

Minotaur: A SIMD-Oriented Synthesizing Superoptimizer

Zhengyang Liu
liuz@cs.utah.edu
University of Utah
USA

Stefan Mada
stefan.mada@utah.edu
University of Utah
USA

John Regehr
regehr@cs.utah.edu
University of Utah
USA

Abstract

Minotaur is a superoptimizer for LLVM’s intermediate representation that focuses on integer SIMD instructions, both portable and specific to x86-64. We created it to attack problems in finding missing peephole optimizations for SIMD instructions—this is challenging because there are many such instructions and they can be semantically complex. Minotaur runs a hybrid synthesis algorithm where instructions are enumerated concretely, but literal constants are generated by the solver. We use Alive2 as a verification engine; to do this we modified it to support synthesis and also to support a large subset of Intel’s vector instruction sets (SSE, AVX, AVX2, and AVX-512). Minotaur finds many profitable optimizations that are missing from LLVM. It achieves limited speedups on the integer parts of SPEC CPU2017, around 1.3%, and it speeds up the test suite for the libYUV library by 2.2%, on average, and by 1.64x maximum, when targeting an Intel Cascade Lake processor.

1 Introduction

Generating high-quality code for vector instruction set extensions remains challenging. For programs in high-level languages, it can be difficult to extract the necessary parallelism and to map source-level constructs onto semantically rich SIMD instructions. On the other hand, writing vector code in assembly is slow and expensive, and makes it difficult to support a wide variety of platforms. A popular middle ground—mostly writing high-level code, but employing SIMD intrinsic functions in hot loops—is workable but has its own issues such as an impedance mismatch where mid-level compiler optimizations lack semantics for intrinsics and cannot optimize around them effectively.

This paper presents Minotaur, a synthesis-based superoptimizer for the LLVM intermediate representation [15], that focuses on supporting LLVM’s portable vector operations as well as Intel-specific intrinsics. Our goal is to automatically discover useful optimizations that LLVM cannot currently perform. Since Minotaur’s search-based approach requires significant compilation time, its primary intended audience is compiler developers, who can then implement the missing transformations. Even so, we have implemented a cache that allows synthesis results to persist across compilations; with a warm cache, the compile-time overhead when building SPEC CPU 2017 is 26%.¹ Our current work is limited to integer operations; it is not technically difficult to support floating point operations, but the current state of the art in SMT solving is simply too slow to make this practical.

Minotaur works on code fragments that do not span multiple loop iterations; it is based on the assumption that existing compiler optimization passes such as loop unrolling, software pipelining, and automatic vectorization will create the necessary opportunities for its optimizations to work effectively. For example, consider this

loop, in C, from the compression/decompression utility `gzip`, where `name` is the base address of a string and `p` is a pointer into the string:

```
do {  
    if (*--p == '.') *p = '_';  
} while (p != name);
```

When this loop is compiled by LLVM 15 for a target supporting AVX2 vector extensions, this code is found inside the loop:

```
%1 = shufflevector %0, <31, 30, 29, ... , 0>  
%2 = icmp eq %1, <46, 46, 46, ... , 46>  
%3 = shufflevector %2, <31, 30, 29, ... , 0>
```

The first `shufflevector` reverses a 32-byte chunk of the string, the `icmp` instruction checks which elements of the chunk are equal to 46 (ASCII for the period character), and then the second `shufflevector` reverses the vector containing the results of the computation. This code cannot be optimized further by LLVM; when it is lowered to object code and executed on an Intel Cascade Lake processor, it requires 13 uOps, or “micro-operations,” processor-internal RISC-like instructions that modern x86 implementations actually execute. This is according to LLVM-MCA, LLVM’s machine code analyzer, which estimates execution costs using a microarchitectural model.

Minotaur, on the other hand, observes that the vector reversals are unnecessary, and that this code fragment performs the same job as the original instruction sequence, but more cheaply (3 uOps):

```
%1 = icmp eq %0, <46, 46, 46, ... , 46>
```

Our work builds on the Alive2 translation validation tool for LLVM IR [20], to which we added support for 165 vector instructions, and LLVM-MCA [10], which we use to build a cost model. On top of these foundations, we implemented a synthesis engine that searches for improved code sequences, a cache that stores previously derived optimizations, and an LLVM plugin that runs as a middle-end optimization pass. We evaluate Minotaur on a variety of benchmarks, showing that it can achieve speedups of up to 2.3x.

2 Background

2.1 Vectors in LLVM

LLVM uses a typed, SSA-based intermediate representation (IR). It supports a derived *vector type*; for example, a vector with eight lanes, where each element is a 64-bit integer, would have type `<8 x i64>`. Many LLVM instructions, such as arithmetic operations, logical operations, and pointer arithmetic, can operate on vectors as well as scalars. IR-level vectors are target-independent; backends attempt to lower vector operations to native SIMD instructions, if available.

Beyond the vertical ALU instructions that are element-wise vector versions of scalar instructions, LLVM supports a variety of horizontal vector reduction intrinsics and an assortment of memory intrinsics such as vector load and store, strided load and store, and scatter/gather. Additionally, there are three vector-specific data movement instructions: *extractelement* retrieves the element at a specified index from a vector, *insertelement* non-destructively creates a new vector where one element of an old vector has

¹Minotaur’s effect on compile time in the case of a cold cache is somewhat arbitrary, since the aggressiveness of its synthesis algorithm is highly tunable.

been replaced with a specified value, and *shufflevector* returns a new vector that is a permutation of two input vectors using elements whose indices are specified by a constant mask vector. Finally, to provide direct access to platform-specific vector instructions, LLVM provides numerous intrinsic functions such as `@llvm.x86.avx512.mask.cvttps2dq.512`, aka “convert with truncation packed single-precision floating-point values to packed signed doubleword integer values.”

2.2 Alive2

Alive2 [20] is an open-source, solver-based tool that takes a pair of functions in LLVM IR and attempts to either prove that the second one refines the first, or else provides a counterexample showing that a refinement relation does not hold. When refinement holds in both directions, two functions are equivalent. However, an equivalence checker is unsuitable for translation validation of LLVM optimizations: non-trivial refinements—transformations that are legal in one direction, but that cannot be soundly reversed—are very common.

2.3 LLVM-MCA

Predicting throughput of code running on modern microprocessors is not straightforward. To help developers improve performance-critical code, the LLVM Machine Code Analyzer (LLVM-MCA) [10] was created. It is an interactive tool that emits a graphical depiction of pipeline behavior, but its functionality can also be accessed programmatically, and this is what Minotaur does. A problem with LLVM-MCA (and all similar tools that we are aware of) is that it is imperfect: in some cases it either over- or under-estimates the cost of certain code sequences [22]. This is a limitation that we simply live with.

3 Synthesizing Optimizations using Minotaur

Minotaur is invoked by loading it into LLVM’s optimization pipeline as a plugin. For every integer typed, or vector-of-integer typed, SSA value in the code being compiled, Minotaur performs a backwards slice following dataflow edges, control flow edges, and memory dependence edges to extract a loop-free program fragment. This fragment is used as the specification for a synthesis problem, where the objective is to synthesize a new program fragment that refines the old one and is cheaper, using LLVM-MCA as a cost model. When a cheaper fragment is found, Minotaur rewrites the code just like a non-superoptimizing compiler pass would, and it also caches the rewrite to avoid repeated synthesis calls. Figure 1 provides a high-level view of how Minotaur works; the rest of this section explains these steps in detail.

3.1 Representing and Caching Rewrites

Minotaur stores each potential optimization as a tuple: (F, V, R) where F is a function in the LLVM intermediate representation (IR), V is an SSA value from that function, and R is a rewrite—an expression in Minotaur’s own intermediate representation that describes a different way to compute V in F . Rewrites are directed acyclic graphs containing nodes that represent operations, and edges representing data flow. Although the elements found in Minotaur IR are similar to those found in LLVM IR, we could not reuse LLVM IR to represent rewrites since LLVM IR does not support incomplete code fragments, and also rewrites must contain enough information

to support connecting the new code in the rewrite to code in the unoptimized function.

To support caching, rewrites must be serializable. The F and V elements of rewrite tuples can be serialized using existing LLVM functionality, and we created a simple S-expression syntax for serializing the R part. Rewrites are cached in a Redis instance—this implementation choice allows the cache to be persistent across multiple Minotaur runs and also makes the cache network-accessible.

Figure 2 shows the syntax of the IR. For example, if a 32-bit value is replaced by left shift by one bit position, the textual format for the expression is `(shl (val i32 %0), (const i32 1), i32)`.

3.2 Correctness for a Peephole Slicer

Peephole optimizers work because an optimization that is correct for a fragment of a program is also correct in the context of the entire program. Let us look at this in a bit more detail. The top-level correctness criterion for an optimizer is that the optimized code must refine the unoptimized code. The Alive2 paper [20] discusses refinement for LLVM functions in detail. A peephole optimizer works by finding a program fragment that can be rewritten. For example, consider a peephole that rewrites $y = x \times 8$ as $y = x \ll 3$, where x and y are bitvectors. This rewrite is a refinement: $x \times 8 \Rightarrow x \ll 3$. The value of y is going to be consumed by subsequent instructions, let us call the function computed by those instructions f . Since refinement is compositional, $f(x \times 8) \Rightarrow f(x \ll 3)$. Using this kind of argument, we can establish whole-function (and whole-program) refinement. To be correct, Minotaur’s slice extraction algorithm needs to faithfully extract an overapproximation of how a given SSA value is computed. As long as it does this, the compositionality of refinement guarantees that its rewrites will be correct.

3.3 Extracting Slices

The state of the art in program synthesis is, at present, not even close to being able to synthesize, from scratch, an optimized version of an arbitrary LLVM function found in the wild. Instead, Minotaur uses a divide-and-conquer approach. However, it is fundamentally more aggressive than Bansal and Aiken’s approach [4], which extracts a small window of sequential instructions, and it is also more aggressive than Souper [25], which refused to consider memory operations and took a very limited view of control flow.

Algorithm 1 shows Minotaur’s value extraction algorithm; it takes an SSA value V in a source function and produces a well-formed, loop-free LLVM function that returns an overapproximation of the specified SSA value. The value extraction algorithm can be split into two stages. In the first stage, Minotaur extracts the SSA values involved in the computation, and their uses. These values are extracted with a depth-first search; during the search, two sets, *Harvest* and *Unknown*, are propagated which will be used in the second stage for constructing the slice. To limit the size of the fragment, we set a user-defined depth limitation for the search. Minotaur uses LLVM’s LoopInfo pass [16] to identify loops in the source function. If value V is in a loop, Minotaur will only extract values that are defined inside the loop. All unsupported operations, operations that are beyond the depth limit, and operations that are outside the loop are discarded and replaced with free inputs.

Minotaur extracts the condition of conditional branch instructions, since conditions carry control flow information that is useful during synthesis. Similarly, when it extracts a load from memory,




Figure 1. Overview of how Minotaur works, and how it fits into the LLVM optimization pipeline

```

Op ::= Inst | Constant | Value
Inst ::= (BinaryOp Op, Op, Type) |
         (UnaryInst Op, Type) |
         (ConvInst Op, Type) |
         (Intrinsic Op, Op) |
         (icmp Cond Op Op) |
         (insertelement Op, Op, Op) |
         (extractelement Op, Op) |
         (shufflevector Op, Op, Constant)
Constant ::= (const Type number-literal)
Value ::= (val Type llvm-identifier)
Type ::= isz <elements × isz>
BinaryInst ::= add | sub | mul | udiv | sdiv |
              xor | and | or | ashr | lshr | shl
UnaryInst ::= ctpop | ctlz | ctz | bswap | bitreverse
ConvInst ::= zext | sext | trunc
Cond ::= eq | ne | ult | ule | slt | sle
Intrinsic ::= avx2.pavg.b ... (165 intrinsics in total)
    
```

Figure 2. Syntax for Minotaur rewrites

Minotaur consults LLVM’s MemorySSA pass [17] to get a list of stores that potentially influence the loaded value. MemorySSA marks memory operations with one of the three memory access tags: MemoryDef, MemoryUse, and MemoryPhi. Each memory operation is associated with a version of memory state. A MemoryDef can be a store, a memory fence, or any operation that creates a new version of the memory state. A MemoryPhi combines multiple MemoryDefs when control flow edges merge. A MemoryUse is a memory instruction that does not modify memory, it only reads the memory state created by MemoryDef or MemoryPhi; a load instruction is always a MemoryUse. Because it must overapproximate, Minotaur is conservative when finding the load-affecting store: it starts from the loads MemoryUse’s memory version and walks along the MemorySSA’s def-use chain, and when the associated memory operation is a MemoryDef, it checks if the operation is a store and pushes the stored value into the worklist. Minotaur gives up when the associated memory version is tagged with MemoryPhi, or when the version is tagged with MemoryDef but the operation is not a store instruction.

In the second stage, Minotaur builds the extracted function, which first clones the original function, and then deletes all instructions that are not in the extracted fragment. Minotaur then

Algorithm 1 SSA Slice Extraction Algorithm

```

1: function EXTRACTSLICE(F: Function, V: Value)
2:   Harvested ← ∅
3:   Unknown ← ∅
4:   WorkList ← { V }
5:   while WorkList is not empty do           ▷ Value Extraction
6:     I ← WorkList.pop()
7:     if I is visited then
8:       continue
9:     Mark I as visited
10:    if depth limit exceeded ∨ I is unsupported then
11:      Insert I into Unknown
12:      continue
13:    if V is in a loop ∧ I is not in V’s loop then
14:      Insert I into Unknown
15:      continue
16:    Insert I into Harvested
17:    if I is a Load instruction then
18:      M ← I’s linked MemoryPhi or MemoryDef
19:      if M is a MemoryDef ∧ M is a store then
20:        Push M’s stored value into WorkList
21:    else
22:      for all operand Op in I do
23:        Push Op’s definition into WorkList
24:    T ← terminator of I’s basicblock
25:    if T is a conditional branch instruction then
26:      Push T’s condition into WorkList
27:    Insert every terminator instruction in F to Harvested
28:    Remove instrs. in F except those in Harvested
29:    Delete all the backedges in F
30:    Add values in Unknown to F’s argument list
31:    Create return instruction for V
32:    return F
    
```

deletes all the loop backedges so that the extracted function is loop-free. Finally, a return instruction is added to return the SSA value that we are interested in.

The size of the extracted slice is important, and is controlled by the slicer’s depth parameter. If too few instructions are sliced, the extracted code will be a broad overapproximation, making it difficult to find profitable optimizations. On the other hand, if too many instructions are sliced, the extracted code may overwhelm the solver, causing it to timeout during the synthesis phase. For all

Algorithm 2 semantics of $\{avx|avx2|avx512\}.pavg.\{b|w\}$

```

1: PAVG<lanes, width, masked>(Sa, Sb, PassThrough, Mask)
2: for each i in range [0 to lanes - 1]
3:   if masked  $\wedge$   $\neg$  Mask[i] then
4:     Sret[i].val  $\leftarrow$  PassThrough[i].val
5:     Sret[i].poison  $\leftarrow$  PassThrough[i].poison
6:   else
7:     Sret[i].val  $\leftarrow$  (Sa[i].val +width Sb[i].val +width 1)  $\gg$  width 1
8:     Sret[i].poison  $\leftarrow$  Sa[i].poison  $\vee$  Sb[i].poison

```

Algorithm 3 semantics of $\{sse2|avx2|avx512\}.pmadd.wd$

```

1: PMADD.WD<lanes, masked>(Sa, Sb, PassThrough, Mask)
2: for each j in range [0 to lanes - 1]
3:   if masked  $\wedge$   $\neg$  Mask[j] then
4:     Sret[j].val  $\leftarrow$  PassThrough[j].val
5:     Sret[j].poison  $\leftarrow$  PassThrough[j].poison
6:   else
7:     Sret[j].val  $\leftarrow$  sext(Sa[2·j].val  $\times$ 16 BIT Sb[2·j].val) +32 BIT
      sext(Sa[2·j+1].val  $\times$ 16 BIT Sb[2·j+1].val)
8:     Sret[j].poison  $\leftarrow$  Sa[2·j].poison  $\vee$  Sb[2·j].poison  $\vee$ 
      Sa[2·j+1].poison  $\vee$  Sb[2·j+1].poison

```

experiments reported in this paper, we have used five as the slicing depth.

3.4 Supporting Vector Intrinsics in Alive2

The version of Alive2 that we started with supports most of the core LLVM intermediate representation, including its target-independent vector operations. However, Alive2 did not have a semantics for any of the numerous LLVM-level intrinsic functions that provide predictable, low-level access to target-specific vector instructions.

We added semantics for 165 x86-64 vector intrinsics to Alive2; these come from the SSE, AVX, AVX2, and AVX512 ISA extensions. The resulting version of Alive2 supports all x86 vector intrinsics except those that use floating point, those that are specifically intended to support cryptographic applications, and some memory operations that we did not see appearing in programs in practice. There is significant overlapping functionality between vector instructions; for example, there are eight different variants of the `pavg` instruction that computes a vertical (element-wise) average of two input vectors. To exploit this overlap, our implementation is parameterized by vector width, vector element size, and by the presence of a masking feature that, when present, uses a bitvector to suppress the output of vector results in some lanes. Algorithms 2 and 3 show, for example, our implementation of the `pavg` (packed average) and `pmadd.wd` (packed multiply and add) family of instructions. This parameterized implementation enabled a high level of code reuse, and our implementation of these semantics is only 660 lines of C++. Note in particular that the semantics here differ from the semantics of the corresponding processor instruction because at the LLVM level, we must account for poison values—a form of deferred undefined behavior. Our strategy for dealing with poison follows the one used by existing LLVM vector instructions: poison propagates lane-wise, but does not contaminate non-dependent vector elements. LLVM has a second kind of deferred undefined behavior: the `undef` value, which we have not supported in our instruction semantics. We believe this is the correct decision since

`undef` is in the process of being deprecated by the LLVM community.

Validating the vector instruction semantics. We found ourselves having difficulty gaining confidence that our semantics for vector intrinsics were correct, so we performed some randomized differential testing of them. Each iteration of our tester creates constant inputs to a single vector intrinsic and then:

1. Creates a small LLVM function passing the chosen inputs to the intrinsic.
2. Evaluates the effect of the function using LLVM’s JIT compilation infrastructure [18]. The effect is always to produce a concrete value, since the inputs are concrete.
3. Converts the LLVM function into Alive2 IR and then asks Alive2 whether this is refined by the output of the JITted code.

Any failure of refinement indicates a bug. We choose input values both systematically (for example, values close to a power of two) and also randomly, hopefully catching most edge-case errors.

When we fielded this tester, it rapidly found 11 cases where our semantics produced an incorrect result. For example, the semantics for `pavg` were incorrect when the sum overflowed. It also found three cases where Minotaur generated SMT queries that failed to typecheck. For example, we set the wrong lane size when parameterizing the semantics for `psra.w` and `psra.d`, causing the solver to reject our malformed queries. After we fixed these 14 bugs, extensive testing failed to find additional defects.

3.5 Augmenting Alive2 with Synthesis

To synthesize an optimization, Minotaur enumerates *partially symbolic* candidates: instructions are always represented concretely, but literal constants are symbolic and are synthesized during the refinement check. The overall synthesis problem is bounded by a limit on the number of new instructions that are being synthesized. Minotaur generates all rewrites that fit into this limit. Next, the rewrites are sorted using the cost function from the TargetTransformInfo pass [19], which provides an approximate cost model that captures the details of the target. Then, it uses Alive2 to filter out every rewrite that does not refine the specification. When a candidate rewrite contains at least one symbolic constant, Minotaur issues an exists-forall query instead of the simpler query that Alive2 would otherwise have used, effectively asking the question: “Does there exist at least one set of literal constants that makes this rewrite work for all values of the inputs?” If this query succeeds, the resulting model produced by the SMT solver contains the literal values for the symbolic constants, giving a complete, sound optimization.

Unlike LLVM, Minotaur takes a low-level, untyped view of vector values. For example, it internally treats a 16-way vector of 8-bit values the same as an 8-way vector of 16-bit values: both of these are simply 128-bit quantities. At the LLVM level, these two types are not interchangeable: a “bitcast” instruction is required to convert between them. Bitcasts have no runtime representation on x86 processors and Minotaur does not expend synthesis power to create them: it inserts bitcasts as needed when converting its own IR into LLVM IR. A consequence of Minotaur’s untyped view of vectors is that, during synthesis, it does not have a fixed idea of how to interpret a value. So, for example, when synthesizing addition for 256-bit vector values, it will try all of $\langle 32 \times i8 \rangle$, $\langle 16 \times i16 \rangle$, $\langle 8 \times i32 \rangle$, and $\langle 4 \times i64 \rangle$ additions.

3.6 Identifying Profitable Rewrites

Traditional compiler optimizations are sometimes based on an implicit cost model. For example, eliminating a redundant store to memory is something that a compiler can always perform, because it is (presumably) always profitable. Other traditional optimizations have an explicit cost model. For example, we might decide to perform inline substitution of every function body that contains seven or fewer instructions. This kind of cost model is used not because it is particularly accurate, but because it is cheap to evaluate at compile time—the execution time of a compiler is an ever-present concern in compiler developers’ minds—and it usually works well enough.

Since a superoptimizer like Minotaur is inherently expensive, and is not expected to be run by software developers during their routine builds, our cost model does not need to be particularly fast. Moreover, in our experience, simple and obvious cost models (such as assigning a fixed cost to each instruction in LLVM IR) are difficult to make work well in the context of vector computations. For one thing, LLVM backends are highly sophisticated and often turn one IR instruction into multiple machine instructions, or many IR instructions into a single machine instruction. For another, estimating the execution cost of machine instructions on modern cores is not straightforward. Thus, Minotaur’s main cost model is based on compiling the LLVM IR to object code and then analyzing its execution on a specific target machine using LLVM-MCA: its machine code analyzer component. In other words, Minotaur accepts a rewrite when it not only refines the specification, but also when it has a lower predicted execution cost than the specification and all of the other candidate rewrites.

Although LLVM-MCA can estimate the cycle cost of code fragments, we instead use the number of uOps (“micro-operations,” a modern x86 processor’s internal instruction set) as the estimated code. We do this because we tried using both cycles and uOps, and uOps work better, perhaps because they represent the total pipeline resources used by the computation.

3.7 Integration with LLVM

Minotaur is loaded into LLVM as a shared library where it runs as an optimization pass. We arranged for it to run at the end of LLVM’s optimization pipeline. We call InstCombine and Dead Code Elimination pass after Minotaur to clean up the code.

4 Evaluation

This section evaluates Minotaur. We begin by showing some optimizations that it has found, and then we examine its efficacy in making code faster.

4.1 Optimizations Discovered by Minotaur

The purpose of this section is to examine Minotaur’s strengths by presenting some optimizations that it found while compiling benchmark programs. None of these optimizations can be performed by the version of LLVM that Minotaur is based on,² at its -O3 optimization level. We present optimizations in an SSA format that is close to LLVM IR, but we have edited it slightly for compactness and legibility.

²The version of Minotaur used for all results in this paper is based on an LLVM snapshot from March 15, 2023. Thus, our version of LLVM is slightly newer than LLVM 16, which was tagged on March 12.

One might be inclined to ask, while reading this section, “Why is LLVM incapable of performing this transformation?” Alas, there is no single answer. In some cases, performing the transformation would require the optimizer to have a semantic model of a processor-specific intrinsic function, but mostly these models do not exist. In other cases, such as Example 5 below, generic reasoning about the code would be very difficult, and a specific pattern matcher might not be robust enough to be worth implementing. Finally, our observation is that vector support in LLVM is somewhat newer and less mature than support for other IR features, and the optimizers have simply not had enough time to accumulate the requisite optimizations.

Example 1. This code is from perlbench in SPEC CPU 2017:

```
%0 = zext <16 x i8> %x to <16 x i16>
%1 = zext <16 x i8> %y to <16 x i16>
%2 = call @avx2.pavg.w(%0, %1)
%3 = trunc <16 x i16> %2 to <16 x i8>
ret <16 x i8> %3
=>
%0 = call @sse2.pavg.b(%x, %y)
ret <16 x i8> %0
```

The unoptimized code zero-extends each 8-bit element of the two input vectors to 16 bits, calls the AVX2 variant of `pavg` to perform element-wise averaging of the extended vectors, and then truncates elements of the resulting vector back to eight bits. The optimized code simply calls an SSE2 version of the `pavg` instruction that operates on 8-bit elements, reducing the uOp cost of the operation from four to one.

Example 2. This code is from libYUV, “... an open source project that includes YUV scaling and conversion functionality”:³

```
%0 = call @avx2.pmadd.wd(%x, <0, 1, 0, 1, ...>)
%1 = call @avx2.pmadd.wd(%x, <1, 0, 1, 0, ...>)
%2 = sub nsw <8 x i32> %1, %0
ret <8 x i32> %2
=>
%0 = call @avx2.pmadd.wd(%x, <1, -1, 1, -1, ...>)
ret <8 x i32> %0
```

The `pmadd.wd` (multiply and add packed integers) instruction multiplies signed 16-bit integers element-wise from two input vectors, and then computes its output by adding adjacent pairs of elements from the resulting vector. Thus, the input to this instruction is two 16-way vectors containing 16-bit elements, and its output is a single 8-way vector of 32-bit elements.

In this example, the second argument to each `pmadd.wd` instruction in the unoptimized code is a vector of alternating zeroes and ones, which has the effect of selecting odd-indexed elements into `%0` and even-indexed elements into `%1`. Then, after the `sub` instruction, which simply performs element-wise subtraction of `%0` and `%1`, the overall effect of this code is to compute the difference between adjacent pairs of elements of `%x`. Minotaur is able to perform this same computation using a single `pmadd.wd` instruction which negates odd-numbered elements of `%x` before performing the addition. The optimized code requires 5 uOps to execute whereas the original code requires 8.

³<https://chromium.googlesource.com/libyuv/libyuv/>

Example 3. This code is from libYUV:

```
%0 = shufflevector <32 x i8> %x, poison,
    <3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31>
%1 = lshr <8 x i8> %0, <6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6>
%2 = zext <8 x i8> %1 to <8 x i32>
ret <8 x i32> %2
=>
%0 = bitcast <32 x i8> %x to <8 x i32>
%1 = call @avx2.psrli.d(<8 x i32> %0, i32 30)
ret <8 x i32> %1
```

The `shufflevector` instruction in the unoptimized code selects every fourth byte-sized element from the input `%x`. The resulting 8-way vector is right-shifted element-wise by six bit positions, and that result is zero-extended to an 8-way vector of 32-bit elements. Minotaur’s optimized version (which executes in 4 uOps instead of 11) first reinterprets the input vector’s data as 32-bit elements; this bitcast is relevant to LLVM’s type system, but it is a nop at the CPU level. Then, the `psrli` instruction shifts each 32-bit element to the right by 30 bit positions. This right-shift-by-30 achieves the same effect as the unoptimized code, where the `shufflevector` can be seen as a right-shift-by-24, followed by an explicit right-shift-by-6.

Example 4. This code, from compiling `perlbench` from SPEC CPU 2017, illustrates Minotaur’s ability to reason about control flow:

```
entry:
  br i1 %c, label %body, label %if.end
body:
  br label %if.end
if.end:
  %p1 = phi [ %a, %body ], [ %b, %entry ]
  %p2 = phi [ %b, %body ], [ %a, %entry ]
  %r = call @avx2.pavg.b(%p1, %p2)
  ret <32 x i8> %r
=>
  %r = call @avx2.pavg.b(%a, %b)
  ret <32 x i8> %r
```

The intent of the code is to compute the element-wise average of input vectors `%a` and `%b`, with a Boolean value `%c` determining the order in which the input vectors are presented to the `pavg` instruction. However, the order of arguments to this instruction does not matter, and Minotaur’s version executes in 4 uOps while the original code requires 10. Note that Minotaur was not explicitly taught that `pavg` is commutative; the necessary information was inferred naturally from the formal specification.

Example 5. This is an optimization discovered by Minotaur when it was used to compile GMP, the GNU Multiple Precision Arithmetic Library, a widely-used library for arbitrary precision integer computation:⁴

```
%0 = lshr i64 %x, 1
%1 = and i64 %0, 0x5555555555555555
%2 = sub i64 %x, %1
%3 = lshr i64 %2, 2
%4 = and i64 %2, 0x3333333333333333
%5 = and i64 %3, 0x3333333333333333
%6 = add nsw nsw i64 %4, %3
%7 = lshr i64 %6, 4
```

⁴<https://gmplib.org/>

```
%8 = add nsw nsw i64 %7, %6
%9 = and i64 %8, 0xf0f0f0f0f0f0f0f
ret i64 %9
=>
%0 = bitcast i64 %x to <8 x i8>
%1 = call @llvm.ctpop(<8 x i8> %0)
%2 = bitcast <8 x i8> %1 to i64
ret i64 %2
```

The original code performs a series of bit-level manipulations on a 64-bit integer value, with the net result of performing an 8-way vectorized 8-bit popcount operation.⁵ The optimized code simply calls an intrinsic function to do the popcount; it costs 13 uOps instead of the original code’s 19. Although robust recognition of open-coded idioms is not the focus of our work, Minotaur does sometimes manage to achieve this.

4.2 A Loop Micro-Benchmark Suite

We obtained a collection of 5,409 compilable loops in C that were automatically extracted, using a custom Clang-based tool, from FFMPEG, FreeImage, DarkNet, xz, bzip2, and the LivermoreC benchmark.⁶ All of the extracted loops are inner-most loops, and they can be compiled because they are extracted along with sufficient context: type declarations, variable declarations, etc. However, these extracted loops are not runnable—they lack necessary runtime context such as code for actually allocating the arrays that they access. The intended purpose of this collection is to support empirical research into loop-based codes.

From the original set of loops that we obtained, we created a loop micro-benchmark for Minotaur by eliminating loops that process floating-point values, and also eliminating loops that, when compiled by LLVM, fail to contain any usage of a vector register in the XMM, YMM, or ZMM families. (A lot of the loops that we filtered out contain trivial or empty loop bodies, and were completely optimized away.) This resulted in 1,337 loops for our Intel Cascade Lake experiment, and 1,234 loops for our AMD Zen 3 experiment.

Figure 3a shows the effect of Minotaur on these loops, when LLVM’s code generation and also Minotaur’s cost model are targeted at Intel’s Cascade Lake microarchitecture. Then, since we cannot run the loops, we used LLVM-MCA again to estimate the performance of the baseline generated code (compiled using `clang -O3 -march=cascadelake`) and the code as optimized by Minotaur, which in this case obtains a mean speedup of 6.1%. (The graph does not show 661 loops that Minotaur was unable to optimize, but we did include these loops when computing mean speedup.) Figure 3b shows the analogous result when targeting the AMD Zen 3 microarchitecture; here the mean speedup is 2.1%.

4.3 Speedups for Benchmarks and Applications

In this section, we show how Minotaur speeds up real-world benchmarks and applications.

Experimental setup. We used two machines for our evaluation: one with an Intel Xeon Gold 6210U processor running at 2.5 GHz (this implements the Cascade Lake microarchitecture [12]) and the other with an AMD Ryzen 5950x processor running at 3.4 GHz (this implements the Zen 3 microarchitecture [2]). The Intel machine supports the AVX-512 instruction set. Both machines run Linux

⁵The popcount, or Hamming weight, of a bitvector is the number of “1” bits in it.

⁶The loop data set was provided by Alexander Brauckmann and Michael O’Boyle at the University of Edinburgh, UK. At present, no citable reference for this work exists.




Figure 3. Speedups—estimated by LLVM-MCA—due to running Minotaur on a loop micro-benchmark suite

and were idle except for a single core running our benchmarks. To reduce the performance variation caused by frequency scaling, we disabled turbo boost on the Intel machine and the core performance boost on the AMD machine. We invoked LLVM with the `-march=native` compilation flag to ask it to take maximum advantage of processor features; we left other compilation flags unchanged, except where noted. All benchmarks are compiled at the `-O3` optimization level. We set the timeout for Z3 [9] queries to 20 seconds. Finally, for each SSA value that it tries to optimize, Minotaur gives up if no solution is found within 20 minutes.

Benchmark selection. We evaluate on SPEC CPU 2017⁷ because it is a widely accepted standard benchmark. We only evaluate on the integer subset of the SPEC suite, and we omit `648.exchange` as it is a Fortran benchmark. We additionally use GMP, the GNU Multiple Precision Library, and libYUV, which is used by Google Chrome/Chromium for manipulating images in the YUV format. We chose these libraries because they have been heavily tuned for performance, they rely on loops containing integer operations, and they come with performance benchmark suites that we could simply reuse.

Compile times. Table 1 shows how long it takes Minotaur to process our benchmarks, along with the number of potentially optimizable values and the number of optimizations found. In most cases, Minotaur found more optimizations when targeting the AMD processor. We believe this is because LLVM is more mature targeting AVX2 than AVX512. As a result, Minotaur extracts more slices.

Solving queries with 256-bit vectors is also less likely to cause Z3 to timeout than are 512-bit vectors. Minotaur is quite slow when it runs with a cold cache because it performs a large number of solver queries.

Optimizing GMP with Minotaur. GMP provides a portable C-language implementation and then, for several platforms, a faster assembly language implementation. For this evaluation, we selected the C implementation, because Minotaur works on LLVM IR and cannot process assembly code at all. The benchmark suite that we used is GMPbench.⁸ Figure 4 summarizes the results. When Minotaur targets the Intel Cascade Lake processor, and when the resulting executables are run on that same microarchitecture, all the benchmarks sped up; across all of the benchmarks, the mean speedup was 7.3%. The analogous experiment using the AMD Zen 3 microarchitecture resulted in one benchmark slowing down, and the rest of benchmarks speeding up, for an overall mean speedup of 6.5%.

Optimizing libYUV with Minotaur. This library has an extensive test suite, part of which is explicitly intended for performance testing; we used this part as a benchmark. Each of them scales, rotates, or converts a 1280 by 728 pixel image 1,000 times. Figure 5 shows the results of this experiment. When Minotaur targets an Intel processor, 148 programs slowed down, 72 did not change performance, and 2,312 sped up, for an overall speedup of 2.2%. Targeting an AMD processor, 188 programs slowed down, 85 did not change performance, and 2,259 sped up, for an overall speedup

⁷<https://www.spec.org/cpu2017/>

⁸<https://gmplib.org/gmpbench>

Benchmarks	Intel Cascade Lake					AMD Zen3				
	Compilation Time (min)			Optimizations Found		Compilation Time (min)			Optimizations Found	
	cold cache	warm cache	clang	# expr.	# opt.	cold cache	warm cache	clang	# expr.	# opt.
SPEC CPU 2017	1,645	3	2	93,281	2,401	1,731	4	3	95,185	2,537
gmp-6.2.1	440	less than 1	less than 1	9,170	336	445	less than 1	less than 1	9,265	387
libYUV	2,196	less than 1	less than 1	6,849	334	2,193	less than 1	less than 1	6,809	357

Table 1. Compile-time statistics




Figure 4. GNU Multiple Precision Library (GMP) speedups

of 2.9%. Minotaur can make code slower because it looks at optimizations in isolation; it does not attempt to model interactions between optimizations.

libYUV is portable code, but it has already been heavily tuned for performance; most commits to its repository over the last several years have been performance-related. Our hypothesis is that this manual tuning has already eaten up most of the performance gains that we would have hoped to gain from Minotaur. For some time now, Google’s released versions of Chrome have been compiled using LLVM; the Chrome engineers have had ample time to ensure that this compiler achieves decent code generation for performance-critical libraries.

Optimizing SPEC CPU2017 with Minotaur. Figure 6 shows the effect of optimizing the integer-heavy benchmarks from SPEC CPU2017 using Minotaur. When optimizing for, and running on, the Intel processor, we observed a mean speedup of 1.3%. When optimizing for, and running on, the AMD processor, we observed a mean speedup of 1.2%. It is notoriously difficult to speed up the

SPEC CPU benchmarks because compiler engineers have already put considerable effort into achieving good code generation for them.

5 Related Work

A *superoptimizer* is a program optimizer that meaningfully relies on search to generate better code, in contrast with traditional compilers that attempt a fixed (but perhaps very large) sequence of transformations. The eponymous superoptimizer [21] exhaustively generated machine instruction sequences, using various strategies to prune the search space, and using testing to weed out infeasible candidates. Also predating modern solver-based methods, Davidson and Fraser [8] constructed peephole optimizations from machine description files. In contrast, modern superoptimizers rely on solvers to perform automated reasoning about program semantics.

Souper [25] is a synthesizing superoptimizer that works on LLVM IR; it is the most directly connected previous work to Minotaur. Souper’s slicing strategy is similar to Minotaur’s in that it




Figure 5. LibYUV Library speedups


extracts a DAG of LLVM instructions that overapproximates how a given SSA value is computed. However, unlike Souper, Minotaur extracts memory operations and multiple basic blocks, so it is capable of (we believe) strictly more transformations than Souper is able to perform. Additionally, Souper’s undefined behavior model does not capture all of the subtleties of undefined behavior in LLVM, whereas we reuse Alive2’s model, which is probably the most widely used formalization of these semantics, and is generally recognized as being correct. Finally, Minotaur focuses on vector-related transformations, whereas Souper supports neither LLVM’s portable vector instruction set nor its platform-specific intrinsics.

Minotaur is also strongly inspired by Bansal and Aiken’s work [4]; their superoptimizer operated on x86 assembly code and was able to make interesting use of vector instructions. Starting from unoptimized assembly produced by GCC, it was able to produce code competitive with higher optimization levels. The overall structure of this superoptimizer, where program fragments are extracted, canonicalized, checked against a cache, and then optimized in the case of a cache miss, is very similar to Minotaur, but there are many differences in the details, particularly in Minotaur’s slice extractor which allows its synthesis specification to approximate the original code’s effect much more closely. Another assembly superoptimizer, STOKE [26–28], is not as closely related; it is based on randomly perturbing assembly-language functions. STOKE can potentially perform transformations that Minotaur cannot, but we believe that


its results are more difficult to translate into standard peephole optimizations than are Minotaur’s.

Several recent projects have focused not on optimizing individual programs but rather on generating program rewrite rules. OptGen [5] finds scalar peephole optimizations that meet a specified syntactic form. Even at small rewrite sizes, it was able to find numerous optimizations that were missing from the 2015 versions of GCC and LLVM. VeGen [6] generates SLP vectorization rules—an SLP vectorizer [14] merges a set of scalar operations into vector instructions. VeGen parses the Intel Intrinsics Guide [13] and uses this to build pattern matchers for x86 vector instructions. VeGen applies the pattern matchers to an input scalar program, and replaces scalar expressions with vector instructions when it finds a profitable match. VeGen uses syntactic pattern matching rather than solver-based equivalence/refinement checking. Diospyros [33] is another vector rewrite rule generator, it takes an equality saturation [30] approach and uses a translation validator to reject unsuitable candidates. As an equality saturation-based tool, Diospyros builds its search space with existing rewrite rules.

Program synthesis—generating implementations that conform to a given specification—is intimately related to superoptimization. Rake [1] performs instruction selection for vectorized Halide [24] expressions using a two stage synthesis algorithm. First, Rake synthesizes a data-movement-free sketch [29], and then in the second




(a) Normalized speedup; geomean = 1.013x




(b) Compilation time in seconds

Targeting Intel Cascade Lake



(c) Normalized speedup; geomean = 1.012x



(d) Compilation time in seconds

Targeting AMD Zen 3

Figure 6. SPEC CPU2017 integer benchmark performance and compilation time

stage it concretizes data movement for the sketch via another synthesis query. Rake targets Hexagon DSP processors [31] which share some functionally similar SIMD instructions with x86. Cowan et al. [7] synthesized quantized machine learning kernels. Their work introduces two sketches: a compute sketch, which computes a matrix multiplication, and a reduction sketch that collects the computation result to the correct registers. It relies on Rosette [32] to generate an efficient NEON [3] implementation that satisfies the specifications for those two sketches. Swizzle Inventor [23] is another tool built on Rosette; it synthesizes data movement instructions for a GPU compute kernel, and it requires user-defined sketches describing the non-swizzle part of the program. MACVETH [11] generates high-performance vector packings of regular strided-access loops, by searching for a SIMD expression that is equivalent to a gather specification. All of these works show good performance results, but they focus on relatively narrow tasks, whereas Minotaur attempts to improve SIMD programs in general.

Most previous superoptimizers and program synthesizers use simple cost models. For example, Souper [25] assigns each kind of instruction a weight and uses the weighted sum as the cost of a rewrite. This kind of cost model is not a very good predictor of

performance on a modern out-of-order processor. Minotaur and MACVETH [11] use the LLVM-MCA [10] microarchitectural performance analyzer, which can still lead to mispredictions, but it is generally more accurate than simple approaches are.

6 Conclusion

We created Minotaur because we noticed that LLVM appeared to be missing relatively obvious optimizations in code containing both its portable vector instructions and also its platform-specific intrinsic functions that provide direct access to hardware-level primitives. Minotaur slices loop-free DAGs of instructions—including branches and memory operations—out of LLVM functions and then attempts to synthesize better implementations for them. When improved code is found, the optimization is performed and also the synthesis result is cached. On the libYUV test suite, Minotaur gives speedups up to 1.64x, with an average speedup of 2.2%. We expect to see impact not by convincing application developers to use Minotaur, but rather by convincing compiler developers to implement useful optimizations that we can discover.

References

- [1] Maaz Bin Safeer Ahmad, Alexander J. Root, Andrew Adams, Shoaib Kamil, and Alvin Cheung. Vector Instruction Selection for Digital Signal Processors Using Program Synthesis. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, ASPLOS 2022, page 1004–1016, 2022.
- [2] AMD. AMD Zen 3, 2023. <https://www.amd.com/en/technologies/zen-core>.
- [3] ARM. ARM NEON Architecture, 2023. <https://developer.arm.com/Architectures/Neon>.
- [4] Sorav Bansal and Alex Aiken. Automatic Generation of Peephole Superoptimizers. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, ASPLOS XII, page 394–403, 2006.
- [5] Sebastian Buchwald. Optgen: A generator for local optimizations. In *International Conference on Compiler Construction*, pages 171–189. Springer, 2015.
- [6] Yishen Chen, Charith Mendis, Michael Carbin, and Saman Amarasinghe. *VeGen: A Vectorizer Generator for SIMD and Beyond*, page 902–914. 2021.
- [7] Meghan Cowan, Thierry Moreau, Tianqi Chen, James Bornholt, and Luis Ceze. Automatic Generation of High-Performance Quantized Machine Learning Kernels. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization*, CGO 2020, page 305–316, 2020.
- [8] Jack W. Davidson and Christopher W. Fraser. Automatic Generation of Peephole Optimizations. In *Proceedings of the 1984 SIGPLAN Symposium on Compiler Construction*, SIGPLAN '84, pages 111–116, 1984.
- [9] Leonardo De Moura and Nikolaj Bjørner. Z3: An efficient smt solver. In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems: 14th International Conference, TACAS 2008, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2008, Budapest, Hungary, March 29–April 6, 2008. Proceedings 14*, pages 337–340. Springer, 2008.
- [10] LLVM Developers. LLVM Machine Code Analyzer, 2023. <https://llvm.org/docs/CommandGuide/llvm-mca.html>.
- [11] Marcos Horro, Louis-Noël Pouchet, Gabriel Rodríguez, and Juan Tourino. Custom High-Performance Vector Code Generation for Data-Specific Sparse Computations. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques*, 2022.
- [12] Intel. Cascade Lake: Overview, 2023. <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/products/platforms/details/cascade-lake.html>.
- [13] Intel. Intel Intrinsics Guide, 2023. <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/docs/intrinsics-guide/index.html>.
- [14] Samuel Larsen and Saman Amarasinghe. Exploiting Superword Level Parallelism with Multimedia Instruction Sets. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 2000 Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, PLDI '00, page 145–156, 2000.
- [15] Chris Lattner and Vikram Adve. LLVM: A Compilation Framework for Lifelong Program Analysis & Transformation. In *Proceedings of the 2004 International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO'04)*, Palo Alto, California, Mar 2004.
- [16] LLVM Developers. LoopInfo, 2023. https://llvm.org/doxygen/classllvm_1_1LoopInfo.html.
- [17] LLVM Developers. MemorySSA, 2023. <https://llvm.org/docs/MemorySSA.html>.
- [18] LLVM Developers. ORC Design and Implementation, 2023. <https://llvm.org/docs/ORCv2.html>.
- [19] LLVM Developers. TargetTransformInfo Class Reference, 2023. https://llvm.org/doxygen/classllvm_1_1TargetTransformInfo.html.
- [20] Nuno P. Lopes, Juneyoung Lee, Chung-Kil Hur, Zhengyang Liu, and John Regehr. *Alive2: Bounded Translation Validation for LLVM*, page 65–79. 2021.
- [21] Henry Massalin. Superoptimizer: A look at the smallest program. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, ASPLOS II, page 122–126, 1987.
- [22] Charith Mendis, Alex Renda, Saman Amarasinghe, and Michael Carbin. Ithema: Accurate, portable and fast basic block throughput estimation using deep neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4505–4515. PMLR, 2019.
- [23] Phitchaya Mangpo Phothilimthana, Archibald Samuel Elliott, An Wang, Abhinav Jangda, Bastian Hagedorn, Henrik Barthels, Samuel J. Kaufman, Vinod Grover, Emina Torlak, and Rastislav Bodik. Swizzle Inventor: Data Movement Synthesis for GPU Kernels. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, ASPLOS '19, page 65–78, 2019.
- [24] Jonathan Ragan-Kelley, Andrew Adams, Dillon Sharlet, Connelly Barnes, Sylvain Paris, Marc Levoy, Saman Amarasinghe, and Frédo Durand. Halide: Decoupling Algorithms from Schedules for High-Performance Image Processing. *Commun. ACM*, 61(1):106–115, dec 2017.
- [25] Raimondas Sasnauskas, Yang Chen, Peter Collingbourne, Jeroen Ketema, Gratian Lup, Jubi Taneja, and John Regehr. Souper: A synthesizing superoptimizer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.04422*, 2017.
- [26] Eric Schkufza, Rahul Sharma, and Alex Aiken. Stochastic Superoptimization. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, ASPLOS '13, page 305–316, 2013.
- [27] Eric Schkufza, Rahul Sharma, and Alex Aiken. Stochastic optimization of floating-point programs with tunable precision. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 49(6):53–64, 2014.
- [28] Rahul Sharma, Eric Schkufza, Berkeley Churchill, and Alex Aiken. Conditionally correct superoptimization. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 50(10):147–162, 2015.
- [29] Armando Solar-Lezama. The Sketching Approach to Program Synthesis. In *Proceedings of the 7th Asian Symposium on Programming Languages and Systems*, APLAS '09, page 4–13, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009. Springer-Verlag.
- [30] Ross Tate, Michael Stepp, Zachary Tatlock, and Sorin Lerner. Equality Saturation: A New Approach to Optimization. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, POPL '09, page 264–276, 2009.
- [31] Qualcomm Technologies. Hexagon dsp sdk. <https://developer.qualcomm.com/software/hexagon-dsp-sdk>.
- [32] Emına Torlak and Rastislav Bodik. Growing Solver-Aided Languages with Rosette. In *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM International Symposium on New Ideas, New Paradigms, and Reflections on Programming & Software*, Onward! 2013, page 135–152, 2013.
- [33] Alexa VanHattum, Rachit Nigam, Vincent T. Lee, James Bornholt, and Adrian Sampson. Vectorization for Digital Signal Processors via Equality Saturation. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, ASPLOS '21, page 874–886, 2021.