Computer Architecture

CH4 Processor Microarchitecture (IV)

Prof. Ren-Shuo Liu NTHU EE



Outline



- Background
- Single-cycle design
- Pipelined design
 - Pipeline concepts and MIPS's pipeline
 - Cost and issues of pipelining
- Detailed pipelined datapath and control
 - Trace the pipeline
 - Dependencies, hazards, and forwarding
 - Stalls and exceptions



Two lw cases





Data Hazards That Cause Stall(s)

• Three branch cases



4

How to Handle



- Detect the situations
- Stall the pipeline
- Example







6





7









9













Exceptions



- An function call whose calling point is not predefined
 - In comparison, the calling points of normal functions are known at compile time
- Some very similar concepts
 - Interrupts
 - Exceptions
 - Traps

Exception Handling Flow



- Hardware
 - Sets the EPC register to be PC
 - Sets the Cause register to reflect the type of the exception
- Hardware flushes mis-fetched instructions
- Hardware sets PC to be a predefined value
 - Where an OS-level exception handler resides
 - The OS-level exception handler reads the Cause register
 - The OS-level exception handler may further invokes a userlevel exception handler
- Exception handler (software) decides whether to jump to the EPC to resume the program

Common Exception Causes



• IF

- Page fault/access fault on instruction fetch
- ID
 - Undefined opcode
- EXE
 - Overflow
 - Divided by zero
- MEM
 - Page fault/access fault on data access
- WB

Example





Example



- If add causes overflow
 - When the exception happens?
 - Which instructions are in the pipeline?
 - Which instructions shouldn't have entered the pipeline?



18







- Already fetched into the pipeline
- Shouldn't have done that (若事先知道 add產生exception,就不該fetch它們)

Exception Hardware





Other Advanced Topics



- Static vs dynamic mechanisms
- Multiple issue
- Loop unrolling
- Branch predictor

Static vs Dynamic



- Static
 - Decisions are made (typically by a compiler) at compile time
- Dynamic
 - Decisions are made at run time according to the information available at run time
- Which performs better?

Multiple-Issue Pipeline



- Fetch and execute multiple instructions in a cycle
- Exploit the inherent parallelism of a program
- Increase the parallelism of a program
- Can be performed statically or dynamically



Static Multiple Issue



- Compiler groups instructions into "issue packets"
 - Group of instructions that can be issued on a single cycle
 - Determined by pipeline resources required
- Think of an issue packet as a very long instruction
 - Specifies multiple concurrent operations
 - \Rightarrow Very Long Instruction Word (VLIW)



MIPS with Static Dual Issue

- Two-issue **packet**s
 - One ALU/branch instruction
 - One load/store instruction
 - 64-bit aligned
 - ALU/branch, then load/store
 - Pad an unused instruction with nop

Address	Instruction type	Pipeline Stages						
n	ALU/branch	IF	ID	EX	MEM	WB		
n + 4	Load/store	IF	ID	EX	MEM	WB		
n + 8	ALU/branch		IF	ID	EX	MEM	WB	
n + 12	Load/store		IF	ID	EX	MEM	WB	
n + 16	ALU/branch			IF	ID	EX	MEM	WB
n + 20	Load/store			IF	ID	EX	MEM	WB



Pipeline with Static Dual Issue



Hazards in the Dual-Issue Pipeline

- More instructions executing in parallel
- EX data hazard
 - Forwarding avoided stalls with single-issue
 - Now can't use ALU result in load/store in same packet
 - add \$t0, \$s0, \$s1
 load \$s2, 0(\$t0)
 - Split into two packets, effectively a stall
- Load-use hazard
 - Still one cycle use latency, but now two instructions
- More aggressive scheduling required

Static Dual Issue Example



Schedule this for dual-issue MIPS

Loop: lw **\$t0**, 0(\$s1) **#** \$t0=array element addu **\$t0**, **\$t0**, \$s2 **#** add scalar in \$s2 sw **\$t0**, 0(\$s1) **#** store result addi **\$s1**, \$s1,-4 **#** decrement pointer bne **\$s1**, \$zero, Loop **#** branch \$s1!=0

	ALU/branch	Load/store	cycle
Loop:	nop	lw \$t0 , 0(\$s1)	1
	addi <mark>\$s1</mark> , \$s1,-4	nop	2
	addu \$t0, <mark>\$t0</mark> , \$s2	nop	3
	bne \$s1 , \$zero, Loop	sw \$t0, 4(\$s1)	4

IPC = 5/4 = 1.25 (c.f. peak IPC = 2)

Static Dual Issue + Loop Unrolling

- Replicate loop body to expose more parallelism and reduce the loop-control overhead
- Use different registers per replication

	ALU/branch			Load/	cycle			
Loop:	addi	\$s1,	\$s1,-	-16	٦w	\$t0,	0(\$s1)	1
	nop				٦w	\$t1,	12(\$s1)	2
	addu	\$t0,	\$t0,	\$s2	٦w	\$t2,	8(\$s1)	3
	addu	\$t1,	\$t1,	\$s2	٦w	\$t3,	4(\$s1)	4
	addu	\$t2,	\$t2,	\$s2	SW	\$t0,	16(\$s1)	5
	addu	\$t3,	\$t4,	\$s2	SW	\$t1,	12(\$s1)	6
	nop				SW	\$t2,	8(\$s1)	7
	bne	\$s1,	\$zero	o, Loop	SW	\$t3,	4(\$s1)	8

• IPC = 14/8 = 1.75 (at the cost of registers and code size)

Dynamic Multiple Issue



- "Superscalar" processors
- CPU decides whether to issue 0, 1, 2, ... instructions each cycle
- Avoids the need for compiler scheduling
 - Though it may still help
 - Code semantics ensured by the CPU

Does Multiple Issue Work?



- Yes, but not as much as we'd like
- Programs have real dependencies that limit instruction level parallelism (ILP)
- Some dependencies are hard to eliminate
 - e.g., pointer
- Some parallelism is hard to expose
 - Limited window size during instruction issue
- Memory delays and limited bandwidth
 - Hard to keep pipelines full
- Speculation can help if done well

Power Efficiency



- Complexity of dynamic scheduling and speculations requires power
- Multiple simpler cores may be better

Microprocessor	Year	Clock Rate	Pipeline Stages	lssue width	Out-of-order/ Speculation	Cores	Power
i486	1989	25MHz	5	1	No	1	5W
Pentium	1993	66MHz	5	2	No	1	10W
Pentium Pro	1997	200MHz	10	3	Yes	1	29W
P4 Willamette	2001	2000MHz	22	3	Yes	1	75W
P4 Prescott	2004	3600MHz	31	3	Yes	1	103W
Core	2006	2930MHz	14	4	Yes	2	75W
UltraSparc III	2003	1950MHz	14	4	No	1	90W
UltraSparc T1	2005	1200MHz	6	1	No	8	70W

Dynamic Branch Prediction



- In deeper and superscalar pipelines, stall cycles of branch hazards are more significant
- Use dynamic prediction
 - Store the recent outcomes (taken/not taken) of branches into a table
 - 1-bit predictor records the last outcome
 - 2-bit predictor can record the last two outcomes
 - To execute a branch
 - Check the table, expect the same outcome
 - Start fetching from fall-through or target
 - If wrong, flush pipeline and flip prediction

1-Bit Predictor: Shortcoming



• Inner loop branches mispredicted twice



Outcome of the inner loop branches: T, T, T, T, T, T, \underline{N} , \underline{T} , T, T, T, T, T, \underline{N} , \underline{T} , T, T, ... (T: taken, N: not taken)

2-Bit Predictor



 Only change prediction on two successive mispredictions



Outcome of the inner loop branches: T, T, T, T, T, N, T, T, T, T, T, T, N, T, T, ... (T: taken, N: not taken)

Fallacies



- (X) Pipelining is easy
 - The basic idea is easy
 - The devil is in the details
 - e.g., detecting data hazards
- (X) Pipelining is independent of technology (i.e, transistor scaling)
 - Latencies of RAM, ALU, etc. affect pipeline design decisions, such as the number of pipeline stages
 - More transistors make more advanced techniques feasible
 - Pipeline-related ISA design needs to take account of technology trends

Pitfalls



- Poor ISA design can make pipelining harder
 - e.g., complex instruction sets (X86)
 - Significant overhead to make pipelining work
 - X86 processor needs to translate X86 instructions into RISC-like operations by hardware
 - This is one small reason why Intel loses the smartphone market
 - e.g., complex addressing modes
 - e.g., delayed branches
 - Advanced pipelines have long delay slots
 - It is hard to fully utilize many slots
 - Program portability is also a concern if delayed branches are adopted

