ComPile: A Large IR Dataset from Production Sources

Aiden Grossman^{1*} Ludger Paehler² Konstantinos Parasyris³ Tal Ben-Nun³ Jacob Hegna⁴ **William Moses**⁵ Jose M Monsalve Diaz⁶ Mircea Trofin⁷ Johannes Doerfert³ ³Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory ¹UC Davis ²Technical University of Munich ⁴University of Minnesota ⁵University of Illinois Urbana Champaign ⁶ Argonne National Laboratory ⁷ Google, Inc. amgrossman@ucdavis.edu ludger.paehler@tum.de {parasyris1,talbn,jdoerfert}@llnl.gov jacobhegna@gmail.com jmonsalvediaz@anl.gov wsmoses@illinois.edu mtrofin@google.com

November 2023

1 Abstract

Code is increasingly becoming a core data modality of modern machine learning research impacting not only the way we write code with conversational agents like OpenAI's ChatGPT, Google's Bard, or Anthropic's Claude, the way we translate code from one language into another, but also the compiler infrastructure underlying the language. While modeling approaches may vary and representations differ, the targeted tasks often remain the same within the individual classes of models. Relying solely on the ability of modern models to extract information from unstructured code does not take advantage of 70 years of programming language and compiler development by not utilizing the structure inherent to programs in the data collection. This detracts from the performance of models working over a tokenized representation of input code and precludes the use of these models in the compiler itself. To work towards the first intermediate representation (IR) based models, we fully utilize the LLVM compiler infrastructure, shared by a number of languages, to generate a 182B token dataset of LLVM IR. We generated this dataset from programming languages built on the shared LLVM infrastructure, including Rust, Swift, Julia, and C/C++, by hooking into LLVM code generation either through the language's package manager or the compiler directly to extract the dataset of intermediate representations from production grade programs. Statistical analysis proves the utility of our dataset not only for large language model training, but also for the introspection into the code generation process itself with the dataset showing great promise for machine-learned compiler components.

2 Datasheet

Motivation

For what purpose was the dataset created? Was there a specific task in mind? Was there a specific gap that needed to be filled? Please provide a description.

The dataset was created to enable large scale analysis of existing compiler techniques and to provide a large, representative set of training data for the next generation of compiler-focused ML models.

Who created this dataset (e.g., which team, research Who funded the creation of the dataset? If there is an

group) and on behalf of which entity (e.g., company, institution, organization)?

The dataset was created by a cross-institutional collaboration including members from UC Davis, Technical University of Munich, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, University of Minnesota, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Argonne National Laboratory, and Google. The primary entity funding the development of ComPile is Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

^{*}Corresponding author

associated grant, please provide the name of the grantor and the grant name and number.

This work was in parts prepared by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344.

Any other comments?

None.

Composition

What do the instances that comprise the dataset represent (e.g., documents, photos, people, countries)? Are there multiple types of instances (e.g., movies, users, and ratings; people and interactions between them; nodes and edges)? Please provide a description.

Each instance within the dataset represents a single LLVM bitcode module. Depending upon the source language, this could represent a single translation unit like in C/C++, a single target as in Rust, or a package as in Julia.

How many instances are there in total (of each type, if appropriate)?

ComPile contains approximately 670,000 modules in its current form. module count

Does the dataset contain all possible instances or is it a sample (not necessarily random) of instances from a larger set? If the dataset is a sample, then what is the larger set? Is the sample representative of the larger set (e.g., geographic coverage)? If so, please describe how this representativeness was validated/verified. If it is not representative of the larger set, please describe why not (e.g., to cover a more diverse range of instances, because instances were withheld or unavailable).

The dataset is a sample of all possible instances. The sample is designed to be representative of bitcode modules that are present in widely-used production applications, but we do not currently have results quantifying how representative ComPile is of this population.

What data does each instance consist of? "Raw" data (e.g., unprocessed text or images) or features? In either case, please provide a description.

Each instance consists of an LLVM bitcode module in binary form along with associated provenance information, including the project that it was sourced from and the license information associated with that project.

Is there a label or target associated with each instance? If so, please provide a description.

No, there is not a label or target associated with each instance in the distributed form of the dataset.

Is any information missing from individual instances? If so, please provide a description, explaining why this information is missing (e.g., because it was unavailable). This does not include intentionally removed information, but might include, e.g., redacted text.

No, no information is missing from individual instances. All instances contain a complete, valid LLVM module and all associated provenance information.

Are relationships between individual instances made explicit (e.g., users' movie ratings, social network links)? If so, please describe how these relationships are made explicit.

Some relationships are made explicit. The per-project provenance information is included directly in each instance, allowing instances to be grouped by their source. However, other relationships such as the targets that modules get linked into are not preserved.

Are there recommended data splits (e.g., training, development/validation, testing)? If so, please provide a description of these splits, explaining the rationale behind them.

There is no recommended data split. The best data split will be highly dependent upon the specific downstream application that the user is interested in.

Are there any errors, sources of noise, or redundancies in the dataset? If so, please provide a description.

Many of the modules will contain some of the same functions, but no entire module will be exactly the same. All of the modules are parseable using an up-to-date LLVM toolchain, but some of them might fail to run through the optimization pipeline or timeout when performing certain analyses due to bugs in various parts of the toolchain.

Is the dataset self-contained, or does it link to or otherwise rely on external resources (e.g., websites, tweets, other datasets)? If it links to or relies on external resources, a) are there guarantees that they will exist, and remain constant, over time; b) are there official archival versions of the complete dataset (i.e., including the external resources as they existed at the time the dataset was created); c) are there any restrictions (e.g., licenses, fees) associated with any of the external resources that might apply to a future user? Please provide descriptions of all external resources and any restrictions associated with them, as well as links or other access points, as appropriate.

The dataset is entirely self-contained and does not rely on any external resources for its useability.

Does the dataset contain data that might be considered confidential (e.g., data that is protected by legal privilege or by doctor-patient confidentiality, data that includes the content of individuals non-public communications)? If so, please provide a description.

The data included in ComPile is obtained from publicly available sources and thus will not contain any confidential data that was not already broadly available. However, we cannot be certain that it does not contain any confidential information. Our dataset construction techniques should remove most cases of confidential information if they are present, like data in project repositories and comments, but does not eliminate all cases, like data embedded in code.

Does the dataset contain data that, if viewed directly, might be offensive, insulting, threatening, or might otherwise cause anxiety? If so, please describe why.

We believe that it is unlikely that any representation of the IR contained within our dataset would have any of these properties.

Does the dataset relate to people? If not, you may skip the remaining questions in this section. No.

Does the dataset identify any subpopulations (e.g., by age, gender)? If so, please describe how these subpopulations are identified and provide a description of their respective distributions within the dataset. N/A.

Is it possible to identify individuals (i.e., one or more natural persons), either directly or indirectly (i.e., in combination with other data) from the dataset? If so, please describe how.

N/A.

Does the dataset contain data that might be considered sensitive in any way (e.g., data that reveals racial or ethnic origins, sexual orientations, religious beliefs, political opinions or union memberships, or locations; financial or health data; biometric or genetic data; forms of government identification, such as social security numbers; criminal history)? If so, please provide a description.

N/A.

Any other comments? None.

Collection Process

How was the data associated with each instance acquired? Was the data directly observable (e.g., raw text, movie ratings), reported by subjects (e.g., survey responses), or indirectly inferred/derived from other data (e.g., part-of-speech tags, model-based guesses for age or language)? If data was reported by subjects or indirectly inferred/derived from other data, was the data validated/verified? If so, please describe how.

After building each piece of software included in the dataset, the data was directly available. The only information associated with each instance is provenance information, which was also readily collected. No labels or targets are included with each instance.

What mechanisms or procedures were used to collect the data (e.g., hardware apparatus or sensor, manual human curation, software program, software API)? How were these mechanisms or procedures validated?

We wrote a custom suite of tooling available at https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.10155760. The software pulls lists of software from specific package indices, attempts to build all the specified software, and extracts LLVM-IR in bitcode form from all of the software that successfully built.

If the dataset is a sample from a larger set, what was the sampling strategy (e.g., deterministic, probabilistic with specific sampling probabilities)?

We included as much IR as possible from package indices where it was feasible to automatically build all the packages. There was a significant portion of builds that failed and we also omitted multiple package indices that we believed would be more difficult to automate collection from. In addition, there are many projects that are not included in package repositories that the techniques we used to collect this dataset would not be able to obtain.

Who was involved in the data collection process (e.g., students, crowdworkers, contractors) and how were they compensated (e.g., how much were crowdworkers paid)?

All collection was automated.

Over what timeframe was the data collected? Does this timeframe match the creation timeframe of the data associated with the instances (e.g., recent crawl of old news articles)? If not, please describe the timeframe in which the data associated with the instances was created.

The most recent collection of the dataset was performed in early November of 2023. This version of the dataset was collected with the most up to date versions of the package indices available at the time and the latest release or nightly version of language specific toolchains depending upon the specific language.

Were any ethical review processes conducted (e.g., by an institutional review board)? If so, please provide a description of these review processes, including the outcomes, as well as a link or other access point to any supporting documentation. No.

Does the dataset relate to people? If not, you may skip the remaining questions in this section. No.

Did you collect the data from the individuals in question directly, or obtain it via third parties or other sources (e.g., websites)?

N/A.

Were the individuals in question notified about the data collection? If so, please describe (or show with screenshots or other information) how notice was provided, and provide a link or other access point to, or otherwise reproduce, the exact language of the notification itself.

N/A.

Did the individuals in question consent to the collection and use of their data? If so, please describe (or show with screenshots or other information) how consent was requested and provided, and provide a link or other access point to, or otherwise reproduce, the exact language to which the individuals consented. N/A.

If consent was obtained, were the consenting individuals provided with a mechanism to revoke their consent in the future or for certain uses? If so, please provide a description, as well as a link or other access point to the mechanism (if appropriate). N/A.

Has an analysis of the potential impact of the dataset and its use on data subjects (e.g., a data protection impact analysis) been conducted? If so, please provide a description of this analysis, including the outcomes, as well as a link or other access point to any supporting documentation.

N/A.

Any other comments?

None.

Preprocessing/cleaning/labeling

Was any preprocessing/cleaning/labeling of the data done (e.g., discretization or bucketing, tokenization, part-of-speech tagging, SIFT feature extraction, removal of instances, processing of missing values)? If so, please provide a description. If not, you may skip the remainder of the questions in this section.

We performed a deduplication step based on LLVM's StructuralHash to remove duplicate modules from the dataset. In addition, we filtered by project to only include projects with permissive licensing.

Was the "raw" data saved in addition to the preprocessed/cleaned/labeled data (e.g., to support unanticipated future uses)? If so, please provide a link or other access point to the "raw" data.

The raw data was saved, but there are no plans to release it. There are license constraints imposed by the source projects that we need to abide by, restricting us from publishing a completely unfiltered version. In addition, while LLVM's **StructuralHash** is slightly lossy, almost all of the duplicates it identifies are accurate, and publishing a dataset that contains many duplicate modules provides little additional value.

Is the software used to preprocess/clean/label the instances available? If so, please provide a link or other access point.

Yes. All of the software used to process the dataset is available at (llvm-ir-dataset-utils link).

Any other comments?

None.

Uses

Has the dataset been used for any tasks already? If so, please provide a description.

We have used the dataset internally to perform some tasks, including training large language models, to good effect. The results for our usage here are currently unpublished.

Is there a repository that links to any or all papers or systems that use the dataset? If so, please provide a link or other access point.

No, there is not currently a repository that links to all users of the dataset.

What (other) tasks could the dataset be used for?

In addition to large-scale training of machine learning models, we also believe the dataset could be valuable for large-scale analyses of existing and classical compilation techniques.

Is there anything about the composition of the dataset or the way it was collected and preprocessed/cleaned/labeled that might impact future uses? For example, is there anything that a future user might need to know to avoid uses that could result in unfair treatment of individuals or groups (e.g., stereotyping, quality of service issues) or other undesirable harms (e.g., financial harms, legal risks) If so, please provide a description. Is there anything a future user could do to mitigate these undesirable harms?

The dataset was collected from a corpus of software at a specific point in time and with specific toolchain versions. There have been significant changes in the past like the migration to opaque pointers that significantly impact how the IR looks. Major, and even relatively minor changes in LLVM and the language frontends should be analyzed before using ComPile to ensure that the data is representative.

Are there tasks for which the dataset should not be used? If so, please provide a description.

The dataset is currently not representative of all languages that contain an LLVM frontend. For example, we do not include any IR from Fortran. Language specific tasks where the language is not represented in ComPile should not currently be performed using ComPile.

Any other comments?

None.

Distribution

Will the dataset be distributed to third parties outside of the entity (e.g., company, institution, organization) on behalf of which the dataset was created? If so, please provide a description.

Currently, we are pushing the dataset through an internal review process. We will upload it to HuggingFace after the review is complete where it will be available at https://huggingface.co/datasets/llvm-ml/ComPile. Sadly, we can not provide an exact time-frame for when the dataset will be publicly available.

How will the dataset will be distributed (e.g., tarball on website, API, GitHub) Does the dataset have a digital object identifier (DOI)?

The dataset will be available for download on the HuggingFace hub https://huggingface.co/datasets/llvm-ml/ComPile after review approval.

When will the dataset be distributed?

Late 2023.

Will the dataset be distributed under a copyright or other intellectual property (IP) license, and/or under applicable terms of use (ToU)? If so, please describe this license and/or ToU, and provide a link or other access point to, or otherwise reproduce, any relevant licensing terms or ToU, as well as any fees associated with these restrictions.

Users of the dataset will need to comply with the licenses of the individual projects that compose ComPile. The authors of ComPile do not impose any additional restrictions on users of the dataset.

Have any third parties imposed IP-based or other restrictions on the data associated with the instances? If so, please describe these restrictions, and provide a link or other access point to, or otherwise reproduce, any relevant licensing terms, as well as any fees associated with these restrictions.

Yes, there are restrictions based on the licenses that the source projects that compose ComPile use. These include attribution for distribution of the data in verbatim form. ComPile only includes projects that are licensed under the MIT license, the Apache-2.0 license, the BSD-3-Clause license, and the BSD-2-Clause license. The exact terms for each license can be found on the OSI's website at https://opensource.org/licenses/.

Do any export controls or other regulatory restrictions apply to the dataset or to individual instances? If so, please describe these restrictions, and provide a link or other access point to, or otherwise reproduce, any supporting documentation. No.

Any other comments? None.

Maintenance

Who will be supporting/hosting/maintaining the dataset?

The authors will be continuing to maintain and support the dataset. It will be hosted on HuggingFace.

How can the owner/curator/manager of the dataset be contacted (e.g., email address)?

The authors of the dataset can be contacted utilizing the contacts listed in the list of authors above.

Is there an erratum? If so, please provide a link or other access point.

No.

Will the dataset be updated (e.g., to correct labeling errors, add new instances, delete instances)? If so, please describe how often, by whom, and how updates will be communicated to users (e.g., mailing list, GitHub)?

The dataset will be updated periodically to contain the latest versions of the packages currently included in the dataset, any new packages added to the package indices that the data is pulled from. More package indices might also be added in the future. Additionally, updates of the dataset will be built against the latest version of the toolchain available for each specific language to better represent the contemporary distribution of IR.

If the dataset relates to people, are there applicable limits on the retention of the data associated with the instances (e.g., were individuals in question told that their data would be retained for a fixed period of time and then deleted)? If so, please describe these limits and explain how they will be enforced.

The dataset does not relate to people.

Will older versions of the dataset continue to be supported/hosted/maintained? If so, please describe how. If not, please describe how its obsolescence will be communicated to users.

Yes, older versions of the dataset will be available on HuggingFace to enable comparative analysis over time.

If others want to extend/augment/build on/contribute to the dataset, is there a mechanism for them to do so? If so, please provide a description. Will these contributions be validated/verified? If so, please describe how. If not, why not? Is there a process for communicating/distributing these contributions to other users? If so, please provide a description.

The tooling to construct the dataset is open source and available at https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.10155760.

Any other comments?

None.