

Partial Evaluation for Program Comprehension

Sandrine Blazy, Philippe Facon

► **To cite this version:**

Sandrine Blazy, Philippe Facon. Partial Evaluation for Program Comprehension. ACM. ACM Computing Surveys, Symposium on partial evaluation, 1998, (revue électronique), 30/3 es (3 es), 1998. <inria-00106403>

HAL Id: inria-00106403

<https://hal.inria.fr/inria-00106403>

Submitted on 15 Oct 2006

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Partial Evaluation for Program Comprehension

Sandrine Blazy
and
Philippe Facon

CEDRIC-IIE, 18 allée Jean Rostand, 91025 Évry Cedex, France (blazy@iie.cnam.fr)

1. INTRODUCTION

Program comprehension is the most tedious and time consuming task of software maintenance, an important phase of the software life cycle [A.Frazer 1992]. This is particularly true while maintaining scientific application programs that have been written in Fortran for decades and that are still vital in various domains even though more modern languages are used to implement their user interfaces. Very often, programs have evolved as their application domains increase continually and have become very complex due to extensive modifications. This generality in programs is implemented by input variables whose value does not vary in the context of a given application. Thus, it is very interesting for the maintainer to propagate such information, that is to obtain a simplified program, which behaves like the initial one when used according to the restriction.

We have adapted partial evaluation for program comprehension. Our partial evaluator performs mainly two tasks: constant propagation and statements simplification. It includes an interprocedural alias analysis. As our aim is program comprehension rather than optimization, there are two main differences with classical partial evaluation. Firstly, we do not change the original structure of the code. In particular, we do not unfold statements. In the same way, our partial evaluator generates neither new variables nor rename variables. The residual code is easier to understand because many statements and variables have been removed and no additional statement or variable has been inserted.

Secondly, some identifiers are not replaced by their corresponding values in the residual code. The benefit of replacing an identifier by its value depends on the meaning of the identifier for the user: thus, it depends on the kind of identifier, but also on the kind of user. For any user, identifiers like PI are likely to be kept in the code, on the contrary to intermediate variables used only to decompose some

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or direct commercial advantage and that copies show this notice on the first page or initial screen of a display along with the full citation. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers, to redistribute to lists, or to use any component of this work in other works, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Permissions may be requested from Publications Dept, ACM Inc., 1515 Broadway, New York, NY 10036 USA, fax +1 (212) 869-0481, or permissions@acm.org.

computations. A physicist who is familiar with the equations implemented in the code may prefer to keep variables that are meaningful for him; on the contrary other users may prefer to see as few variables as possible. In fact, our partial evaluator is very flexible in that respect. Of course, even when there is no replacement, the known value of a variable is kept in the environment of our simplification task, as it can give opportunities to remove useless code.

2. FORMAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE PARTIAL EVALUATOR

Our partial evaluator - as software maintenance tool - must introduce absolutely no unforeseen changes in programs. Therefore, we have used a formal development method. The partial evaluator's behavior is described in natural semantics [G.Kahn 1987] augmented with various set operators: the simplification is inductively defined, by inference rules on the Fortran abstract syntax. These formal concepts were very useful to clarify concepts of Fortran (e.g. common blocks in Fortran 77, pointers in Fortran 90) and to model complex transformations. They also allowed us to prove the correctness of the partial evaluation, with respect to the dynamic semantics of Fortran 90, also given in natural semantics [S.Blazy and P.Facon 1995]. Last, our specification is abstract enough to be easily adapted to any imperative language.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE TOOL

The partial evaluator has been implemented on top of a kernel that has been generated by the generic programming environment Centaur [INRIA 1994]. When provided with the description of a particular programming language, including its syntax and semantics, Centaur produces a language specific environment. We have merged two specific environments into an environment for partial evaluation: a Fortran 90 environment, and an environment dedicated to a language that we have defined for expressing the scope of general constraints on variables.

The formal specifications have been implemented in a language provided by Centaur, called Typol, intended to be an implementation of natural semantics. Thus, the Typol rules are close to the formal specification rules. Typol programs are compiled into Prolog code. Set operators have been written directly in Prolog. Although our partial evaluation propagates only equalities (and some specific inequalities), our initial constraints on input variables are written in a general language for expressing relations between variables and values, because our next work will be to propagate such relations.

As our partial evaluator is a program comprehension tool, we have implemented a sophisticated graphical interface to facilitate the exploration of Fortran application programs. It has been written in Lisp, enhanced with structures for programming communication between graphical objects and processes. Different windows visualize with hyperlinks specialized versions of a procedure, propagated data, initial and residual application programs. Usually initial application programs consist of several Fortran files and each file is a Fortran procedure with about 150 lines of statements. Furthermore several instances of the tool can be triggered in parallel. The first experiments with that tool at EDF (the French electricity provider) are very encouraging [S.Blazy and P.Facon 1997].

4. CONCLUSION

Partial evaluation appears to be a promising technique not only for program optimization but also for program comprehension by allowing to focus on a specific context of the computation. Our partial evaluator may be used in two ways: by visual display of the simplified program as part of the initial program (for documentation or debugging), or by generating this simplified program as an independent (executable) program.

We are currently working on the propagation of more general constraints than equalities. Furthermore, partial evaluation is complementary to program slicing [K.Gallagher and J.R.Lyle 1991], another technique for extracting code when debugging a program. Program slicing aims at identifying the statements of a program which impact directly or indirectly on some variables values. We believe that merging partial evaluation (a forward

walk on the call graph) and program slicing (a backward walk) would improve a lot the reduction of programs.

REFERENCES

- S.BLAZY AND P.FACON. 1995. Formal specification and prototyping of a program specializer. In *TAPSOFT Conference Proceedings*, Volume 915 of *LNCS* (May 1995), pp. 666–680.
- S.BLAZY AND P.FACON. 1997. Application of formal methods to the development of a software maintenance tool. In *Automated Software Engineering Conference Proceedings* (November 1997), pp. 162–171. IEEE.
- A.FRAZER. 1992. Reverse engineering- hype, hope or here? In *Software Reuse and Reverse Engineering in Practice*, pp. 209–243. P.A.V. Hall (ed.).
- K.GALLAGHER AND J.R.LYLE. 1991. Using program slicing in software maintenance. *ACM Trans. Soft. Eng. 17*, 8, 751–761.
- INRIA. 1994. *Centaur 1.2 Documentation*. INRIA.
- G.KAHN. 1987. Natural semantics. In *STACS Proceedings*, Volume 247 of *LNCS* (1987).