CIS 501
Computer Architecture

Unit 6: Pipelining

This Unit: (Scalar In-Order) Pipelining



- Basic Pipelining
  - Pipeline control
- Data Hazards
  - Software interlocks and scheduling
  - Hardware interlocks and stalling
  - Bypassing
- Control Hazards
  - Branch prediction

Readings

- H+P
  - Appendix A

Datapath and Control



- **Datapath**: implements execute portion of fetch/exec. loop
  - Functional units (ALUs), registers, memory interface
- **Control**: implements decode portion of fetch/execute loop
  - Mux selectors, write enable signals regulate flow of data in datapath
  - Part of decode involves translating insn opcode into control signals

Single-Cycle Datapath



- **Single-cycle datapath**: true "atomic" VN loop
  - Fetch, decode, execute one complete insn every cycle
  - **"Hardwired control"**: opcode to control signals ROM
  - + Low CPI: 1 by definition
  - – Long clock period: to accommodate longest insn

Multi-Cycle Datapath



- **Multi-cycle datapath**: also true "atomic" VN loop
  - Fetch, decode, execute one complete insn over multiple cycles
  - **Micro-coded control**: "stages" control signals
    - Allows insns to take different number of cycles (the main point)
  - ± Opposite of single-cycle: short clock period, high IPC

Single-cycle vs. Multi-cycle Performance

- Single-cycle
  - Clock period = 50ns, CPI = 1
  - Performance = **50ns/insn**
- Multi-cycle has opposite performance split of single-cycle
  - + Shorter clock period
  - – Higher CPI
- Multi-cycle
  - Branch: 20% (**3** cycles), load: 20% (**5** cycles), ALU: 60% (**4** cycles)
  - Clock period = **11ns**, CPI = (0.2*3+0.2*5+0.6*4) = 4
    - Why is clock period 11ns and not 10ns?
  - Performance = **44ns/insn**
- Aside: CISC makes perfect sense in multi-cycle datpath

Latency vs. Throughput



- Can we have both low CPI and short clock period?
  - Not if datapath executes only one insn at a time
- Latency vs. Throughput
  - – Latency: no good way to make a single insn go faster
  - + **Throughput**: fortunately, no one cares about single insn latency
    - Goal is to make programs, not individual insns, go faster
    - Programs contain billions of insns

Pipelining



- Important performance technique
  - **Improves instruction throughput rather instruction latency**
- Begin with multi-cycle design
  - When instruction advances from stage 1 to 2
  - Allow next instruction to enter stage 1
  - Form of parallelism: "insn-stage parallelism"
  - Individual instruction takes the same number of stages
  - + **But instructions enter and leave at a much faster rate**
- Automotive assembly line analogy

5 Stage Pipelined Datapath



- Temporary values (PC,IR,A,B,O,D) re-latched every stage
  - Why? 5 insns may be in pipeline at once with different PCs
  - Notice, PC not latched after ALU stage (why not?)
  - **Pipelined control**: one single-cycle controller
    - Control signals themselves pipelined

Pipeline Terminology



- Five stage: **F**etch, **D**ecode, e**X**ecute, **M**emory, **W**riteback
  - Nothing magical about the number 5 (Pentium 4 has 22 stages)
- Latches (pipeline registers) named by stages they separate
  - **PC**, **F/D**, **D/X**, **X/M**, **M/W**

More Terminology & Foreshadowing

- **Scalar pipeline**: one insn per stage per cycle
  - Alternative: "superscalar" (later)
- **In-order pipeline**: insns enter execute stage in VN order
  - Alternative: "out-of-order" (later)
- **Pipeline depth**: number of pipeline stages
  - Nothing magical about five
  - Trend has been to deeper pipelines (again, more later)

Instruction Convention

- Real ISAs are inconsistent about order
- Some ISAs (for example MIPS)
  - Instruction destination (i.e., output) **on the left**
  - add $1, $2, $3 means $1←$2+$3
- Other ISAs
  - Instruction destination (i.e., output) **on the right**

  `add r1,r2,r3` means `r1+r2➔r3`

  `ld 0(r5),r4` means `mem[r5+8]➔r4`

  `st r4,0(r5)` means `r4➔mem[r5+8]`
- Will try to specify to avoid confusion, next slides MIPS style

Pipeline Example: Cycle 1



`add $3,$2,$1`

- 3 instructions

Pipeline Example: Cycle 2



`lw $4,0($5)` `add $3,$2,$1`

Pipeline Example: Cycle 3



`sw $6,4($7)` `lw $4,0($5)` `add $3,$2,$1`

Pipeline Example: Cycle 4



- 3 instructions

Pipeline Example: Cycle 5



Pipeline Example: Cycle 6



Pipeline Example: Cycle 7



Pipeline Diagram

- **Pipeline diagram**: shorthand for what we just saw
  - Across: cycles
  - Down: insns
  - Convention: **X** means `lw $4,0($5)` finishes execute stage and writes into X/M latch at end of cycle 4

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
`add $3,$2,$1`	F	D	X	M	W				
`lw $4,0($5)`		F	D	**X**	M	W			
`sw $6,4($7)`			F	D	X	M	W		

Example Pipeline Perf. Calculation

- Single-cycle
  - Clock period = 50ns, CPI = 1
  - Performance = 50ns/insn
- Multi-cycle
  - Branch: 20% (3 cycles), load: 20% (5 cycles), ALU: 60% (4 cycles)
  - Clock period = 11ns, CPI = (0.2*3+0.2*5+0.6*4) = 4
  - Performance = 44ns/insn
- 5-stage pipelined
  - Clock period = **12ns** (approx. (50ns / 5 stages) + overheads)
  - + CPI = **1** (each insn takes 5 cycles, but 1 completes each cycle)
    - + Performance = **12ns/insn**
  - – Well actually … CPI = 1 + some penalty for pipelining (next)
    - CPI = **1.5** (on average insn completes every 1.5 cycles)
    - Performance = **18ns/insn**

Q1: Why Is Pipeline Clock Period …

- … > (delay thru datapath) / (number of pipeline stages)?
  - Latches add delay
  - Extra "bypassing" logic adds delay
  - Pipeline stages have different delays, clock period is max delay
  - These factors have implications for ideal number pipeline stages

Q2: Why Is Pipeline CPI…

- … > 1?
  - CPI for scalar in-order pipeline is 1 **+ stall penalties**
  - Stalls used to resolve hazards
    - **Hazard**: condition that jeopardizes sequential illusion
    - **Stall**: pipeline delay introduced to restore sequential illusion
- Calculating pipeline CPI
  - **Frequency of stall** * **stall cycles**
  - Penalties add (stalls generally don't overlap in in-order pipelines)
  - 1 + stall-freq$_1$*stall-cyc$_1$ + stall-freq$_2$*stall-cyc$_2$ + …
- Correctness/performance/make common case fast (MCCF)
  - Long penalties OK if they happen rarely, e.g., 1 + 0.01 * 10 = 1.1
  - Stalls also have implications for ideal number of pipeline stages

Dependences and Hazards

- **Dependence**: relationship between two insns
  - **Data**: two insns use same storage location
  - **Control**: one insn affects whether another executes at all
  - Not a bad thing, programs would be boring without them
  - Enforced by making older insn go before younger one
    - Happens naturally in single-/multi-cycle designs
    - But not in a pipeline

- **Hazard**: dependence & possibility of wrong insn order
  - Effects of wrong insn order cannot be externally visible
    - **Stall**: for order by keeping younger insn in same stage
  - Hazards are a bad thing: stalls reduce performance

Why Does Every Insn Take 5 Cycles?



- Could/should we allow **`add`** to skip M and go to W? No
  - It wouldn't help: peak fetch still only 1 insn per cycle
  - **Structural hazards**: imagine **`add`** follows **`lw`**

Structural Hazards

- **Structural hazards**
  - Two insns trying to use same circuit at same time
    - E.g., structural hazard on regfile write port

- **To fix structural hazards**: proper ISA/pipeline design
  - Each insn uses every structure exactly once
  - For at most one cycle
  - Always at same stage relative to F (fetch)

- **Tolerate structure hazards**
  - Add stall logic to stall pipeline when hazards occur

Example Structural Hazard

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
`ld r2,0(r1)`	F	D	X	**M**	W				
`add r1,r3,r4`		F	D	X	M	W			
`sub r1,r3,r5`			F	D	X	M	W		
`st r6,0(r1)`				**F**	D	X	M	W	

- **Structural hazard**: resource needed twice in one cycle
  - Example: unified instruction & data cache
  - Solutions:
    - Separate instruction/data caches
    - Redesign cache to allow 2 accesses per cycle (slow, expensive)
    - Stall pipeline

Data Hazards



- Let's forget about branches and the control for a while
- The three insn sequence we saw earlier executed fine…
  - But it wasn't a real program
  - Real programs have **data dependences**
    - They pass values via registers and memory

Dependent Operations

- Independent operations

```
add $3,$2,$1
add $6,$5,$4
```

- Would this program execute correctly on a pipeline?

```
add $3,$2,$1
add $6,$5,$3
```

- What about this program?

```
add $3,$2,$1
lw $4,0($3)
addi $6,1,$3
sw $3,0($7)
```


Data Hazards



- Would this "program" execute correctly on this pipeline?
  - Which insns would execute with correct inputs?
  - **add** is writing its result into $3 in current cycle
  - **lw** read $3 2 cycles ago → got wrong value
  - **addi** read $3 1 cycle ago → got wrong value
  - **sw** is reading $3 this cycle → maybe (depending on regfile design)

Memory Data Hazards



- What about data hazards through memory? No
  - **lw** following **sw** to same address in next cycle, gets right value
  - Why? Data mem read/write always take place in same stage
- Data hazards through registers? Yes (previous slide)
  - Occur because register write is 3 stages after register read
  - Can only read a register value 3 cycles after writing it

Observation!



- Technically, this situation is broken
  - `lw $4,0($3)` has already read `$3` from regfile
  - `add $3,$2,$1` hasn't yet written `$3` to regfile
- But fundamentally, everything is OK
  - `lw $4,0($3)` hasn't actually used `$3` yet
  - `add $3,$2,$1` has already computed `$3`

Reducing Data Hazards: Bypassing



- **Bypassing**
  - Reading a value from an intermediate (μarchitectural) source
  - Not waiting until it is available from primary source
  - Here, we are bypassing the register file
  - Also called **forwarding**

WX Bypassing



- What about this combination?
  - Add another bypass path and MUX input
  - First one was an **MX** bypass
  - This one is a **WX** bypass

ALUinB Bypassing



- Can also bypass to ALU input B

WM Bypassing?



- Does WM bypassing make sense?
  - Not to the address input (why not?)
  - But to the store data input, yes

Bypass Logic



- Each MUX has its own, here it is for MUX ALUinA
  (D/X.IR.RegSource1 == X/M.IR.RegDest) => 0
  (D/X.IR.RegSource1 == M/W.IR.RegDest) => 1
  Else => 2

Pipeline Diagrams with Bypassing

- If bypass exists, "from"/"to" stages execute in same cycle
  - Example: full bypassing, use MX bypass

```
                1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
add r2,r3➔r1    F  D  X  M  W
sub r1,r4➔r2       F  D  X  M  W
```

  - Example: full bypassing, use WX bypass

```
                1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
add r2,r3➔r1    F  D  X  M  W
ld [r7]➔r5         F  D  X  M  W
sub r1,r4➔r2          F  D  X  M  W
```

  - Example: WM bypass

```
                1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
add r2,r3➔r1    F  D  X  M  W
?                  F  D  X  M  W
```

    - Can you think of a code example that uses the WM bypass?

Have We Prevented All Data Hazards?



- No. Consider a "load" followed by a dependent "add" insn
- Bypassing alone isn't sufficient
- Solution? Detect this, and then stall the "add" by one cycle

Stalling to Avoid Data Hazards



- Prevent F/D insn from reading (advancing) this cycle
  - Write `nop` into D/X.IR (effectively, insert `nop` in hardware)
  - Also reset (clear) the datapath control signals
  - Disable F/D latch and PC write enables (why?)
- Re-evaluate situation next cycle

Stalling on Load-To-Use Dependences




```
add $4,$2,$3      lw $3,4($2)
```

Stall = (D/X.IR.Operation == LOAD) &&
((F/D.IR.RegSrc1 == D/X.IR.RegDest) ||
((F/D.IR.RegSrc2 == D/X.IR.RegDest) && (F/D.IR.OP != STORE))

Stalling on Load-To-Use Dependences




```
add $4,$2,$3      (stall bubble)      lw $3,4($2)
```

Stall = (D/X.IR.Operation == LOAD) &&
((F/D.IR.RegSrc1 == D/X.IR.RegDest) ||
((F/D.IR.RegSrc2 == D/X.IR.RegDest) && (F/D.IR.OP != STORE))

Stalling on Load-To-Use Dependences




```
add $4,$2,$3      (stall bubble)      lw $3,…
```

Stall = (D/X.IR.Operation == LOAD) &&
((F/D.IR.RegSrc1 == D/X.IR.RegDest) ||
((F/D.IR.RegSrc2 == D/X.IR.RegDest) && (F/D.IR.OP != STORE))

Performance Impact of Load/Use Penalty

- Assume
  - Branch: 20%, load: 20%, store: 10%, other: 50%
  - 50% of loads are followed by dependent instruction
    - require 1 cycle stall (I.e., insertion of 1 **nop**)
- Calculate CPI
  - CPI = 1 + (1 * 20% * 50%) = **1.1**

Pipeline Diagram With Load-Use Dep.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
`add $3,$2,$1`	F	D	X	M	W				
`lw $4,4($3)`		F	D	X	M	W			
`addi $6,$4,1`			F	D	**d***	X	M	W	

- Use compiler scheduling to reduce load-use stall frequency
  - More on compiler scheduling later

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
`add $3,$2,$1`	F	D	X	M	W				
`lw $4,4($3)`		F	D	X	M	W			
`sub $8,$3,$1`			F	D	X	M	W		
`addi $6,$4,1`				F	D	X	M	W	

Pipelining and Multi-Cycle Operations



- What if you wanted to add a multi-cycle operation?
  - E.g., 4-cycle multiply
  - **P/W**: separate output latch connects to W stage
  - Controlled by pipeline control and multiplier FSM

A Pipelined Multiplier



- Multiplier itself is often pipelined, what does this mean?
  - Product/multiplicand register/ALUs/latches replicated
  - Can start different multiply operations in consecutive cycles

Pipeline Diagram with Multiplier

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
`mul $4,$3,$5`	F	D	P0	P1	P2	P3	W		
`addi $6,$4,1`		F	D	**d***	**d***	**d***	X	M	W

- What about…
  - Two instructions trying to write regfile in same cycle?
  - Structural hazard!
- Must prevent:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
`mul $4,$3,$5`	F	D	P0	P1	P2	P3	W		
`addi $6,$1,1`		F	D	X	M	W			
`add $5,$6,$10`			F	D	X	M	**W**		

More Multiplier Nasties

- What about…
  - Mis-ordered writes to the same register
  - Software thinks `add` gets `$4` from `addi`, actually gets it from `mul`

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
`mul $4,$3,$5`	F	D	P0	P1	P2	P3	W		
`addi $4,$1,1`		F	D	X	M	**W**			
…									
…									
`add $10,$4,$6`					F	D	X	M	W

- Common? Not for a 4-cycle multiply with 5-stage pipeline
  - More common with deeper pipelines
  - In any case, must be correct

Corrected Pipeline Diagram

- With the correct stall logic
  - Prevent mis-ordered writes to the same register
  - Why two cycles of delay?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
`mul $4,$3,$5`	F	D	P0	P1	P2	P3	W		
`addi $4,$1,1`		F	D	**d***	**d***	X	M	**W**	
…									
…									
`add $10,$4,$6`					F	D	X	M	W

- **Multi-cycle operations complicate pipeline logic**

Pipelined Functional Units

- Almost all multi-cycle functional units are pipelined
  - Each operation takes N cycles
  - But can start initiate a new (independent) operation every cycle
  - Requires internal latching and some hardware replication
  - \+ A cheaper way to add bandwidth than multiple non-pipelined units

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
`mulf f0,f1,f2`	F	D	E*	E*	E*	E*	W				
`mulf f3,f4,f5`		F	D	E*	E*	E*	E*	W			

- One exception: int/FP divide: difficult to pipeline and not worth it

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
`divf f0,f1,f2`	F	D	E/	E/	E/	E/	W				
`divf f3,f4,f5`		F	D	**s***	**s***	**s***	E/	E/	E/	E/	W

- **s*** = structural hazard, two insns need same structure
  - ISAs and pipelines designed to have few of these
  - Canonical example: all insns forced to go through M stage

What About Branches?



- **Control hazards options**
  - Could just stall to wait for branch outcome (two-cycle penalty)
  - **Fetch past branch insns before branch outcome is known**
    - Default: assume "**not-taken**" (at fetch, can't tell it's a branch)

Branch Recovery



- **Branch recovery**: what to do when branch is actually taken
  - Insns that will be written into F/D and D/X are wrong
  - **Flush them**, i.e., replace them with `nops`
  - + They haven't had written permanent state yet (regfile, DMem)
  - – Two cycle penalty for taken branches

Branch Performance

- Back of the envelope calculation
  - **Branch: 20%**, load: 20%, store: 10%, other: 50%
  - Say, **75% of branches are taken**
- CPI = 1 + 20% * 75% * 2 =
  1 + **0.20 * 0.75 * 2** = 1.3
  - – **Branches cause 30% slowdown**
    - Even worse with deeper pipelines
  - How do we reduce this penalty?

Big Idea: Speculative Execution

- Speculation: "risky transactions on chance of profit"
- **Speculative execution**
  - Execute before all parameters known with certainty
  - **Correct speculation**
    - + Avoid stall, improve performance
  - **Incorrect speculation (mis-speculation)**
    - – Must abort/flush/squash incorrect insns
    - – Must undo incorrect changes (recover pre-speculation state)
  - The "game": **[$\%_{correct}$ * gain] – [(1–$\%_{correct}$) * penalty]**
- **Control speculation**: speculation aimed at control hazards
  - Unknown parameter: are these the correct insns to execute next?

Control Speculation and Recovery



- **Mis-speculation recovery**: what to do on wrong guess
  - Not too painful in an in-order pipeline
  - Branch resolves in X
  - \+ Younger insns (in F, D) haven't changed permanent state
  - **Flush** insns currently in F/D and D/X (i.e., replace with `nops`)



Reducing Penalty: Fast Branches

- **Fast branch**: targets control-hazard penalty
  - Basically, branch insns that can resolve at D, not X
    - Test must be comparison to zero or equality, **no time for ALU**
  - \+ New taken branch penalty is 1
  - – Additional comparison insns (e.g., `cmplt`, `slt`) for complex tests
  - – Must bypass into decode stage now, too



Fast Branch Performance

- Assume: Branch: 20%, 75% of branches are taken
  - CPI = 1 + 20% * 75% * **1** = 1 + **0.20*0.75*1** = **1.15**
    - **15% slowdown** (better than the 30% from before)
- But wait, fast branches assume only simple comparisons
  - Fine for MIPS
  - But not fine for ISAs with "branch if $1 > $2" operations
- In such cases, say 25% of branches require an extra insn
  - CPI = 1 + (20% * 75% * 1) + 20%*25%*1(extra insn) = **1.2**
- Example of ISA and micro-architecture interaction
  - Type of branch instructions
  - Another option: "Delayed branch" or "branch delay slot"
  - What about condition codes?

Fewer Mispredictions: Branch Prediction



- **Dynamic branch prediction**:
  - Hardware guesses outcome
  - Start fetching from guessed address

Branch Prediction Performance

- Parameters
  - **Branch: 20%**, load: 20%, store: 10%, other: 50%
  - 75% of branches are taken
- Dynamic branch prediction
  - Branches predicted with 95% accuracy
  - CPI = 1 + 20% * 5% * 2 = **1.02**

Dynamic Branch Prediction Components



- Step #1: is it a branch?
  - Easy after decode...
- Step #2: is the branch taken or not taken?
  - **Direction predictor** (applies to conditional branches only)
  - Predicts taken/not-taken
- Step #3: if the branch is taken, where does it go?
  - Easy after decode…

Branch Direction Prediction

- Learn from past, predict the future
  - Record the past in a hardware structure
- **Direction predictor (DIRP)**
  - Map conditional-branch PC to taken/not-taken (T/N) decision
  - Individual conditional branches often unbiased or weakly biased
    - 90%+ one way or the other considered **"biased"**
    - Why? Loop back edges, checking for uncommon conditions
- **Branch history table (BHT)**: simplest predictor
  - PC indexes table of bits (0 = N, 1 = T), no tags
  - Essentially: branch will go same way it went last time



  - What about aliasing?
    - Two PC with the same lower bits?

Branch History Table (BHT)

- **Branch history table (BHT)**: simplest direction predictor
  - PC indexes table of bits (0 = N, 1 = T), no tags
  - Essentially: branch will go same way it went last time
  - Problem: consider **inner loop branch** below (* = mis-prediction)

```
for (i=0;i<100;i++)
   for (j=0;j<3;j++)
      // whatever
```

State/prediction	**N***	**T**	**T**	**T***	**N***	**T**	**T**	**T***	**N***	**T**	**T**	**T***
Outcome	T	T	T	N	T	T	T	N	T	T	T	N

  - Two "built-in" mis-predictions per inner loop iteration
  - Branch predictor "changes its mind too quickly"

Two-Bit Saturating Counters (2bc)

- **Two-bit saturating counters (2bc)** [Smith]
  - Replace each single-bit prediction
    - (0,1,2,3) = (N,n,t,T)
  - Adds "hysteresis"
    - Force predictor to mis-predict twice before "changing its mind"

State/prediction	**N***	**n***	**t**	**T***	**t**	**T**	**T**	**T***	**t**	**T**	**T**	**T***
Outcome	T	T	T	N	T	T	T	N	T	T	T	N

  - One mispredict each loop execution (rather than two)
    - \+ Fixes this pathology (which is not contrived, by the way)
    - Can we do even better?

Correlated Predictor

- **Correlated (two-level) predictor** [Patt]
  - Exploits observation that branch outcomes are correlated
  - Maintains separate prediction per (PC, BHR)
    - **Branch history register (BHR)**: recent branch outcomes
  - Simple working example: assume program has one branch
    - BHT: one 1-bit DIRP entry
    - BHT+**2BHR**: 2^2 = **4** 1-bit DIRP entries

State/prediction	BHR=NN	**N***	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
"active pattern"	BHR=NT	N	**N***	T	T	T	**T**	T	T	T	**T**	T	T
	BHR=TN	N	N	N	N	**N***	T	T	T	**T**	T	T	T
	BHR=TT	N	N	**N***	**T***	N	N	**N***	**T***	N	N	**N***	**T***
Outcome	N N	T	T	T	N	T	T	T	N	T	T	T	N

  - We didn't make anything better, what's the problem?

Correlated Predictor

- What happened?
  - BHR wasn't long enough to capture the pattern
  - Try again: BHT+**3BHR**: 2^3 = **8** 1-bit DIRP entries

State/prediction	BHR=NNN	**N***	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
	BHR=NNT	N	**N***	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
	BHR=NTN	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
"active pattern"	BHR=NTT	N	N	**N***	T	T	T	**T**	T	T	T	**T**	T
	BHR=TNN	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
	BHR=TNT	N	N	N	N	N	**N***	T	T	T	**T**	T	T
	BHR=TTN	N	N	N	N	**N***	T	T	T	**T**	T	T	T
	BHR=TTT	N	N	N	**N**	N	N	N	**N**	N	N	N	N
Outcome	N N N	T	T	T	N	T	T	T	N	T	T	T	N

  - \+ No mis-predictions after predictor learns all the relevant patterns

Correlated Predictor

- Design choice I: one **global** BHR or one per PC (**local**)?
  - Each one captures different kinds of patterns
  - Global is better, captures local patterns for tight loop branches
- Design choice II: how many history bits (BHR size)?
  - Tricky one
  - \+ Given unlimited resources, longer BHRs are better, but…
  - – BHT utilization decreases
    - – Many history patterns are never seen
    - – Many branches are history independent (don't care)
    - PC xor BHR allows multiple PCs to dynamically share BHT
    - BHR length < $\log_2$(BHT size)
  - – Predictor takes longer to train
  - Typical length: 8–12

Hybrid Predictor

- **Hybrid (tournament) predictor** [McFarling]
  - Attacks correlated predictor BHT utilization problem
  - Idea: combine two predictors
    - **Simple BHT** predicts history independent branches
    - **Correlated predictor** predicts only branches that need history
    - **Chooser** assigns branches to one predictor or the other
    - Branches start in simple BHT, move mis-prediction threshold
  - \+ Correlated predictor can be made smaller, handles fewer branches
  - \+ 90–95% accuracy



When to Perform Branch Prediction?

- During Decode
  - Look at instruction opcode to determine branch instructions
  - Can calculate next PC from instruction (for PC-relative branches)
  - – One cycle "mis-fetch" penalty even if branch predictor is correct

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
`bnez r3,targ`	F	**D**	X	M	W				
`targ:add r4,r5,r4`			**F**	D	X	M	W		

- During Fetch?
  - How do we do that?

Revisiting Branch Prediction Components



- Step #1: is it a branch?
  - Easy after decode... during fetch: **predictor**
- Step #2: is the branch taken or not taken?
  - **Direction predictor** (as before)
- Step #3: if the branch is taken, where does it go?
  - **Branch target predictor (BTB)**
  - Supplies target PC if branch is taken

Branch Target Buffer (BTB)

- As before: learn from past, predict the future
  - Record the past branch targets in a hardware structure
- **Branch target buffer (BTB)**:
  - "guess" the future PC based on past behavior
  - "Last time the branch X was taken, it went to address Y"
    - "So, in the future, if address X is fetched, fetch address Y next"
- Operation
  - Like a cache: address = PC, data = target-PC
  - Access at Fetch *in parallel* with instruction memory
    - predicted-target = BTB[PC]
  - Updated at X whenever target != predicted-target
    - BTB[PC] = target
  - Aliasing? No problem, this is only a prediction

Branch Target Buffer (continued)

- At Fetch, how does insn know that it's a branch & should read BTB?
  - Answer: it doesn't have to, all insns read BTB
- Key idea: use BTB to predict which insn are branches
  - Tag each entry (with bits of the PC)
    - Just like a cache
  - Tag hit signifies instruction at the PC is a branch
  - Update only on taken branches (thus only taken branches in table)
- Access BTB at Fetch in parallel with instruction memory



Why Does a BTB Work?

- Because most control insns use **direct targets**
  - Target encoded in insn itself → same target every time
- What about **indirect targets**?
  - Target held in a register → can be different each time
  - Indirect conditional jumps are not widely supported
  - Two indirect call idioms
    - + Dynamically linked functions (DLLs): target always the same
    - Dynamically dispatched (virtual) functions: hard but uncommon
  - Also two indirect unconditional jump idioms
    - Switches: hard but uncommon
    - – Function returns: hard and common but…

Return Address Stack (RAS)



- **Return address stack (RAS)**
  - Call instruction? RAS[TOS++] = PC+4
  - Return instruction? Predicted-target = RAS[--TOS]
  - Q: how can you tell if an insn is a call/return before decoding it?
    - Accessing RAS on every insn BTB-style doesn't work
  - Answer: **pre-decode bits** in Imem, written when first executed
    - Can also be used to signify branches

Putting It All Together

- BTB & branch direction predictor during fetch



- If branch prediction correct, no taken branch penalty

Branch Prediction Performance

- Dynamic branch prediction
  - Simple predictor at fetch; branches predicted with 75% accuracy
    - CPI = 1 + (20% * **25%** * 2)= **1.1**
  - More advanced predictor at fetch: 95% accuracy
    - CPI = 1 + (20% * **5%** * 2) = **1.02**
- Branch mis-predictions still a big problem though
  - Pipelines are long: typical mis-prediction penalty is 10+ cycles
  - Pipelines are superscalar (later)

Avoiding Branches via ISA: Predication

- Conventional control
  - Conditionally executed insns also conditionally fetched

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
`beq r3,targ`	F	D	X	M	W					
`sub r6,1,r5`		F	D	--	--	--				flushed: wrong path
`targ:add r4,r5,r4`			F	--	--	--	--			flushed: why?
`targ:add r4,r5,r4`				F	D	X	M	W		

  - If **`beq`** mis-predicts, both **`sub`** and **`add`** must be flushed
  - Waste: **`add`** is independent of mis-prediction
- **Predication**: not prediction, predication
  - ISA support for conditionally-executed unconditionally-fetched insns
  - If **`beq`** mis-predicts, annul **`sub`** in place, preserve **`add`**
    - Example is if-then, but if-then-else can be predicated too
  - How is this done? How does **`add`** get correct value for **`r5`**

Full Predication

- **Full predication**
  - Every insn can be annulled, annulment controlled by…
  - Predicate registers: additional register in each insn (e.g., IA64)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
`setp.eq r3,p3`	F	D	X	M	W					
`sub.p r6,1,r5,p3`		F	D	X	--	--				annulled
`targ:add r4,r5,r4`			F	D	X	M	W			

  - Predicate codes: condition bits in each insn (e.g., ARM)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
`setcc r3`	F	D	X	M	W					
`sub.nz r6,1,r5`		F	D	X	--	--				annulled
`targ:add r4,r5,r4`			F	D	X	M	W			

  - Only ALU insn shown (**`sub`**), but this applies to all insns, even stores
  - Branches replaced with "set-predicate" insns

Conditional Register Moves (CMOVs)

- **Conditional (register) moves**
  - Construct appearance of full predication from one primitive

```
cmoveq r1,r2,r3        // if (r1==0) r3=r2;
```

  - May require some code duplication to achieve desired effect
  - Painful, potentially impossible for some insn sequences
  - Requires more registers
  - Only good way of retro-fitting predication onto ISA (e.g., IA32, Alpha)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
`sub r6,1,r9`		D	X	M	W				
`cmovne r3,r9,r5`		F	D	X	M	W			
`targ:add r4,r5,r4`			F	D	X	M	W		

Predication Performance

- Predication overhead is additional insns
  - Sometimes overhead is zero
    - Not-taken if-then branch: predicated insns executed
  - Most of the times it isn't
    - Taken if-then branch: all predicated insns annulled
    - Any if-then-else branch: half of predicated insns annulled
    - Almost all cases if using conditional moves
- Calculation for a given branch, predicate (vs speculate) if…
  - Average number of additional insns > overall mis-prediction penalty
  - For an individual branch
    - Mis-prediction penalty in a 5-stage pipeline = 2
    - Mis-prediction rate is <50%, and often <20%
    - Overall mis-prediction penalty <1 and often <0.4
  - So when is predication worth it?

Predication Performance

- What does predication actually accomplish?
  - In a scalar 5-stage pipeline (penalty = 2): nothing
  - In a 4-way superscalar 15-stage pipeline (penalty = 60): something
    - Use when mis-predictions >10% and insn overhead <6
  - In a 4-way out-of-order superscalar (penalty ~ 150)
    - Should be used in more situations
  - Still: only useful for branches that mis-predict frequently
- Strange: ARM typically uses scalar 5-9 stage pipelines
  - Why is the ARM ISA predicated then?
  - Low-power: eliminates the need for a large branch predictor
  - Real-time: predicated code performs consistently
  - Loop scheduling: effective software pipelining requires predication

Research: Perceptron Predictor

- **Perceptron predictor** [Jimenez]
  - Attacks BHR size problem using machine learning approach
  - BHT replaced by table of function coefficients F_i (signed)
  - Predict taken if $\sum(BHR_i * F_i) >$ threshold
  - \+ Table size #PC*|BHR|*|F| (can use long BHR: ~60 bits)
    - – Equivalent correlated predictor would be $\#PC*2^{|BHR|}$
  - How does it learn? Update F_i when branch is taken
    - $BHR_i == 1 ? F_i{+}{+} : F_i{-}{-}$;
    - "don't care" F_i bits stay near 0, important F_i bits saturate
  - \+ Hybrid BHT/perceptron accuracy: 95–98%



More Research: GEHL Predictor

- Problem with both correlated predictor and perceptron
  - Same BHT real-estate dedicated to 1st history bit (1 column) …
  - … as to 2nd, 3rd, 10th, 60th…
  - Not a good use of space: 1st bit much more important than 60th
- **GEometric History-Length predictor** [Seznec, ISCA'05]
  - Multiple BHTs, indexed by geometrically longer BHRs (0, 4, 16, 32)
    - BHTs are (partially) tagged, not separate "chooser"
    - Predict: use matching entry from BHT with longest BHR
    - Mis-predict: create entry in BHT with longer BHR
  - \+ Only 25% of BHT used for bits 16-32 (not 50%)
    - Helps amortize cost of tagging
  - \+ Trains quickly
  - 95-97% accurate

Championship Branch Prediction

- **CBP**
  - Workshop held in conjunction with even year MICRO's
  - Submitted code is tested on standard branch traces
  - Highest prediction accuracy wins

- Two tracks
  - Idealistic: predictor simulator must run in under 2 hours
  - Realistic: predictor must synthesize into 32KB + 256 bits or less

- 2006 winners
  - Realistic: L-TAGE (GEHL follow-on)
  - Idealistic: GTL (another GEHL follow-on)