Logical & Relational Operators
How to represent the following in assembly?

\[ x < 10 \quad \&\& \quad y > 3 \]

Answer: it depends on the target machine.

Several approaches:

- Numerical representation
- Positional Encoding (e.g. MIPS assembly)
- Conditional Move and Predication

Correct choice depends on both context and ISA (Instruction Set Architecture)
Assign numerical values to true and false

- In C, false = 0 and true = anything else.

Use comparison operator from the ISA to get a value from a relational operator:

- MIPS has **SLT** instruction (Set Less Than);
- and **SLTU** instruction (Set Less Than Unsigned)
- `slt $1, $2, $3` # if ($2<$3) $1=1 else $1=0
### Examples

Assuming $x$ and $y$ are in registers $\$x$ and $\$y$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x &lt; y$</td>
<td><code>slt $t0, $x, $y</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x \leq y$</td>
<td><code>slt $t0, $y, $x</code> # $y &lt; x`</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>xori $t1, $t0, 0x1</code> # reverse result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x == y$</td>
<td><code>xor $t0,$x,$y</code> # which bits different?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>sltu $t1,$t0,1</code> # no difference if 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x \neq y$</td>
<td><code>xor $t0,$x,$y</code> # which bits different?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>sltu $t1,$zero,$t0</code> # different if 0 &lt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the other two missing relational operators, swap the arguments.
What if the ISA does not provide comparison operators?

- Use conditional branch to interpret the result of a relational operator.

**Example: \( x < y \)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>blt</code></td>
<td>( x, y ), LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>li</code></td>
<td>( t0 ), 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>j</code></td>
<td>END</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td><code>li</code> ( t0 ), 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The absence of comparison instructions is not as bad as you think.
Most boolean expressions are used with branching anyway.

Example
if (x < y)
  z = 3;
else
  z = 4;

Corresponding assembly code
```
bge $x, $y, ELSE
li $z, 3
j END
ELSE: li $z, 4
END: ...
```
What about logical operators `&&` and `||`?

In the general case, **must** use branching!

**Example with function calls**

```plaintext
foo() || bar()
```

If `foo()` returns true, `bar` is never called! This is called a **short-circuit**.

**Simpler example**

```plaintext
x || y
```

**Corresponding assembly code**

```plaintext
bne $x, $zero, TRUE
bne $y, $zero, TRUE
li $t0, 0
j END
TRUE: li $t0, 1
END: ...
```
Combining Logical and Relational Operators

If supported by the ISA, simplest approach consists of using numerical encoding for relational operators and positional for logical operators.

Example

$x < 4 \quad \text{||} \quad y < 6$

Corresponding assembly code

```
li $t0, 4
slt $t1, $x, $t0
bne $t1, $zero, TRUE

li $t2, 6
slt $t3, $y, $t2
bne $t3, $zero, TRUE

li $t4, 0
j END
```

TRUE: li $t4, 1
END: ...
Conditional move and predication can simplify code (if ISA supports it!)

Example
```c
if (x < y)
    z = 3;
else
    z = 4;
```

Corresponding (naive) assembly code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditional Move</th>
<th>Predicated Execution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>li $t1, 3</td>
<td>slt $t0, $x, $y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>li $t2, 4</td>
<td>$t0?li $z, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slt $t0, $x, $y</td>
<td>$t0?li $z, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cmov $z, $t0, $t1, $t2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately, these instructions are not available on MIPS (they are on ARM: i.e. condition flags).
Last words on logical and relational operators

Best choice depends on two things

- ISA instructions/features available, *e.g.*:
  - SLT instruction;
  - Predication support.
- Context, *e.g.**:
  - Assignment of same value in each branch of an if-then-else;
  - Presence of short-circuit logical operators.
Logical & Relational Operators

Code Generation
Need to have unique labels that we can emit.

**Label class**

class Label {
    static counter = 0;
    String name;
    Label() { name = "label"+counter++; }
}
Expression code generator class

class ExprCodeGen {
    Register visit(Expr expr) {
        return switch(expr) {
            case ... ->
            case ... ->
        }
    }
}
case BinOp bo -> {
    Register lhsReg = visit(bo.lhs);
    Register resReg = newVirtualRegister();

    switch(bo.op) {
        ...
        case LT:
            Register rhsReg = visit(bo.rhs);
            emit("slt", resReg, lhsReg, rhsReg);
            break;
        ...
        ...
    }

    yield resReg;
}
Logical OR || Expression

case BinOp bo -> {
    Register lhsReg = visit(bo.lhs);
    Register resReg = newVirtualRegister();

    switch(bo.op) {
        ...
        case OR:
            Label trueLbl = new Label();
            Label endLbl = new Label();
            emit("bne", lhsReg, zeroReg, trueLbl);

            Register rhsReg = visit(bo.rhs);
            emit("bne", rhsReg, zeroReg, trueLbl);

            emit("li", resReg, 0);
            emit("j", endLbl);

            emit(trueLbl);
            emit("li", resReg, 1);

            emit(endLbl);
        ...
    }
    yield resReg;
}
Control-Flow
Control-Flow

- If-then-else
- Loops (for, while, ...)
- Switch/case statements
If-then-else
Follow the model for evaluating relational and boolean with branches.

Branching versus predication (e.g. IA-64, ARM ISA) trade-off:

- Frequency of execution: uneven distribution, try to speedup common case
- Amount of code in each case: unequal amounts means predication might waste issue slots
- Nested control flow: any nested branches complicates the predicates and makes branching attractive
Loops

**Basic pattern**

- Evaluate condition before the loop (if needed)
- Evaluate condition after the loop
- Branch back to the top (if needed)

*while, for and do while* loops follow a very similar pattern.
Example: for loop

```c
for (i = 0; i < 100; i++) {
    body
}
next stmt
```

Corresponding assembly

```
li $t0, 0
li $t1, 100
bge $t0, $t1, NEXT

BODY: body
    addi $t0, $t0, 1
    blt $t0, $t1, BODY

NEXT: next stmt
```
Exercise

Write the assembly code for the following while loop:

```
while (x >= y) {
    body
}
```

next stmt
Most modern programming languages include a break statement (loops, switch statements)

```java
for (...)
{
    ...
    if (...)
        break;
    ...
}
```

In such cases, use an unconditional branch to the next statement following the control-flow construct (loop or case statement).

For skip/continue statement, branch to the next iteration (loop start)
Case Statement (switch)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>switch (c) {</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>case 'a': stmt1;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>case 'b': stmt2; break;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>case 'c': stmt3;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Evaluate the controlling expression
2. Branch to the selected case
3. Execute the code for that case
4. Branch to the statement after the case

Part 2 is key!

Strategies:

- Linear search (nested if-then-else)
- Build a table of case expressions and use binary search on it
- Directly compute an address (requires dense case set)
Exercise

Knowing that the character 'a' corresponds to the decimal value 97 (ASCII table), write the assembly code for the example below using linear search.

```c
char c;
...
switch (c) {
    case 'a': stmt1;
    case 'b': stmt2; break;
    case 'c': stmt3; break;
    case 'd': stmt4;
}
stmt5;
```
Food for thoughts: on the dangers of fallthrough switch cases

With C (and many other languages), default behaviour is to fallthrough to next case, unless `break` is used. This behaviour directly matches assembly code.

This is often a source of bugs if programmers forget to use `break`!

To prevent this:

- Some languages makes it mandatory to have a `break` (*e.g.* C#).
- Many languages (*e.g.* Scala, Pascal, Ada) opt to have an implicit `break` by default and don’t allow fallthrough.
- Others don’t fallthrough unless `next` (continue) is used at the end of the case.
Exercise

Knowing that the character ‘a’ corresponds to the decimal value 97 (ASCII table), write the assembly code for the example below using linear search.

```c
char c;
...
switch (c) {
    case 'a': stmt1;
    case 'b': stmt2; break;
    case 'c': stmt3; break;
    case 'd': stmt4;
}
stmt5;
```

Exercise: can you do it without any conditional jumps?

Hint: use the JR MIPS instruction which jumps directly to an address stored in a register.

We can now find the matching case in $O(1)$!
Control-Flow

Code Generation
No register to return this time.

Statement code generator class

```java
class StmtCodeGen {

    void visit(Stmt stmt) {
        switch (stmt) {
            case ... ->
            case ... ->
        }
    }
}
```
Pattern-Matching Statements

If statement

```java
case If ifStmt -> {
    Register cond = (new ExprCodeGen()).visit(ifStmt.cond);

    Label elseLbl = new Label();
    Label endLbl = new Label();

    emit("beq", cond, zeroReg, elseLbl);
    visit(ifStmt.then);
    emit("j", endLbl);
    emit(elseLbl);
    visit(ifStmt.els); // assumes else is present
    emit(endLbl);
}
```
Next lecture

More code generation:

• Memory Allocation
• Function Call
• References vs. Values