 end

- $A_1 \equiv \text{if B then call } Z \text{ else call } A_2 \text{ fi end}$
- $A_2 \equiv \mathbf{S}_2$; call A_3 end
- $A_3 \equiv \mathbf{S}_1$; call A_1 end endactions

 P_1 translates to this action system:

actions A_0 :

 $A_0 \equiv \mathbf{S}_1$; call A_1 end

- $A_1 \equiv \text{if B then call } Z \text{ else call } A_2 \text{ fi end}$
- $A_2 \equiv \mathbf{S}_2$; call A_0 end endactions

Loop Inversion

Expand the call A_0 in A_2 :

 $A_2 \equiv \mathbf{S}_2; \ \mathbf{S}_1; \ \mathbf{call} \ A_1 \ \mathbf{end}$

Destructure the sequence:

- $A_2 \equiv \mathbf{S}_2$; call A_3 end
- $A_3 \equiv \mathbf{S}_1$; call A_1 end

The two action systems are now identical.

```
To prove that the program P_1:
while B do S od
```

```
is equivalent to P_2:
```

```
while B do S; if B \wedge Q then S fi od
```

```
P_1 as an action system:
```

```
actions A_0:
```

 $A_0 \equiv$ while B do S od; call Z end endactions

Destructure the action system:

actions A_0 :

 $A_0 \equiv$ if **B** then call A_1 else call Z fi end $A_1 \equiv$ **S**; call A_0 end endactions

 P_2 as an action system:

actions A_0 :

 $A_0 \equiv$ while B do S; if B \land Q then S fi od; call Z end endactions

Destructure the action system:

actions A_0 :

 $A_0 \equiv \text{if B then call } A_1 \text{ else call } Z \text{ fi end}$

 $A_1 \equiv \mathbf{S}; \text{ call } A_2 \text{ end}$

- $A_2 \equiv \text{if } \mathbf{B} \land \mathbf{Q} \text{ then } A_3 \text{ else call } A_0 \text{ fi end}$
- $A_3 \equiv \mathbf{S}$; call A_0 end endactions

Consider the P_1 action system again:

actions A_0 :

 $A_0 \equiv \text{if B then call } A_1 \text{ else call } Z \text{ fi end}$

 $A_1 \equiv \mathbf{S}$; call A_0 end endactions

 P_2 has an action $A_3 \equiv \mathbf{S}$; call A_0 end so we add this action to P_1 and note that any call to A_1 can be replaced by a call to A_3 .

In particular, A_0 is equivalent to:

 $A'_0 \equiv$ if **B** then call A_3 else call Z fi end

Also, P_2 has if **B** \wedge **Q** then ... fi where P_1 has call A_0 .

So replace call A_0 in A_1 by the equivalent statement:

if $\mathbf{B} \wedge \mathbf{Q}$ then call A_0' else call A_0 fi

Unroll call A'_0 in A_1 : actions A_0 : $A_0 \equiv \text{if B then call } A_1 \text{ else call } Z \text{ fi end}$ $A_1 \equiv \mathbf{S}$; if $\mathbf{B} \wedge \mathbf{Q}$ then if \mathbf{B} then call A_3 else call Z fi else call A_0 fi end $A_3 \equiv \mathbf{S}$; call A_0 end endactions Simplify: actions A_0 : $A_0 \equiv \text{if B then call } A_1 \text{ else call } Z \text{ fi end}$ $A_1 \equiv \mathbf{S}$; if $\mathbf{B} \wedge \mathbf{Q}$ then call A_3 else call A_0 fi end $A_3 \equiv \mathbf{S}$; call A_0 end endactions

Destructure:

actions A_0 :

- $A_0 \equiv \text{if B then call } A_1 \text{ else call } Z \text{ fi end}$
- $A_1 \equiv \mathbf{S}; \text{ call } A_2 \text{ end}$
- $A_2 \equiv \text{if } \mathbf{B} \land \mathbf{Q}$ then call A_3 else call A_0 fi end
- $A_3 \equiv \mathbf{S}$; call A_0 end endactions

This is identical to the destructured version of P_2 .

Entire Loop Unrolling

To prove that P_1 :

while B do S od

```
is equivalent to P_3:
```

while B do S; while B \wedge Q do S od od

Convert P_3 to an action system:

actions A_0 :

$$A_0 \equiv \text{if B then call } A_1 \text{ else call } Z \text{ fi end}$$

 $A_1 \equiv \mathbf{S}; \text{ call } A_2 \text{ end}$

 $A_2 \equiv \text{if } \mathbf{B} \land \mathbf{Q}$ then call A_3 else call A_0 fi end

 $A_3 \equiv \mathbf{S}$; call A_2 end endactions

This is the same as P_2 (which we have proved to be equivalent to P_1) except that there is a **call** A_2 in the body of A_3 instead of **call** A_0 .

Entire Loop Unrolling

actions A_0 : $A_0 \equiv \text{if B then call } A_1 \text{ else call } Z \text{ fi end}$ $A_1 \equiv S; \text{ call } A_2 \text{ end}$ $A_2 \equiv \text{if B} \land Q \text{ then call } A_3 \text{ else call } A_0 \text{ fi end}$ $A_3 \equiv S; \text{ call } A_2 \text{ end endactions}$

Case analysis to prove call A_2 is equivalent to call A_0 in A_3 :

- 1. If **B** is false or **Q** is false, then call A_2 leads to call A_0
- 2. If \mathbf{B} is true and \mathbf{Q} is true, then
 - (a) call A_2 leads, via call A_3 , to execute **S** and call A_2 , while
 - (b) call A_0 leads, via call A_1 , to execute **S** and call A_2

Entire Loop Unrolling

Another way to prove that call A_2 is equivalent to call A_0 in A_3 is to replace call A_2 by the equivalent statement: if $\mathbf{B} \wedge \mathbf{Q}$ then call A_2 else call A_2 fi Expand each call and simplify: actions A_0 : $A_0 \equiv \text{if B then call } A_1 \text{ else call } Z \text{ fi end}$ $A_1 \equiv \mathbf{S}; \text{ call } A_2 \text{ end}$ $A_2 \equiv \text{if } \mathbf{B} \wedge \mathbf{Q}$ then call A_3 else call A_0 fi end $A_3 \equiv \mathbf{S};$ if **B** \wedge **Q** then **S**; call A_1 else call A_0 fi end endactions Replace **S**; call A_1 by call A_0 (since **B** is true here). We have: $A_3 \equiv \mathbf{S}; \text{ call } A_0 \text{ end}$