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The Esterel Language

Developed by Gérard Berry starting 1983

Originally for robotics applications

Imperative, textual language

Synchronous model of time like that in digital circuits

Concurrent

Deterministic
A Simple Example

The specification:

The output O should occur when inputs A and B have both arrived. The R input should restart this behavior.
A First Try: An FSM
The Esterel Version

module ABRO:
input A, B, R;
output O;

loop
  [ await A || await B ];
  emit O each R
end module

Esterel programs built from modules
Each module has an interface of input and output signals

Much simpler since language includes notions of signals, waiting, and reset.
The Esterel Version

module ABRO:
  input A, B, R;
  output O;

loop
  [ await A || \|\| await B ];
  emit O each R
end module
The Esterel Version

module ABRO:
input A, B, R;
output O;

loop
    [ await A || await B ];
    emit O
    each R
end module

Parallel terminates when all its threads have

Emit O makes signal O present when it runs
Basic Ideas of Esterel

Imperative, textual language
Concurrent
Based on synchronous model of time:

- Program execution synchronized to an external clock
- Like synchronous digital logic
- Suits the cyclic executive approach

Two types of statements:

- Combinational statements, which take “zero time” (execute and terminate in same instant, e.g., emit)
- Sequential statements, which delay one or more cycles (e.g., await)
Uses of Esterel

Wristwatch

- Canonical example
- Reactive, synchronous, hard real-time

Controllers, e.g., for communication protocols

Avionics

- Fuel control system
- Landing gear controller
- Other user interface tasks

Processor components (cache controller, etc.)
Advantages of Esterel

Model of time gives programmer precise timing control
Concurrency convenient for specifying control systems
Completely deterministic
  • Guaranteed: no need for locks, semaphores, etc.
Finite-state language
  • Easy to analyze
  • Execution time predictable
  • Much easier to verify formally

Amenable to both hardware and software implementation
Disadvantages of Esterel

Finite-state nature of the language limits flexibility

- No dynamic memory allocation
- No dynamic creation of processes

Little support for handling data; limited to simple decision-dominated controllers

Synchronous model of time can lead to overspecification

Semantic challenges:

- Avoiding causality violations often difficult
- Difficult to compile

Limited number of users, tools, etc.
The Esterel Language
Esterel’s Model of Time

The standard CS model (e.g., Java’s) is asynchronous: threads run at their own rate. Synchronization is through calls to wait() and notify().

Esterel’s model of time is synchronous like that used in hardware. Threads march in lockstep to a global clock.
Signals

Esterel programs communicate through signals

These are like wires

Each signal is either present or absent in each cycle

Can’t take multiple values within a cycle

Presence/absence not held between cycles

Broadcast across the program

Any process can read or write a signal
Basic Esterel Statements

**emit** S

Make signal S present in the current cycle
A signal is absent unless emitted *in that cycle*.

**pause**

Stop for this cycle and resume in the next.

**present S then s₁ else s₂ end**

Run $s_1$ immediately if signal $S$ is present in the current cycle, otherwise run $s_2$
module Example1:
output A, B, C;
emit A;
present A then
  emit B
end;
pause;
emit C
end module
Signal Coherence Rules

Each signal is only present or absent in a cycle, never both.

All writers run before any readers do.

Thus

```
present A else
    emit A
end
```

is an erroneous program. (Deadlocks.)

The Esterel compiler rejects this program.
Advantage of Synchrony

Easy to regulate time

Synchronization is free (e.g., no Bakers’ algorithm)

Speed of actual computation nearly uncontrollable

Allows function and timing to be specified independently

Makes for deterministic concurrency

Explicit control of “before” “after” “at the same time”
Time Can Be Controlled Precisely

This guarantees every 60th S an M is emitted

```plaintext
every 60 S do
  emit M
end
```

`emit` takes no time (cycles)

every invokes its body every 60th S
The || Operator

Groups of statements separated || by run concurrently and terminate when all groups have terminated

```
[ emit A; pause; emit B;
||
pause; emit C; pause; emit D
];
emit E
```

A   B
   C   D
    E
Communication Is Instantaneous

A signal emitted in a cycle is visible immediately

[  
    pause; emit A; pause; emit A
||
    pause; present A then emit B end
]

A   A
B
Bidirectional Communication

Processes can communicate back and forth in the same cycle

[ 
  pause; emit A;
present B then emit C end;
pause; emit A
]

||

pause; present A then emit B end
]

A   A
B
C
Concurrency and Determinism

Signals are the only way for concurrent processes to communicate

Esterel does have variables, but they cannot be shared

Signal coherence rules ensure deterministic behavior

Language semantics clearly defines who must communicate with whom when
The Await Statement

The await statement waits for a particular cycle await S waits for the next cycle in which S is present

```plaintext
[ emit A ; pause ; pause; emit A || await A; emit B ]
```

A A A B
The Await Statement

Await normally waits for a cycle before beginning to check

`await immediate` also checks the initial cycle

```
[ emit A ; pause ; pause; emit A
||
     await immediate A; emit B
]
```

A        A
B

| | | | |
Loops

Esterel has an infinite loop statement

Rule: loop body cannot terminate instantly

Needs at least one pause, await, etc.

Can’t do an infinite amount of work in a single cycle

```
loop
    emit A; pause; pause; emit B
end
```

A A A A A
B B B B B
Loops and Synchronization

Instantaneous nature of loops plus await provide very powerful synchronization mechanisms

```plaintext
loop
    await 60 S;
    emit M
end
```

```
S S S S S S S S
M M M
```

```
1 ... 59 60 61 ... 120
```
Preemption

Often want to stop doing something and start doing something else

E.g., Ctrl-C in Unix: stop the currently-running program

Esterel has many constructs for handling preemption
The Abort Statement

Basic preemption mechanism

General form:

```
abort
  statement
when  condition
```

Runs `statement` to completion. If `condition` ever holds, `abort` terminates immediately.
The Abort Statement

```
abort
  pause;
pause;
emit A
when B;
emit C
```

- Normal Termination
- Aborted termination
- Aborted termination; emit A preempted
- Normal Termination
  B not checked in first cycle (like await)
Strong vs. Weak Preemption

Strong preemption:

- The body does not run when the preemption condition holds
- The previous example illustrated strong preemption

Weak preemption:

- The body is allowed to run even when the preemption condition holds, but is terminated thereafter
- “weak abort” implements this in Esterel
Strong vs. Weak Abort

Strong abort
emit A does not run
abort
  pause;
  pause;
  emit A;
  pause
when B;
emit C

Weak abort
emit A runs
weak abort
  pause;
  pause;
  emit A;
  pause
when B;
emit C

Diagram:

- Strong abort:
  - A
  - B
  - C

- Weak abort:
  - A
  - B
  - C
Strong vs. Weak Preemption

Important distinction

Something may not cause its own strong preemption

Erroneous

```
abort
    pause; emit A
when A
```

OK

```
weak abort
    pause; emit A
when A
```
The Trap Statement

Esterel provides an exception facility for weak preemption
Interacts nicely with concurrency
Rule: outermost trap takes precedence
The Trap Statement

```
trap T in
[
  pause;
  emit A;
  pause;
  exit T
]
||
await B;
emit C
]
end trap;
emit D
```

A  D  

Normal termination from first process

A
B
C  D  

Emit C also runs

A  B
C
D

Second process allowed to run even though first process has exited
Nested Traps

```plaintext
trap T1 in
  trap T2 in
    [ // exit T1
      ||
      exit T2
    ]
  end;
emit A
end;
emit B
```

Outer trap takes precedence; control transferred directly to the outer trap statement. `emit A` not allowed to run.
The Suspend Statement

Preemption (abort, trap) terminate something, but what if you want to resume it later?

Like the unix Ctrl-Z

Esterel’s suspend statement pauses the execution of a group of statements

Only strong preemption: statement does not run when condition holds
The Suspend Statement

suspend
  loop
    emit A; pause; pause
  end
when B

A  A  B  A  B  A

B prevents A from being emitted here; resumed next cycle
B delays emission of A by one cycle
Causality

Unfortunate side-effect of instantaneous communication coupled with the single valued signal rule

Easy to write contradictory programs, e.g.,

\texttt{present A else emit A end}

\texttt{abort pause; emit A when A}

\texttt{present A then nothing end; emit A}

These sorts of programs are erroneous; the Esterel compiler refuses to compile them.
Causality

Can be very complicated because of instantaneous communication

For example, this is also erroneous

```
abort
  pause;
emit B
when A
||
pause;
present B then emit A end
```

Emission of B indirectly causes emission of A
Causality

Definition has evolved since first version of the language
Original compiler had concept of “potentials”
Static concept: at a particular program point, which signals could be emitted along any path from that point
Latest definition based on “constructive causality”
Dynamic concept: whether there’s a “guess-free proof” that concludes a signal is absent
Causality Example

emit A;
present B then emit C end;
present A else emit B end;

Considered erroneous under the original compiler

After emit A runs, there’s a static path to emit B Therefore, the value of B cannot be decided yet

Execution procedure deadlocks: program is bad
Causality Example

emit A;
present B then emit C end;
present A else emit B end;

Considered acceptable to the latest compiler

After emit A runs, it is clear that B cannot be emitted because A’s presence runs the “then” branch of the second present

B declared absent, both present statements run
Esterel Programming Examples
People Counter Example

Construct an Esterel program that counts the number of people in a room. People enter the room from one door with a photocell that changes from 0 to 1 when the light is interrupted, and leave from a second door with a similar photocell. These inputs may be true for more than one clock cycle.

The two photocell inputs are called ENTER and LEAVE. There are two outputs: EMPTY and FULL, which are present when the room is empty and contains three people respectively.

Overall Structure

Conditioner detects rising edges of signal from photocell.

Counter tracks number of people in the room.
Implementing the Conditioner

module Conditioner:
    input A;
    output Y;

    loop
        await A; emit Y;
        await [not A];
    end

end module
Testing the Conditioner

```
# esterel -simul cond.strl
# gcc -o cond cond.c -lcsimul # may need -L
# ./cond
Conditioner> ;
--- Output:
Conditioner> A;     # Rising edge
--- Output: Y
Conditioner> A;     # Doesn’t generate a pulse
--- Output:
Conditioner> ;      # Reset
--- Output:
Conditioner> A;     # Another rising edge
--- Output: Y
Conditioner> ;      # Reset
--- Output:
Conditioner> A;     # Rising edge
--- Output: Y
```
Implementing the Counter: First Try

module Counter:
input ADD, SUB;
output FULL, EMPTY;

var count := 0 : integer in
  loop
    present ADD then if count < 3 then
      count := count + 1 end end;
    present SUB then if count > 0 then
      count := count - 1 end end;
    if count = 0 then emit EMPTY end;
    if count = 3 then emit FULL end;
    pause
  end
end
end module
Testing the Counter

Counter> ;
--- Output: EMPTY
Counter> ADD SUB;
--- Output: EMPTY
Counter> ADD;
--- Output:
Counter> SUB;
--- Output: EMPTY
Counter> ADD;
--- Output:
Counter> ADD;
--- Output:
Counter> ADD;
--- Output: FULL
Counter> ADD SUB;
--- Output: # Oops: still FULL
Counter, second try

module Counter:
    input ADD, SUB;
    output FULL, EMPTY;

    var c := 0 : integer in
        loop
            present ADD then
                present SUB else
                    if c < 3 then c := c + 1 end
                end
            else
                present SUB then
                    if c > 0 then c := c - 1 end;
                end;
            end;
            if c = 0 then emit EMPTY end;
            if c = 3 then emit FULL end;
            pause
        end
    end
end module
Testing the second counter

Counter> ;
--- Output: EMPTY
Counter> ADD SUB;
--- Output: EMPTY
Counter> ADD SUB;
--- Output: EMPTY
Counter> ADD;
--- Output:
Counter> ADD;
--- Output:
Counter> ADD;
--- Output: FULL
Counter> ADD SUB;
--- Output: FULL
Counter> ADD SUB;
--- Output: FULL
Counter> SUB;
--- Output:
Counter> SUB;
--- Output:
Counter> SUB;
--- Output: EMPTY
Counter> SUB;
--- Output: EMPTY
Assembling the People Counter

module PeopleCounter:
input ENTER, LEAVE;
output EMPTY, FULL;

signal ADD, SUB in
  run Conditioner[signal ENTER / A,
                 ADD / Y]
||
  run Conditioner[signal LEAVE / A,
                 SUB / Y]
||
  run Counter
end

end module
Vending Machine Example

Design a vending machine controller that dispenses gum once. Two inputs, N and D, are present when a nickel and dime have been inserted, and a single output, GUM, should be present for a single cycle when the machine has been given fifteen cents. No change is returned.

N = nickel
D = dime
GUM = gum

module Vending:
input N, D;
output GUM;

loop
  var m := 0 : integer in
  trap WAIT in
    loop
      present N then m := m + 5; end;
      present D then m := m + 10; end;
      if m >= 15 then exit WAIT end;
    pause
  end
  emit GUM; pause
end loop
end module
loop
    await
    case immediate N do await
    case N do await
        case N do nothing
        case immediate D do nothing
    end
    case immediate D do nothing
    end
case immediate D do await
    case immediate N do nothing
    case D do nothing
    end
end;
emit GUM; pause
end
Tail Lights Example

Construct an Esterel program that controls the turn signals of a 1965 Ford Thunderbird.

Tail Light Behavior
Tail Lights

There are three inputs, LEFT, RIGHT, and HAZ, that initiate the sequences, and six outputs, LA, LB, LC, RA, RB, and RC. The flashing sequence is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LC</th>
<th>LB</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>step</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>RC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Single Tail Light

module Lights:
output A, B, C;

loop
  emit A; pause;
  emit A; emit B; pause;
  emit A; emit B; emit C; pause;
  pause
end

end module
module Thunderbird :
    input LEFT, RIGHT, HAZ;
    output LA, LB, LC, RA, RB, RC;

    ...

    end module
The T-Bird Controller Body

loop
  await
    case immediate HAZ do
      abort
      run Lights[signal LA/A, LB/B, LC/C]
    ||
      run Lights[signal RA/A, RB/B, RC/C]
      when [not HAZ]
    case immediate LEFT do
      abort
      run Lights[signal LA/A, LB/B, LC/C]
      when [not LEFT]
    case immediate RIGHT do
      abort
      run Lights[signal RA/A, RB/B, RC/C]
      when [not RIGHT]
  end
end
Comments on the T-Bird

I choose to use Esterel’s innate ability to control the execution of processes, producing succinct easy-to-understand source but a somewhat larger executable.

An alternative: Use signals to control the execution of two processes, one for the left lights, one for the right.

A challenge: synchronizing hazards.

Most communication signals can be either level- or edge-sensitive.

Control can be done explicitly, or implicitly through signals.
Traffic-Light Controller Example

This controls a traffic light at the intersection of a busy highway and a farm road. Normally, the highway light is green but if a sensor detects a car on the farm road, the highway light turns yellow then red. The farm road light then turns green until there are no cars or after a long timeout. Then, the farm road light turns yellow then red, and the highway light returns to green. The inputs to the machine are the car sensor $c$, a short timeout signal $s$, and a long timeout signal $l$. The outputs are a timer start signal $r$, and the colors of the highway and farm road lights.

The Traffic Light Controller

module Fsm:

input C, L, S;
output R;
output HG, HY, FG, FY;

loop
  emit HG ; emit R; await [C and L];
  emit HY ; emit R; await S;
  emit FG ; emit R; await [not C or L];
  emit FY ; emit R; await S;
end

end module
The Traffic Light Controller

```plaintext
module Timer:
  input R, SEC;
  output L, S;

  loop
    weak abort
      await 3 SEC;
      [ sustain S
        || await 5 SEC;
        sustain L
      ]
    when R;
  end

end module
```
The Traffic Light Controller

module TLC:
    input C, SEC;
    output HG, HY, FG, FY;

    signal S, L, S in
        run Fsm
    ||
        run Timer
    end

end module
Compiling Esterel

Semantics of the language are formally defined and deterministic

It is the responsibility of the compiler to ensure the generated executable behaves correctly w.r.t. the semantics

Challenging for Esterel
Compilation Challenges

- Concurrency
- Interaction between exceptions and concurrency
- Preemption
- Resumption (pause, await, etc.)
- Checking causality
- Reincarnation
  Loop restriction prevents most statements from executing more than once in a cycle
  Complex interaction between concurrency, traps, and loops allows certain statements to execute twice or more
Automata-Based Compilation

Key insight: Esterel is a finite-state language

Each state is a set of program counter values where the program has paused between cycles

Signals are not part of these states because they do not hold their values between cycles

Esterel has variables, but these are not considered part of the state
Automata Compiler Example

loop
  emit A;
  await C;
  emit B;
pause
end

void tick() {
  static int s = 0;
  A = B = 0;

  switch (s) {
    case 0:
      A = 1;
      s = 1;
      break;
    case 1:
      if (C) {
        B = 1; s = 0;
      }
      break;
  }
}
Automata Compiler Example

```plaintext
emit A;
emit B;
await C;
emit D;
present E then
  emit B
end

switch (s) {
case 0:
  A=1;
  B=1;
  s=1;
  break;
case 1:
  if (C) {
    D=1;
    if (E) B=1;
    s=2;
  }
  break;
case 2:
}
```
Automata Compilation Considered

Very fast code (Internal signaling can be compiled away)

Can generate a lot of code because concurrency can cause exponential state growth

$n$-state machine interacting with another $n$-state machine can produce $n^2$ states

Language provides input constraints for reducing states

- “these inputs are mutually exclusive”
  \[
  \text{relation } A \# B \# C;
  \]
- “if this input arrives, this one does, too”
  \[
  \text{relation } D \Rightarrow E;
  \]
Automata Compilation

Not practical for large programs

Theoretically interesting, but don’t work for most programs longer than 1000 lines

All other techniques produce slower code
Netlist-Based Compilation

Key insight: Esterel programs can be translated into Boolean logic circuits

Netlist-based compiler:
Translate each statement into a small number of logic gates, a straightforward, mechanical process
Generate code that simulates the netlist
Netlist Example

emit A; emit B; await C;
emit D; present E then emit B end
Netlist Compilation Considered

Scales very well

- Netlist generation roughly linear in program size
- Generated code roughly linear in program size

Good framework for analyzing causality

- Semantics of netlists straightforward
- Constructive reasoning equivalent to three-valued simulation

Terribly inefficient code

- Lots of time wasted computing irrelevant values
- Can be hundreds of time slower than automata
- Little use of conditionals
Netlist Compilation

Currently the only solution for large programs that appear to have causality problems

Scalability attractive for industrial users

Currently the most widely-used technique
Control-Flow Graphs

Key insight: Esterel looks like a imperative language, so treat it as such

Esterel has a fairly natural translation into a concurrent control-flow graph

Trick is simulating the concurrency

Concurrent instructions in most Esterel programs can be scheduled statically

Use this schedule to build code with explicit context switches in it
every R do
    loop
        await A;
        emit B;
        if present C then
            emit D end;
        pause
    end
end

if ((s0 & 3) == 1) {
    if (S) {
        s3 = 1; s2 = 1; s1 = 1;
    } else
        if (s1 >> 1)
            s1 = 3;
        else {
            if ((s3 & 3) == 1) {
                s3 = 2; t3 = L1;
            } else {
                t3 = L2;
            }
        }
}
every R do
  loop
    await A;
    emit B;
    present C then
      emit D end;
    pause
  end
end

| |
| |
| |
loop
  present B then
    emit C end;
  pause
end
end
Add Threads

every R do
  loop
    await A;
    emit B;
    present C then
      emit D end;
    pause
  end
end

loop
  present B then
    emit C end;
  pause
end
end
every R do
  loop
    await A;
    emit B;
    present C then
    emit D end;
  pause
end

loop
  present B then
  emit C end;
pause
end
Add Code Between Pauses

every R do
  loop
    await A;
    emit B;
    present C then
      emit D end;
    pause
  end
end

loop
  present B then
    emit C end;
  pause
end

Diagram:
every R do
    loop
        await A;
        emit B;
        present C then
            emit D end;
        pause
    end
end

loop
    present B then
        emit C end;
    pause
end
every R do
  loop
    await A;
    emit B;
    present C then
      emit D end;
    pause
  end
end

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A

B

C

D

s=2

s=1
Add Dependencies and Schedule

every R do
  loop
    await A;
    emit B;
    present C then
      emit D end;
    pause
  end
end

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1  | S |
2  |   |

R

s=1

s=2

1

2

A

B

C

D

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
B  |   |
C  |   |
D  |   |

s=1

s=2
Run First Node

\[ R \]

\[ s=2 \quad s=1 \]

\[ \text{A} \quad \text{B} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{D} \]

\[ 1 \quad 2 \]
Run First Part of Left Thread
Run Right Thread
Context Switch
Finish Left Thread
Completed Example
Control-flow Approach Considered

Scales as well as the netlist compiler, but produces much faster code, almost as fast as automata.

Not an easy framework for checking causality.

Static scheduling requirement more restrictive than netlist compiler.

This compiler rejects some programs the others accept.

Only implementation hiding within Synopsys’ CoCentric System Studio. Will probably never be used industrially.

module Example:
input I, S;
output O, Q;
signal R, A in
every S do
    await I;
    weak abort
    sustain R
when immediate A;
emit O
end every
end signal
end module
GRC Selection Tree
GRC Control-flow graph
After Clustering
/els:

3
Generated code (1)

#define sched1a next1 = head1, head1 = &&C1a
#define sched1b next1 = head1, head1 = &&C1b
#define sched2 next2 = head1, head1 = &&C2
#define sched3a next3 = head1, head1 = &&C3a
#define sched3b next3 = head1, head1 = &&C3b
#define sched4 next4 = head2, head2 = &&C4
#define sched5a next5 = head3, head3 = &&C5a
#define sched5b next5 = head3, head3 = &&C5b
#define sched5c next5 = head3, head3 = &&C5c
#define sched6a next6 = head4, head4 = &&C6a
#define sched6b next6 = head4, head4 = &&C6b
#define sched6c next6 = head4, head4 = &&C6c
#define sched7a next7 = head5, head5 = &&C7a
#define sched7b next7 = head5, head5 = &&C7b
Generated code (2)

```c
int cycle() {
    void *next1;
    void *next2;
    void *next3;
    /* other next pointers */

    void *head1 = &&END_LEVEL_1;
    void *head2 = &&END_LEVEL_2;
    /* other level pointers */

    if (s1) { s1 = 0; goto N26; }
    else {
        s1 = 0;
        if (S) {
            s2 = 1; code0 = -1;
            sched7a; sched1b; sched3b;
            s3 = 2; sched6b;
        } else {
```
Generated code (3)

```c
if (s2) {
    s2 = 1;
    code0 = -1;
    sched7a; sched1a; sched3a;
    switch (s3) {
    case 0: sched6c; break;
    case 1:
        s3 = 1; code1 = -1;
        sched6a; sched2; goto N38;
    case 2:
        if (I) {
            s3 = 1; code1 = -1;
            sched6a; sched5a;
            N38: R = 1; code1 &=- (1 << 1);
        } else { s3 = 2; sched6b; }
        break;
    } }
} else {
    N26: s2 = 0; sched7b;
}
}
goto *head1;
```
**Generated code (4)**

C1a: if (s5) Q = 1;
C1b: if (R) s5 = 1;
else s5 = 0;
code0 &= -(1 << 1);
goto *next1;

C2: if (s6) sched4;
else s6 = 0;
goto *next2;

C3a: if (s4) s4 = 0;
else {
    if (R) A = 1;
C3b: s4 = 1;
}
code0 &= -(1 << 1);
goto *next3;

END_LEVEL1: goto *head2;
Linked Lists — initial state

Level 0
/* Cluster 0 */

  goto *head1;

Level 1
C1a:
C1b:
  goto *next1;
C2:
  goto *next2;
C3a:
C3b:
  goto *next3;
END_LEVEL1:
goto *head2;

Level 2
C4:
  goto *next4;
END_LEVEL2:
goto *head3;
Linked Lists – schedule C3a

Level 0
/*/ Cluster 0 */
.
.
goto *head1;

Level 1
C1a:
C1b:
.
.
goto *next1;

C2:
.
.
goto *next2;

C3a:
C3b:
.
.
goto *next3;

END_LEVEL1:
goto *head2;

Level 2
C4:
.
.
goto *next4;

END_LEVEL2:
goto *head3;
Linked Lists – schedule C1b

Level 0
/* Cluster 0 */

Level 1
C1a:
C1b:

Level 2
C4:

END_LEVEL1:
goto *head2;

C2:

C3a:
C3b:

END_LEVEL2:
goto *head3;

goto *next1;

goto *next2;

goto *next3;

goto *next4;
Linked Lists – schedule C4

Level 0
/* Cluster 0 */
  
  goto *head1;

Level 1
C1a:
  C1b:
    
    goto *next1;

C2:
  C3a:
    C3b:
      
      goto *next3;

END_LEVEL1:
  goto *head2;

Level 2
C4:
  
  goto *next4;

END_LEVEL2:
  goto *head3;
Summary
What To Understand About Esterel

Synchronous model of time

- Time divided into sequence of discrete instants
- Instructions either run and terminate in the same instant or explicitly in later instants

Idea of signals and broadcast

- “Variables” that take exactly one value each instant and don’t persist
- Coherence rule: all writers run before any readers

Causality Issues

- Contradictory programs
- How Esterel decides whether a program is correct
What To Understand About Esterel

Compilation techniques

Automata: Fast code, Doesn’t scale

Netlists: Scales well, Slow code, Good for causality

Control-flow: Scales well, Fast code, Bad at causality

Discrete Events: Scales well, Fast code, Better with more concurrency