Multicycle Pipeline Operations

09-1

Material may be added to this set.

Material Covered

Section 3.7.

Long-Latency Operations (Topics)

Typical instructions: floating point

Pipelined v. non-pipelined execution units

Initiation interval and latency

Placement in Chapter-3 DLX pipeline

Timing diagrams

09-2

Long-Latency Operations

Typical Instructions

Fastest: Floating-Point Add, Subtract, Conversions

In DLX: `addf`, `addd`, `cvti2f` (convert integer to float), `ltd` (compare less-than of doubles), etc.

Intermediate Speed: Multiply

In DLX: `multd`, `multf`.

Slowest Speed: Divide, Modulo, Square Root

In DLX: `divd`, `divf`.

09-2

09-3

Implementation of Long-Latency Operations

Implementation balances cost and performance.

Low Cost: Unpipelined, Single Functional Unit, Data Recirculates

Functional unit occupied by instruction during computation ...
... so it can execute only one instruction at a time.

Intermediate Cost: Multiple Unpipelined Functional Units

Functional units occupied by instruction during computation ...
... each can execute a different instruction.

Cost a multiple of single-unit cost.

Highest Cost: Pipelined Functional Unit

Functional unit pipelined, at best each stage can hold a different instruction.

Cost disadvantage depends on how unpipelined units implemented.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.

09-3

09-4

Hazards With Long-Latency Operations in Chapter-3 Pipeline

Structural Hazards

Functional Unit Structural Hazards

Because an instruction can occupy a functional unit (*e.g.*, DIV) more than one cycle ...
... a following instruction needing that unit may be stalled.

(Occurs when initiation interval greater than one.)

Register Write (MEM Stage) Structural Hazards

Because different units have different latencies ...
... instructions that started at different times can finish at the same time ...
... only one can write results (unless extra register file ports added).

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-4

09-5

Data Hazards

RAW Hazards

As with integer operations, result not ready in time.

With long-latency operations instructions may wait longer.

WAW Hazards

Occurs when two nearby instructions write same register ...
... and second instruction finishes first.

WAR Hazards

Cannot occur in Chapter-3 pipeline because instructions start in order.

Precise Exceptions

A headache because an instruction can be ready to write ...
... long before a preceding instruction raises an exception.

09-6

Handling Functional Unit Structural Hazards

Example, 4-cycle latency unpipelined divide.

Unless FU changed, instructions must be stalled to avoid hazard.

```
divd f0, f2, f4  IF  ID  DIV DIV DIV DIV DIV WB
divd f6, f8, f10     IF  ID  --------------> DIV DIV DIV DIV WB
```

Hazard easily handled:

Units provide a *ready-next-cycle* signal to ID stage.

Instruction stalled if ready-next-cycle for needed unit is 0.

09-6

09-7

Eliminating Hazards

Provide more than one functional unit.

Example, provide two 4-cycle latency divide units, `DVa` and `DVb`.

```
divd f0, f2, f4  IF  ID  DVa DVa DVa DVa DVa WB
divd f6, f8, f10     IF  ID  DVb DVb DVb DVb DVb WB
```

Pipeline functional unit.

Example, use 5-cycle latency, initiation interval 2, pipelined divide ...
... and live with single stall cycle.

```
divd f0, f2, f4  IF  ID  DV0 DV0 DV1 DV1 DV2 DV2 WB
divd f6, f8, f10     IF  ID  --> DV0 DV0 DV1 DV1 DV2 DV2 WB
```

09-8

Handling Register Write Structural Hazards

Example (stall to avoid hazard in cycle 8)

```
!Cycle              0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
multd f0, f2, f4    IF  ID  M0  M1  M2  M3  M4  M5  WB
addi  r1, r1, #1        IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
addd  f6, f8, f10           IF  ID  --> A0  A1  A2  A3  WB
```


EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-8

09-9

Handling Register Write Structural Hazards

Method 1: Delay instruction in ID. (Used above.)

Include a shift register called a *reservation register*.

Each cycle the reservation register is shifted.

A 1 indicates a "reservation" to enter WB.

Bit position indicates time ...
... with the LSB indicating two cycles later ...
... the next bit indicating three cycles later ...
... and so on.

The ID stage controller, based on the opcode of the instruction ...
... knows the number of cycles before WB will be entered.

It checks the corresponding reservation register bit ...
... if it's 1 then IF and ID are stalled ...
... if it's 0 then the bit is set to 1 and the instruction proceeds.

If such a stall occurs the reservation register is still shifted ...
... and so a 0 will eventually move into the bit position.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-9

09-10

Method 2: Delay instructions ready to enter WB.

Each functional unit provides a signal ...

... indicating when it has an instruction ready to enter WB.

One of those signals is chosen (using some method) ...

... the corresponding instruction moves to WB ...

... while the others are stalled.

09-10

09-11

Comparison of Method 1 and 2

Method 1 is easier to implement ...

... since logic remains in one stage.

In contrast, logic for method 2 would span several stages ...

... since stages back to IF might need to be stalled ...

... and so critical paths would be long.

Method 2 is more flexible ...

... since priority could be given to longer-latency instructions.

09-12

Handling RAW Hazards

The interlock mechanism for RAW hazards ...

... must keep track of registers with pending writes ...

... and use this information to stall instructions.

Consider, `add f1, f2, f3`.

Check if any uncompleted preceding instructions write `f2` or `f3`.

If so, stall until register(s) written or can be bypassed to adder.

09-13

Possible RAW Interlock Implementations.

Brute Force: Check all following stages

As done for integer operations, check following stages ...
... for pending write to register.

Each stage of every pipelined unit must be checked.

Too expensive.

Register file includes *ready bit* for each register.

Ready bit normally 1, indicating no pending writes (so value valid).

When instruction issued, bit set to 0 ...
... when instruction completes and result written, set back to 1.

Instruction stalls if either operand's ready bit is 0 ...
... *and* cannot be bypassed.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-13

09-14

WAW Hazards

Example with 3-stage pipelined multiply and one-stage add, no MEM.

```
mulf f0, f1, f2    IF  ID  M0  M1  M2  WB
addf f0, f3, f4        IF  ID  A0  WB      ! Incorrect execution!!
```

Handling WAW Hazards

The interlock mechanism for RAW hazards handles WAW hazards in which there is an intervening read.

Example with 3-stage pipelined multiply and one-stage add, no MEM.

```
mulf f0, f1, f2    IF  ID  M0  M1  M2  WB
subf f5, f0, f6        IF  ID  ----->  A0  WB
addf f0, f3, f4            IF  ----->  ID  A0  WB ! No problem.
```

If there is no intervening write the earlier instruction is squashed.

```
mulf f0, f1, f2    IF  ID  M0x
addf f0, f3, f4        IF  ID  A0  WB
```


EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-14

09-15

WAR Hazards

Possible when register read delayed.

Can't happen in Chapter-3 DLX because instructions

(1) read registers in ID

(2) pass through ID in program order

(3) and produce results only after leaving ID.

Consider:

```
Cycle:            0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10  11
multf f0, f1, f2  IF  ID  M0  M1  M2  M3  M4  M5  M6  M7  WB
addf  f1, f3, f4      IF  ID  A0  A1  A2  A3  WB
```

There *would* be a WAR hazard if `addf` wrote `f1` before `multf` read it.

That can't happen since `multf` would leave ID (with `f1`) as `addf` just enters ID.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-15

CPI and Multicycle Operations

09-16

CPI more sensitive to dependencies between instructions.

CPI Loop Example

Consider:

```
LOOP:
ld   f0, 0(r1)
addi r1, r1, #8
gtd  f0, f2
bfpt LOOP
addi r2, r2, #1
j LOOP
xor  r3, r4, r5
```

Note dependency between `gtd` and `bfpt`.

What is the CPI during the execution of this loop?

09-17

When branch not taken:

```
LOOP:
Cycle:           0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10  11  12  13
ld   f0, 0(r1)   IF  ID  EX  MEM WB                          IF  ID  EX
addi r1, r1, #8      IF  ID  EX  MEM WB                          IF  ID
gtd  f0, f2              IF  ID  A0  A1  A2  A3  WB                  IF
bfpt LOOP                    IF  ID  ------------>  EX  MEM WB
addi r2, r2, #1                  IF  ------------>  ID  EX  MEM WB
j LOOP                                              IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
xor  r3, r4, r5                                         IF
```

Note: Second iteration will execute exactly as first.

Therefore, can base iteration time on corresponding points in consecutive iterations.

By inspection of diagram, iteration time: 11 cycles. Instructions: 6.

For a large number of iterations. CPI: $\frac{11}{6} = 1.8333$.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-17

09-18

When branch taken.

```
LOOP:
Cycle:           0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10  11  12  13
ld   f0, 0(r1)   IF  ID  EX  MEM WB                  IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
addi r1, r1, #8      IF  ID  EX  MEM WB                  IF  ID  EX  MEM
gtd  f0, f2              IF  ID  A0  A1  A2  A3  WB          IF  ID  EX
bfpt LOOP                    IF  ID  ------------>  EX  MEM WB  IF  ID
addi r2, r2, #1                  IF  ------------>  x               IF
j LOOP
xor  r3, r4, r5
```

Note: Second iteration will execute exactly as first.

Iteration time: 9 cylces. Instructions: 4.

For a large number of iterations: CPI is $\frac{9}{4} = 2.25$.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-18

09-19

Precise Exceptions

Problem is registers written out of order ...
... so some registers must be *unwritten* ...
... so that when handler starts ...
... it must *seem* as though ...
... all instructions before faulting instructions executed ...
... while no instructions after faulting instruction execute.

```
multf f0, f1, f2  IF  ID  M0  M1  M2  M3  M4  M5 *M6* WB
addf  f1, f3, f4      IF  ID  A0  A1  A2  A3  WB
```

To do this either ...
... add lots of stalls so instructions do finish in order ...
... limit those instructions that can raise precise exceptions ...
... or need to *unexecute* instructions.

The first option is fine for debugging, too slow otherwise.

The second option requires lots of hardware.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-19

09-20

Stalling to Maintain Precise Exceptions

Method 1: Stall so that instructions complete in order.

```
multf f0, f1, f2  IF  ID  M0  M1  M2  M3  M4  M5  M6  WB
addf  f1, f3, f4      IF  ID  --------->  A0  A1  A2  A3  WB
```

This works, (WB in program order) but reduces performance.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.

09-20

09-21

Method 2: Early Detection of Exceptions

FP unit raises exceptions early in computation . . .
. . . if computation passes that point, it will finish without exceptions.

For example, 26-cycle DIV unit may check operands by cycle 3 . . .
. . . if computation reaches cycle 4 there is no possibility of an exception.

Instructions only stall until preceding instruction checked for exceptions.

For example, suppose the FP multiply unit finds exceptions by end of M5.

Then at cycle 8 (below) `addf` can write (no chance of an exception in M6).

```
Cycle:          0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
multf f0,f1,f2 IF  ID  M0  M1  M2  M3  M4  M5  M6  WB
addf  f1,f3,f4     IF  ID  ->  A0  A1  A2  A3  WB
```


EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-21

09-22

Method 3: Have precise and non-precise FP operations.

Let the names of imprecise instructions end in `ip`.

Second `addf` doesn't stall since an exception in `multfip` need not be precise.

```
Cycle:              0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10  11  12  13  14
multf   f0,f1,f2    IF  ID  M0  M1  M2  M3  M4  M5  M6  WB
addf    f1,f3,f4        IF  ID  ---------->  A0  A1  A2  A3  WB
multfip f5,f6,f7            IF  ---------->  ID  M0  M1  M2  M3  M4  M5  M6  WB
addf    f6,f8,f9                             IF  ID  A0  A1  A2  A3  WB
```


EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-22

09-23

Method 4: FP instructions precise when followed by special test instruction.

Call the special instruction `testexc`.

No stalls (and imprecise exceptions) where `testexc` not used.

```
Cycle:  0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10  11  12  13  14  15  16 17
multf   IF  ID  M0  M1  M2  M3  M4  M5  M6  WB
testexc     IF  ID  ----------------->  EX  MEM WB
addf            IF  ----------------->  ID  A0  A1  A2  A3  WB
multf                                   IF  ID  M0  M1  M2  M3  M4  M5  M6 WB
addf                                        IF  ID  A0  A1  A2  A3  WB
```


EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-23

09-24

Unexecuting Instructions

An instruction is unexecuted ...

... by restoring the previous contents of any register it wrote.

Method 1: *History File*

History file holds replaced values.

These are used to undo writes.

09-24

09-25

Method 2: Writes to register file are buffered.

Register writes (register number and new value) ...

... are first placed in a buffer ...

... possibly out of program order.

Writes from buffer to register file performed in order ...

... waiting for long-latency operations to complete.

Register reads check the buffer first, then the register file.

When an exception occurs ...

... only writes preceding the faulting instruction ...

... are made from the buffer to the register file.

Disadvantage: Checking both buffer and register file is time-consuming.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-25

09-26

Method 3: *Future File*

Two register files maintained, *main* and *future*.

Future file written as instruction complete ...

... main file written in program order.

Future file is used for reading registers.

At an exception, ...

... main file updated up to faulting instruction ...

... future file is effectively erased ...

... its contents replaced by main register file before handler starts.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-26

09-27

Performance of FP in the Chapter-3 DLX Implementation

Stalls per FP operation on SPEC 92 FP benchmarks.

Running SPEC 92 benchmarks on DLX compiled using old version of gcc.

Value indicates stall cycles per instruction type.

E.g., running doduc, there are an average of 1.7 stall cycles due to each compare.

Stall cycles are due to RAW hazards except for *divide structural* bars.



09-27

FIGURE 3.48 Stalls per FP operation for each major type of FP operation.

09-28

Number of stalls determined by:

- latency of functional unit,
- characteristics of program, and
- quality of compiler.

Example:

```
Cycle:              0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10  11  12  13  14
multf   f0,f1,f2    IF  ID  M0  M1  M2  M3  M4  M5  M6  WB
addf    f3,f0,f4        IF  ID  ---------------------->  A0  A1  A2  A3  WB
```

Here, six stall cycles "charged" to `multf`.

Lower latency (better functional unit) would mean fewer stall cycles.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-28

09-29

Example, better scheduling:

```
Cycle:              0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10  11  12  13  14
multf   f0,f1,f2    IF  ID  M0  M1  M2  M3  M4  M5  M6  WB
gtf     f5,f6,f7        IF  ID  A0  A1  A2  A3  WB
subd    f8,f10,f12          IF  ID  A0  A1  A2  A3  WB
addf    f3,f0,f4                IF  ID  ------------>  A0  A1  A2  A3  WB
```

Here `multf` charged with only four cycles because of `gtf` and `subd`.

The existence of such instructions depends on program characteristics.

Discovery and scheduling (arrangement) of such instructions depends on compiler.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-29

09-30

Performance of FP in the Chapter-3 DLX Implementation

Running SPEC 92 benchmarks on DLX compiled using old version of gcc.

Value indicates stalls per instruction by cause.

Stalls caused primarily by RAW hazards.



FIGURE 3.49 The stalls occurring for the DLX FP pipeline for the five FP SPEC benchmarks.

09-30

09-31

Performance of MIPS (now Silicon Graphics) R4000.

Running SPEC 92 benchmarks on R4000.

In R4000:

Load latency is two cycles.

Branch delay two cycles.

FP functional units partially pipelined.



09-31

09-32

Dependencies

Dependency:
A relationship between two instructions . . .
. . . indicating their execution should be in program order.

If there is a dependency between instruction A and instruction B . . .
. . . and B follows A in program order . . .
. . . then B is said to be *dependent* on A.

If B is dependent on A then A should normally execute before B.

Dependency Types:

- *True or Data Dependence*
- *Name Dependence*
- *Control Dependence*

09-32

Data Dependence

09-33

Data Dependence:
A dependence between two instructions . . .
. . . indicating data needed by the second is produced by the first.

Example:

```
add  r1, r2, r3
sub  r4, r1, r5
and  r6, r4, r7
```

The `sub` is dependent on `add` (via `r1`).

The `and` is dependent on `sub` (via `r4`).

The `and` is dependent `add` (via `sub`).

Execution may be incorrect if . . .
. . . a program having a data dependence . . .
. . . is run on a processor having an uncorrected RAW hazard.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.

09-33

09-34

Name Dependencies

There are two kinds: *antidependence* and *output dependence*.

Antidependence:
A dependence between two instructions ...
... indicating a value written by the second ...
... that the first instruction reads.

Antidependence Example

```
add  r1, r2, r3
sub  r2, r4, r5
```

`sub` is antidependent on the `add`.

Execution may be incorrect if ...
... a program having an antidependence ...
... is run on a processor having an uncorrected WAR hazard.

09-34

09-35

Output Dependence

A dependence between two instructions ...

... indicating that both instructions write the same location ...

... (register or memory address).

Output Dependence Example

```
add  r1, r2, r3
sub  r1, r4, r5
```

The `sub` is output dependent on `add`.

Execution may be incorrect if ...

... a program having an output dependence ...

... is run on a processor having an uncorrected WAW hazard.

09-36

Control Dependence

A dependence between a branch instruction and a second instruction ...

... indicating that whether the second instruction executes ...

... depends on the outcome of the branch.

```
beqz  r1, SKIP
add   r2, r3, r4
sub   r5, r6, r7
```

The `add` is control dependent on the `beqz`.

The `sub` is not control dependent on the `beqz`.

Instruction-Level Parallelism

09-37

Instruction-Level Parallelism

The average number of instructions in a machine-language program ...

... that can be simultaneously started [per cycle] ...

... when execution is only limited by true dependencies.

Note: Text definition is less specific.

Number of instructions started per cycle, IPC, is $\frac{1}{\text{CPI}}$.

Provides a bound on performance of an implementation of an ISA.

09-38

ILP for SPEC92 programs in MIPS:



FIGURE 4.38 ILP available in a perfect processor for six of the SPEC benchmarks.

Based on graph it's possible to attain a CPI of $\frac{1}{54.8}$ for gcc ...
... which is much better than 1 for Chapter-3 DLX.

These IPC's are much higher than believed attainable.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-38

ILP Example

09-39

Example 1: No control-transfer instructions, no name dependencies.

```
lw   r1, 0(r2)
sub  r4, r1, r5
and  r6, r1, r7
xor  r8, r4, r6
slt  r9, r8, r10
or   r11, r8, r12
addi r13, r8, #1
```

09-40

Execution on DLX:

```
Cycle:               0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10  11
 lw   r1, 0(r2)      IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
 sub  r4, r1, r5         IF  ID  --> EX  MEM WB
 and  r6, r1, r7             IF  --> ID  EX  MEM WB
 xor  r8, r4, r6                 IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
 slt  r9, r8, r10                    IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
 or   r11, r8, r12                       IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
 addi r13, r8, #1                            IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
```

On DLX, execution speed $\frac{7}{8} = 0.875$ inst/cycle.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-40

09-41

Execution on ideal machine used for determining ILP:

To find ILP use 0-cycle latencies and true dependencies:

```
!Cycle:              0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10  11
 lw   r1, 0(r2)      St
 sub  r4, r1, r5         St
 and  r6, r1, r7         St
 xor  r8, r4, r6             St
 slt  r9, r8, r10                St
 or   r11, r8, r12               St
 addi r13, r8, #1                St
```

ILP is $\frac{7}{4} = 2.75$ inst/cycle, much better.

Note: No stall after load.

Simultaneous execution of instructions at cycle 1 and 3.

09-42

Example 1a: No control-transfer instructions, name dependencies.

```
 lw   r1, 0(r2)
 add  r2, r1, r3  ! Data dependence between lw and add
 xor  r1, r4, r5  ! Anti dependence between add and xor.
 add  r6, r1, r6  ! Data dependence between xor and add.
```

Execution on the Chapter-3 DLX implementation.

```
!Cycle:           0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10  11
 lw   r1, 0(r2)   IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
 add  r2, r1, r3      IF  ID  --> EX  MEM WB
 xor  r1, r4, r5          IF  --> ID  EX  MEM WB
 add  r6, r1, r6                  IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
```

ILP Analysis.

```
!Cycle:           0   1
 lw   r1, 0(r2)   St
 add  r2, r1, r3     St   ! Wait due to data dependency.
 xor  r1, r4, r5  St      ! No need to wait for name dependency.
 add  r6, r1, r6     St
```


EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-42

Example 2: No control-transfer instructions, load/stores.

09-43

On Chapter-3 DLX:

```
!Cycle:                          0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
 add  r1, r2, r3                 IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
 sw   0(r10), r1                     IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
 lw   r4, 0(r11) ! r10 = r11             IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
 lw   r5, 0(r12) ! r10 != r12                IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
 sub  r6, r4, r7                             IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
 add  r8, r5, r9                                 IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
```

ILP Analysis:

```
!Cycle:                          0   1   2   3
 add  r1, r2, r3                 St
 sw   0(r10), r1                     St
 lw   r4, 0(r11) ! r10 = r11             St
 lw   r5, 0(r12) ! r10 != r12    St
 sub  r6, r4, r7                             St
 add  r8, r5, r9                     St
```

ILP is $\frac{6}{4} = 1.5$.

To achieve this hardware must determine effective address relationships.

ILP and Basic Blocks

09-44

Basic Block:

Consecutive instruction that are always executed consecutively.

Equivalently: consecutive instructions in which . . .
. . . only the first may be a branch target . . .
. . . and only the last may contain a control transfer.

All members of a basic block get executed the same number of times.

```
L1:
 add  r1, r2, r3   ! Basic block 1.
L0:
 sub  r2, r3, r4   ! Basic block 2.
 and  r5, r6, r7   ! Basic block 2.
 bneq r5, TARGET   ! Basic block 2.
 xor  r6, r7, r8   ! Basic block 3.
TARGET:
 or   r9, r10, r11 ! Basic block 4.
L2:
```

Code contains four basic blocks.

09-45

ILP and Basic Blocks

Much ILP comes from *ignoring* control dependencies . . .
. . . that is, simultaneously executing instructions in different basic blocks.

Example 3: Control Transfers

On Chapter-3 DLX:

```
! Cycle              0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10
add  r1, r2, r3     IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
bneq r4, SKIP           IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
add  r5, r6, r7             IFx
SKIP:
or   r8, r9, r10                IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
bneq r8 SKIP2                       IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
addi r1, r1, #5                         IFx
SKIP2:
xor  r11, r11, r12                          IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
```


EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-45

09-46

ILP Analysis:

```
! Cycle              0   1
add  r1, r2, r3      St
bneq r4, SKIP        St
add  r5, r6, r7
SKIP:
or   r8, r9, r10     St
bneq r8 SKIP2            St
addi r1, r1, #5
SKIP2:
xor  r11, r11, r12   St
```

ILP: $\frac{5}{2}$.

Instruction overlap determined by operands only, not branches.

Loop Unrolling

09-47

Loop Unrolling:

A code restructuring technique for loops in which ...
... the computations performed by several iterations of the original loop ...
... are performed by one iteration of the unrolled loop.

The unrolled loop performs the same amount of work ...
... but uses fewer instructions and induces fewer stalls.

Loop is said to be unrolled *twice* ...
... if two iterations of original loop performed by one of unrolled loop.

Loop is said to be unrolled n times ...
... if n iterations of original loop performed by one of unrolled loop.

A loop unrolled once is the same as the original loop.

Loop Unrolling Example

09-48

Suppose loop below runs for 24 iterations.

Execution on DLX:

```
! Cycle          0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8
LOOP:
lw   r1, 0(r2)   IF  ID  EX  MEM WB          IF  ID
add  r3, r3, r1      IF  ID  --> EX  MEM WB      IF
addi r2, r2, #4          IF  --> ID  EX  MEM WB
sub  r5, r4, r2                  IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
bneq r5, LOOP                        IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
and                                      IFx
```

Execution on DLX. $\frac{7}{5} = 1.5\,\mathrm{CPI}$ ...

... execution time $24 \times 7 = 168$ cycles.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.

09-48

09-49

Unrolled twice:

```
! Cycle            0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10
LOOP:
lw   r1, 0(r2)     IF  ID  EX  MEM WB                  IF  ID  EX
lw   r10, 4(r2)        IF  ID  EX  MEM WB                  IF  ID
addi r2, r2, #8            IF  ID  EX  MEM WB                  IF
add  r3, r3, r1                IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
add  r3, r3, r10                   IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
sub  r5, r4, r2                        IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
bneq r5, LOOP                              IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
and                                            IFx
```

Instruction execution time: $\frac{8}{7} = 1.14$ CPI...

... execution time $12 \times 8 = 96$ cycles.

Double benefit: ...

... faster execution per instruction and ...

... fewer instructions.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-49

09-50

ILP Analysis (for comparison): $\frac{1}{5} = 0.2$ CPI.

```
! Cycle          0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
LOOP:
lw   r1, 0(r2)   St1 St2
add  r3, r3, r1      St1 St2
addi r2, r2, #4  St1 St2
sub  r5, r4, r2      St1 St2
bneq r5, LOOP            St1 St2
and
```

Total execution time: 24 cycles.

Unrolled loop still far from ideal.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-50

09-51

Scheduled:

```
! Cycle          0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
LOOP:
lw   r1, 0(r2)   IF  ID  EX  MEM WB      IF
addi r2, r2, #4      IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
add  r3, r3, r1          IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
sub  r5, r4, r2              IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
bneq r5, LOOP                    IF  ID  EX  MEM WB
and                                  IFx
```

Scheduled: $\frac{6}{5} = 1.2\,\mathrm{CPI}$ ...

... execution time $24 \times 6 = 144$ cycles.

Not as good as unrolled loop, 96 cycles.

EE 4720 Lecture Transparency. Formatted 12:33, 15 October 1999 from lsli09.
09-51

09-52

How Unrolling Improves Performance

Suppose original loop had 24 iterations and unrolled twice.

Unrolled loop runs for 12 iterations.

Twelve, instead of 24 end-of-loop branches ...
... eliminates 12 branch condition test instructions, 12 branch instructions, ...
... and 12 bubbles inserted after branch.

If indexed addressing allowed (*e.g.*, `lw r10, 4(r2)`) ...
... eliminates 12 address increment instructions.

With more instructions per iterations, its easier to eliminate RAW hazard stalls by scheduling.