Advanced Computer Architectures - Notes - v0.11.0

260236

July 2025

Preface

Every theory section in these notes has been taken from two sources:

- Computer Architecture: A Quantitative Approach. [1]
- Pipelining slides. [2]
- Course slides. [3]

About:

GitHub repository



These notes are an unofficial resource and shouldn't replace the course material or any other book on advanced computer architectures. It is not made for commercial purposes. I've made the following notes to help me improve my knowledge and maybe it can be helpful for everyone.

As I have highlighted, a student should choose the teacher's material or a book on the topic. These notes can only be a helpful material.

For the midterm, I created a simple formulary:



Contents

| 1 | Pip | elining | | | 6 |
|---|------|---------|--|--|--------|
| | 1.1 | Basic | Concepts | | 6 |
| | 1.2 | | V Pipelining | | 11 |
| | | 1.2.1 | Pipelined execution of instructions | | 14 |
| | | 1.2.2 | Pipeline Implementation | | |
| | 1.3 | Proble | em of Pipeline Hazards | | 18 |
| | | 1.3.1 | RISC-V Optimized Pipeline | | |
| | | 1.3.2 | Solutions to RAW Hazards | | |
| | 1.4 | Perfor | mance evaluation | | |
| 2 | Con | trol H | azards and Branch Prediction | | 28 |
| | 2.1 | Condi | tional Branch Instructions | | 28 |
| | 2.2 | Contro | ol Hazards | | 30 |
| | 2.3 | Naïve | Solutions to Control Hazards | | 32 |
| | 2.4 | Intro t | to Branch Prediction | | 35 |
| | 2.5 | Static | Branch Prediction | | 36 |
| | | 2.5.1 | Branch Always Not Taken | | 37 |
| | | 2.5.2 | Branch Always Taken | | |
| | | 2.5.3 | Backward Taken Forward Not Taken (BTFNT) | | |
| | | 2.5.4 | Profile-Driven Prediction | | |
| | | 2.5.5 | Delayed Branch | | 44 |
| | | | 2.5.5.1 From Before | | 46 |
| | | | 2.5.5.2 From Target | | 47 |
| | | | 2.5.5.3 From Fall-Through | | 49 |
| | | | 2.5.5.4 From After | | 51 |
| | 2.6 | Dynar | nic Branch Prediction | | 52 |
| | | 2.6.1 | 1-bit Branch History Table | | |
| | | 2.6.2 | 2-bit Branch History Table | | |
| | | 2.6.3 | Branch Target Buffer | | |
| | | 2.6.4 | Correlating Branch Predictors | | |
| | | | 2.6.4.1 (1,1) Correlating Predictors | | |
| | | | 2.6.4.2 (2,2) Correlating Predictors | | |
| | | 2.6.5 | Two-Level Adaptive Branch Predictors | | |
| 3 | Inst | ructio | n Level Parallelism | | 68 |
| | 3.1 | The p | roblem of dependencies | | 68 |
| | | 3.1.1 | Data Dependencies | | |
| | | 3.1.2 | Name Dependencies | | 70 |
| | | 3.1.3 | Control Dependencies | | 73 |
| | 3.2 | Multi- | Cycle Pipelining | | 74 |
| | | 3.2.1 | Multi-Cycle In-Order Pipeline | | 75 |
| | | 3.2.2 | Multi-Cycle Out-of-Order Pipeline | | 78 |
| | 3.3 | | nic Scheduling | | 81 |
| | 3.4 | | ole-Issue Processors | | |
| | | 3.4.1 | Introduction to Multiple-Issue Pipelines | | |
| | | 3.4.2 | Evolution Towards Superscalar Execution | | |
| | | 3.4.3 | Superscalar Processors | | 89 |
| | | 3 / / | Static vs Dynamic Scheduling | | 02 |

| 3.5 ILP Limitations & Alternatives 3.6 Scoreboard: Dynamic Scheduling Algorithm 3.6.1 Assumptions and Architecture 3.6.2 Pipeline Stage Refinement 3.6.3 Hazard Management (RAW, WAR, WAW) 3.6.4 Control Logic and Stages 3.6.5 Summary 3.6.6 Scoreboard Data Structures 3.6.7 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7 Tomasulo's Algorithm 3.7.1 Introduction 3.7.2 Register Renaming: Static vs. Implicit 3.7.3 Basic Concepts of Tomasulo's Algorithm 3.7.4 Architecture 3.7.5 Stages 3.7.5.1 Stage 1: Issue 3.7.5.2 Stages 2: Start Execution 3.7.5.2 Stage 2: Start Execution 3.7.5.3 Stage 3: Write Result 3.7.6 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding 3.7.8 Register Renaming 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9 Reorder Buffer (ROB) 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors | . 95 |
|--|----------------|
| 3.6.1 Assumptions and Architecture 3.6.2 Pipeline Stage Refinement 3.6.3 Hazard Management (RAW, WAR, WAW) 3.6.4 Control Logic and Stages 3.6.5 Summary 3.6.6 Scoreboard Data Structures 3.6.7 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7 Tomasulo's Algorithm 3.7.1 Introduction 3.7.2 Register Renaming: Static vs. Implicit 3.7.3 Basic Concepts of Tomasulo's Algorithm 3.7.4 Architecture 3.7.5 Stages 3.7.5.1 Stage 1: Issue 3.7.5.2 Stages 3.7.5.2 Stage 2: Start Execution 3.7.5.3 Stage 3: Write Result 3.7.6 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding 3.7.8 Register Renaming 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9 Reorder Buffer (ROB) 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors | |
| 3.6.3 Hazard Management (RAW, WAR, WAW) 3.6.4 Control Logic and Stages 3.6.5 Summary 3.6.6 Scoreboard Data Structures 3.6.7 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7 Tomasulo's Algorithm 3.7.1 Introduction 3.7.2 Register Renaming: Static vs. Implicit 3.7.3 Basic Concepts of Tomasulo's Algorithm 3.7.4 Architecture 3.7.5 Stages 3.7.5.1 Stage 1: Issue 3.7.5.2 Stage 2: Start Execution 3.7.5.3 Stage 3: Write Result 3.7.6 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding 3.7.8 Register Renaming 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors | . 97 |
| 3.6.4 Control Logic and Stages 3.6.5 Summary 3.6.6 Scoreboard Data Structures 3.6.7 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7 Tomasulo's Algorithm 3.7.1 Introduction 3.7.2 Register Renaming: Static vs. Implicit 3.7.3 Basic Concepts of Tomasulo's Algorithm 3.7.4 Architecture 3.7.5 Stages 3.7.5.1 Stage 1: Issue 3.7.5.2 Stage 2: Start Execution 3.7.5.3 Stage 3: Write Result 3.7.6 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors 5.4 Statically Scheduled Processors 5.4 Statically Scheduled Processors 5.5 Statically Scheduled Proc | . 99 |
| 3.6.5 Summary 3.6.6 Scoreboard Data Structures 3.6.7 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7 Tomasulo's Algorithm 3.7.1 Introduction 3.7.2 Register Renaming: Static vs. Implicit 3.7.3 Basic Concepts of Tomasulo's Algorithm 3.7.4 Architecture 3.7.5 Stages 3.7.5.1 Stage 1: Issue 3.7.5.2 Stage 2: Start Execution 3.7.5.2 Stage 3: Write Result 3.7.6 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding 3.7.8 Register Renaming 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.9 Reorder Buffer (ROB) 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors 5.4 Statically Scheduled Processors 5.5 Statically Scheduled Processors 5.5 | . 101 |
| 3.6.6 Scoreboard Data Structures 3.6.7 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7 Introduction 3.7.1 Introduction 3.7.2 Register Renaming: Static vs. Implicit 3.7.3 Basic Concepts of Tomasulo's Algorithm 3.7.4 Architecture 3.7.5 Stages 3.7.5.1 Stage 1: Issue 3.7.5.2 Stage 2: Start Execution 3.7.5.3 Stage 3: Write Result 3.7.6 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding 3.7.8 Register Renaming 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors 5.4 Statically Scheduled Processors 5.5 Statically Schedule | . 103 |
| 3.6.7 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7 Tomasulo's Algorithm 3.7.1 Introduction 3.7.2 Register Renaming: Static vs. Implicit 3.7.3 Basic Concepts of Tomasulo's Algorithm 3.7.4 Architecture 3.7.5 Stages 3.7.5.1 Stage 1: Issue 3.7.5.2 Stage 2: Start Execution 3.7.5.3 Stage 3: Write Result 3.7.6 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding 3.7.8 Register Renaming 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors 5.4 Statically Scheduled Processors 5.5 Statical | . 105 |
| 3.7 Introduction 3.7.2 Register Renaming: Static vs. Implicit 3.7.3 Basic Concepts of Tomasulo's Algorithm 3.7.4 Architecture 3.7.5 Stages 3.7.5.1 Stage 1: Issue 3.7.5.2 Stage 2: Start Execution 3.7.5.3 Stage 3: Write Result 3.7.6 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding 3.7.8 Register Renaming 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.9 Reorder Buffer (ROB) 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors 5.4 5.5 Statically Scheduled Processors | . 107 |
| 3.7.1 Introduction 3.7.2 Register Renaming: Static vs. Implicit 3.7.3 Basic Concepts of Tomasulo's Algorithm 3.7.4 Architecture 3.7.5 Stages 3.7.5.1 Stage 1: Issue 3.7.5.2 Stage 2: Start Execution 3.7.5.3 Stage 3: Write Result 3.7.6 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding 3.7.8 Register Renaming 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors 5.4 Statically Scheduled Processors 5.5 Statically Scheduled Processors | . 109 |
| 3.7.2 Register Renaming: Static vs. Implicit 3.7.3 Basic Concepts of Tomasulo's Algorithm 3.7.4 Architecture 3.7.5 Stages 3.7.5.1 Stages 1: Issue 3.7.5.2 Stage 2: Start Execution 3.7.5.3 Stage 3: Write Result 3.7.5 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding 3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding 3.7.8 Register Renaming 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9 Reorder Buffer (ROB) 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors 5.4 Statically Scheduled Processors 5.5 Statically Scheduled Pr | |
| 3.7.3 Basic Concepts of Tomasulo's Algorithm 3.7.4 Architecture 3.7.5 Stages 3.7.5.1 Stage 1: Issue 3.7.5.2 Stage 2: Start Execution 3.7.5.3 Stage 3: Write Result 3.7.6 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding 3.7.8 Register Renaming 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9 Reorder Buffer (ROB) 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors | |
| 3.7.4 Architecture 3.7.5 Stages 3.7.5.1 Stage 1: Issue 3.7.5.2 Stage 2: Start Execution 3.7.5.3 Stage 3: Write Result 3.7.6 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding 3.7.8 Register Renaming 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled | |
| 3.7.5 Stages | |
| 3.7.5.1 Stage 1: Issue 3.7.5.2 Stage 2: Start Execution 3.7.5.3 Stage 3: Write Result 3.7.6 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding 3.7.8 Register Renaming 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9 Reorder Buffer (ROB) 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors | |
| 3.7.5.2 Stage 2: Start Execution 3.7.5.3 Stage 3: Write Result 3.7.6 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding 3.7.8 Register Renaming 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9 Reorder Buffer (ROB) 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) | |
| 3.7.5.3 Stage 3: Write Result 3.7.6 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding 3.7.8 Register Renaming 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9 Reorder Buffer (ROB) 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction | |
| 3.7.6 In-Depth Execution Example 3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding 3.7.8 Register Renaming 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9 Reorder Buffer (ROB) 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors | |
| 3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding | |
| 3.7.8 Register Renaming 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9 Reorder Buffer (ROB) 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors | |
| 3.7.8.1 Introduction 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9 Reorder Buffer (ROB) 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors | |
| 3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9 Reorder Buffer (ROB) 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors | |
| 3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution 3.7.9 Reorder Buffer (ROB) 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors | |
| 3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution | |
| 3.7.9 Reorder Buffer (ROB) 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors | |
| 3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors | |
| 3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors | |
| 3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism | |
| 3.7.9.4 Architecture 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors | |
| 3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics | |
| 4 Performance Evaluation 4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics 4.2 Amdahl's Law 4.3 Pipelined Processors 4.4 Memory Hierarchy 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Data dependencies 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors | |
| 5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) 5.1 Introduction | . 245 . 247 |
| 5.1 Introduction | . 201 |
| 5.2 Data dependencies | 260 |
| 5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors | |
| J | |
| | |
| 5.4 Code Scheduling | |
| 5.4.1 Scheduling Basics | |
| 5.4.2 Dependence Graph and Critical Path | . 271 |
| 6 Exams | 273 |
| $6.1 2025 \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots $ | . 273 |
| 6.1.1 Midterm - May 5 | . 273 |
| 6.1.2 February 11 | ~ ~ - |

Index 349

1 Pipelining

1.1 Basic Concepts

Pipelining is a fundamental **technique** in computer architecture aimed at improving instruction throughput by overlapping the execution of multiple instructions. The main idea behind pipelining is to divide the execution of an instruction into distinct stages and process different instructions simultaneously in these stages. This approach significantly increases the efficiency of instruction execution in modern processors.

X Understanding the RISC-V instruction set

Before delving into pipelining, it is essential to understand the **basic instruction set** of the RISC-V architecture. The instruction set consists of three major categories:

- ALU Instructions (Arithmetic and Logic Operations)
 - Performs addition between registers:
 - add rd, rs1, rs2

Performs the addition between the values in registers rs1 and rs2 and stores the result in register rd.

$$\texttt{rd} \leftarrow \texttt{rs1} + \texttt{rs2}$$

- Performs an addition between a constant and a register:
- addi rd, rs1, 4

Performs the addition between the value in register rs1 and the value 4 and stores the result in register rd.

$$\mathtt{rd} \leftarrow \mathtt{rs1} + 4$$

- Load/Store Instructions (Memory Operations)
 - Loads data from memory:
 - 1 ld rd, offset(rs1)

Load data into register rd from an address formed by adding rs1 to a signed offset.

$$rd \leftarrow M [rs1 + offset]$$

- Stores data in memory:
- sd rs2, offset(rs1)

Store data from register rs2 to an address formed by adding rs1 to a signed offset.

$$M \left[\mathtt{rs1} + \mathtt{offset} \right] \leftarrow \mathtt{rs2}$$

• Branching Instructions (Control Flow Management)

- Conditional Branches

- * Branch on equal:
- beq rs1, rs2, L1

Branch to the label L1 if the value in register rs1 is equal to the value in register rs2.

$$rs1 = rs1 \xrightarrow{go to} L1$$

- * Branch on not equal:
- bne rs1, rs2, L1

Branch to the label L1 if the value in register rs1 is not equal to the value in register rs2.

$$rs1 \neq rs2 \xrightarrow{go to} L1$$

- Unconditional Jumps

- * Jump to the label (jump):
- 1 j L1

Jump directly to the L1 label.

- * Jump to the address stored in a register (jump register):
- ı jr ra

Take the value in register ra and use it as the address to jump to. So it is assumed that ra contains an address.

These basic instructions will be used throughout the course.

Execution phases in RISC-V

- 1. **IF** (**Instruction Fetch**): The instruction is **fetched** from memory.
- 2. **ID** (Instruction Decode): The instruction is decoded, and the required registers are read.
- 3. **EX** (Execution): The instruction is **executed**, typically involving ALU operations.
- 4. **ME** (Memory Access): For *load/store* instructions, this stage reads from or writes to memory.
- WB (Write Back): The result is written back to the destination register.

These five stages form the basis of the RISC-V pipeline.

X Implementation of the RISC-V Data Path

The RISC-V Data Path is a fundamental component of the processor's architecture, responsible for executing instructions efficiently by coordinating various hardware units. It defines how instructions flow through different stages of execution, interacting with memory, registers, and the Arithmetic Logic Unit (ALU).



Figure 1: Generic implementation of the RISC-V Data Path.



Figure 2: Specific implementation of the RISC-V Data Path.

Its fundamental components include:

- Instruction Memory and Data Memory Separation. RISC-V adopts a Harvard Architecture style, where the Instruction Memory (IM) and Data Memory (DM) are separate. This prevents structural hazards where instruction fetch and memory access could conflict in a single-memory design (this topic will be addressed later).
- General-Purpose Register File (RF). It consists of 32 registers, each 32-bit wide. The register file has two read ports and one write port to support simultaneous read and write operations. This setup allows faster register access, which is crucial for pipelined execution.
- Program Counter (PC). It holds the address of the next instruction to be fetched. Automatically increments during execution, typically by 4 bytes (for 32-bit instructions).

• Arithmetic Logic Unit (ALU). Performs arithmetic and logical operations required by instructions. Inputs to the ALU come from registers or immediate values decoded from the instruction.

Other components that we can see in the general implementation of the RISC-V data path are:

- Register File. Stores temporary values used by instructions. Contains read ports (two registers can be read simultaneously for ALU operations) and write port (one register can be updated per clock cycle). The register file ensures high-speed execution of operations by reducing memory accesses.
- Instruction Fetch (IF). The PC (Program Counter) retrieves the next instruction from Instruction Memory. The PC is incremented using an adder (PC + 4), ensuring sequential instruction flow.
- Instruction Decode (ID). Extracts opcode (determines the instruction type), source and destination registers, immediate values (if present). It reads values from the Register File based on instruction requirements.
- Execution (EX). The ALU performs arithmetic and logical operations. A multiplexer (MUX) selects the second operand: a register value (for R-type instructions) or an immediate value (for I-type instructions like addi). The ALU result is forwarded to the next stage.
- Memory Access (ME). Load (1d) and Store (sd) instructions interact with data memory. Data is either loaded from memory into a register or stored from a register into memory.
- Write Back (WB). The result from ALU or memory is written back to the Register File.

Example 1: Data Path Execution Example

Let's consider a simple RISC-V load instruction (ld x10, 40(x1)) passing through the data path:

- 1. **IF Stage**: Instruction Fetch
 - ullet PC ightarrow Instruction Memory ightarrow 1d x10, 40(x1) fetched
 - \bullet PC updated to PC + 4
- 2. **ID Stage**: Instruction Decode
 - Registers read: x1 (base register for memory access)
 - Immediate value extracted: 40
- 3. EX Stage: Execution
 - \bullet ALU calculates memory address: x1 + 40
- 4. ME Stage: Memory Access
 - Data is loaded from M[x1 + 40]
- 5. **WB Stage**: Write Back
 - \bullet Data stored in x10

1.2 RISC-V Pipelining

Pipelining is analogous to an assembly line in a factory. Instead of waiting for one instruction to complete before starting the next, different instructions are executed simultaneously in different stages.

If we consider a **non-pipelined execution**:

- Each instruction completes all five stages sequentially before the next instruction starts.
- If each instruction stage (IF stage, ID stage, etc.) takes, say, 2 nanoseconds, executing all stages of an instruction (IF, ID, EX, MEM, WB) takes 5 times 2 nanoseconds, then 10 nanoseconds. If we also want to execute 5 instructions, we need 10 nanoseconds times 5, then 50 nanoseconds!

Now, we consider a **pipelined execution**:

- Once the first instruction moves to the second stage, the next instruction starts in the first stage.
- The **pipeline becomes fully utilized** after the first few cycles, significantly **improving throughput**.

In an **ideal scenario**, a 5-stage pipeline should provide a speedup of $5 \times$ reducing execution time to:

$$(5+4) \times 2 \text{ ns} = 18 \text{ ns}$$

Where 5 are the steps of the first instruction, 5 are the steps of the last instruction, minus 1 because one step is already counted in the first instruction, so 4. Therefore, 9 is multiplied by 2 nanoseconds, the time taken by each stage. The result, 18 nanoseconds, is the time it takes the pipeline to execute 5 instructions in an ideal scenario.



Figure 3: Sequential vs. Pipelining execution.

Pipeline Performance and Speedup

The ideal performance improvement from pipelining is derived from the fact that once the pipeline is filled, a new instruction completes every cycle. The key performance metrics include:

- Latency (Execution Time): The total time to complete a single instruction does not change (sequential or pipeline).
- Throughput (Instructions per Unit Time): The number of completed instruction per unit time significantly increases.

• Speedup Calculation

- A non-pipelined CPU with 5 execution cycles of 2 ns would take 10 ns per instruction.
- A pipelined CPU with 5 stages of 2 ns results in 1 instruction completing every 2 ns.
- This gives a theoretical speedup of $5 \times$ (ideal case).

Unfortunately, real-world implementations are subject to **pipeline hazards** that reduce efficiency.

■ Understanding Pipelining Performance

Pipelining improves instruction throughput by allowing multiple instructions to be processed simultaneously in different stages. The execution of an instruction is divided into 5 pipeline stages:

- 1. IF (Instruction Fetch)
- 2. ID (Instruction Decode)
- 3. EX (Execution)
- 4. MEM (Memory Access)
- 5. WB (Write Back)

Each stage takes 2 ns (a *pipeline cycle*), meaning that an instruction moves from one stage to the next every 2 ns. Now, let's analyze the timeline of instruction execution:

| Clock Cycle | IF | ID | EX | MEM | $\overline{\mid \mathbf{W} \mathbf{B}}$ |
|----------------|----|----|----|-----|---|
| 1st (0-2 ns) | I1 | | | | |
| 2nd (2-4 ns) | 12 | I1 | | | |
| 3rd (4-6 ns) | 13 | 12 | I1 | | |
| 4th (6-8 ns) | 14 | 13 | 12 | I1 | |
| 5th (8-10 ns) | 15 | 14 | 13 | 12 | I1 |
| 6th (10-12 ns) | 16 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 12 |
| 7th (12-14 ns) | 17 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 13 |
| 8th (14-16 ns) | 18 | 17 | 16 | I5 | 14 |
| 9th (16-18 ns) | 19 | 18 | 17 | 16 | 15 |

Table 1: Pipelining timeline execution in an ideal case.

- The first instruction I1 takes 5 (clock) cycles to complete, i.e., 10 ns.
- However, starting from cycle 5, a new instruction finishes every cycle (every 2 ns).
- \bullet In a non-pipelined system, each instruction would take 10 ns (5 stages \times 2 ns each).
- In a pipelined system, once the pipeline is full, an instruction completes every cycle (every 2 ns), achieving a 5× speedup compared to the non-pipelined execution.

Thus, after an initial "fill" time (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th), a new instruction completes every 2 ns (from 5th to 6th, I1 is finished; from 6th to 7th, I2 is finished; from 7th to 8th, I3 is finished), which is the duration of a single pipeline stage.

1.2.1 Pipelined execution of instructions

Each RISC-V instruction follows the five pipeline stages, but their interactions with the pipeline vary depending on the instruction type.

• ALU Instructions (e.g., op \$x, \$y, \$z)

These are register-based operations that do not require memory access. Since there is no memory operation, the instruction **bypasses the ME stage**.

| Stage | Description |
|------------------------|--|
| IF | Fetch instruction from memory |
| ID | Decode instruction, read registers y and z |
| $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{X}$ | Perform ALU operation ($x = y + z$) |
| ME | No memory access (skipped) |
| WB | Write the ALU result to x |

• Load Instructions (e.g., lw \$x, offset(y))

These instructions retrieve data from memory and store it in a register. The **memory access stage** (ME) **is crucial** here since the instruction must fetch data from memory.

| Stage | Description |
|------------------------|--|
| IF | Fetch instruction from memory |
| ID | Decode instruction, read base register \$y |
| $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{X}$ | Compute memory address (\$y + offset) |
| ME | Read data from memory |
| WB | Write data into destination register x |

• Store Instructions (e.g., sw \$x, offset(\$y))

These instructions write data from a register into memory. Unlike lw, store instructions do not require the WB stage, as data is written directly into memory.

| Stage | Description |
|------------------------|--|
| IF | Fetch instruction from memory |
| ID | Decode instruction, read base register \$y and source register \$x |
| $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{X}$ | Compute memory address (\$y + offset) |
| ME | Write \$x into memory at the computed address |
| WB | No write-back stage (skipped) |

• Conditional Branches (e.g., beq \$x, \$y, offset)

Branching introduces control hazards, as the pipeline needs to determine whether the branch is taken or not. Branches can introduce **stalls** due to dependencies on comparison results. This issue is typically mitigated using branch prediction.

| Stage | Description |
|------------------------|--|
| IF | Fetch instruction from memory |
| ID | Decode instruction, read registers x and y |
| $\mathbf{E}\mathbf{X}$ | Compare \$x and \$y, compute target address |
| ME | No memory access (skipped) |
| WB | Update PC if branch is taken |

This section breaks down how different types of instructions behave in the pipeline:

- ALU Instructions complete in the EX stage and do not use memory.
- Load Instructions require a memory access in the ME stage.
- Store Instructions write to memory instead of registers.
- Branch Instructions introduce control hazards because they may change the PC.

This means that **not all instructions behave the same** in the pipeline. Some instructions **skip certain stages** (e.g., stores do not have WB, ALU instructions skip ME), and some instructions **introduce potential problems** (e.g., branches can cause delays).

In conclusion, this section sets the stage for understanding pipeline stalls, forwarding, and hazard resolution techniques that are essential for designing high-performance processors.

1.2.2 Pipeline Implementation

The RISC-V pipeline implementation is designed to efficiently execute multiple instructions simultaneously, following the classical five-stage pipeline model:

- 1. IF (Instruction Fetch)
- 2. ID (Instruction Decode)
- 3. EX (Execution)
- 4. MEM (Memory Access)
- 5. WB (Write Back)

Each clock cycle, a new instruction enters the pipeline while previous instructions move to the next stage, allowing five different instructions to be in execution at the same time.



Figure 4: Structure of RISC-V pipeline.

* Execution Stages and Pipeline Modules

Each stage of the pipeline corresponds to a specific hardware module in the CPU. The RISC-V pipeline is composed of five primary hardware modules:

- Instruction Fetch (IF) Module: Fetches instructions from instruction memory and updates the PC.
- Instruction Decode (ID) Module: Decodes the fetched instruction and reads register values.
- Execution (EX) Module: Performs arithmetic/logical operations in the ALU or computes memory addresses.
- Memory Access (MEM) Module: Reads from or writes data to memory.

• Write Back (WB) Module: Writes the computed result back into the register file.

Each module is responsible for a specific **stage of execution**, and together they allow overlapping execution of multiple instructions.

Pipeline Registers

To maintain separation between stages, pipeline registers are used (see Figure 4, page 16). These registers store intermediate results and ensure proper communication between stages:

- IF/ID Register: Holds fetched instruction and updated PC.
- ID/EX Register: Stores decoded instruction, read register values, and control signals.
- **EX/MEM Register**: Holds ALU results, destination register, and memory access information.
- MEM/WB Register: Stores memory data or ALU result to be written back to registers.

These pipeline registers eliminate the need for re-fetching or re-decoding instructions at each cycle, thus maintaining pipeline efficiency.

1.3 Problem of Pipeline Hazards

A Assumptions Made

Until now, our discussion on the RISC-V pipeline implementation has relied on several key assumptions to simplify the analysis and focus on fundamental concepts. These **assumptions help in understanding the ideal case of pipelining** before introducing complexities like hazards and optimizations.

- 1. All instructions are independent, so there are no dependencies between them.
- 2. No branches or jumps that change execution flow.

This is a theoretical idealization, because in real-world scenarios, hazards (structural, data, and control) interfere with smooth execution. Also, our second assumption ignores branch instructions (beq, bne, j, jr), which cause control hazards that require branch prediction or pipeline flushing.

? What is a Pipeline Hazard?

Now that we have understood the ideal execution of a RISC-V pipeline, we must discuss pipeline hazards, which are obstacles that prevent the pipeline from operating at maximum efficiency.

A Hazard (or conflict) is a phenomenon that occurs when the overlapping execution of instructions in the pipeline changes the expected order of instruction execution. This can lead to incorrect results or the need to insert stalls (pipeline bubbles), reducing performance.

In other words, hazards cause the next instruction in the pipeline to be delayed, which reduces the ideal throughput of 1 instruction per cycle. Thus, hazards disrupt the smooth flow of instructions and require techniques to resolve them.

= Classes of Pipeline Hazards

- Structural Hazards: Attempt to use the same resource from different instructions simultaneously.
 - **?** Example: Single memory for both instruction and data access.
- Data Hazards: Attempt to use a result before it is ready.
 - **?** Example: Instruction depending on a result of a previous instruction still in the pipeline.
- Control Hazards: Try to make a decision about the next statement to execute before the condition is evaluated.
 - **?** Example: Conditional branch execution.

Structural Hazards

A structural hazard occurs when multiple pipeline stages need to use the same hardware resource at the same time.

✓ Structural Hazard cannot be applied to RISC-V. This is a great thing, because thanks to the Harvard Architecture, RISC-V uses separate instruction and data memory, and this adoption avoids structural hazards.

? Control Hazards

A control hazard (section 2, page 28) occurs when the pipeline does not know which instruction to fetch next, usually due to a branch or jump instruction. It is discussed in the following sections.

Data Hazards

A data hazard (section 3.1, page 68) occurs when an instruction depends on the result of a previous instruction that is still in the pipeline.

There are several types of data hazards:

• RAW (Read After Write). An instruction tries to read a register before a previous instruction writes to it.

? Example:

```
1 lw x2, 0(x1)
2 add x3, x2, x4
```

The add instruction needs x2, but x2 is still being fetched from memory in the MEM stage. Without hazard resolution, the processor would get the wrong value for x2.

- WAR (Write After Read). A later instruction writes to a register before an earlier instruction reads it (rare in RISC).
- WAW (Write After Write). Two instructions try to write to the same register in the wrong order.

1.3.1 RISC-V Optimized Pipeline

The RISC-V optimized pipeline introduces refinements that reduce stalls, improve data access, and enhance instruction throughput. The key optimizations include:

- ✓ Efficient Register File Access. In the standard RISC-V pipeline, register accesses happen in two stages:
 - ID (Instruction Decode) \rightarrow Reads register values.
 - \bullet WB (Write Back) \to Writes computed values back to registers.

22 Optimization: Read and Write in the Same Cycle

- In the optimized pipeline:
 - Register writing happens in the *first half* of the **clock cycle**;
 - While register reading happens in the second half of the clock cycle.
- This means an instruction can write its result to a register in WB, and the **next instruction can immediately read** that value in ID during the **same cycle**.

This optimization removes unnecessary stalls when an instruction immediately depends on a result written in the previous cycle.



Figure 5: Visual example of an optimized pipeline; here the result (WB stage) of I1 is written in the first half of the clock cycle and the read (ID stage) of I4 is done in the second half of the clock cycle. So there is no hazards!

- ✓ Forwarding (Bypassing) to Reduce Stalls. Forwarding (also called bypassing) is a hardware technique that eliminates stalls by providing ALU results directly to dependent instructions without waiting for the WB stage. It is a possible solution for Data Hazards.
 - Forwarding Paths: To support forwarding, the pipeline includes extra paths that allow instructions to fetch values from intermediate pipeline registers instead of waiting for WB.

WB

• EX/EX Path. Allows ALU results to be forwarded from EX stage output to the next EX stage input. Used when an instruction depends on an arithmetic result of the previous instruction.

Example 2: EX/EX Forwarding # Compute x2 = x1 - x3sub x2, x1, x3 2 and x12, x2, x5 # Use x2 immediately Cycle sub x2, x1, x3 and x12, x2, x5 1 IF 2 ID $_{ m IF}$ 3 EXID4 MEM Stall5 WBStall6 EX7 MEM

The and instruction must wait until WB writes x2 to the register file. Two stall cycles are introduced and this wastes execution time.

8

Instead of waiting for WB, we forward the ALU result from the EX stage of sub directly to the EX stage of and.

| Cycle | sub x2, x1, x3 | and x12, x2, x5 |
|-------|----------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | l IF | |
| 2 | ID | IF |
| 3 | EX | ID |
| 4 | MEM | EX (forwarded x2 from EX) |
| 5 | WB | MEM |
| 6 | | WB |

In cycle 4, and x12, x2, x5 gets the forwarded x2 from the EX stage of sub, removing stalls.

This is EX/EX forwarding, taking ALU results from one EX stage directly into the next EX stage.

• MEM/EX Path. Forwards the ALU result from MEM stage to EX stage. Used when an instruction depends on an ALU operation two cycles before.



Figure 6: Example of MEM/EX path.

• MEM/MEM Path. Forwarding directly between two memory operations in the MEM stage. It removes stalls in Load/Store dependencies.



Figure 7: Example of MEM/MEM path.



Figure 8: Implementation of RISC-V with Forwarding Unit.

1.3.2 Solutions to RAW Hazards

To handle RAW hazards, we can **use both** static (compile-time) and dynamic (hardware-based) techniques. These include:

- Static (compile-time):
 - ✓ nop insertion: compiler adds empty instructions to delay execution.
 - ✓ Instruction Scheduling: compiler reorders instructions to avoid conflicts.
- Dynamic (hardware-based):
 - ✓ Pipeline Stalling (bubbles): inserts delay cycles when necessary.
 - ✓ Forwarding (bypassing): uses intermediate values from the pipeline instead of waiting.

Static (compile-time) solution: Inserting nops (naïve)

One simple way to handle RAW hazards is to insert nop instructions manually between dependent instructions. This gives the pipeline time to complete the write-back of the needed value.

Key takeaway of inserting nops:

- **X** Simple, but inefficient because it wastes clock cycles. It should be the very last solution considered.
- ✗ Instead of using useful instructions, the processor waits, reducing performance.

```
Example 3: nop insertion

1 sub x2, x1, x3
2 nop  # Delay slot (bubble)
3 and x12, x2, x5 # Now x2 is ready
```

Static (compile-time) solution: Instruction Scheduling

A more efficient technique is **instruction reordering**, also known as **compiler scheduling**. The **compiler reorders instructions to avoid data hazards without inserting nops**.

Key takeaway of instruction scheduling:

- Instruction reordering is a **compiler optimization**.
- ✓ It works well if independent instructions are available.
- ✗ In some cases, no independent instructions exist, so stalling or forwarding is needed.

Example 4: Instruction Scheduling 1 sub x2, x1, x3 2 # Independent instruction 3 # (can execute while sub is completing) 4 add x4, x10, x11 5 and x12, x2, x5 # Now x2 is ready Instead of a nop, we insert add x4, x10, x11, which does not depend on x2. This keeps the pipeline utilized while avoiding RAW hazards.

⊘ Dynamic (hardware-based): Pipeline Stalling (Bubble Insertion)

When no independent instructions can be scheduled, the **hardware must stall** the pipeline by inserting a **bubble** (stall cycle).

Key takeaway of pipeline stalling:

- X Stalling is simple but **reduces performance** (pipeline sits idle).
- ✓ We **prefer forwarding** (next solution) instead of stalling.

```
x2, x1, x3
                         ID
                              EX ME
                                        WB
                         IF
                                             EX
                                                       WB
                                        ID
                                                  ME
                             ID-Stallo ID-Stallo
and x12, x2, x5
                                              ID
                                                   EX
                                                        ME
                                                            WB
                                         IF
                             IF-Stallo IF-Stallo
or x13, x6, x2
                                                             ME
add x14, x2, x2
                                              IF
                                                   ID
                                                        EX
                                                                  W
sd x15,100(x2)
                                                   IF.
                                                        ID
                                                             EX
                                                                  ME
                                                                       WB
```

Figure 9: Example of inserting stalls.

⊘ Dynamic (hardware-based): Forwarding (Bypassing)

Forwarding is an optimized hardware technique that avoids pipeline stalls by directly passing results between pipeline registers. The entire implementation has already been explained on page 20.

Key takeaway of forwarding:

- ✓ Forwarding is the best solution because it eliminates stalls and maximizes performance.
- It requires extra hardware (MUX and control logic), but it significantly improves throughput.

1.4 Performance evaluation

Evaluating the performance of a pipelined processor is essential to understanding the impact of stalls, hazards, and instruction throughput. In an **ideal scenario**, a **pipeline achieves one instruction per cycle** (CPI = 1), but real-world execution includes pipeline stalls, which degrade performance.

Several **key metrics** are used to evaluate the efficiency of pipelining:

- Instruction Count (IC). Represents the total number of instructions executed. Used as a basis for performance calculations.
- Clocks Per Instruction (CPI). CPI measures the average number of clock cycles required to execute one instruction. Ideal CPI for a pipelined processor is 1, but hazards and stalls increase CPI.

$$CPI = \frac{\text{Total Clock Cycles}}{\text{Instruction Count (IC)}}$$
 (1)

Where the total clock cycles is:

Total Clock Cycles =
$$IC + 4 + Stall Cycles$$
 (2)

Where +4 is the fill time of the first instruction. The +4 represents the initial pipeline fill time required before the pipeline reaches full execution throughput.

Example 5: Why is the Pipeline Startup Overhead +4?

A 5-stage pipeline (IF, ID, EX, MEM, WB) requires 4 extra cycles before the first instruction completes. Consider the following scenario:

| Clock Cycle | IF | ID | EX | MEM | WB |
|-------------|----|----|----|-----|----|
| 1 | I1 | | | | |
| 2 | 12 | I1 | | | |
| 3 | 13 | 12 | I1 | | |
| 4 | 14 | 13 | 12 | I1 | |
| 5 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 12 | I1 |
| 6 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 12 |
| 7 | 17 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 13 |

The first instruction (I1) requires 5 cycles to complete. The next instruction (I2) completes in cycle 6, and so on. After the first 5 cycles, the **pipeline reaches steady state**, completing 1 instruction per cycle (ideal scenario, no hazards).

• Instruction Per Clock (IPC). IPC is the inverse of CPI:

$$IPC = \frac{1}{CPI} \tag{3}$$

Measures how many instructions complete per clock cycle.

• Millions of Instructions Per Second (MIPS). Evaluates processor speed in terms of millions of instructions executed per second:

$$MIPS = \frac{f_{\text{clock}}}{\text{CPI} \times 10^6} \tag{4}$$

Higher clock frequency (f_{clock}) and lower CPI result in better MIPS.

Example 6: Performance Calculation

Given:

- Instruction Count (IC) = 5
- Stall Cycles = 2
- Clock Frequency = 500 MHz

Metrics:

• Total Clock Cycles:

Clock Cycles =
$$IC + Stall Cycles + 4 = 5 + 2 + 4 = 11$$

• CPI Calculation:

$$\mathtt{CPI} = \frac{11}{5} = 2.2$$

• MIPS Calculation:

$$\mathtt{MIPS} = \frac{500 \ \mathrm{MHz}}{2.2 \times 10^6} = 227$$

Without stalls, CPI would be 1 (ideal pipeline). But stalls increase CPI, reducing MIPS and overall efficiency.

Performance in Loops and Asymptotic Analysis

When evaluating **loops** or **long-running programs**, we use asymptotic performance metrics.

For a loop with:

- *m* instructions per iteration.
- k stall cycles per iteration.
- \bullet *n* iterations.

We have:

• Clock Cycles per Iteration:

Clock Cycles per Iteration =
$$m + k + 4$$
 (5)

• CPI per Iteration:

$$CPI_{iter} = \frac{(m+k+4)}{m} \tag{6}$$

• MIPS per Iteration:

$$\mathtt{MIPS}_{\mathrm{iter}} = \frac{f_{\mathrm{clock}}}{\mathtt{CPI}_{\mathrm{iter}} \times 10^6} \tag{7}$$

For large n, the impact of pipeline startup delay (+4 cycles) is reduced:

• CPI per Iteration:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CPI}_{\text{AS}} &= \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{(\text{IC}_{\text{AS}} + \text{Stall Cycles}_{\text{AS}} + 4)}{\text{IC}_{\text{AS}}} \\ &= \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{(m \times n + k \times n + 4)}{(m \times n)} \\ &= \frac{(m + k)}{m} \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

• Millions of Instructions Per Second (MIPS):

$$MIPS_{AS} = \frac{f_{clock}}{CPI_{AS} \times 10^6}$$
 (9)

For large programs, startup stalls become negligible, and performance depends mainly on stall cycles per iteration. Minimizing k (stalls per iteration) is crucial to achieving high efficiency.

Why CPI is Greater than 1 in Real Pipelines

Even with an **optimized pipeline**, **real-world execution is affected by hazards**. Thus, actual CPI is always greater than 1, even in well-optimized designs.

2 Control Hazards and Branch Prediction

2.1 Conditional Branch Instructions

In pipelined processor architectures, control flow is not always linear, and decisions about the next instruction to execute are often dependent on certain conditions. This introduces the necessity for conditional branch instructions, particularly relevant in RISC-V architectures, where typical instructions include:

- beq (branch if equal): beq rs1, rs2, L1
 Transfers execution to the label L1 if the contents of registers rs1 and rs2 are equal.
- bne (branch if not equal): bne rs1, rs2, L1
 Transfers control to L1 if rs1 and rs2 hold different values.

These branch instructions are essential in implementing control structures such as loops, conditionals (if/else), and function returns.

At the hardware level, the **Branch Target Address (BTA)** plays a central role. This **address** represents **where the processor should continue execution if the branch is taken** (i.e., if the condition specified by the branch instruction evaluates as true). When the condition is satisfied, the processor **updates the Program Counter (PC)** with the BTA, thus redirecting the flow of instruction fetch.

Conversely, if the **condition is not satisfied**, the **branch is not taken**, and the processor continues **sequential execution**. In RISC-V, since instructions are generally 32 bits (4 bytes) long, the next instruction is fetched from PC + 4.

Understanding whether a branch is taken or not is crucial for instruction fetch in pipelined architectures. **Mispredicting** this can introduce **performance penalties**, which are addressed in detail through the study of control hazards and branch prediction techniques in later sections.

X Execution of Branches in Pipelined Architectures

When executing a **branch instruction**, such as **beq rx**, **ry**, **L1**, the processor must **compare two registers** (**rx**, **ry**) to determine whether the branch should be **taken** (i.e., jump to label **L1**) or **not taken** (continue sequentially). In **RISC-V**, the **Branch Outcome** (Taken/Not Taken) and **Branch Target Address** (**BTA**) are **calculated during the EX stage** (when the ALU performs arithmetic and logical operations):

- EX Stage:
 - Compare rx and ry using the ALU.
 - Compute PC + offset to obtain the BTA.

- ME Stage:
 - Based on the comparison, update the PC to either PC + 4 (if not taken) or PC + offset (if taken).

MIPS follows a similar structure but emphasizes that branch decisions are finalized at the end of the EX stage, with the PC update happening at the ME stage. This introduces a delay in resolving the branch, which becomes critical for understanding control hazards.

A Implication for IF

Since new instructions are fetched every clock cycle, the processor needs to decide early which instruction to fetch next. However, with branches, this decision is not immediately clear because the branch condition hasn't yet been evaluated. The Program Counter (PC) cannot be updated correctly until the branch outcome is known, leading to potential pipeline stalls or incorrect instruction fetches.

2.2 Control Hazards

In a pipelined architecture, one of the primary challenges in achieving high performance is dealing with Control Hazards, also known as branch hazards. These arise due to the presence of conditional branch instructions, where the processor must decide the next instruction to fetch before knowing whether the branch will be taken.

? What really causes Control Hazards?

To sustain the pipeline and avoid idle stages, a processor needs to fetch one instruction per clock cycle. However, with branch instructions, this becomes problematic because the branch decision (branch outcome) and the branch target address (BTA) are not immediately available. Specifically, during the IF stage, when the next instruction is fetched, the processor still does not know whether the branch will be taken or not, because this information typically becomes available later in the pipeline.

This leads to uncertainty:

- **?** Which instruction should be fetched after a branch?
- ? Should it be sequential instruction (PC + 4) or the instruction at the BTA?

If the processor fetches the wrong instruction, it might need to discard or "flush" it later, wasting valuable cycles. Alternatively, the processor may stall, delaying the fetching of any instruction until the branch decision is known, which also hurts performance.

The key issue is this: in a pipeline, the **instruction stream needs to continue**, but the **correct path is unclear** until the branch condition is evaluated. Thus:

- 1. Either wrong-path instructions are fetched (requiring flushing later)
- 2. Or **pipeline stalls** are introduced (causing delay and loss of ideal speedup)

Key Takeaways: Control Hazards

- Definition: Pipeline hazard due to uncertainty in branch outcome during instruction fetch.
- Cause: The branch condition is unresolved when the next instruction must be fetched (IF stage).
- Instructions Involved: Conditional branches (beq, bne) and jumps, all instructions modifying the PC.
- Pipeline Timing Conflict: BO and BTA known only in EX or later, but instruction fetch must occur every cycle.

- Main Problem: Cannot decide whether to fetch next sequential instruction (PC + 4) or BTA.
- Possible Outcomes:
 - Stall: Delay fetch until branch resolved.
 - Fetch wrong instruction \rightarrow flush.
- Performance Impact: Loss of ideal pipelining speedup; reduced throughput due to stalls or wasted fetches.
- Goal of Solutions: Mitigate stalls and improve fetch accuracy through early evaluation or prediction.

2.3 Naïve Solutions to Control Hazards

To manage control hazards in a simple and reliable way, one of the **earliest approaches** developed was the **conservative solution** of introducing **branch stalls**. The idea is straightforward: when a branch instruction enters the pipeline, the **processor stalls** the **pipeline until the branch decision is known and the correct next instruction can be safely fetched.**

? How does the conservative solution work?

In the typical 5-stage pipeline, the Branch Outcome (i.e., whether the branch is taken or not) and the Branch Target Address (BTA) are usually resolved at the end of the EX stage. However, the Program Counter (PC) is actually updated at the end of the ME stage. This introduces a delay of multiple cycles between the branch instruction entering the pipeline and the point when the next instruction can be fetched with certainty.

To avoid fetching an incorrect instruction, the **processor simply pauses instruction fetch** for **3 clock cycles** after the branch instruction enters the pipeline. These are called **stalls**, essentially empty cycles where no new instructions enter the pipeline. Once the PC is correctly updated based on the branch outcome, instruction fetch resumes.



Figure 10: Example of stalls inserted in the pipeline to read the correct value after a branch condition.

Performance Impact

It's pretty obvious that if each branch introduces a penalty of 3 cycles, it will significantly degrade performance, especially in programs with frequent branching. Since pipelining aims to maximize instruction throughput, this solution sacrifices speed for correctness. In fact, it is called conservative because it does not attempt to guess or speculate about the branch outcome. Instead, it waits for certainty, favoring reliability over efficiency.

? Can optimized evaluation at the ID stage improve performance?

Although the conservative solution degrades performance, it can be relatively optimized thanks to hardware optimization. Processor designers have introduced hardware optimizations that allow the branch outcome (BO) and the branch target address (BTA) to be computed earlier in the pipeline. Specifically, these computations can be moved from the EX stage to the

ID stage (during the decoding phase). This optimization is often referred to as **Early Branch Evaluation**.

X How Early Branch Evaluation Works

To achieve this, the Instruction Decode (ID) stage must be enhanced with additional hardware logic that allows it to:

- Compare register values (rx and ry) to determine the branch condition.
- 2. Compute the BTA using the sign-extended offset from the instruction and the current PC value.
- 3. Update the PC as soon as BO and BTA are known.

By doing this, both BO and BTA are available at the end of the ID stage, allowing the processor to update the PC immediately and fetch the correct instruction in the following cycle.



Figure 11: Hardware features modifications to allow early branch evaluation.

& Hardware Overhead: Complexity vs. Performance

This optimization requires **more complex hardware**, as the ID stage now includes:

- ALU logic for comparison and addition.
- Additional multiplexer and control signals to direct the PC update.
- Expanded data paths for handling the offset and register values.

♥ Effect on Pipeline Execution

Let's consider an example. In a pipeline using early evaluation:

- The processor **only stalls for 1 cycle** after a branch instruction, as opposed to the 3 cycles required by the conservative approach.
- This **one-cycle stall** allows the processor to fetch the correct instruction **immediately after the branch** is resolved.

The following diagram illustrates that the instruction fetch after the branch is delayed by only one stall cycle, resulting in a smaller performance hit.



Conclusion

In summary, by anticipating branch evaluation at the ID stage, the processor reduces the branch penalty to 1 cycle per branch. This is a significant improvement over the 3-cycle stall of conservative stalling. While it introduces hardware overhead, it offers a better balance between performance and correctness and serves as a stepping stone toward even more advanced techniques, such as branch prediction.

2.4 Intro to Branch Prediction

In modern computer architectures, achieving high performance requires efficient instruction-level parallelism (ILP)¹. However, one of the **major obstacles to ILP is the occurrence of branch hazards**, which happen when the processor encounters a branch instruction (e.g., if, for, while) and cannot immediately determine which instruction to execute next. To mitigate the performance loss caused by these hazards, branch prediction is employed.

Branch Prediction is essentially a speculative execution technique where the processor guesses the outcome of a branch instruction, whether the branch will be taken (control jumps to the branch target) or not taken (execution continues sequentially), before the actual result is known. Instead of stalling the pipeline and waiting for the branch condition to be resolved, the processor proceeds based on the predicted outcome. If the prediction:

- ✓ Is **correct**, performance is preserved.
- X Is wrong (a misprediction), the incorrectly fetched instructions are flushed, and execution restarts at the correct address, causing a performance penalty.

≡ Branch Prediction categories

Branch prediction techniques are generally classified into two main categories:

- Static Branch Prediction Techniques. In this method, the branch direction (taken/untaken) is decided at compile time and remains fixed during the program's execution. Static prediction often relies on compiler heuristics or profiling data to guess likely outcomes. Since the behavior doesn't adapt to runtime changes, this technique works best when branch outcomes are highly predictable and consistent across executions.
- Dynamic Branch Prediction Techniques. Unlike static methods, dynamic prediction uses hardware mechanisms to observe past branch behavior at runtime and make predictions accordingly. The prediction adapts to actual program execution, making it more effective for applications with complex or data-dependent control flow. This method can dynamically switch its guess depending on the branch history.

It's important to note that in both static and dynamic techniques, the **processor must avoid updating its internal state** (registers, memory, etc.) **until the branch outcome is known with certainty**. This ensures speculative execution doesn't cause side effects in case of misprediction.

Additionally, **hybrid approaches** are possible, where static and dynamic predictions are combined to optimize performance further.

¹Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP): A measure of how many of the operations in a computer program can be performed simultaneously. High ILP enables multiple instructions to be executed in parallel within a single processor cycle, exploiting the parallelism inherent in sequential instruction streams through techniques like pipelining, superscalar execution, and out-of-order execution.

2.5 Static Branch Prediction

Static branch prediction represents one of the **simplest approaches** to handling branch hazards. In this technique, the **prediction** regarding whether a branch will be taken or not is **made at compile time** and **remains unchanged throughout program execution**. This method **relies heavily on heuristics or compiler-generated hints**, which estimate the likely behavior of each branch without any consideration of the program's actual runtime behavior.

When does static branch prediction work well?

This approach is particularly effective in scenarios where the **branch behavior** is stable and highly predictable, such as in embedded or domain-specific applications. In such cases, the overhead and complexity of dynamic prediction mechanisms may not justify the potential benefits, making static prediction a practical alternative.

A RISC-V assumption

A key architectural note here is the assumption that we are working with a RISC-V processor, which is optimized for early branch evaluation during the Instruction Decode (ID) stage (see more in section 2.3, page 33). This means that in RISC-V, the decision to predict a branch direction occurs early in the pipeline, minimizing the potential for instruction fetch delays if the prediction is accurate.

2.5.1 Branch Always Not Taken

The Branch Always Not Taken strategy is the simplest form of static branch prediction. It operates under the assumption that the branch condition will never be satisfied, i.e., the control flow of the program will continue sequentially as if the branch is not taken. As a result, instructions immediately following the branch in program order are fetched and executed without any need to determine or access the Branch Target Address (BTA).

♦ When is Branch Always Not Taken effective?

This approach is especially effective for **certain control flow patterns**, such as **if-then-else** structures where the **then** clause is more likely to be executed than the **else** clause. For example:

```
1 z = x + y;

2 if (z > 0)

3  w = x;

4 else

5  w = y;
```

Assuming z is typically positive, the branch is not taken because execution proceeds sequentially to w = x. This makes predict-not-taken a suitable and effective default strategy for such cases.

X Implementation Details

The prediction is made at the end of the Instruction Fetch (IF) stage, without calculating or knowing the BTA (since the branch is always not taken and the next instruction to execute is the PC + 4, as always). This makes the approach lightweight and efficient.

A Misprediction Case

If the actual **branch outcome** (BO) evaluated during the Instruction Decode (ID) stage is **not taken**, then the **prediction is correct**, and **no penalty cycles** are incurred. The pipeline proceeds as planned.

Otherwise, if the actual **branch outcome** (BO) turns out to be **taken**, then the **prediction was incorrect**, leading to a **misprediction penalty**. The processor must:

- 1. Flush the fetched instruction(s) after the branch (turned into NOPs).
- 2. Fetch the instruction at the Branch Target Address (BTA) and restart execution from there.

This results in a **one-cycle branch penalty**, which is minimal but still affects performance.



Figure 12: Branch Always Not Taken techniques failed and the processor must flush instruction i+1 and restart execution from the BTA.

2.5.2 Branch Always Taken

This approach represents the dual case of the previous technique (page 37): it assumes that every branch will be taken, meaning the control flow will jump to the branch target address rather than continue sequentially. This method is especially useful for backward branches, which occur in loops such as for, while, and do-while, since these branches are typically taken repeatedly during loop iterations.

? Implementation Challenge

Unlike the not-taken strategy, where the processor simply continues to PC + 4, the taken strategy requires knowledge of the Branch Target Address (BTA) at the Instruction Fetch (IF) stage. This is non-trivial because:

- ? The BTA depends on the branch instruction's target, which typically requires decoding.
- ✓ To solve this, we introduce a Branch Target Buffer (BTB), a special hardware structure.

? What is BTB and why do we need it?

The Branch Target Buffer (BTB) is a specialized cache in the processor designed to predict the target address of a taken branch instruction before the branch condition is actually resolved.

In Branch Always Taken, we assume that the program will jump to a new address (the Branch Target Address, BTA). However, this **BTA** is not immediately known during Instruction Fetch (IF) because it typically requires decoding the branch instruction (Instruction Decode, ID). To avoid delays, the **BTB** remembers past branch target addresses, allowing the processor to quickly predict where to jump when encountering a branch.

₩ How does BTB work? Quickest explanation

- BTB Structure, it is a kind of lookup table or cache where:
 - Key: address of the branch instruction (the PC value where the branch resides)
 - Value: Predicted Target Address (PTA), i.e., where to jump if the branch is taken
- BTB Lookup: when fetching a branch instruction, the processor simultaneously queries the BTB via the branch PC.
 - ✓ If a match is found (cache hit), the BTB immediately provides the Predicted Target Address (PTA), and the processor starts fetching from that address, before knowing if the branch is actually taken.

X If a no match (cache miss), the processor might default to sequential execution (PC + 4) or wait for the BTA to be calculated, which causes delay.

Example 1: BTB and Branch Always Taken technique

Let's say:

- A loop branch at address 0x100 typically jumps to 0x80.
- The BTB stores: $0x100 \rightarrow 0x80$ (key \rightarrow value).

When the branch at 0x100 is fetched again:

- The BTB predicts the next instruction will be at 0x80 (taken).
- The processor starts fetching from 0x80, without waiting to evaluate the branch condition.

If it turns out the **branch was not taken**, the processor **flushes the incorrect fetch** from 0x80 and resumes at 0x104.

♥ Correct Prediction Path

If the branch is indeed taken, and the BTB correctly supplies the BTA, the processor proceeds without penalty. Execution continues from the target address just as expected.

Misprediction Case

If the actual outcome is not taken, the prediction is incorrect:

- 1. The Instruction Fetched (IF) from the target address is flushed (NOP).
- 2. The processor must fetch the sequential instruction at PC + 4.
- 3. One-cycle penalty incurred, similar to the not-taken misprediction case.

M When is this technique effective?

This method is well-suited for loop constructs, where branches typically go backward and are taken with high probability. For example:

- In a do-while loop, the branch is taken almost every time except the last iteration.
- Conversely, in forward branches like if-then-else, the branch is less likely to be taken, making this technique less effective.

This underscores that **branch direction** (forward or backward) **can influence** the effectiveness of prediction strategies.



Figure 13: Branch Always Taken techniques failed and the processor must flush instruction i+1 and restart execution from the BTA.

2.5.3 Backward Taken Forward Not Taken (BTFNT)

The Backward Taken Forward Not Taken (BTFNT) strategy represents a refinement of static prediction that uses a simple yet effective heuristic: the direction of the branch, whether it jumps backward or forward in memory, can be used to predict its outcome.

Prediction Rule

- Backward-going branches (i.e., branches where the target address is lower than the current PC) are predicted as taken.
 - These branches **often occur in loops**, where execution loops back to an earlier instruction (e.g., in for, while, or do-while constructs).
- Forward-going branches (i.e., target address is greater than the current PC) are predicted as **not taken**.
 - These branches typically correspond to if-then-else constructs, where the else path is less probable and control usually proceeds sequentially.

? Why does this work?

The rationale behind BTFNT lies in **empirical observations**:

- Loops tend to execute multiple times, hence backward branches are mostly taken.
- Conditional statements often have rarely taken else paths, hence forward branches are mostly not taken.

Pros and Cons

- ✓ Simple to implement because BTFNT requires just a comparison of the target address vs the current PC:
 - target address < PC \Rightarrow predict taken
 - target address > PC \Rightarrow predict <u>not</u> taken

Also, better accuracy than uniform always-taken or always-not-taken, especially for mixed codebases.

X Not adaptive; fails for atypical control flows where direction doesn't align with expected behavior.

2.5.4 Profile-Driven Prediction

Profile-Driven Prediction is a static prediction technique that uses empirical data from previous program executions to guide the prediction of branch outcomes. Rather than relying solely on heuristics or branch direction, this method leverages profiling to derive probabilistic insights about how branches behave under typical conditions.

✗ How does it work?

- 1. The target application is executed multiple times beforehand, using diverse data sets to simulate realistic execution scenarios.
- 2. During these early runs, the **behavior of each branch instruction is recorded**. Specifically, how often it was taken or not taken.
- 3. This **profiling produces statistics** for each branch, e.g., a pattern like:

T T T T T T T T NT NT NT

"Taken" is most probable.

- 4. Once the profiling is complete, the **compiler encodes a hint** directly into each branch instruction (e.g., in a dedicated **hint bit** in the instruction format):
 - 1: if the branch is usually taken.
 - \bullet 0: if the branch is usually <u>not</u> taken.

This enables the **processor** to **consult the hint during execution** and predict accordingly, without requiring runtime monitoring.

Advantages

- ✓ Offers higher accuracy than heuristics alone, especially for applications with stable branch behavior.
- ✓ No runtime hardware cost, since prediction decisions are guided by static hints.

Limitations

- **X Static nature**: Predictions don't adapt to runtime variability; changes in data patterns may invalidate the profile.
- **X** Requires **extra compilation effort**: profiling and hint encoding add complexity to the build process.
- **X** Less effective for programs with input-dependent control flow.

2.5.5 Delayed Branch

The **Delayed Branch** technique is a static scheduling approach where the **compiler** plays a central role in mitigating branch penalties. Unlike traditional branch prediction, which involves guessing the outcome of a branch, delayed branching **reorders instructions so that useful work is done regardless of the branch direction**.

■ Core Concept

When a branch instruction is executed, it typically introduces a delay before the processor can determine where to fetch the next instruction. During this delay (known as the branch delay slot), rather than letting the pipeline sit idle or fetch incorrect instructions, the compiler schedules an independent instruction to execute in that slot.

- The instruction in the branch delay slot is always executed, regardless of whether the branch is taken or not.
- This allows useful work to be completed during what would otherwise be a stall or pipeline bubble.



Figure 14: Example Scenario. In this case, the add instruction is scheduled after the branch, always executed, and does not affect the branch condition or outcomes.

A Compiler Responsibility

A critical task for the compiler is to find a valid and useful instruction to place in the branch delay slot. The instruction must be:

- Independent from the branch decision.
- Safe to execute whether the branch is taken or not.

To guide this, the compiler can choose an instruction:

- 1. Section 2.5.5.1, page 46 From **before** the branch.
- 2. Section 2.5.5.2, page 47 From the **target** of the branch.
- 3. Section 2.5.5.3, page 49 From the **fall-through path** (i.e., the sequential next instruction).
- 4. Section 2.5.5.4, page 51 From **after** the branch.

We'll explore each of these four scheduling strategies step-by-step next.

| Technique | Prediction Source | Complexity | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Always Not Taken | Assume PC + 4 | Very Low | |
| Always Taken | Assume jump to BTA | Moderate (BTB) | |
| BTFNT | Direction-based | Low | |
| Profile-Driven | Prior run data | High (compile time) | |
| Delayed Branch | Compiler scheduled | High (compiler) | |
| | | | |
| Technique | Risk | Best for | |
| Technique Always Not Taken | Risk Mispredict backward branches | Best for if-then-else | |
| | | | |
| Always Not Taken | Mispredict backward branches | if-then-else | |
| Always Not Taken Always Taken | Mispredict backward branches Mispredict forward branches | if-then-else Loops (backward branches) | |

Table 2: Quick Comparison Table.

2.5.5.1 From Before

In the "From Before" strategy of delayed branch scheduling, the compiler selects an instruction that appears before the branch in program order and moves it into the branch delay slot. The selected instruction must be independent of the branch decision and safe to execute regardless of whether the branch is taken.

■ Key Characteristics

- The instruction in the branch delay slot is always executed.
- This instruction will never be flushed, since it is guaranteed to execute irrespective of the branch's outcome.
- After the delay slot, execution continues normally, either to the branch target or the fall-through instruction, depending on whether the branch is taken.

```
Original code:

1 add x1, x2, x3
2 beq x2, x4, L1
3 [delay slot, stall]

After scheduling:

1 beq x1, x2, x3
2 add x1, x2, x3 # delay slot filled

Here, the add is originally before the beq and has no dependency on the branch condition. It is safely moved into the delay slot.
```

? Pipeline Behavior

- Branch Not Taken
 - The instruction in the delay slot is executed.
 - Execution continues sequentially with the next instruction after the branch.

• Branch Taken

- The delay slot instruction still executes.
- Execution jumps to the branch target after the delay slot.

The instruction moved to the delay slot is always executed.

Advantages

- ✓ No need for instruction flushing: the delay slot instruction is always valid.
- ✓ Efficiency: reuses existing instructions from earlier in the program to hide the branch delay.

2.5.5.2 From Target

In the "From Target" strategy, the compiler schedules an instruction from the branch target into the delay slot. This technique is useful when the branch is likely to be taken, as the delay slot instruction corresponds to what would naturally execute next in that control path.

■ Key Characteristics

- The delay slot contains an instruction from the branch target path.
- This strategy is typically used when the branch is taken with high probability, such as in loops.
- Challenge: If the branch is not taken, this instruction may be invalid and might have to be flushed (if mispredicted), or it must be safe to execute even if not needed.

```
Example 3: From Target
  Original code:
sub x4, x5, x6
                    # target instruction
2 add x1, x2, x3
                      # branch instruction
3 if x1 == 0 then
                      # branch condition
4 [delay slot, stall]
  After scheduling:
1 add x1, x2, x3
                      # if branch taken, go here!
_2 if x1 == 0 then
                      # branch condition
3 sub x4, x5, x6
                    # delay slot filled
 Here, the sub instruction from the branch target is moved into the delay
```

slot. If the branch is taken, execution proceeds smoothly. If not, we

either flush sub or ensure it causes no side effects.

? Pipeline Behavior

- Branch Taken
 - The delay slot instruction is part of the intended control flow.
 - Execution continues with the **next instruction in the target path**.

• Branch Not Taken

Delay slot may need to be flushed (as it's not part of the sequential path), or must be safe to execute anyway (no side effects or wasted computation).

▲ Instruction Duplication

When we move an instruction from the branch target into the delay slot, we still need to keep it at the target location because other parts of the code might also jump there.

Let's take an example to illustrate the problem. Let's say:

- We have two branches that can jump to label L1.
- Instruction X is the first instruction at L1.
- We move Instruction X into the delay slot of one branch, but the other branch still needs to find instruction X at L1.

Here's what happens:

```
Branch A → L1
Branch B → L1

L1:
Instruction X
Instruction Y
```

If Branch A decides to move Instruction X inside its delay slot, Branch B cannot see Instruction X anymore! Therefore, we have to keep Instruction X in two places:

- 1. In Branch A's delay slot
- 2. At Label L1 for Branch B

Okay, and that should be a problem? For three reasons:

- We've duplicated Instruction X.
- More code = more memory = larger executable.
- Harder to maintain: if we change Instruction X in one place, we might forget to update the duplicate.

Best Use Case

Loops, particularly do-while constructs, where backward branches are taken most of the time.

2.5.5.3 From Fall-Through

In the "From Fall-Through" strategy, the compiler selects an instruction that comes after the branch in program order (i.e., from the fall-through path) and moves it into the branch delay slot. This method is suitable when the branch is unlikely to be taken, as execution will naturally continue sequentially.

■ Key Characteristics

- The fall-through path is taken when the branch is not taken.
- The delay slot instruction comes from this path, meaning it is executed anyway if the branch is not taken.
- If the **branch is taken**, the delay slot instruction is either:
 - **Flushed** (discarded), or
 - Must be safe to execute (no side effects), even though it becomes useless work.

```
Example 4: From Fall-Through
  Original code:
1 add x1, x2, x3
_2 if x1 == 0 then
                      # branch condition
3 [delay slot, stall]
4 or x7, x8, x9
                      # execute if branch is not taken
                      # execute if branch is taken
5 sub x4, x5, x6
  After scheduling:
1 add x1, x2, x3
_2 if x1 == 0 then
                      # branch condition
3 or x7, x8, x9
                      # delay slot filled
                     # execute if branch is taken
4 sub x4, x5, x6
 Here, or x7, x8, x9 is moved into the delay slot from the instruc-
  tion that would normally execute next if the branch is not taken.
```

? Pipeline Behavior

- Branch Not Taken (Mist Likely)
 - Delay slot instruction is correctly executed.
 - Execution proceeds sequentially.
- Branch Taken
 - Delay slot instruction is not needed.
 - It must be flushed, or safe to execute even though its result is discarded.

⊘ When is this strategy used?

- ✓ When the branch is not likely to be taken.
- ✓ Common in forward branches, such as if-then-else, where else is rare.

| Strategy | Delay Slot Instruction | Executed when branch | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| From Fall-Through From Target | Instruction at PC + 4 (next in sequence) Instruction at BTA (label target) | Not Taken (common case) Taken (common case) | |

Table 3: Comparison between "From Target" and "From Fall-Through".

2.5.5.4 From After

The "From After" scheduling technique is rarely used because it is too complex to be practical. However, in the "From After" strategy, the instruction scheduled in the branch delay slot is taken from a later point the the code, specifically, from after the fall-through instruction.

Let's number the instructions to make it easy:

```
1 Instr A  # Before branch
2 Branch  # Branch condition
3 Instr B  # PC + 4 (fall-through)
4 Instr C  # After fall-through ← from after
5 Instr D
```

In "from after", the compiler moves Instr C into the delay slot, even though Instr B (PC + 4) should come right after the branch in normal execution (if not taken).

A Why is this hard?

To safely move Instr C up into the delay slot, the compiler must guarantee:

1. No Data Dependency Conflicts

• Instr C must not use or modify data that depends on Instr A, B, or the branch outcome. For example, if Instr C uses a value computed in Instr B, moving it before Instr B causes incorrect results.

2. Safe if Executed Early

- Even if the branch is taken and Instr C should never execute, now it always executes in the delay slot.
- So Instr C must be safe to execute even when it's not needed.
- We call this a speculatively safe instruction.

3. No Control Flow Violation

• If Instr C should only run after a condition is met, moving it earlier might break program logic.

2.6 Dynamic Branch Prediction

While static branch prediction relies on fixed rules or compile-time knowledge, dynamic branch prediction aims to learn and adapt during program execution. It uses hardware mechanisms to observe past branch behavior and predict future outcomes at runtime.

Core Idea

Dynamic prediction is **based on a key assumption**: if a branch behaved a certain way in the past, it's likely to behave the same way again. Therefore, instead of guessing statically, the **processor monitors each branch at runtime** and uses past outcomes to inform future predictions.

Hardware Components

Dynamic prediction relies on two tightly-coupled hardware blocks, both situated in the Instruction Fetch (IF) stage:

- 1. Branch Outcome Predictor (BOP):
 - Predicts branch direction: Taken (T) or Not Taken (NT).
 - Based on runtime history (past outcomes of this or other branches).
- 2. Branch Target Buffer (BTB):
 - Predicts the target address to jump to if the branch is predicted taken.
 - Returns the Predicted Target Address (PTA)².
 - Useful only when BOP predicts Taken; irrelevant if Not Taken.

X How it works

During instruction fetch:

- 1. BOP predicts T/NT.
- 2. If Taken (T), BTB provides the PTA.
- 3. The processor fetches the next instruction accordingly.

²Predicted Target Address (PTA): The memory address that the processor predicts as the destination for a taken branch. If the branch is predicted taken, the Branch Target Buffer (BTB) provides the PTA so that instruction fetch can continue from this address without waiting for the branch condition to be resolved.

? Execution Scenarios

- Prediction: Not Taken (PC + 4)
 - If Branch Outcome = Not Taken ⇒ ✓ Correct prediction ⇒ No penalty.
 - − If Branch Outcome = Taken \Rightarrow X Misprediction:
 - 1. Flush next instruction (NOP)
 - 2. Fetch from BTA (to understand where to jump)
 - 3. One-cycle penalty
- Prediction: Taken (BTB used)
 - If Branch Outcome = Taken ⇒ ✓ Correct prediction ⇒ No penalty.
 - − If Branch Outcome = Not Taken \Rightarrow **X** Misprediction:
 - 1. Flush fetched target instruction (NOP) provided by BTB
 - 2. Fetch PC + 4 (next instruction sequentially)
 - 3. One-cycle penalty

Unlike static prediction, **dynamic prediction is adaptive**. If a branch changes its behavior at runtime, future predictions adjust accordingly.

2.6.1 1-bit Branch History Table

In general, the Branch History Table (BHT), or Branch Prediction Buffer, is a dynamic hardware structure that predicts branch outcomes based on recent behavior. The simplest version uses 1 bit per branch to remember whether the branch was recently taken or not taken. For this reason, it is called a 1-bit Branch History Table (1-bit BHT). It operates at runtime and uses a Final State Machine (FSM) with 1-bit history:

- If last outcome was Taken \Rightarrow predict Taken.
- If last outcome was Not Taken \Rightarrow predict Not Taken.



X How it works

- Each branch instruction's address (or part of it) indexes a table entry.
- That entry holds a single bit (T/NT) representing the last observed outcome.
- On next encounter:
 - Use the bit to predict the outcome.
 - After actual branch resolution:
 - * Correct prediction \Rightarrow keep bit unchanged
 - * Incorrect prediction ⇒ flip bit

Indexing the Table

- Use k lower bits (right side) of the branch's address as the index.
- ⚠ No tags: any branch with the same low-order bits shares the entry (can cause interference).
 - 2^k entries total.

n-bit Branch Address BHT k-bit Branch Address 2^k entries 1-bit

Figure 15: Visual representation of the 1-bit Branch History Table.

Example 5: Accuracy Issue

Consider a loop that executes 10 iterations. The expected behavior of the branch is:

TTTTTTTTTTT

Where the last is Not Taken because the code must exist from the loop and must continue (and not jump).

There are two mispredictions:

- At the end: Since iteration 9 is marked as Taken, the 10th iteration is predicted to be Taken, since the BHT contains Taken. This throws a misprediction because the branch result is Not Taken.
- On the next time loop starts: since the last iteration is stored in the BHT as Not Taken, the BHT has to flip the bit on the next time loop starts, and a misprediction occurs.

As a result, with 100% of 10 iterations, the BHT only catches 8 out of 10 iterations, the accuracy is 80%.

Shortcomings

- **X** Flipping prediction after 1 misprediction causes instability, especially in loops.

 ✓
- **X** Conflict problem: two different branches with same index overwrite each other's bit.

Partial Solutions

To reduce interference:

- Increase table size (more k bits).
- Use hashing to mix address bits better.

2.6.2 2-bit Branch History Table

2-bit Branch History Table (BHT) is an **improvement over 1-bit BHT** designed to increase prediction stability, especially for loops, and reduce mispredictions.

♥ Why 2-bit? The Problem with 1-bit BHT

In loops, 1-bit BHT suffers from flip-flopping: 1 misprediction is enough to change the prediction. This causes two misprediction per loop:

- Exiting the loop (NT mispredicted as T).
- Re-entering the loop (T mispredicted as NT).

The 2-bit BHT introduces a **4-state FSM** using **2 bits per entry**. It requires **2 consecutive mispredictions to change the predicted outcome**, thus adding stability. The FSM states are:

- 1. Strongly Taken $(ST) \rightarrow Predict Taken$
- 2. Weakly Taken (WT) \rightarrow Predict Taken
- 3. Weakly Not Taken (WNT) \rightarrow Predict Not Taken
- 4. Strongly Not Taken (SNT) \rightarrow Predict Not Taken



2 Control Hazards and Branch Prediction 2.6 Dynamic Branch Prediction

♥ Effect on Loops

Assume a loop with:

TTTTTTTTTT

- Exit NT causes 1 misprediction, but FSM moves from Strongly Taken to Weakly Taken. So the prediction remains Taken.
- Re-enter on the loop causes a Branch Outcome Taken, and the 2-bit BHT predicts correctly because it is on the WT state.

Only 1 misprediction per loop, improving accuracy to 90% (from 80%).

Benefits

- Improved accuracy in loops and repetitive patterns.
- Reduces misprediction penalty in typical branch-heavy code.
- Balances prediction stability and adaptability.

2.6.3 Branch Target Buffer

The Branch Target Buffer (BTB) is a specialized cache used to store target address of taken branches. The stored Predicted Target Address (PTA) allows the processor to fetch instructions from the target without delay when a branch is predicted taken. The PTA is typically stored in PC-relative format (offset from current PC).

Core Idea

While the Branch History Table (BHT) predicts whether a branch will be taken, the Branch Target Buffer (BTB) predicts where the program should go if the branch is taken. The BTB stores Predicted Target Addresses (PTAs) for previously encountered branches and enables fast redirection of control flow.

X How Is the BTB Structured?

- The BTB is designed as a **direct-mapped cache**:
 - The address of the branch instruction is used to index the BTB.
 - Tags are used for associative lookup to confirm correctness (i.e., ensure the indexed entry really belongs to the current branch)
- Components per **entry**:
 - Tags: Identifies the branch instruction.
 - **PTA**: The Predicted Target Address.
 - Often combined with T/NT bits from a Branch History Table
 (1-bit or 2-bit) for branch outcome prediction.



Figure 16: Branch Target Buffer without Branch Outcome Predictor.



Figure 17: Branch Target Buffer with Branch Outcome Predictor.

BTB in the Pipeline

It is placed in the Instruction Fetch (IF) phase. During fetch:

- The BTB is queried using the current PC (branch address).
- If hit and BHT predicts Taken, fetch from PTA.
- If miss or predict Not Taken, continue at PC + 4.

| Prediction | BTB use | Action |
|--------------------------|--------------|--|
| Predict Not Taken | BTB not used | Fetch from PC + 4 |
| Predict Taken (BTB hit) | BTB used | Fetch from PTA stored in BTB |
| Predict Taken (BTB miss) | BTB miss | Stall or default to PC + 4, then calculate BTA |

Table 4: Summary of Behavior.

⊘ Advantages

- ✓ Eliminates delay from calculating the branch target address manually.
- ✓ Enables speculative instruction fetch from correct target, improving pipeline efficiency.

2.6.4 Correlating Branch Predictors

? What is the problem?

With standard BHT, we **predict each branch individually**, based only on **its own past behavior**. But real programs often have **branches that influence each other**. For example, let's look at the following code:

- Branch B often behaves like Branch A, because they depend on the same condition (x > 0).
- A normal predictor doesn't know this. It treats A and B independently.

E Key Idea

Use global branch history (outcomes of previous branches) to improve prediction for the current branch. This approach exploits correlation between different branches. This technique is called Correlating Predictors or 2-level Predictors.

General Case: (m, n)

In a (m, n) correlating predictor, the past outcomes of the last m branches are used to select among 2^m prediction tables, each of which uses n-bit prediction entries.

- m: The number of global history bits.
- n: The number of bits per prediction entry in the BHTs (e.g., 1 or 2).

It works like this:

- 1. Track the Last *m* Branches: Store the outcomes (T/NT) of the last *m* branches in a Global History Register (GHR). This forms an *m*-bit global history pattern.
- 2. Use GHR to Select Table: The m-bit GHR selects 1 out of 2^m Branch History Tables (BHTs). Each BHT contains n-bit entries.
- 3. Index the Selected Table: Use low-order bits of the branch instruction address (e.g., PC bits) to index an entry in the selected table.
- 4. **Predict Using** *n***-bit Entry**: Use the *n*-bit entry to predict:
 - 1-bit BHT: predict Taken or Not Taken.
 - 2-bit BHT: use 4-state FSM (Strong and Weak Taken and Not Taken)

So what we have in the **memory** is:

2 Control Hazards and Branch Prediction 2.6 Dynamic Branch Prediction

- Total tables: 2^m BHTs.
- Each BHT has: 2^k entries (k is the number of PC bits used).
- Total entries: $2^m \times 2^k$.

⊘ Advantages

- Captures patterns across multiple branches.
- Helps in complex control flow where a branch's outcome depends on prior branches.
- \bullet More accurate than per-branch-only prediction.

2.6.4.1 (1,1) Correlating Predictors

Use the result of the last executed branch (global history, m = 1 bit) to choose between two prediction tables, each of which has 1-bit entries.

- 1-bit Global History: Stores last branch outcome (Taken = 1, Not Taken = 0).
- 2 BHTs (T1 & T2): Each is a 1-bit predictor table, selected based on global history. We use a 1-bit Branch History Table technique.
- Indexing: Use PC low-order bits to index into the selected table.

Consider a pseudo code:

Let's say if A is true, B is usually true. The execution walkthrough:

- Cycle 1: First Execution of Branch A
 - 1. Global History: unknown or NT (0); because it doesn't track anything yet. We assume Not Taken (0).
 - 2. Use Table T2 (since GH = 0).
 - 3. Index into T2 with Branch A's PC bits.
 - Predict: Not Taken!
 - Unfortunately, the Branch Outcome (BO) says Taken ⇒ X Mispredict ⇒ update T2 entry to T.
 - 4. Update Global History = 1 (Taken).
- Cycle 2: Now Executing Branch Branch B
 - 1. Global History = 1 (Taken) from Branch A.
 - 2. Use Table T1 (since GH = 1).
 - 3. Index with Branch B's PC bits.
 - T1 says: "Try to predict as Taken".

 - 4. No update needed. The Global History doesn't need an update either, because it is already 1 (Taken).

Since Branch A was Taken, Branch B is likely to be Taken. This is a smart technique because normal predictors treat Branch B alone. Instead, the Correlating Branch Predictor uses context, and the last branch helps predict this one.

| Branch | Global History | Table Used | Prediction | Outcome | Update |
|----------|----------------|------------|------------|---------|---------------|
| Branch A | 0 | Т2 | NT | Т | T2 entry to T |
| Branch B | 1 | T1 | Т | Т | No change |



Figure 18: Visual representation of the (1,1) Correlating Predictor.

| Aspect | Description |
|------------------|--|
| $\overline{m=1}$ | Use 1-bit GHR (last branch result). |
| n = 1 | 1-bit prediction, (T or NT). |
| Tables | 2 BHTs (for GHR = 0 and GHR = 1). |
| Selection Logic | If last branch T, use Table T1; else T2. |

Table 5: (1,1) Correlating Predictor.

2.6.4.2 (2,2) Correlating Predictors

The correlating predictors with m=2 and n=2 have the following components:

- 2-bit Global History: Stores outcomes of the last 2 branches. Forms 4 patterns:
 - 00: both Not Taken.
 - 01: last branch Taken, penultimate branch Not Taken.
 - 10: last branch Not Taken, penultimate branch Taken.
 - 11: both Taken.
- 4 Prediction Tables: One for each global history pattern ($2^2 = 4$ BHTs).
- 2-bit entries per BHT: Each BHT uses 2-bit saturating counters for stable predictions.
- **Indexing**: Use PC low bits + global history to access an entry in a BHT.

Consider a pseudo code:

Let's simulate Branch 3's prediction, influenced by Branches 1 & 2.

- 0. Initial State
 - Global History Register (GHR) = 00 (no branches taken yet).
 - BHT for history 00 selected.
 - Predicts Branch 3 using its 2-bit counter in BHT[00].
- 1. Cycle 1: Branch 1 =Taken
 - GHR: $00 \rightarrow 01$ (shift in T = 1, Taken).
 - Update BHT[00] (for Branch A), since we used GHR = 00 before A.
- 2. Cycle 2: Branch 2 = Not Taken
 - GHR: $01 \rightarrow 10$ (T, NT).
 - Update BHT[01] (for Branch B), since GHR = 01 before B.
- 3. Cycle 3: Predict Branch 3
 - GHR = 10, so select the BHT that contains 10 for prediction.
 - Use Branch 3's PC low bits + GHR = 10 to index BHT[10].
 - Check the 2-bit FSM in this entry. Assume the FSM state is Weakly Taken, so the **prediction is Taken**.
 - The outcome of Branch 3 is Taken, so the prediction is correct and we update the FSM of entry BHT[10].

2 Control Hazards and Branch Prediction 2.6 Dynamic Branch Prediction

| Cycle | Branch | Outcome | GHR Before | GHR After | BHT Used for Update |
|-------|------------|---------|------------|-----------|---------------------|
| 1 | A | Т | 00 | 01 | BHT[00] |
| 2 | В | NT | 01 | 10 | BHT[01] |
| 3 | $^{\rm C}$ | Т | 10 | 01 | BHT[10] |



Figure 19: Visual representation of the (2,2) Correlating Predictor.

| Aspect | Description | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|
| m=2 | Track outcomes of last 2 branches (GHR = 2 bits) | | |
| n = 2 | 2-bit prediction entries per BHT | | |
| Tables | 4 BHTs (for GHR = 00, 01, 10, 11). | | |
| Indexing | 4-bit PC + 2-bit GHR $ ightarrow$ 6-bit index for accessing a table | | |
| Prediction Stability | More robust due to 2-bit FSM per entry. | | |

Table 6: (2,2) Correlating Predictor.

2.6.5 Two-Level Adaptive Branch Predictors

Two-Level Adaptive Branch Predictors are advanced techniques that aim to provide highly accurate and adaptive predictions by combining history tracking with pattern-based decision-making. Unlike simpler predictors that use only the outcome of the last branch or last few outcomes of a single branch, these predictors consider patterns over time and across different branches to improve prediction accuracy.

■ Core Concept

The two-level approach consists of:

- 1. A history-tracking component: to record the outcomes of recent branches.
- 2. A **pattern-based prediction component**: to use that history to make accurate predictions.

This design allows the processor to learn and adapt to recurring patterns in branch behavior, which is particularly useful for complex control flows and loops.

X Structure

- 1. Branch History Register (BHR)
 - A k-bit shift register that records the outcomes of the k most recent branches (e.g., T, NT, NT, T).
 - The BHR can be either:
 - Global: one register for all branches.
 - Local: separate register for each branch.
- 2. Pattern History Table (PHT)
 - A table of **2-bit saturating counters** (like in 2-bit BHT).
 - Indexed using the content of the BHR.
 - Each entry provides a prediction (Taken/Not Taken) and adapts over time.

3. Prediction Process

- (a) Use the BHR value to index the PHT.
- (b) Read the 2-bit counter at that entry.
- (c) Predict Taken if in a Taken state, otherwise Not Taken.
- (d) After the actual branch outcome:
 - i. Update the 2-bit counter accordingly.
 - ii. Shift the actual outcome into the BHR.

■ Global Adaptive Predictor (GA)

The Global Adaptive Predictor (GA) is a specific form of the two-level predictor where global history (BHR) is used to index the PHT.

- The **BHR** is shared across all branches, and thus captures the global correlation among different branches.
- The **PHT** is local in the sense that it provides per-entry adaptation via 2-bit counters.

The main advantage is that by correlating the current branch with the behavior of previous branches (stored in the BHR), the **predictor can detect global** patterns and make more informed predictions.

GShare Predictor

GShare is a variation of the Global Adaptive Predictor, designed to improve the indexing of the PHT and reduce aliasing (i.e., different branches mapping to the same PHT entry).

Instead of directly using BHR to index the PHT, **GShare performs an XOR** between:

- The **BHR** (global history of recent outcomes).
- The low-order bits of the program counter (PC) of the current branch.

The XOR operation mixes the global history with branch-specific information, making it more likely that different branches will access different entries in the PHT, thus reducing prediction interference (aliasing). This allows GShare to reduce aliasing and have a global and local view.

| Predictor | History used | Indexing to PHT | Benefit |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Global Adaptive (GA) | Global BHR | BHR value directly indexes PHT | Simple, effective for globally correlated branches |
| GShare | Global BHR + PC | BHR XOR PC bits index PHT | Reduces aliasing, captures global + local context |

Table 7: Summary of Global Adaptive and GShare.

3 Instruction Level Parallelism

3.1 The problem of dependencies

Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP) is a foundational concept in modern processor design that aims to improve performance by executing multiple instructions simultaneously within a single processor core. The fundamental premise of ILP is that many instructions within a program can be executed independently, and thus, can be overlapped in time. This section explores the principles of pipelining as a means to exploit ILP, emphasizing its benefits, ideal performance metrics, and the inherent limitations.

However, **instruction dependencies** represent critical **constraints** on this parallelism. Understanding these dependencies is essential for analyzing the potential parallelism in a program and for designing hardware or compilers that can exploit ILP safely and efficiently.

Instruction dependencies determine which instructions can be executed simultaneously and which ones must respect a specific order of execution. These dependencies are classified into three broad categories: data dependencies, name dependencies, and control dependencies.

♥ Correct Program Behavior

For correct program behavior, two program properties must always be preserved during instruction scheduling:

- 1. Data Flow. The correct values must be produced and consumed in the proper order.
- 2. Exception Behavior. Reordering must not alter the way exceptions are raised and handled in the program.

While dependencies are intrinsic to the program semantics, hazards are an architectural artifact of the pipeline implementation.

3.1.1 Data Dependencies

Data Dependencies, also called True Data Dependencies, are the most fundamental type of instruction dependencies in a program. They express the real flow of data from one instruction to another and are dictated by the *semantics* of the program. These dependencies must be strictly preserved during any reordering or parallel execution of instructions, otherwise the correctness of the program is compromised.

Formally, we say there is a data dependencies from instruction I_i to instruction I_j (where I_j follows I_i in program order), if I_j reads a value that is produced by I_i . In other words, I_j needs the output of I_i as its input. This is known as a **Read After Write (RAW)** hazard in pipeline terminology.

? Why is it called "true"?

This type of dependence is "true" because the **second instruction cannot** proceed correctly until the first one completes its write operation. It reflects an actual requirement for program correctness.

Example 1: RAW Hazard

```
1 I1: r3 \leftarrow r1 + r2 # produces a value in r3
2 I2: r4 \leftarrow r3 + r5 # consumes the value from r3
```

Here, I2 is data-dependent on I1 because it reads from register r3, which is written by I1. The instructions must execute in order:

- I1 must execute and complete its write to r3 before.
- I2 reads r3 to perform its own computation.

If this order is violated, e.g., I2 executes before I1 finishes, then I2 will read an incorrect or undefined value.

▲ Why Data dependencies Matter for ILP

Data dependencies define which instructions must not be executed in parallel, because doing so would result in violating program semantics.

- In a **pipelined processor**, data dependencies may cause **pipeline stalls**.
- In out-of-order processors, special mechanisms (like reservation stations and the reorder buffer) track and resolve data dependencies to allow other independent instructions to proceed while dependent ones wait for operands.

3.1.2 Name Dependencies

Unlike true data dependencies, Name Dependencies arise when two instructions use the same register or memory location, but there is no actual flow of data between them. These dependencies are called False Dependencies or Pseudo-Dependencies because they are not required for program correctness from a data perspective, but still impose constraints on instruction scheduling.

These constraints are due to the reuse of names (i.e., identifiers like register names), not due to real dependencies in the data values. They may still cause hazards in a pipeline and need to be addressed, especially when trying to execute instructions in parallel or out of order.

Types of Name Dependencies

There are two main types:

- Anti-Dependence (Write After Read WAR). An anti-dependence occurs when:
 - A first instruction **reads** from a location (register/memory);
 - A second instruction writes to that same location, after it.

This introduces a WAR hazard: if the second instruction is executed too early (before the first instruction finishes reading), it might overwrite the value before the first instruction uses it.

```
Example 2: WAR Hazard

1 I1: r3 ← r1 + r2 # reads r1 and r2
2 I2: r1 ← r4 + r5 # writes to r1

In this case:

— I1 reads from r1

— I2 writes to r1

There is no data flow between the two (i.e., I1 doesn't use the result of I2, and vice versa), but if I2 executes before I1 finishes, the read in I1 may get a corrupted value.
```

• Output Dependence (Write After Write - WAW). An output dependence occurs when two instructions write to the same location (register or memory). This results in a WAW hazard: executing the second instruction first may overwrite the location, changing the final value from what the program originally intended.

value in r3.

Example 3: WAW Hazard 1 I1: r3 \leftarrow r1 + r2 # writes to r3 2 I2: r3 \leftarrow r4 + r5 # writes to r3 There's no direct data flow between the two, but the ordering matters. If I2 is supposed to overwrite r3 after I1, reversing the order would result in I1's result being incorrectly seen as the final

▼ Resolving Name Dependencies: Register Renaming

The key idea in dealing with name dependencies is to recognize that they are not real and can be eliminated if we avoid the reuse of names. The technique used to eliminate these artificial constraints is called Register Renaming. The idea is simple:

• If two instructions refer to the same register but don't actually share data, assign them different physical registers.

This is only possible when the underlying hardware (or compiler) provides more physical registers than the number of logical registers visible in the ISA.

```
Example 4: Resolving WAR and WAW
  Original code (WAR):
           \texttt{r3} \; \leftarrow \; \texttt{r1} \; + \; \texttt{r2}
_2 I2: r1 \leftarrow r4 + r5
  Renamed:
1 I1:
           r3 \leftarrow r1 + r2
                                   # write to r9 instead of r1
  Now, there is no conflict, I2 can proceed independently of I1.
  Original code (WAW):
1 I1: r3 \leftarrow r1 + r2
2 I2:
         r3 \leftarrow r4 + r5
  Renamed:
           r3 \leftarrow r1 + r2
1 I1:
           \texttt{r9} \; \leftarrow \; \texttt{r4} \; + \; \texttt{r5}
2 I2:
                                   # write to a new register
```

44 Hardware vs. Software Register Renaming

- Hardware (Dynamic Renaming). Performed at runtime by structures such as the Register Alias Table (RAT), typically in out-of-order superscalar processors.
 - ✓ Flexible
 - Adds hardware complexity
- Software (Static Renaming). Performed at compile time by the compiler, particularly for VLIW or statically scheduled processors.
 - Simpler in hardware
 - 2 Puts more pressure on compiler technology

3.1.3 Control Dependencies

While data and name dependencies arise from how instructions read and write operands, Control Dependencies stem from the flow of control in the program, that is, the presence of branches and conditional execution.

Control dependencies are fundamentally about **deciding whether an instruction should execute at all**, based on the **result of** a preceding **branch** or **conditional instruction**.

Formally, an instruction I_j is **control-dependent** on a branch instruction I_b if:

- I_j must only execute if a particular outcome of I_b is taken.
- But the decision made by I_b (e.g., whether to branch or not) is not yet known when I_j enters the pipeline.

This introduces uncertainty: should I_j be fetched and executed, or not?

? Why Control Dependencies matter for ILP

Control dependencies **limit instruction parallelism**:

- We cannot freely reorder or speculate on the instructions following a branch.
- Waiting for the branch outcome introduces stalls in the pipeline.

Thus, exploiting ILP requires **breaking or relaxing control dependencies**, without violating program semantics.

♥ Control Dependencies Solution

We have dedicated an entire section to this topic, see 2, page 28.

3.2 Multi-Cycle Pipelining

As processor microarchitectures evolved to support more complex instructions and higher performance demands, the basic model of a uniform single-cycle pipeline became insufficient. In practice, **many instructions**, especially those involving floating-point operations, memory access, or division, **require more than one clock cycle** to complete their execution or memory stages.

This leads to the development of **multi-cycle pipelines**, where **individual stages** (particularly EX and MEM) may **last for multiple cycles**, depending on the instruction type and runtime events. In such architectures, the ability to manage instruction progress intelligently becomes central to maintaining high throughput and correctness.

■ Motivation and Assumptions

In a classical 5-stage pipeline (IF, ID, EX, MEM, WB), all **stages are assumed to complete in one clock cycle**. However, this assumption doesn't hold in realistic systems:

- Integer instructions may complete in 1-2 cycles.
- Floating-point operations, like multiplication or division, can take 3 to 10+ cycles.
- Memory access times are unpredictable due to cache hits and misses, which can add variable delays.
- **Instruction fetch** may also stall due to instruction cache misses or branch resolution delays.

To accommodate these characteristics, **processors adopt multi-cycle pipe-**lines, where:

- Execution latency varies by operation type.
- Memory access can take multiple cycles.
- Functional units are not necessarily pipelined, particularly for floating-point operations.

Basic assumptions in this model:

- 1. The processor is **single-issue** (one instruction issued per cycle).
- 2. **Instructions** are typically **issued in-order** (fetched and passed into the pipeline in the order that they appear in the program).
- 3. Execution and memory stages may involve multiple functional units with variable latencies.
- 4. Write-back is often delayed or synchronized to ensure consistent state updates and avoid hazards.

3.2.1 Multi-Cycle In-Order Pipeline

In a Multi-Cycle In-Order Pipeline, instructions are:

- Issued in program order (in-order issue).
- Executed on dedicated functional units, each potentially requiring multiple cycles.
- Committed in order, i.e., write-back to the architectural state occurs in the order instructions were issued (in-order commit).

This model retains a strict discipline:

- Even if a later instruction finishes earlier (because it uses a faster unit), it cannot write back until its turn arrives.
- This avoids WAR (Write After Read) and WAW (Write After Write) hazards by ensuring in-order commit.

⊘ Advantages

- ✓ Simpler control logic.
- ✓ Preserves the precise exception model.
- ✓ No need for register renaming or reorder buffers.

Disadvantages

- ➤ Poor ILP exploitation: independent instructions may stall behind slow ones.
- ✗ All instructions are serialized through the same issue logic, even if no true dependence exists.



Figure 20: Multi-Cycle In-Order Pipeline architecture. This processor includes different execution units, each optimized for a specific operation type:

- X1-X2: 2-stage execution, used for basic integer ALU.
- Fadd: 3-stage execution, used for floating-point addition.
- Fmul: 3-stage execution, used for floating-point multiplication.
- FDiv: not pipelined, used for floating-point division (long)

So integer operations may take 2 cycles, add/mul take 3, and divide takes many cycles and cannot overlap because it's not pipelined. The instruction flow moves through:

- IF (Instruction Fetch): from PC and instruction memory.
- D (Decode): identifies operand registers, selects execution unit.
- X1, X2, ...: execution pipeline stages, depending on instruction type.
- Data Mem: if needed (e.g., for load/store).
- W (commit point) + GPRs/FPRs: Write-Back (WB) stage to either General-Purpose Registers or Floating-Point Registers.

| Feature | Description |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Issue | In order |
| Execution | In order |
| Completion (write-back) | In order (even if execution latency differs) |
| Architectural State Updates | In order; results are committed exactly in program order |
| ILP | Limited, stalls propagate even to independent instructions |
| Complexity | Moderate, simpler control logic, no renaming or reorder buffer needed |
| Exceptions | Always precise, easy to track and recover since instructions complete in order |

Table 8: Summary of Multi-Cycle In-Order Pipeline.

3.2.2 Multi-Cycle Out-of-Order Pipeline

To overcome the limitations of in-order execution, processors adopt Multi-Cycle Out-of-Order (OoO) Pipelines. It is a more sophisticated architecture that aims to maximize ILP by executing independent instructions as early as possible, regardless of program order, and allowing instructions to complete out of order.

In this model:

- Instructions are still fetched and decoded in-order (in-order issue).
- After decoding, instructions are placed into issue queues or reservation stations (out-of-order execution).
- As soon as operands are available and a suitable functional unit is free, instructions execute, regardless of original order.
- Write-back and commit may also occur out-of-order, although the final architectural state is updated in program order to preserve correctness (out-of-order commit).

✓ Advantages

- Maximizes ILP by letting independent instructions execute as soon as possible.
- ✓ Improves throughput by keeping all functional units busy.
- ✓ Hides long latencies, like FP division or memory misses.

A Challenges

Out-of-Order execution introduces serious architecture challenges:

- WAR and WAW Hazards. If later instructions write back before earlier ones:
 - X They might overwrite data that's still needed.
 - ✓ Hardware must detect and prevent these scenarios.

This is typically handled using: register renaming and scoreboarding / reservation stations.

- Imprecise Exceptions. If an exception occurs (e.g., divide-by-zero), but the processor has already executed and committed later instructions, the architectural state is **no longer consistent** with the point of the fault. To fix this, high-performance CPUs use:
 - ✓ Reorder Buffers (ROB) to store results until it's safe to commit them in program order.

✓ Checkpointing and rollback mechanisms to recover precise state.

Formally, an **exception is imprecise** occurs if the processor state when an exception is thrown does not look exactly as if the instructions were executed in order.

| Feature | Description |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Issue | In order |
| Execution | Out of order |
| Completion (write-back) | Out of order |
| Architectural State Updates | May occur out of order (but real designs use reorder buffers to enforce in-order commit) |
| ILP | High |
| Complexity | High - needs hazard detection, renaming, ROBs |
| Exceptions | Risk of imprecision without commit logic |

Table 9: Summary of Multi-Cycle Out-of-Order Pipeline.



Figure 21: High-Level Multi-Cycle Out-of-Order Pipeline architecture.

- IF (Instruction Fetch): fetches the next instruction in program order from instruction memory using the program counter (PC).
- ID (Instruction Decode). This stage is now split into two sub-stages:
 - 1. ID: decoding the instruction format and operation type.
 - 2. Issue: reading registers and checking availability of operands.

This split is key to **preparing instructions early**, even if they're not ready to execute immediately.

- Functional Units. The processor has multiple independent execution units, each possibly multi-cycle and with different latencies:
 - ALU: used for integer arithmetic, logic, and takes 1-2 cycles.
 - Mem: used for load/store, with cache hits/misses, and takes a variable number of cycles.
 - Fadd: used for floating-point addition, and takes ≈ 3 cycles.
 - Fmul: used for floating-point multiplication, and takes ≈ 3 cycles.
 - Fdiv: used for floating-point division, and takes multiple cycles and is not always pipelined.

Each unit operates independently, and several can be active at once.

• GPRs and FPRs (General/Floating-Point Registers): architectural registers where results are ultimately written. But in this pipeline, results may first go to **temporary storage** until committed (through not shown here explicitly, concepts like **reorder buffer (ROB)** are implied).

Unlike the in-order pipeline, there is **no single commit point** shown. This means out-of-order commit, and introduces the risk of: WAR and WAW hazards, and imprecise exceptions.

3.3 Dynamic Scheduling

As we've seen, static in-order pipelines are limited in their ability to exploit ILP because they stall the entire pipeline when a single instruction is blocked. **Dynamic Scheduling** solves this by allowing **instructions to be issued, executed, and even completed out of order**, as long as doing so does not violate program correctness.

? The Need for Dynamic Scheduling

Consider the following instruction sequence:

```
1 I1: FO \leftarrow F2 / F4 # long-latency divide
2 I2: F10 \leftarrow F0 + F8 # depends on F0
3 I3: F12 \leftarrow F8 - F14 # independent of I1 and I2
```

In a naive in-order pipeline:

- I2 stalls waiting for F0, and
- I3 stalls behind I2, even though it's independent.

This results in lost parallelism. In contrast, **dynamic scheduling** would:

- Allow I1 to begin and proceed through the divider.
- Stall I2 because it depends on F0.
- Allow I3 to proceed and complete immediately, despite the stall.

This is possible because the processor can **track operand availability** and issue instructions **as soon as dependencies are satisfied**, not based solely on their program order.

* How Dynamic Scheduling Works

Instructions are issued in order but may execute and complete out of order, depending on operand readiness and unit availability. The processor uses dedicated hardware structures to manage this:

- Reservation Stations (or Issue Queues)
- Reorder Buffer (ROB)
- Register Renaming Tables
- Common Data Bus (CDB) for broadcasting results

In a dynamically scheduled pipeline, stages are typically:

- Fetch (IF): Get instruction from memory.
- **Decode** (**ID**): Determine opcode, operands, destination.
- Issue: Place instruction into reservation station if operands aren't ready.
- Execute (EX): Start when all operands are available.

- Write Result: Write result to a temporary buffer or broadcast to waiting instructions.
- Commit: Update architectural registers in order.

Benefits

- ✓ Higher ILP: Instructions don't wait unnecessarily.
- ✓ Resource Utilization: Keeps functional units busy.
- ✓ Latency Hiding: Tolerates cache misses, long FP ops.
- **✓ Exploits Independence**: Independent ops no longer block one another.

▲ Challenges Introduced

While powerful, dynamic scheduling is **complex**:

- **★ WAR and WAW Hazards**. With out-of-order execution, later instructions might write before earlier ones. Solution: use register renaming to remove name dependencies.
- ✗ Imprecise Exceptions. If a later instruction causes an exception, but earlier ones have already modified state, it becomes hard to roll back. Solution: use a Reorder Buffer (ROB) that holds results temporarily and commits them in program order.
- **X** Hardware Cost and Complexity. Additional logic is needed for:
 - Dependency tracking
 - Wakeup and select logic
 - Common data bus broadcasting
 - Instruction window buffering

3.4 Multiple-Issue Processors

3.4.1 Introduction to Multiple-Issue Pipelines

In previous sections, we explored how pipelining (section 3.2) and dynamic scheduling (section 3.3) help improve instruction throughput by exploiting instruction-level parallelism (ILP). However, traditional scalar **pipelines are fundamentally limited**: they can issue only one instruction per clock cycle. To overcome this limitation and achieve even higher performance, computer architects developed Multiple-Issue Processors.

Definition 1: Multiple-Issue Processors

Multiple-Issue Processors are processors designed to fetch, decode, issue, and execute more than one instruction per clock cycle, with the goal of increasing instruction throughput and exploiting instruction-level parallelism (ILP).

They achieve higher performance than scalar processors by issuing multiple independent instructions in parallel, using either hardware-based dynamic scheduling (as in superscalar architectures) or compiler-driven static scheduling (as in VLIW architectures).

This section introduces the key principles of multiple-issue pipelines and lays the foundation for understanding both superscalar and VLIW architectures.

▲ The Limits of Scalar Pipelines

In a scalar pipeline, only one instruction is issued and completed per clock cycle, even if other instructions are independent and could be executed in parallel.

Let's consider a classic 5-stage pipeline:

$$\mathtt{IF} \to \mathtt{ID} \to \mathtt{EX} \to \mathtt{MEM} \to \mathtt{WB}$$

In an ideal case, the pipeline achieves an IPC (Instructions Per Cycle) of 1. That is:

- 1 instruction finishes per cycle.
- Corresponding CPI (Cycles Per Instruction) is also 1:

$$CPI_{ideal} = 1, \quad IPC_{ideal} = 1$$

But in reality, hazards (data, control, structural) can cause stalls and the IPC can fall below 1. As we have already discussed in the previous sections.

A Key Limitation: Even if the program contains many independent instructions, the scalar pipeline processes them sequentially, one at a time.

Raising Performance: Introducing Multiple Issue

To extract more parallelism and achieve better throughput, multiple-issue processors aim to:

- Fetch multiple instructions per cycle.
- Issue and execute multiple instructions in parallel.
- Increase IPC above $1 \uparrow$ and reduce CPI below $1 \downarrow$

This means:

- The processor is no longer limited by the sequential issue constraint.
- ILP is exploited across multiple instructions simultaneously.

A simple example is the **dual-issue pipeline**, where up to two instructions can be issued and completed per clock cycle. It allows two independent instructions to proceed through the pipeline in parallel, potentially doubling the instruction throughput compared to a scalar pipeline:

$$IPC_{ideal} = 2 \hspace{1cm} CPI_{ideal} = \frac{1}{IPC_{ideal}} = \frac{1}{2} = 0.5$$

Definition 2: Dual-Issue Pipeline

A **Dual-Issue Pipeline** is a **type** of multiple-issue processor pipeline that can fetch, decode, and issue **up to two instructions per clock cycle**.



Figure 22: Dual-Issue Pipeline timeline.

Architectural Requirements

It's pretty obvious that multi-issues processors require more hardware resources to support parallelism:

- Wider Instruction Fetch (IF) units: able to fetch 2 instructions per cycle from instruction memory.
- Parallel Instruction Decoders (IDs): 2 independent decode units to process both instructions in parallel.
- Multi-Ported Register File (RF):
 - 4 Read Ports: to read up 2 source operands per instruction.
 - 2 Write Ports: to write results from both instructions simultaneously.
- Duplicated Functional Units: at least 2 independent units (e.g., 1 ALU or branch, 1 load/store) to allow parallel execution.

These additions increase complexity, area, and power consumption, but allow significant performance gains.



Figure 23: Dual-Issue Pipeline architecture.

3.4.2 Evolution Towards Superscalar Execution

The transition from simple scalar pipelines to high-performance superscalar processors is not abrupt. It is the result of a **progressive refinement** of microarchitectural techniques aimed at exposing and exploiting more Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP). This section traces the key evolutionary steps that bridge the gap between single-issue scalar designs and fully dynamic multiple-issue architectures.

▼ Step 1: Single-Issue, In-Order Execution

This is the traditional scalar baseline and was explained in the earlier sections (section 3.2.1, page 75).

- Only one instruction is issued and committed per clock cycle.
- All instructions are fetched, decoded, executed, and written back in **strict program order**.
- Hazards (data, structural, control) cause pipeline stalls that affect all subsequent instructions.
- CPI ≥ 1 , IPC ≤ 1 .

This model is simple and ensures precise state at all times, but it is severely limited in ILP exploitation.

▼ Step 2: Single-Issue, Out-of-Order Execution

To overcome unnecessary stalls caused by instruction dependencies, processors began executing instructions out of order, while still issuing only one instruction per cycle (section 3.2.2, page 78).

- Instructions are fetched and issued in program order.
- But independent instructions are allowed to execute and complete out of order, as soon as their operands are ready and a functional unit is available.
- Techniques like **dynamic scheduling** (e.g., Tomasulo's algorithm) are used to manage dependencies and operand availability.
- A commit stage ensures in-order architectural updates, preserving program correctness and exception handling.

This significantly improves ILP, but throughput is still constrained by the single-issue limit.

This step involves fetching, decoding, and executing more than one instruction per cycle, but in program order.

- Typical example: **dual-issue pipelines** (e.g., MIPS dual-issue architecture, section 3.4.1, page 83).
- The hardware allows the issue of up to two instructions per clock, provided they are independent and compatible (e.g., one ALU + one Load–/Store).
- Requires hardware additions such as:
 - Multiple functional units,
 - Multi-ported register file,
 - Hazard detection logic across simultaneously issued instructions.

This model increases IPC (ideal IPC = 2), but still suffers from limitations:

- **X** Dependent instructions must wait, even if others could proceed.
- **X Static scheduling** (compiler) or simple hardware interlocks determine issue feasibility.

This is the most flexible and powerful configuration, forming the basis of superscalar processors.

- Fetches and decodes multiple instructions per cycle.
- Uses **dynamic scheduling logic** to decide which subset can be issued and executed out of order.
- Independent instructions proceed as soon as their operands are ready, regardless of program order.
- Results are **committed in order** to maintain a precise architectural state.
- This model requires **complex hardware**:
 - Reservation stations
 - Register renaming
 - Reorder buffer (ROB)
 - Instruction window/wakeup-select logic

This architecture provides the **highest ILP**, as it combines the breadth of multiple issue with the flexibility of out-of-order execution.

The transition toward superscalar execution is a gradual process, where each step builds upon the previous to **mitigate limitations**, **maximize resource utilization**, and **exploit greater ILP**. Superscalar architectures represent the culmination of this evolution, dynamically scheduling and executing multiple instructions in parallel, out of order, while maintaining program correctness and exception safety.

| $\overline{	ext{Step}}$ | Issue | Execution | Commit | Example |
|-------------------------|----------|--------------|----------|-----------------------|
| 1 | In-order | In-order | In-order | Scalar pipeline |
| 2 | In-order | Out-of-order | In-order | Dynamic single-issue |
| 3 | In-order | In-order | In-order | Dual-issue pipeline |
| 4 | In-order | Out-of-order | In-order | Superscalar processor |

Table 10: Evolution towards superscalar execution.

3.4.3 Superscalar Processors

The culmination of the architectural evolution toward higher ILP is the super-scalar processor, a class of processors capable of issuing, executing, and committing multiple instructions per clock cycle, dynamically and out of order. Superscalar architectures aim to exploit maximum parallelism hidden within sequential instruction streams, while preserving the illusion of sequential execution.

Definition 3: Superscalar Processor

A Superscalar Processor is a dynamically scheduled, multiple-issue architecture capable of issuing and executing several instructions per clock cycle, using complex hardware mechanisms to detect and exploit instruction-level parallelism at runtime.

Unlike static VLIW processors³, where instruction parallelism is exposed at compile time, superscalar designs rely on hardware to discover and schedule parallel instructions on the fly.

■ Key Characteristics

- Multiple-Issue Width, also called issue width, is the maximum number of instructions a processor can fetch, decode, issue, and begin executing in a single clock cycle. It defines the instruction throughput potential of a multiple-issue processor.
 - Therefore, this value is given by the superscalar processor, but obviously it is the maximum and it cannot be always reached (hazards, etc.).
 - The maximum number of instructions per single clock cycle affects the theoretical IPC limit:

$$\mathrm{CPI}_{\mathrm{ideal}} = \frac{1}{\mathrm{issue\ width}}$$

2. Dynamic Scheduling

- Hardware analyzes instruction dependencies in real time.
- Independent instructions are allowed to proceed out of order.

3. Out-of-Order Execution

- Instructions execute as soon as operands and resources are ready.
- Improves pipeline utilization and hides latencies.

³VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) Processor: A type of multiple-issue processor where the compiler statically schedules multiple operations into a single wide instruction word. Each operation in the bundle is executed in parallel, assuming they are independent. VLIW architectures rely on simple hardware and place the burden of dependency checking and scheduling on the compiler rather than the processor.

4. In-Order Commit

- Despite out-of-order execution, the processor updates architectural state in program order.
- Ensures **precise exceptions** and consistent state.

Core Hardware Components

To support superscalar execution, the architecture must include:

- Multiple Functional Units: ALUs, FPUs, load/store units, enough to support parallel execution.
- Register Renaming: Eliminates WAR and WAW hazards by mapping architectural registers to a larger set of physical registers.
- Reservation Stations / Issue Queues: Buffer instructions waiting for operands or functional units.
- Reorder Buffer (ROB): Holds results of completed instructions until they are safe to commit. Ensures correct program order and precise exceptions.
- Common Data Bus (CDB): Broadcasts results to dependent instructions.
- Instruction Window: Sliding window of in-flight instructions from which the scheduler selects those ready to issue.

Benefits

- ✓ High ILP: Multiple independent instructions can be executed in parallel.
- **⊘** Dynamic Parallelism: No need for compiler to expose ILP, hardware finds it at runtime.
- ✓ Latency Hiding: Long operations (e.g., cache misses, FP div) can be overlapped with other instructions.
- **⊘** General Purpose: Works well with a wide range of programs, even without manual tuning.

Challenges

- **3** Complex Hardware: Scheduling, renaming, hazard detection logic increases area and power.
- $oxed{8}$ Issue Logic Scalability: The complexity of deciding which N instructions to issue out of M in-flight grows quickly.

- **8** Branch and Memory Dependencies: Control and memory dependencies still limit achievable ILP.
- ② Diminishing Returns: After 3-4 issue width, real programs rarely expose enough parallelism to fully utilize the issue bandwidth.

Superscalar processors represent a powerful solution to the ILP problem, combining multiple-issue capability with hardware-driven dynamic scheduling. They dominate the high-performance general-purpose processor space (e.g., x86 and ARM cores), though their complexity and scalability limitations have motivated complementary techniques such as multithreading, vectorization, and heterogeneous architectures.

3.4.4 Static vs Dynamic Scheduling

Instruction-level parallelism (ILP) can be **exploited** either **at compile time** by the compiler or **at runtime** by the hardware. These two approaches give rise to two distinct classes of architectures:

- Statically scheduled processors, such as VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) architectures.
- Dynamically scheduled processors, such as superscalar architectures.

This section compares these two philosophies, focusing on their mechanisms, advantages, drawbacks, and the contexts in which each is most appropriate.

| Scheduling Type | Performed By | When? |
|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Static | Compiler | At compile time |
| Dynamic | Hardware | At runtime |

Table 11: Key difference: who does the scheduling?

? What is VLIW (Static Scheduling)?

VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) is a statically scheduled, multiple issue processor architecture in which the compiler selects and packs multiple independent operations into a single, wide instruction word that is executed in parallel by the processor.

The instruction word in a VLIW architecture consists of multiple operations (e.g., an ALU op, a memory op, and a floating-point op) that are intended to be executed simultaneously. The compiler is responsible for:

- Detecting ILP in the program.
- Scheduling independent instructions to avoid hazards.
- Filling empty slots with NOPs when no instruction fits.

In contrast to superscalar processors (which discover ILP dynamically at runtime), VLIW processors rely entirely on compile-time scheduling.

- ✓ Simple hardware: no need for out-of-order logic, dependency checks at runtime, or renaming hardware.
- ✓ Predictable performance: useful in embedded or real-time systems.
- ✓ Energy efficient: avoids complex runtime scheduling logic.
- **X** Compiler must do all the work: requires sophisticated analysis and scheduling. So the performance depends on the quality of the compiler and the amount of visible ILP.

- Binary compatibility issues (limited portability): compiled code often tied to a specific machine configuration (e.g., number of functional units). Cannot adapt to unpredictable latencies at runtime (e.g., cache misses, branch misprediction).
- **▼ Wasted instruction slots**: when insufficient ILP is found, unused slots become NOPs, reducing efficiency.

? Superscalar: Dynamic Scheduling

In dynamically scheduled architectures:

- The compiler generates sequential code (as usual, no additional effort).
- The processor's **hardware detects ILP at runtime**, using structures like reservation stations, reorder buffers, and register renaming.
- The processor decides which instructions to issue and execute based on operand availability and resource status.
- Automatically adapts to unpredictable latencies and instruction dependencies.
- ✓ Improved performance portability: no need to recompile code for each variant.
- ✓ Better at exploiting ILP in general-purpose programs.
- **X** Higher hardware complexity, area, and power consumption.
- **X** Scheduling logic becomes a bottleneck at wider issue widths.
- **X** Greater difficulty in verifying and validating timing behavior.

| Feature | Static (VLIW) | Dynamic (Superscalar) | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| Scheduling responsibility | Compiler | Hardware | |
| Instruction issue | Fixed and pre-planned | Determined at runtime | |
| Flexibility at runtime | Low | High | |
| Hardware complexity | Low | High | |
| Compiler complexity | High | Moderate | |
| Portability of compiled code | Low (machine-dependent) | High | |
| Latency tolerance | Poor (fixed schedule) | Good (adaptive execution) | |
| ILP exploitation | Only what compiler exposes | Also includes dynamic/hidden parallelism | |

Table 12: Static vs Dynamic Scheduling.

Static and dynamic scheduling represent two fundamentally different approaches to exploiting ILP.

- **VLIW** is ideal for **predictable workloads**, embedded systems, or domain specific processors, where simplicity and determinism matter.
- Superscalar processors excel in general-purpose computing, where dynamic behavior and runtime variability make hardware-managed scheduling more effective.

Ultimately, both models aim to improve throughput, but the trade-off between hardware complexity and compiler sophistication defines their respective domains of success.

3.5 ILP Limitations & Alternatives

Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP) has been the cornerstone of high performance processor design for decades. Techniques such as pipelining, multiple-issue architectures, dynamic scheduling, and register renaming have pushed ILP to impressive levels. However, **ILP alone has fundamental limits**, both theoretical and practical, which restrict its scalability and efficiency in modern workloads. This section explores **why ILP hits a wall**, and how architects are moving toward **complementary and alternative forms of parallelism**, including multithreading, SIMD, and heterogeneous computing, to sustain performance growth.

A Limitations of ILP

1. Limited Parallelism in Programs

- Many **programs are inherently sequential in logic** (e.g., controlintensive code, algorithms with tight dependencies).
- Available ILP is often limited to short instruction windows. An instruction window is the set of instructions that the processor can see and analyze at a give time to find parallelism. Due to hardware constraints (area, power, timing), the instruction window usually holds a few dozen to a few hundred instructions.

 It means that even if the entire program contains parallelism, the pro-
 - It means that even if the entire program contains parallelism, the processor can only exploit what it sees in its current instruction window. This is a practical limit.
- Amdahl's Law bounds the speedup achievable by parallel execution of a sequential program.⁴ Even if we have unlimited issue width, perfect branch prediction, and ideal memory, this law says that we can't speed up the parts of the program that are inherently sequential (e.g., control logic, data dependencies). For example, if 10% of our program is serial (f = 0.1), then the best speedup we can ever get is: $\frac{1}{0.1} = 10$.

Then:

Speedup
$$(p) = \frac{1}{f + \frac{(1-p)}{p}}$$

And the maximum speed (when $p \to \infty$) is:

$$Speedup_{max} = \frac{1}{f}$$

Even with infinite hardware resource, the speedup is limited by the serial part of the code.

⁴Amdahl's Law states that the maximum theoretical speedup of a program is limited by the fraction of the program that must be executed sequentially, even if the rest can be infinitely accelerated or parallelized. Let:

⁻ S: speedup

⁻ f: fraction of the program that is serial (cannot be parallelized)

⁻⁽¹⁻f): fraction that is parallelizable

⁻ p: speedup of the parallel portion (e.g., number of processors)

2. Dependency Constraints

- True data dependences (RAW) cannot be bypassed or parallelized because the value doesn't exist yet. No matter how many cores, execution units, or parallel tricks we have, if one instruction computes a value that another must use, the second must wait for the first to finish.
- Some instructions must wait for preceding results, creating **bubbles** in the issue pipeline.

3. Control Dependencies and Branches

- Branches disrupt instruction flow.
- Even with speculative execution and prediction, mispeculation causes flushes and wasted cycles.

4. Memory Latency and Aliasing

- Cache misses introduce long, unpredictable delays.
- Memory dependencies (e.g., between loads and stores) are difficult to resolve safely at runtime, limiting aggressive scheduling.

5. Hardware Complexity and Power

- The **logic** needed for dependency checking, wakeup-select, register renaming, and instruction window scaling **grows rapidly**.
- Superscalar processors beyond 4-6 issue width become infeasible to scale due to power, area, and control path complexity.

Alternative Forms of Parallelism

- 1. Thread-Level Parallelism (TLP) Multithreading. Execute multiple threads in parallel on the same core or across multiple cores. TLP hides long-latency events (e.g., cache misses) by switching to ready threads.
- 2. Data-Level Parallelism (DLP) SIMD and Vectorization. Exploits uniform operations over data arrays (e.g., matrix ops, DSP, graphics). Single Instruction, Multiple Data (SIMD), one instruction operates on multiple data elements.
- 3. Heterogeneous Computing Specialized Accelerators. Use of domain-specific architectures (DSAs) optimized for specific tasks: GPU, TPUs, NPUs, FPGAs. Offload compute-intensive or parallel workloads from the CPU to accelerators.

Scoreboard: Dynamic Scheduling Algorithm 3.6

3.6.1 **Assumptions and Architecture**

The **Scoreboard** is a **dynamic scheduling** mechanism introduced in the CDC 6600 that enables out-of-order execution while maintaining program correctness. It coordinates the flow of instructions in a way that allows independent instructions to execute in parallel, despite pipeline stalls caused by data or structural hazards. This approach was fundamental to enhancing instruction-level parallelism (ILP) without relying on complex compiler-level optimizations.

Assumptions of the Scoreboard Model

To analyze the behavior of the scoreboard, it's crucial to understand the initial architectural assumptions:

- Single-Issue Processor: only one instruction can be fetched and issued per cycle, enforcing a serialized dispatching model despite the internal parallelism.
- In-Order Issue: instructions are issued in the program order (page 74). However, once issued, they are allowed to execute and complete out-oforder depending on operand availability.
- No Forwarding Mechanism: unlike Tomasulo's algorithm, which allows results to be forwarded from functional units directly to waiting instructions, the Scoreboard lacks this feature. Operands are only considered available once written back to the Register File (RF).
- Multiple Pipelined Functional Units (FUs): the architecture assumes the presence of multiple pipelined FUs, e.g. floating-point add, multiply, divide, and integer units; each with potentially variable latency.
- Latency-Aware Execution: both the Execution Stage (EX) and Memory Access Stage (ME) are allowed to span multiple cycles depending on the operation type and cache behavior.
- Out-of-Order Execution and Commit: execution and result writeback (or commit) can happen out-of-order, introducing hazards such as:
 - Write After Write (WAW)
 - Write After Read (WAR)

These are especially critical since there's no register renaming mechanism (page 71) to avoid false dependencies.

This configuration allows the scoreboard to bypass pipeline stalls by executing independent instructions out-of-order, while relying on a centralized control logic to track hazards and resource usage.

Architectural Scheme

The Scoreboard orchestrates execution by separating three phases:

- 1. Instruction Issue (in-order)
- 2. Instruction Execution (out-of-order)
- 3. Instruction Completion (out-of-order)

This setup breaks the rigid in-order pipeline flow and increases functional unit utilization. Furthermore:

- Multiple instructions can be in execution simultaneously.
- Precise exceptions are **not** guaranteed due to the possibility of earlier instructions committing after later ones, a model referred to as **imprecise interrupts**.




Figure 24: The basic structure of a RISC V processor with a scoreboard. [1]

- A shared Register File feeds data into multiple data buses.
- Each Functional Unit (FU) is independently pipelined and connected to the scoreboard. Units include two FP multipliers, FP adder, FP divider, and integer unit.
- A centralized Scoreboard logic block maintains: Control/Status signals, Dependency tracking, Issue constraints.
- There's a separate Memory Unit, handled similarly to functional units, responsible for data memory operations.

3.6.2 Pipeline Stage Refinement

In a traditional pipeline:

- The Instruction Decode (ID) stage performs both decoding and operand reading at once.
- But this assumes operands are always ready, which is not true in a dynamically scheduled out-of-order pipeline.

So the scoreboard splits Instruction Decode (ID) stage into:

1. Issue Stage

- Responsible for decoding the instruction.
- Checks for **structural hazards** (page 19), particularly whether the appropriate functional unit (FU) is available and whether the scoreboard's bookkeeping allows the instruction to proceed (this will become clearer later).
- Enforces **in-order issue**, instructions are considered strictly in the sequence fetched from memory.

2. Read Operands Stage (RR)

- Waits until operands are available and not blocked by earlier instructions.
- Specifically, avoids RAW (Read After Write) hazards (page 19) by deferring operand reads until the register is no longer "reserved" by an active instruction writing to it. In other words, delays reading operands until they're truly ready, that is, the producer instruction has completed writing them.
- Operands are then read from the register file (since forwarding is not available).

This separation increases the scoreboard's ability to exploit Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP) while maintaining control over dependency tracking and avoiding illegal hazards.

✓ Flexible Execution Behavior

After the two front-end stages:

- Out-of-Order Execution: Once operands are read, instructions may enter the execution stage as soon as the corresponding FU is available, regardless of program order.
- Variable Latency Handling: Functional units (FUs) may have different latencies (e.g., FP divide vs. add), so instructions finish execution at different times and write back their results out-of-order.
- Out-of-Order Commit: Because instructions complete independently and there is no reorder buffer, the commit (or write-back) stage is also out-of-order, unlike more modern precise pipelines.

| Stage | Behavior | Order Enforcement |
|---------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Issue | Decode, FU check | In-Order |
| Read Operands | Wait for availability | Out-of-Order |
| Execute | Run in FU | Out-of-Order |
| Write Result | Commit to Reg. File | Out-of-Order |

Table 13: Key features of the scoreboard.

? What is the scoreboard constantly tracking?

We can think of the scoreboard as a "Control Office" inside the processor. The main job of the scoreboard is to keep tack of every instruction that's in the pipeline at the same time, and make sure they don't mess each other up.

To do this, it monitors four key things:

- 1. Availability of Source Operands. Every instruction needs to read its inputs (like F2, F4, etc.). The scoreboard checks: are those registers ready, or is another instruction still going write them (busy)? If they're not ready yet, the instruction waits in the Read Operands (RR) stage.
 - **?** Why? To avoid RAW (Read After Write) hazards, reading too early before the data is correct.
- 2. Status of each Functional Unit (FU). It knows which units (like the adder, multiplier) are busy or free. It won't assign two instructions to the same FU at the same time, that would cause structural hazards.
 - **?** Why? So it knows which instruction can be issued and which needs to wait for hardware.
- 3. Pending writes and register conflicts. If two instructions plan to write to the same register, it keeps track of this. This helps prevent:
 - ✓ WAW (Write After Write): two instructions writing to the same register in the wrong order.
 - **✓ WAR** (Write After Read): an instruction overwriting a value that another one still needs to read.
 - **?** Why? This avoids **wrong results**, even if instructions execute out-of-order.
- 4. Which instructions have completed. It tracks when each instruction finishes execution and when it's allowed to write back its result.
 - Remember: there's **no reorder buffer**, so the scoreboard must **carefully manage write-backs to prevent conflicts**.
 - **?** Why? So it knows when to release resources and update registers safely.

3.6.3 Hazard Management (RAW, WAR, WAW)

A hazard occurs when the pipeline execution of instructions might lead to incorrect results. Hazards arise from:

- Resource conflicts
- Data dependencies
- Instruction ordering mismatches

The scoreboard handles three types of data hazards dynamically:

Occurs when:

 Instruction B tries to read a register before instruction A has written its result.

Scoreboard handling:

- The scoreboard stalls Instruction B in the Read Operands (RR)⁵ stage until Instruction A completes its write.
- ✓ Handled in the RR (Read Operands) stage
- WAR (Write After Read) Anti-Dependency

Occurs when:

 Instruction A needs to read a register before Instruction B overwrites it.

Scoreboard handling:

- The scoreboard stalls Instruction B in the Write Result stage until Instruction A has read the register.
- ✓ Handled in the WR (Write Result) stage
- WAW (Write After Write) Output Dependency

Occurs when:

- Two instructions write to the same register in the wrong order.

Scoreboard handling:

- The scoreboard stalls the second instruction in the Issue stage until the first instruction has written its result.
- ✓ Handled in the Issue stage (or sometimes delayed to Write stage)

⁵Note that the Read Operands (RR) stage is the second stage in the Instruction Decode stage. Its purpose is to wait until all source operands are available and not blocked by an active instruction. Only then can the instruction safely read its operands from the register file.

So Scoreboard solves WAR/WAW **explicitly via stalls**, instead of using *register renaming*. This makes scoreboard simpler, but **limits how much parallelism it can safely exploit** compared to more modern approaches.

| Hazard | Cause | Scoreboard Action | Handled In |
|--------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| RAW | Read before prior write | Stall reader until value ready | Read Operands |
| WAR | Write before earlier read | Stall writer until read completes | Write Result |
| WAW | Write before earlier write | Stall issuer | Issue |

Table 14: Hazards managed by the scoreboard.

3.6.4 Control Logic and Stages

The Scoreboard architecture divides instruction **execution into four dynamic control stages**, each governed by centralized logic. These stages (**Issue**, **Read Operands**, **Execution**, and **Write Result**), replace the traditional ID, EX, and WB stages of a standard RISC pipeline.

The key idea is that the scoreboard monitors dependencies and structural hazards in hardware and makes real-time decisions on when each instruction can safely advance to the next stage.



Figure 25: The Scoreboard architecture. Pipeline Flow is: Instruction Fetch (I), Read Operands Blocks (R), Execution Units (E), Memory Stage (M) and Write Result Stage (W).

- 1. **Issue Stage (In-Order)**. This is the first stage after Instruction Fetch (IF).
 - (a) The instruction is **decoded**.
 - (b) The scoreboard **checks**:
 - i. **Structural Hazards**: is the required Function Unit (FU) available?
 - ii. WAW (Write After Write) Hazards: is another instruction already writing to the destination register?

If neither hazard exists, the instruction is issued and marked in the scoreboard's internal tables. Otherwise, the instruction stalls.

Performance Optimizations: WAW hazards are typically detected here, but optimizations may postpone this to the write-back stage.

- 2. Read Operands Stage (Out-of-Order). The scoreboard waits for both source operands to become available.
 - (a) RAW (Read After Write) hazards are checked dynamically.
 - (b) If any **operand** is still **pending** (i.e. will be written by another instruction), the **scoreboard stalls this stage**.
 - (c) Once **ready**, operands are **read from the Register File** (RF) (no forwarding!).
 - (d) The instruction is then sent to the Functional Unit (FU) to begin execution.

This is the **stage that enables out-of-order execution**, as independent instructions may pass each other based on operand readiness.

3. Execution Stage

- (a) The instruction **executes** in the assigned Functional Unit.
- (b) Functional Units (FUs) may have **variable latency**, depending on the operation (e.g., divides vs. add).
- (c) Upon completion, the unit signals the scoreboard.

This phase also includes additional memory access latency for load/store instructions affected by cache hit/miss.

4. Write Result Stage (Out-of-Order)

- (a) Before writing the result to the destination register, the **scoreboard checks** for:
 - WAR (Write After Read) hazards: is any previous instruction still waiting to read this register?
 - Structural hazards: are the Register File (RF) write ports available?

If clear, the instruction writes back the result. If a WAR hazard exists, the scoreboard stalls this instruction until the reading instruction completes.

| Stage | Hazard Checked | Order | Description |
|---------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|
| Issue | Structural, WAW | In-Order | FU availability + dest reg conflict |
| Read Operands | RAW | Out-of-Order | Waits for source operands |
| Execute | - | Out-of-Order | Runs in FU (latency varies) |
| Write Result | WAR, Structural (RF) | Out-of-Order | Writes result if safe |

Table 15: Hazards managed by the scoreboard.

3.6.5 Summary

In this section, we present a summary of the Scoreboard's dynamic scheduling algorithm.

The Scoreboard implements a **classic dynamic scheduling mechanism** where instruction progress through the pipeline is dictated not just by structural availability, but also by **true data readiness**.

| Pipeline Stage | Order | Hazard Checked | Notes |
|----------------|--------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Issue | In-order | Structural, WAW | Instruction decoded, FU reserved |
| Read Operands | Out-of-order | RAW, structural (RF ports) | Wait for all inputs to be ready |
| Execution | Out-of-order | - | Variable latency depending on FU |
| Write Result | Out-of-order | WAR, structural (write port) | Write to reg file if safe |

The scoreboard enforces **precise tracking** at each stage to dynamically resolve hazards without register renaming or forwarding.

X Execution Properties

• In-Order Issue

- Simplifies the hardware: instructions are always issued in program order
- Helps **detect WAW hazards** early.

• Out-of-Order Read Operands

- Once issued, instructions wait until all operands are available, then read them from the Register File (RF).
- No data forwarding! Operands are read only from the Register File (RF).
- Allows **independent instructions** to leapfrog stalled ones.

• Out-of-Order Execution

- Instructions execute as soon as their operands are ready and the FU is free.
- Multiple instructions can execute **simultaneously** in parallel FUs or pipelined units.
- Leads to higher FU utilization and throughput.

• Out-of-Order Completion

- Results are written back when ready, unless a WAR hazard is detected.
- This breaks precise exception semantics, i.e., exceptions can be imprecise.

▼ No Forwarding, No Renaming

- No data forwarding: causes extra stalls at operand read stage.
- No register renaming: makes the scoreboard vulnerable to WAR and WAW hazards, which it handles by stalls and centralized checks.

■ Control Logic Centralization

All control decisions (hazard detection, operand availability, resource usage) are made by a **central scoreboard table**. This avoids complex distributed hardware (as in Tomasulo), but limits the potential for speculation or aggressive scheduling.

3.6.6 Scoreboard Data Structures

At the heart of the scoreboard's centralized control logic are **three hardware data structures** that track the status of instructions, functional units, and register dependencies. These structures allow the scoreboard to make safe, real-time decisions about instruction scheduling, execution, and result writing, all while avoiding hazards.

- 1. Instruction Status Table. Tracks the lifecycle of each instruction through the pipeline. For each instruction, the scoreboard record whether it has:
 - Been issued
 - Read operands
 - Completed execution
 - Written back the result

We can think of this as a per-instruction timeline: it tracks which stage the instruction is currently in.

- 2. Functional Unit Status Table. Tracks the current state of each Functional Unit (FU). Each FU entry includes:
 - Busy: whether the FU is currently in use.
 - Op: operation being performed (e.g., ADD, MULT).
 - Fi: destination register of the operation.
 - Fj, Fk: source register operands.
 - Qj, Qk: functional units producing Fj and Fk.
 - Rj, Rk: boolean flags indicating if Fj, Fk are ready.

These fields help the scoreboard:

- (a) Decide when operands are ready (for RAW)
- (b) Prevent WAW and WAR
- (c) Handle operand read scheduling
- 3. Register Result Status Table. Tracks which FU will produce each register value. For each register (e.g., F0, F2, ..., F30), it stores:
 - The name of the FU that will write to it.
 - Or blank (-, don't care) if no instruction is scheduled to write it.

This structure is essential to:

- Detect WAW hazards at **issue** stage.
- $\bullet\,$ Detect WAR hazards at $\mathbf{write\text{-}back}$ stage.
- \bullet Ensure only the latest producing instruction claims the register.

Example 6

Let's say MULT ${\tt f0, f2, f4}$ is issued to Mult1 (functional unit). The scoreboard will:

- 1. Mark Mult1 as Busy
- 2. Set
 - Op = MULT
 - Fi = F0
 - Fj = F2
 - Fk = F4
- 3. Fill $\tt Qj$ and $\tt Qk$ if other FUs are writing $\tt F2$ or $\tt F4$
- 4. In the Register Result Status, assign F0 = Mult1

This coordination ensures:

- \bullet Other instructions know F0 will be produced by Mult1
- $\bullet\,$ F2 and F4 are only read when available
- \bullet Subsequent instructions that depend on F0 will wait

3.6.7 In-Depth Execution Example

The goal of this section is to observe how the scoreboard manages dependencies, tracks resource usage, and handles all threats over time using an example.

★ Initial Setup: Instruction List and Dependencies

The instructions are:

```
LD F6, 34(R2)
LD F2, 45(R3)
MULTD F0, F2, F4 # RAW on F2
SUBD F8, F6, F2 # RAW on F6, F2
DIVD F10, F0, F6 # RAW on F0, F6
ADDD F6, F8, F2 # WAW & WAR on F6, RAW on F8 & F2
```

We have a mix of:

- RAW hazards: F2, F6, F0, F8
- WAW/WAR: around register F6

During the example, we will show the status of three main hardware data structures introduced in the section 3.6.6, page 107:

- Instruction Status Table: tracks the lifecycle state of each instruction in the pipeline.
- Functional Unit Status Table: tracks the usage and readiness of each functional unit (FU), and the dependency state of the operands.
- Register Result Status Table: tracks which FU is scheduled to write to each floating-point register.

- \bullet LD F6, 34(R2) is issued and begins execution.
- \bullet Integer unit is now $\mathbf{busy}.$
- All other instructions wait.

 $\bf No~hazard~{\rm yet}.~$ This sets up the first data dependency (F6 will be written soon)

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | | | |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | | | | |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | | | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | | | | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------|------|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| | Integer | Yes | Load | F6 | | R2 | | | | Yes |
| | Mult1 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Divide | No | | | | | | | | |

Functional unit status.

| Clock F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 . | F30 |
|------------|----|----|---------|----|-----|---------|-----|
| 1 | | | Integer | | | | |

 ${\bf Register\ result\ status.}$

- ⚠ Cannot issue LD F2, 45(R3) yet, due to structural hazard on the Integer unit.
- Execution of first LD continues.

 ${\bf Stall\ due\ to\ structural\ hazard,\ despite\ in-order\ issue.}$

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | | |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | | | | |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | | | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | | | | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------|------|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| | Integer | Yes | Load | F6 | | R2 | | | | Yes |
| | Mult1 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Divide | No | | | | | | | | |

Functional unit status.

| Clock F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|------------|----|----|---------|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2 | | | Integer | | | | |

- First load finishes execution.
- Still can't issue second load.

Memory latency is ideal (1 cycle), but scoreboard doesn't allow overcommit of the integer unit.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | | | | |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | | | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | | | | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------|------|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| | Integer | Yes | Load | F6 | | R2 | | | | Yes |
| | Mult1 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Divide | No | | | | | | | | |

Functional unit status.

| Clock F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|------------|----|----|---------|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 3 | | | Integer | | | | |

- F6 is written to the register file (RF)
- \bullet Integer unit is now free.

Register F6 becomes available, other instructions depending on it can now move (when their turn comes).

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | | | | |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | | | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | | | | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qј | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Mult1 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Divide | No | | | | | | | | |

Functional unit status.

| Clock F | 0 F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|-----------|------|----|---------|----|-----|-----|---------|
| 4 | | | Integer | | | | |

- \bullet LD F2, 45(R3) is issued and starts execution.
- \bullet Instruction 2 enters pipeline, finally.

No data hazards here, but we're about to enter the ${\bf RAW}$ jungle starting next cycle.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | <u>5</u> | | | |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | | | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | | | | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------|------|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| | Integer | Yes | Load | F2 | | F3 | | | | Yes |
| | Mult1 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Divide | No | | | | | | | | |

Functional unit status.

| Clock F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|------------|---------|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 5 | Integer | | | | | | |

- ✓ MULTD F0, F2, F4 is issued to Mult1.
- **X** RAW hazard on F2: operand not yet available (second load not completed).
- MULTD waits in the Read Operands stage.
- LD F2 is executing (started in Cycle 5).

Highlights:

- ✓ MULTD is issued because: the Mult1 functional unit is free (no structural hazard), and no other instruction is writing to FO (no WAW hazard).
- X But execution (of MULTD) is blocked because:
 - F2 (a source operand) is still being loaded by LD F2, and this is a RAW (Read After Write) hazard.
 - MULTD must wait until LD F2 writes its result into register F2.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | <u>6</u> | | |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | | | | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------|------|------|----|----|----|---------|----|----|-----|
| | Integer | Yes | Load | F2 | | F3 | | | | Yes |
| | Mult1 | Yes | Mult | FO | F2 | F4 | Integer | | No | Yes |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Divide | No | | | | | | | | |

Functional unit status.

| Clock | FO | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|-------|------|---------|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 6 | Mult | Integer | | | | | | |

- ✓ LD F2 completes (data cache hit), result will be written to F2 next cycle.
- ✓ SUBD F8, F6, F2 is issued to Add unit (free).
- **★** But SUBD cannot start execution yet:
 - It needs F6 and F2 as operands.
 - F2 just finished loading and is not yet written back, so still blocked (RAW hazard).
 - F6 was written earlier by LD F6 and is now available.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|----------------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | <mark>7</mark> | |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | | | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------|------|------|----|----|----|---------|---------|-----|-----|
| | Integer | Yes | Load | F2 | | F3 | | | | Yes |
| | Mult1 | Yes | Mult | FO | F2 | F4 | Integer | | No | Yes |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | Yes | Sub | F8 | F6 | F2 | | Integer | Yes | No |
| | Divide | No | | | | | | | | |

Functional unit status.

| Clock | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|-------|------|---------|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 7 | Mult | Integer | | | Add | | | |

- ✓ DIVD F10, F0, F62 is issued to Divide unit (free).
- ✓ LD F2 writes back to F2, now MULTD and SUBD can read F2 (cycle 9).
- **X** But execution is blocked because:
 - It needs F0 (being written by MULTD), so **RAW hazard** on F0.
 - It also uses F6, which is already ready.
 - F2 just finished loading and is not yet written back (this cycle), so still blocked (RAW hazard).

This stage shows **cascading dependency chains** forming: DIVD waits for MULTD, which waits for LD F2.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | | | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 8 | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------|------|------|-----|----|----|------|---------|-----|-----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Mult1 | Yes | Mult | FO | F2 | F4 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | Yes | Sub | F8 | F6 | F2 | | Integer | Yes | Yes |
| | Divide | Yes | Div | F10 | FO | F6 | Mult | | No | Yes |

Functional unit status.

| Clock | FO | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|-------|------|----|----|----|-----|---------------------|-----|-----|
| 8 | Mult | | | | Add | <mark>Divide</mark> | | |

- ✓ MULTD and SUBD read operands (in parallel): scoreboard uses a multi-port register file (e.g., 4 read ports) to allow simultaneous operand reads.
- MULTD begins execution on Mult unit (10-cycle latency, table "Functional unit status").
- SUBD begins execution on Add unit (2-cycle latency).
- ★ ADDD cannot be issued because the Add unit is already in use by SUBD (structural hazard).

Scoreboard enables parallel out-of-order read and execution.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | 9 | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | 9 | | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 8 | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------|------|------|-----|----|----|------|---------|-----|-----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Mult1 | Yes | Mult | FO | F2 | F4 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Add | Yes | Sub | F8 | F6 | F2 | | Integer | Yes | Yes |
| | Divide | Yes | Div | F10 | FO | F6 | Mult | | No | Yes |

Functional unit status.

| Clock | FO | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|-------|------|----|----|----|-----|--------|-----|---------|
| 9 | Mult | | | | Add | Divide | | |

 ${\bf Register\ result\ status.}$

- \bullet MULTD and SUBD are executing.
- \bullet DIVD is still waiting for F0 (from MULTD).
- ADDD remains stalled.

This block shows classic out-of-order read and execution behavior.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | 9 | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | 9 | | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 8 | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------------|------|------|-----|----|----|------|---------|-----|-----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Mult1 | Yes | Mult | FO | F2 | F4 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Add Divide | Yes | Sub | F8 | F6 | F2 | | Integer | Yes | Yes |
| | Divide | Yes | Div | F10 | FO | F6 | Mult | | No | Yes |

Functional unit status.

| Clock | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|-------|------|----|----|----|-----|---------------------|-----|---------|
| 10 | Mult | | | | Add | <mark>Divide</mark> | | |

- ✓ SUBD finishes execution (2-cycle latency complete).
- ✓ SUBD is now ready to write back to F8.
- X But SUBD cannot write yet, it will occur in the next cycle.
- MULTD is still executing (10-cycle latency).
- DIVD continues to wait for FO, which is still in production by MULTD.
- ADDD remains stalled, since the Add unit is busy with SUBD.

The key idea here is that the scoreboard **only allows one instruction to be written per cycle**; even completed executions must wait their turn.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | 9 | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | 9 | 11 | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 8 | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------|------|------|-----|----|----|------|---------|-----|-----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Mult1 | Yes | Mult | FO | F2 | F4 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| O | Add | Yes | Sub | F8 | F6 | F2 | | Integer | Yes | Yes |
| | Divide | Yes | Div | F10 | FO | F6 | Mult | | No | Yes |

Functional unit status.

| Clock F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|------------|----|----|----|-----|---------------------|-----|-----|
| 11 Mult | ; | | | Add | <mark>Divide</mark> | | |

Register result status.

- ✓ SUBD writes result to F8
- ✓ The Add unit becomes available again.
- MULTD is still executing.
- $\bullet\,$ DIVD still waiting for F0.
- ADDD can now potentially be issued, since the Add unit is no longer busy.

Hazard check: the WAW hazard on F6 (from ADDD) is now clear because no one is writing to F6 at this moment.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | 9 | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 12 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 8 | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|--------------|---------|------|------|-----|----|----|------|----|-----|-----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Mult1 | Yes | Mult | FO | F2 | F4 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Divide | Yes | Div | F10 | F0 | F6 | Mult | | No | Yes |

Functional unit status.

| Clock | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | | F30 |
|-------|------|----|----|----|----|--------|-----|--|-----|
| 12 | Mult | | | | | Divide | | | |

 ${\it Register \ result \ status.}$

- ✓ ADDD is issued to the Add unit: no structural hazard and WAW on F6 is clear.
- ✓ It waits in the Read Operands (RR) stage.
- X Still blocked by a WAR hazard on F6:
 - DIVD is supposed to read F6, but ADDD wants to write it.
 - ADDD must wait until <code>DIVD</code> reads F6 to avoid overwriting it too early.
- MULTD still executing.

Classic WAR hazard: writer (ADDD) must not overwrite a register untile readers (DIVD) finish reading it.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-----------------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | 9 | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 12 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 8 | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | <mark>13</mark> | | | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|----------|---------|------|------|-----|----|----|------|----|-----|-----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| <u>6</u> | Mult1 | Yes | Mult | FO | F2 | F4 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | Yes | Add | F6 | F8 | F2 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Divide | Yes | Div | F10 | FO | F6 | Mult | | No | Yes |

Functional unit status.

| Clock | FO | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | . F30 |
|-------|------|----|----|-----|----|--------|-----|---------|
| 13 | Mult | | | Add | | Divide | | |

- ✓ ADDD reads its operands F8 and F2:
 - F8 just written by SUBD (cycle 12).
 - F2 is available since cycle 8.
- ➤ DIVD is still waiting on FO (from MULTD), so hasn't read F6 yet.
- 22 Event though DIVD was issued before ADDD, here ADDD performs operand read first. This is out-of-order read!

Scoreboard allows out-of-order read operands when no hazards exist.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | 9 | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 12 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 8 | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 13 | 14 | | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|----------|---------|------|------|-----|----|----|------|----|-----|-----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Mult1 | Yes | Mult | FO | F2 | F4 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Add | Yes | Add | F6 | F8 | F2 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Divide | Yes | Div | F10 | FO | F6 | Mult | | No | Yes |

Functional unit status.

| Clock F | 0 F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | | F30 |
|-----------|------|----|-----|----|--------|-----|--|-----|
| 14 Mu | lt | | Add | | Divide | | | |

- ✓ ADDD starts execution on Add unit.
- \bullet MULTD and DIVD still wait:
 - MULTD still processing.
 - DIVD still cannot read F0, so it also hasn't read F6; keeping the \mathbf{WAR} hazard active on F6.

 $\mathbf{Execution}$ parallelism: ADDD and MULTD are both executing, in separate units.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | 9 | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 12 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 8 | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 13 | 14 | | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------|------|------|-----|----|----|------|----|-----|-----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Mult1 | Yes | Mult | FO | F2 | F4 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Add | Yes | Add | F6 | F8 | F2 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Divide | Yes | Div | F10 | FO | F6 | Mult | | No | Yes |

Functional unit status.

| Clock | FO | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 F30 |
|-------|------|----|----|-----|----|--------|-------------|
| 15 | Mult | | | Add | | Divide | |

- ✓ ADDD finishes execution.
- **X** Cannot write back yet due to WAR hazard:
 - ADDD wants to write to F6, but DIVD hasn't yet read it.
- \bullet DIVD is $\mathbf{still}\ \mathbf{stalled},$ waiting for F0 (result of MULTD).
- MULTD continues execution (almost done!).

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \textbf{Scoreboard protection}: even though ADDD finished early, it must \textbf{wait} to avoid corrupting data DIVD still needs. \\ \end{tabular}$

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | 9 | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 12 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 8 | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 13 | 14 | <mark>16</mark> | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------|------|------|-----|----|----|------|----|-----|-----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Mult1 | Yes | Mult | FO | F2 | F4 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| O | Add | Yes | Add | F6 | F8 | F2 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Divide | Yes | Div | F10 | FO | F6 | Mult | | No | Yes |

Functional unit status.

| Clock | FO | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | | F30 |
|-------|------|----|----|-----|----|--------|-----|--|-----|
| 16 | Mult | | | Add | | Divide | | | |

- Same situation:
 - ADDD is waiting to write to F6.
 - DIVD is waiting to read both F0 and F6.

▲ WAR hazard on F6 still active.

• MULTD is almost done (last cycle of execution).

 ${f Note}:$ WAR hazards delay write-back, not execution.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | 9 | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 12 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 8 | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 13 | 14 | 16 | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------|------|------|-----|----|----|------|----|-----|-----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Mult1 | Yes | Mult | FO | F2 | F4 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | Yes | Add | F6 | F8 | F2 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Divide | Yes | Div | F10 | FO | F6 | Mult | | No | Yes |

Functional unit status.

| Clock | FO | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | . F30 |
|-------|------|----|----|-----|----|--------|-----|---------|
| 17 | Mult | | | Add | | Divide | | |

- Again, same situation:
 - ADDD is \mathbf{still} $\mathbf{waiting}$ to write F6 (WAR hazard).
 - DIVD is still blocked from reading FO (pending from MULTD).
- MULTD completes execution (latency ends here)

Now the scoreboard is ready for MULTD to write its result.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | 9 | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 12 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 8 | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 13 | 14 | 16 | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------|------|------|-----|----|----|------|----|-----|-----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Mult1 | Yes | Mult | FO | F2 | F4 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | Yes | Add | F6 | F8 | F2 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Divide | Yes | Div | F10 | FO | F6 | Mult | | No | Yes |

Functional unit status.

| Clock | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | | F30 |
|-------|------|----|----|-----|----|--------|-----|--|-----|
| 18 | Mult | | | Add | | Divide | | | |

- ✓ MULTD writes to F0.
- \checkmark This finally allows DIVD to read operands in the **next cycle** (20).
- ▲ ADDD still waits on WAR hazard, DIVD still hasn't read F6.

This is a key cycle: ${\bf RAW}$ on F0 is ${\bf resolved},$ allowing DIVD to make progress at last.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | 9 | 19 | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 12 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 8 | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 13 | 14 | 16 | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------|------|------|-----|----|----|------|----|-----|-----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Mult1 | Yes | Mult | FO | F2 | F4 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | Yes | Add | F6 | F8 | F2 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Divide | Yes | Div | F10 | FO | F6 | Mult | | No | Yes |

Functional unit status.

| Clock | FO | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|-------|------|----|----|-----|----|--------|-----|---------|
| 19 | Mult | | | Add | | Divide | | |

- \checkmark DIVD reads both F0 and F6:
 - F0 from MULTD, now available
 - F6 from earlier LD.
- ✓ With both operands read, **WAR hazard on F6 is gone**.
- ✓ This unlocks ADDD, which can now write F6.

Scoreboard logic synchronizes dependent events: DIVD completes operand read, then ADDD can write, then hazard avoided.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | 9 | 19 | 20 |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 12 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 8 | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 13 | 14 | 16 | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | | | | | | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|--------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|
| | Integer Mult1 Mult2 Add Divide | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Mult1 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | Yes | Add | F6 | F8 | F2 | | | Yes | Yes |
| | Divide | Yes | Div | F10 | FO | F6 | | | Yes | Yes |

Functional unit status.

| Clock | FO | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|-------|----|----|----|-----|----|--------|-----|---------|
| 20 | | | | Add | | Divide | | |

- ✓ DIVD finally reads its operands:
 - FO written by MULTD in cycle 19.
 - F6 read now, which clears the WAR hazard blocking ADDD.
- ✓ ADDD can now safely write back to F6 in the next cycle.

Key transitions: DIVD finishes operand read (last one of the program); ADDD gets the green ligth to write since no instructions are waiting to read F6.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | 9 | 19 | 20 |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 12 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 8 | 21 | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 13 | 14 | 16 | |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------------------------|------|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Integer Mult1 Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add Divide | Yes | Add | F6 | F8 | F2 | | | Yes | Yes |
| 40 | Divide | Yes | Div | F10 | FO | F6 | | | Yes | Yes |

Functional unit status.

| Clock F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | | F30 |
|------------|----|----|-----|----|--------|-----|--|-----|
| 21 | | | Add | | Divide | | | |

- ✓ ADDD writes result to F6: this completes the final WAW dependency involving F6.
- DIVD is now **executing** (started after operand read).
- No structural or data hazards remain, all previous dependencies are solved.

Everything is now in-flight or completed:

- All operands have been read.
- All issued instructions are either executing or have completed.
- The scoreboard is now idling except for the ongoing DIVD.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | 9 | 19 | 20 |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 12 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 8 | 21 | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 22 |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|---------------|---------|------|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Mult1 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | No | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | Divide | Yes | Div | F10 | F0 | F6 | | | Yes | Yes |

Functional unit status.

| Clock | FO | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|-------|----|----|----|----|----|--------|-----|---------|
| 22 | | | | | | Divide | | |

- ✓ DIVD completes its execution.
 - Recall: DIVD was issued in cycle 8, and with a long latency (40 cycles), it finally ends execution here.
 - The scoreboard marks the Divide functional unit as ready to write.

This shows how the scoreboard tracks long-latency FUs without blocking the pipeline. Other instructions have long since finished.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | 9 | 19 | 20 |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 12 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 8 | 21 | <mark>61</mark> | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 22 |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------------------------|------|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Integer Mult1 Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | No | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Divide | Yes | Div | F10 | FO | F6 | | | Yes | Yes |

Functional unit status.

| Clock | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | | F30 |
|-------|----|----|----|----|----|--------|-----|--|-----|
| 61 | | | | | | Divide | | | |

 ${\bf Register\ result\ status.}$

- ✓ DIVD writes result to F10.
- All instructions have now:
 - Been **issued**
 - Executed
 - Written back

All functional units are idle, the pipeline is now completely drained.

| Instruction | Issue | Read Op. | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|------------------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 6 | 9 | 19 | 20 |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 12 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 8 | 21 | 61 | 62 |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 22 |

Instruction status.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Fi | Fj | Fk | Qj | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Mult1 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Divide | No | | | | | | | | |

Functional unit status.

| Clock | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | | F30 |
|-------|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|--|-----|
| 62 | | | | | | | | | |

Register result status.

The 62-cycle examle is a demonstration of: efficient hazard management, robust scheduling logic, clean and scalable hardware coordination. The score-board shines in showing how simple rules, carefully enforced, can deliver powerful out-of-order behavior without complexity of modern speculative or superscalar techniques.

3.7 Tomasulo's Algorithm

3.7.1 Introduction

Tomasulo's Algorithm represents a pivotal innovation in the domain of dynamic scheduling and out-of-order execution within high-performance computing. Developed in 1967 at IBM for the IBM System/360 Model 91, it was introduced as a means to exploit Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP) in the absence of compiler support or source-level reordering. The essential goal was to overcome pipeline stalls due to data hazards, particularly Write After Write (WAW) and Write After Read (WAR) hazards, both of which are challenging to resolve through simple pipeline control mechanisms.

Core Idea

Tomasulo's algorithm enables instructions to execute out of program order, yet maintains data correctness via hardware-level mechanisms. Central to this approach is the concept of implicit register renaming, which dynamically assigns storage locations (reservation stations) to values rather than using architectural register names directly. This mechanisms ensures that no two instructions mistakenly read or overwrite the same register unless there is a true data dependency (RAW, Read After Write).

■ New features introduced: a kind of Dynamic Scheduling 2.0

- Implicit Register Renaming: avoids WAR and WAW hazards by assigning intermediate results to reservation stations rather than architecture registers.
- Dynamic Scheduling: unlike static instruction scheduling (done at compile time), Tomasulo's algorithm uses runtime analysis to decide the order of instruction execution (yes, like the Scoreboard algorithm, but smarter).
- Out-of-Order Execution: instructions can be issued and begin execution as soon as operands are ready, independently of program order, provided that dependencies are resolved.
- Common Data Bus (CDB): results are broadcast to all units waiting for them, further enabling parallelism.

Historical Significance

Tomasulo's work appeared just three years after the CDC 6600 Scoreboarding mechanism (Seymour Cray's design), which was the first dynamic scheduling mechanisms. Unlike the scoreboard, Tomasulo's algorithm **distributes control** among the **functional units** via **reservation stations**, offering more scalable and parallel data communication through the CDB.

It served as the architectural blueprint for later processors such as:



Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding: What's the difference?

Both **Tomasulo's Algorithm** and the **Scoreboard Algorithm** are techniques for **dynamic instruction scheduling**, meaning they allow instructions to be executed **out of program order** while still preserving correctness. But Tomasulo goes a step further in terms of efficiency and cleverness:

| Feature | Scoreboard (CDC 6600) | Tomasulo (IBM 360/91) |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| Register Renaming | X No | ✓ Yes (implicit via reservation stations) |
| WAR/WAW Hazards Handling | X Needs to stall | ✓ Avoided by renaming |
| Data Communication | ✓ Writes to Register File | ✓ Used CDB to forward directly |
| Control | Centralized scoreboard | Distributed (each FU has its own RS) |
| Execution Start Condition | Wait for operand registers | Wait for operand values or tags |

Table 16: Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding.

3.7.2 Register Renaming: Static vs. Implicit

? First of all, why Register Renaming?

One of the main challenges in pipelined and out-of-order execution is handling false dependencies. False Dependencies (page 70) occur when instructions appear to depend on each other because they use the same register name, but there is no true data dependency between them. These are name-related hazards, not value-related. There are two main types:

- WAR (Write After Dependencies): a later instruction writes to a register that a previous instruction needs to read.
- WAW (Write After Write): two instructions write to the same register, but the second one is issued before the first finishes.

These are not *true* data dependencies (like Read After Write, RAW), but **name conflicts**, where different values want to use the same register name.

⊘ Register renaming solves this by dynamically or statically mapping registers to different physical storage locations.

▼ Static Register Renaming (Compiler-Based)

In Static Renaming, the compiler performs the renaming at compile time, allocating temporary (non-architectural) registers to break WAR and WAW dependencies.

For example:

```
1 DIV.D F0, F2, F4
2 ADD.D F6, F0, F8 ; RAW on F0
3 S.D F6, O(R1) ; RAW on F6
4 MUL.D F6, F10, F8 ; WAW & WAR on F6
```

There is a **WAW hazard** (both ADD.D and MUL.D write to F6), and a **WAR** hazard (S.D reads F6 while MUL.D wants to write it). With static register renaming, the compiler assigns a new register (e.g., S) to avoid the conflict:

```
DIV.D F0, F2, F4
ADD.D S, F0, F8 ; RAW still valid
S.D S, O(R1) ; Now reads S
MUL.D F6, F10, F8 ; Safe to use F6
```

Now the hazards are gone: ADD.D writes to S, which is consumed by the store; MUL.D writes to F6 independently.

⚠ Static Register Renaming - Limitation. Static Renaming requires predicting all hazards in advance and knowing the full execution path (hard with branches, loops, dynamic inputs, etc.). Also, it requires many more architectural registers to be encoded in the ISA, not always feasible.

✓ Implicit Register Renaming (Hardware-Based - Tomasulo's way)

Tomasulo's algorithm takes a smarter **dynamic** approach. Instead of using physical register names, it uses **Reservation Stations (RS)** as **Temporary Names (tags)** for operands. This renaming is done **implicitly** by the hardware at runtime.

Using the previous example:

```
1 DIV.D F0, F2, F4
2 ADD.D F6, F0, F8 ; RAW on F0
3 S.D F6, O(R1) ; RAW on F6
4 MUL.D F6, F10, F8 ; WAW & WAR on F6
```

Tomasulo rewrites it with **RS identifiers**:

```
1 DIV.D F0, F2, F4
2 ADD.D RS1, F0, F8 ; ADD result goes to RS1
3 S.D RS1, O(R1) ; Store reads from RS1
4 MUL.D F6, F10, F8 ; Now safe, F6 is available
```

- ADD.D doesn't write to F6, but to a reservation station named RS1.
- S.D reads from RS1, not from F6.
- This avoids WAW (two writes to F6) and WAR (store reads F6 before MUL.D writes).

Tomasulo's algorithm automatically tracks which RS (Reservation Stations) produces what and only writes to the actual register file once the instruction retires. Until then, everything is handled with RS tags.

This is the **core strength** of Tomasulo over simpler approaches like Scoreboarding or static renaming. It allows **aggressive out-of-order execution** without risking data hazards, making it fundamental in modern CPU design.

Here we have only presented the *secret sauce* of Tomasulo's power, in future sections we will gradually reveal how the tag-based mechanism works in practice.

3.7.3 Basic Concepts of Tomasulo's Algorithm

★ Goals of Tomasulo's Design

Tomasulo's algorithm was designed to solve a major performance bottleneck in pipelined processors: **pipeline stalls caused by operand unavailability** due to data hazards. The solution? Introduce a distributed, smart scheduling mechanism that:

- Avoids WAR and WAW hazards (false dependencies)
- Allows out-of-order execution
- Enables register renaming implicitly
- Uses Reservation Stations (RSs) and a Common Data Bus (CDB)

Reservation Stations (RSs): Tomasulo's Brain

Rather than having a central scoreboard (as in CDC 6600), Tomasulo distributes the control logic and buffering close to the Functional Units (FUs) using Reservation Stations.

Each functional unit (like a floating-point adder or multiplier) has its own RSs in front of it. These are small buffers that:

- Hold instruction operands (or *tags* pointing to where the operand will come from).
- Wait until operands are ready.
- Dispatch instructions into the FU as soon as everything is available.

This local storage of operands removes the need to stall the entire pipeline, each unit become self-scheduling.

■ Implicit Register Renaming with RS Tags

Instead of keeping track of operand names (e.g., F2, F4, F6, etc.), **Tomasulo** tracks:

- Either the value of the operand (if available)
- Or the tag of the RS that will produce that value (if not yet ready)

This is very powerful because:

- ✓ Registers are replaced by **RS** names or actual values
- ✓ WAR and WAW hazards are completely avoided
- ✓ Instruction scheduling becomes data-driven

We no longer wait for registers, we wait for values, and when they're ready, we go.

■ Tags, RSs, and the CDB

A critical component that ties everything together is the Common Data Bus (CDB):

- 1. When a functional unit finishes execution, the result is broadcast on the CDB.
- 2. Any **RS waiting for that result's tag** will grab the value and store it in its local buffer.
- 3. Also, the result is written to the **Register File**, but only if no newer instruction is overwriting that register.

This broadcasting mechanism allows Tomasulo to perform a kind of **hardware-level forwarding**, operands are handed off *before* they hit the register file.

| Feature | Scoreboarding | Tomasulo |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Operand Waiting | Wait for register | Wait for value or tag |
| Operand Tracking | Centralized | Distributed in RSs |
| WAR/WAW hazards | Cause stalls | Avoided via renaming |
| Communication | Implicit write-back | Broadcast over CDB |
| Renaming | × None | ✓ Implicit via RS |

Table 17: Compared to Scoreboarding.

Tomasulo replaces rigid, centralized scheduling with a fluid, decentralized approach. Reservation Stations track availability, rename registers, and drive execution. The Common Data Bus broadcasts results to all who need them.

The processor becomes **dataflow-like**: instructions execute when their operands are ready, not when some global scheduler says so.

3.7.4 Architecture

The classic architecture includes:

- An **Instruction Queue** that feeds instructions in program order.
- Several Reservation Stations (RSs) sitting in front of Functional Units (FUs) (like ADD, MUL, DIV units).
- A Register File that doesn't just store values, but also tracks where the next value will come from.
- A Common Data Bus (CDB) that broadcasts results to all RSs and the Register File.

X Components of a Reservation Station (RS)

Each **Reservation Station (RS)** is a mini-instruction buffer attached to a specific type of Functional Unit. It holds **1 instruction** and includes the following fields:

| Field | Description |
|------------|---|
| Tag (name) | Unique ID of the RS (e.g., RS1, RS2,) |
| Busy | A boolean flag: is the RS holding an instruction? |
| OP | Operation type (e.g., ADD.D, MUL.D) |
| Vj, Vk | Value of operands (if available) |
| Qj, Qk | Tag of RS producing Vj, Vk (if not available) |

- If V_j/V_k are valid \rightarrow operands are ready.
- If Qj/Qk are nonzero \rightarrow wait for the result tagged with that RS name to arrive on the CDB.

Only **one of (V, Q)** is valid for each operand at any given time. Finally, note that for memory instructions (like Load/Store), Vj often holds the **address**, not a register value.

* Register File and Store Buffers

The Register File in Tomasulo's architecture does more than just store values. Each register contains:

- Vi, current value (if available)
- Qi, tag of the RS that will produce this value (if pending)

All depends on the Qi value:

- If $Qi = 0 \rightarrow$ the value is already available \rightarrow use Vi.
- \bullet If $\mathtt{Qi}\neq 0\to \mathrm{the}$ register is waiting for an instruction to produce that value.

This tagging makes the register file an elegant interface for:

- Implicit register renaming
- Hazard tracking
- Register freeing

Likewise, **Store Buffers** behave like a special type of RS:

- They wait for both address and data to be ready before sending it to memory
- Both elements may depend on other RS outputs, so Store Buffers also monitor the CDB.

X Load/Store Buffers

Memory operations need special handling due to:

- Address calculation
- Unknown data dependencies
- Potential memory hazards

So we use:

- Load Buffers, consisting of two fields: Busy, Address. Calculated in two steps:
 - 1. Address calculation using base register + offset.
 - 2. Wait for memory unit availability to load the data.
- Store Buffers, wait for the data to be stored and the address. Once both are ready, send to memory.

Store Buffers act like RSs, they hold partial information and wait on operand values (tags), same as ADD or MUL units.

? Why this architectural design works?

- Decouple instruction issue from operand readiness, then out-oforder execution becomes natural.
- Multiple RSs per FU, then enables multiple instructions to be in-flight for the same unit type.
- Register file doesn't need to "remember everything", then RSs temporarily hold data and manage dependencies.
- Broadcast via CDB, then all waiting units instantly get what they need, without central control.

In other words, the Tomasulo's architecture is a **beautifully decentralized**, **tag-driven pipeline**:

- Each Reservation Station acts as a micro-scheduler for its FU.
- The Register File manages what is available vs. what is still pending.
- Load/Store Buffers elegantly handle memory-side hazards and operand waits.
- The CDB ties it all together, broadcasting results as soon as they're ready.

This structure sets the stage for the dynamic instruction lifecycle, which we'll explore in detail in the next section.

X Example of Tomasulo structure

The following figure shows an example of RISC-V structure using Tomasulo. It is a very good example to understand how the architecture works.




Figure 26: The Basic Structure of a Tomasulo-Style FPU. [1] It illustrates the hardware datapaht and control structure used in a RISC-V Floating-Point Unit (FPU) that supports dynamic scheduling via Tomasulo's algorithm. This architecture shows how a processor executes FP instructions out of order, tracks dependencies using tags, and delivers results using the Common Data Bus (CDB).

- Instruction Queue. Holds instructions waiting to be issued. The instructions are issued in-order (First In, First Out) to Reservation Stations.
- Reservation Stations (RSs). Act as temporary instruction buffers for each type of FU (e.g., FP ADD, MULT, DIV). Each RS holds:
 - Operation Type (e.g., ADD.D, MUL.D)
 - Operand values (Vj/Vk) or tags (Qj/Qk)
 - Status bits (busy, ready, etc.)

Waits until **both operands are ready** and the FU is free, then issues to the FU.

- Function Units (FUs). Includes separate pipelined units for ADD, MULT, and DIV. Each can execute one instruction at a time. Upon completion, sends result to the CDB.
- Register File (RF). Stores FP register values (F0-F31). Each register has: Value field (Vi), and Tag field (Qi) that is the ID of the RS that will produce its value. When reading a register:
 - If Qi = 0, value is ready \rightarrow use Vi.
 - If $Qi \neq 0$, value is pending \rightarrow use tag to track it.
- Common Data Bus (CDB). Broadcasts completed results (value and tag) to: all waiting RSs (those with Qj/Qk matching the tag), Register File (if that tag matches a register Qi). Enables hardware forwarding: results don't need to wait for write-back to the register file.
- Load/Store Queue (optional). In a full Tomasulo implementation, memory operations are handled by Load and Store buffers. This diagram is focused on FP register-register instructions, so memory is abstracted.

X Execution Flow

- 1. Issue (Instruction Queue \rightarrow RS)
 - (a) Fetch next Floating Point (FP) instruction.
 - (b) If a Reservation Station (RS) for the operation type is available:
 - i. Copy instruction into RS
 - ii. Fetch operands from Register File (RF)
 - If ready \rightarrow store value in Vj/Vk
 - If not \rightarrow store producer RS tag in Qj/Qk
 - iii. Update the destination register's Qi with this RS tag (register renaming).

2. Execute (RS \rightarrow FU)

- (a) Once operands are ready (Qj = Qk = 0) and FU is free:
 - i. RS issues to its Functional Unit (FU)
 - ii. FU computes the result (may take multiple cycles)
 - iii. Execution is **out of order**, instructions are scheduled based on readiness, not program order.

3. Write Result (FU \rightarrow CDB)

- (a) When the FU finishes:
 - i. Sends the result with its tag on the CDB.
 - ii. All RSs waiting on that tag update their operand fields.
 - iii. Register file updates any registers whose Qi matches the tag.
 - iv. The RS becomes free again.

3.7.5 Stages

Tomasulo's execution model is based on three main pipeline stages:

- 1. **Issue** (in-order): decode instruction, send to RS.
- 2. Execute (out-of-order): wait for operands, perform operation.
- 3. Write Result (out-of-order): broadcast result via CDB to RF and RSs.

Each instruction flows through these three stages, but thanks to the algorithm's design, they don't have to do so in program order after issuing.

3.7.5.1 Stage 1: Issue

The Issue Stage is the first step in Tomasulo's 3-phase pipeline. In this stage, instructions are decoded and dispatched from the Instruction Queue (IQ) into Reservation Stations (RSs) (see Figure 26, page 143), where they wait until operands and functional units are ready.

? Main Responsibilities of the Issue Stage

- 1. **Instruction decoding**. Identify the opcode and register operands.
- 2. Reservation Station assignment. Check for an available RS of the appropriate type (e.g., an ADD.D goes to an RS attached to the FP ADD unit).
- 3. Operand availability check. For each source register:
 - ✓ If ready, read its value \rightarrow store in Vj/Vk.
 - **X** If **not ready**, read its $tag \rightarrow store in Qj/Qk$ (wait for it!).
- 4. Destination register renaming. Update the register file's tag field (Qi). It now points to the RS handling this instruction. This is implicit register renaming.

? Why is this stage in-order?

Tomasulo always issues instructions in **program order**, one at a time. Why? Three reasons:

- Ensures **precise exceptions**, it helps the machine know which instruction caused a fault.
- Keeps memory operations (like stores) in **correct order**.
- Prevents complexity from instruction reordering too early.

Out-of-Order behavior starts after issue, in the Execute stage.

⚠ What can cause a stall during Issue?

- 1. Structural Hazard: no free Reservation Station.
- 2. Load/Store queue full: for memory operations.
- 3. (in more advanced versions) **Pending branch**: speculative instructions must wait.

⊘ Why this Stage is powerful

- Begins implicit renaming, eliminating WAR and WAW hazards.
- Allows instructions to wait for operands without blocking the pipeline.
- Decouples instruction arrival from execution readiness.

Example 7: Issue stage

Say the instruction is:

- 1 ADD.D F6, F2, F4
 - 1. Tomasulo checks: "Is there a free ADD reservation station?"
 - × No, insert a stall: avoid structural hazard.
 - ✓ If there are available reservation stations, then checks:
 - (a) Is F2 ready?
 - \checkmark Yes \rightarrow Vj = value of F2
 - \times No \rightarrow Qj = tag of RS producing F2
 - (b) Is F4 ready?
 - \checkmark Yes \rightarrow Vk = value of F4
 - \times No \rightarrow Qk = tag of RS producing F4
 - 2. Finally, it updates: F6.Qi = RS1 (renaming F6 to RS1). This means: "F6 is not ready yet, it will be produced by RS1".

From this point on, any instruction that needs F6 will wait for RS1, not for F6 directly.

For example, a second instruction appears:

Tomasulo checks: "what's the status of F6?". It finds:

$$F6.Qi = RS1$$

F6 does not contain a value yet, but its value will come from RS1. So now, in the RS for the MUL instruction (say RS2), we set:

- Qj = RS1 (because F6 is not ready, and its result will come from RS1).
- Vk = value of F10 (assuming F10 is ready).

This is the magic: RS2 knows that it must listen for RS1's result on the Common Data Bus (CDB).

' Quick Recap

- 1. Decode instruction
- 2. Allocate Reservation Station (RS)
- 3. Read operand values or tags
- 4. Rename destination register via tag (Qi)
- 5. If no RS \rightarrow stall

This stage is like **preparing an instruction for its flight**, loading its bags, assigning it a gate, and scheduling it to depart; but waiting for the runway (operands and Functional Unit) to be clear.

3.7.5.2 Stage 2: Start Execution

This is the phase where the instruction actually performs the computation in the appropriate Functional Unit (FU), like ADD, MULT, or DIV. But, and this is key, it can only happen when all operand values are ready and the Functional Unit (FU) is available.

So, execution isn't just about doing the math, it's also about waiting for the right moment.

? Preconditions: When can an Instruction start executing?

To start execution, three things must happen:

1. Both operands are available. In the Reservation Station (RS), this means:

$$Qj = Qk = 0$$

No tags, just valid values in Vj and Vk.

- 2. The Functional Unit (FU) is free, e.g., the FP ADD unit is idle.
- 3. (optional) **Instruction dependencies are resolved**, e.g., no pending branches or memory issues ahead.

Only when all conditions are met, the instruction *leaves* the Reservation Stations (RS) and enters the Functional Unit (FU).

X What Happens in the Execute Stage?

Once instructions are in Reservation Stations (RSs) and waiting for operands, the Execute Stage begins. This is where:

- The instruction is dispatched to the Functional Unit (FU).
- It executes for its latency.
- The result is **held**, ready to be broadcast in Stage 3.

But unlike a classic pipeline, **Tomasulo waits for readiness**, not for a fixed cycle count.

Let's break it into key sub-steps:

- 1. Operand Readiness Check. Each Reservation Station (RS) monitors:
 - Qj
 - Qk

If both are zero, it means that the values Vj and Vk are ready, and no other Reservation Station needs to broadcast them.

⊘ In other words, when both operands are ready, the instruction can **start executing**.

- 2. Check FU Availability. Tomasulo now checks if the relevant Functional Unit (e.g., FP ADD, FP MUL, FP DIV) is free.
 - \checkmark If yes \rightarrow dispatch instruction from RS to FU.

Multiple Reservation Stations might be ready, but **only one can use a given Functional Unit at a time**. A scheduler chooses which RS gets the FU (usually oldest-first).

- 3. **Instruction Execution (Latency Counts)**. Once inside the Functional Unit (FU):
 - The instruction performs its actual arithmetic operation.
 - This can take multiple cycles depending on the instruction type.

| Instruction | Latency (example) |
|-------------|-------------------|
| ADD.D | 2-3 cycles |
| MUL.D | 4-7 cycles |
| DIV.D | 10+ cycles |

This time is **internal to the FU**, the RS has already "let go" of the instruction. The RS is now **free** and can be reused after the instruction completes Stage 3 (write-back).

- 4. Memory Instructions (LOAD/STORE) Special Case. Unlike register-based instructions (e.g. ADD.D F6, F2, F4), memory instructions read or write actual memory, and memory access has some dangerous side effects:
 - It's **global**: memory affects all parts of the program.
 - It must be **precise**: no reordering can change program behavior.
 - It can raise exceptions (e.g., accessing invalid addresses).

So Tomasulo handles LOAD and STORE more carefully than other instructions.

- LOAD Instruction L.D F4, O(R1). Load the value from memory address R1 + 0 into register F4. What happens:
 - (a) Wait for base register (R1) to be ready.
 - If R1 is not ready, the Load Buffer stores a tag, just like in RSs.
 - Once ready, calculate **effective address** (e.g., 1000).
 - (b) Wait for access to memory. If there's no memory conflict, proceed to load.
 - (c) **Stage 3 (write)**. The value is broadcast on the **CDB** to: waiting RSs (if any), register F4 (if still tagged).

LOADs are usually allowed to execute out-of-order (relative to other LOADs), as long as we're sure no STORE before them is writing to the same address.

- STORE Instruction S.D F4, O(R1). Store the value in F4 to memory address R1 + 0. This is trickier, because:
 - STORE instructions do not write results to a register.
 - They write into memory, which is a shared global state.
 - If we mess up the ordering, we can cause wrong program results.

What happens:

- (a) Wait for both:
 - i. The data to be stored (F4) \rightarrow may need to track a tag.
 - ii. The address to store to $(R1 + 0) \rightarrow$ also may depend on a tag.
- (b) Wait for memory access permission:
 - Tomasulo ensures **store ordering** is preserved.
 - This means STOREs happen in program order.
 - We cannot let a later STORE "jump ahead" of an earlier one.
- (c) When both data and address are ready \rightarrow write to memory (not via CDB).

STORE instructions do not write anything on the CDB, because they don't produce a result for future instructions, they only update memory.

Classical Pipeline vs. Tomasulo

| Classical Pipeline | Tomasulo |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Fixed issue \rightarrow execute | Waits dynamically for operands |
| Register-based data flow | Tag-based tracking via RSs |
| RAW hazards stall issue | RAW stalls only inside RSs |
| WAR/WAW hazards possible | Eliminated via register renaming |

Table 18: Classical Pipeline vs. Tomasulo.

This is dataflow execution: instructions run as soon as data is ready, not when the program says so.

' Quick Recap

- 1. Check if Qj and Qk are 0 (ready).
- 2. If yes and FU is free \rightarrow dispatch.
- 3. Execute in FU (multi-cycle).
- 4. Prepare to broadcast result on CDB.

3.7.5.3 Stage 3: Write Result

This is the moment the instruction finishes its computation in the Functional Unit (FU), and the result is made globally visible by broadcasting it over the Common Data Bus (CDB). It's the stage where:

- The value computed by the FU is sent to:
 - All Reservation Stations (RSs) waiting for it;
 - The **Register File (RF)** (if still tagged with RS).
- The instruction is now officially "done".

X What happens step-by-step

Let's say we have this instruction in Reservation Station 3 (RS3):

MUL.D F6, F2, F4

RS3 starts execution in the MUL unit, takes several cycles, and finally finishes. Now we begin:

1. Broadcast on CDB. The Functional Unit (FU) places the result on the Common Data Bus (CDB) along with its tag (RS3):

$$\mathtt{CDB} \leftarrow \langle \mathtt{tag} = \mathtt{RS3}, \mathtt{value} = \mathtt{result} \rangle$$

This is the Tomasulo version of a "public announcement": "RS3 has finished computing a result. Anyone waiting for this, come get it!".

- 2. Reservation Stations listen for Tags. Every Reservation Station (RS) in the system checks: "does my Qj or Qk match the tag on the CDB?". If yes:
 - The Reservation Station (RS) grabs the value.
 - Stores it in Vj or Vk.
 - Clears the tag:

$$\mathrm{Qj} \leftarrow 0 \quad \vee \quad \mathrm{Qk} \leftarrow 0$$

Meaning: operand is now ready.

This process allows many instructions to **simultaneously wake up** when the result they needed finally becomes available.

- 3. Register File Update. The Register File checks: "is there any register whose Qi = RS3?". If yes:
 - $\bullet\,$ It writes the result into that register.
 - Clears the tag field (Qi = 0), this means "F6 is now valid and available".

If the register has already been renamed again (e.g., Qi = RS4), we don't write to it, this avoid WAW hazards.

4. Free the RS and FU. The instruction in RS3 is now complete, RS3 is marked free, and the Functional Unit (FU) becomes available again for other instructions.

Example 8: why don't we write to a register when it has been renamed?

Suppose we have two instructions writing to the same register:

```
1 ADD.D F6, F2, F4 ; instruction A
2 MUL.D F6, F6, F8 ; instruction B
```

Instruction 1 is issued first, but instruction 2 also writes to F6 (again). This is a Write After Write (WAW) situation.

- 1. Instruction 1 (ADD.D) is issued \rightarrow assigned to RS1
 - Tomasulo sets: F6.Qi \leftarrow RS1 ("F6 will come from RS1").
- 2. Instruction 2 (MUL.D) is issued immediately after \rightarrow assigned to RS2
 - Tomasulo updates again: F6.Qi \leftarrow RS2 ("F6 will now come from RS2").

Now we have:

- Two instructions writing to F6.
- But only the result of RS2 should actually end up in F6.
- RS1's result is now obsolete, because it was overwritten by a newer instruction.

When RS1 finishes (WRITE STAGE), RS1 broadcasts its result on the CDB:

$$\langle \mathtt{Tag} = \mathtt{RS1}, \mathtt{Value} = \dots \rangle$$

Tomasulo checks the Register File: "does any register have Qi = RS1?":

- If yes, update that register.
- 3 If no (this case), F6.Qi = RS2, not RS1 anymore.

So we skip the write. Because if we allowed RS1 to write to F6 now, it would overwrite the result of RS2, which hasn't been computed yet, and then we'd break correctness.

The is how **Tomasulo avoids WAW hazards**: only write to a register if it's still waiting for our result. If someone newer came along and renamed the register again, we're out. Our value is no longer needed in the register file.

- CDB allows many instructions to grab the result at the same time.
- Values are **forwarded before being stored** (no need to wait for register write-back).
- False dependencies (WAR/WAW) are avoided automatically.
- RAW dependencies are resolved dynamically, as instructions "listen" for the values they need.

3.7.6 In-Depth Execution Example

Example 9: Dependence and Hazard Analysis

We're given a sequence of floating-point instructions to be executed by Tomasulo's algorithm:

```
1 L.D F6, 34(R2) ; F6 ← Mem[R2 + 34]

2 L.D F2, 45(R3) ; F2 ← Mem[R3 + 45]

3 MUL.D F0, F2, F4 ; F0 ← F2 × F4

4 SUB.D F8, F6, F2 ; F8 ← F6 − F2

5 DIV.D F10, F0, F6 ; F10 ← F0 ÷ F6

6 ADD.D F6, F8, F2 ; F6 ← F8 + F2
```

We begin by identifying **data dependencies** (RAW, WAR, WAW) between these instructions. Let's go instruction by instruction and analyze dependencies:

- Instruction 1: L.D F6, $34(R2) \rightarrow No$ dependencies, loads into F6.
- Instruction 2: L.D F2, $45(R3) \rightarrow No$ dependencies, loads into F2.
- Instruction 3: MUL.D FO, F2, F4
 - RAW dependency on F2, produced by Instr. 2
 - F4 is assumed ready (not in this instruction stream)
- Instruction 4: SUB.D F8, F6, F2
 - RAW dependency on F6, from Instr. 1
 - RAW dependency on F2, from Instr. 2
- Instruction 5: DIV.D F10, F0, F6
 - RAW dependency on F0, from Instr. 3
 - RAW dependency on F6, from Instr. 1 (but will be overwritten later)
- Instruction 6: ADD.D F6, F8, F2
 - RAW dependency on F8, from Instr. 4
 - RAW dependency on F2, from Instr. 2
 - WAW hazard: Instr. 1 wrote F6, this one overwrites it again.
 - WAR hazard: Instr. 5 reads F6, but this instruction writes it again.

Some key observations:

- Instr. 1 and 2 are **independent loads**, they will issue immediately.
- Instr. 3 (MUL.D) has to wait for F2, but F4 is assumed ready.

- Instr. 4 and 5 have multiple dependencies, they will wait in Reservation Station (RS) until results are available.
- Instr. 6 creates WAW and WAR hazards on F6, this is where Tomasulo's register renaming shines:
 - The second write to F6 gets a **new tag**.
 - The WAR/WAW conflicts are eliminated by tracking RS tags instead of F6 name.

Example 10: Register Renaming

The goal of this section is to demonstrate how **register renaming eliminates false dependencies** (WAR and WAW) and allows **out-of-order execution** by tagging instructions with Reservation Station IDs instead of register names.

Let's revisit the original instruction sequence:

```
1 L.D F6, 34(R2)

2 L.D F2, 45(R3)

3 MUL.D F0, F2, F4

4 SUB.D F8, F6, F2

5 DIV.D F10, F0, F6

6 ADD.D F6, F8, F2
```

Instead of using F6, F2, etc. directly, Tomasulo assigns a Reservation Station (RS) to track **who will produce** each value. This Reservation Station (RS) **renames** the register in the hardware temporarily. This helps **avoid**:

- \bigcirc WAW hazard \rightarrow only the most recent instruction writes to the final destination.
- igvee WAR hazard ightarrow consumers of earlier values don't get overwritten by later writers.

Here's a sample of how registers and reservation stations look during execution:

| Instruction | RS | Dest Reg. | Qi Field in RF | Renaming Effect |
|--|--|-----------|--|------------------------------|
| $\texttt{L.D} \rightarrow \texttt{F6}$ | LB1 | F6 | F6.Qi ← LB1 | F6 will be produced by LB1 |
| $\texttt{L.D} \to \texttt{F2}$ | LB2 | F2 | $\texttt{F2.Qi} \leftarrow \texttt{LB2}$ | F2 will be produced by LB2 |
| $\texttt{MUL.D} \to \texttt{FO}$ | $	ilde{D} 	o 	ext{FO} igg 	ext{MUL1} 	ext{FO} igg 	ext{FO}$ | | $\texttt{F0.Qi} \leftarrow \texttt{MUL1}$ | FO will be produced by MUL1 |
| ${\tt SUB.D} \to {\tt F8}$ | SUB1 | F8 | $\texttt{F8.Qi} \leftarrow \texttt{SUB1}$ | F8 will be produced by SUB1 |
| ${\tt DIV.D} \to {\tt F10}$ | DIV1 | F10 | $\texttt{F10.Qi} \leftarrow \texttt{DIV1}$ | F10 will be produced by DIV1 |
| $\mathtt{ADD.D} \to \mathtt{F6}$ | ADD1 | F6 | $\texttt{F6.Qi} \leftarrow \texttt{ADD1}$ | F6 now renamed again by ADD1 |

Let's follow F6 across the timeline:

1. Instruction 1: $F6 \leftarrow L.D \Rightarrow RF: F6.Qi = LB1$

- 2. Instruction 5: DIV.D uses $F6 \Rightarrow$ waits on LB1's result
- 3. Instruction 6: F6 \leftarrow ADD.D \Rightarrow RF: F6.Qi = ADD1

So by the time ADD.D issues:

- Register File (RF) no longer tracks LB1, even though that result hasn't been written yet.
- DIV.D is still listening for LB1's result.
- WAR/WAW hazards are avoided because consumers and writers track RS tags, not the physical register name F6.

Now consider propagating the result with tags. Let's say MUL1 finishes first:

- 1. It broadcasts (Tag = MUL1, Value = (result))
- 2. The **Register File** updates:
 - \bullet If $\mathtt{Qi} = \mathtt{MUL1} \to \mathrm{write}$ result into the register.
 - If $Qi \neq MUL1 \rightarrow skip$ write.
- 3. RSs waiting on Qj = MUL1 or Qk = MUL1, grab the value.

Same logic applies for LB1, ADD1, etc. Why Register Renaming Solves WAR and WAW?

| Hazard | Traditional Pipeline | Tomasulo's Solution |
|--------|---|---|
| WAR | Later write may overwrite a value before it's read. | Each reader remembers which tag to wait for, not the register name. |
| WAW | Multiple instructions write to same register \rightarrow wrong order. | Only the last tag (Qi) is honored; old ones are discarded. |

Register renaming in Tomasulo means:

- Every instruction output gets a **temporary**, **unique name**, called the *Reservation Station tag*.
- The **Register File tracks tags**, not values, while results are still pending.
- When a result is ready:
 - 1. It's broadcast with its tag
 - 2. Listeners receive it
 - 3. Register File updated only if still needed.

This make execution:

- Safe (no false hazards)
- Flexible (out-of-order)
- Clean (decouples values from register names)

Now we bring Tomasulo to life cycle-by-cycle. We'll track each instruction through the **three stages**:

- Issue
- Start Execution (Execute Start)
- Write Result (Write)

The instructions are:

```
1 L.D F6, 34(R2)

2 L.D F2, 45(R3)

3 MUL.D F0, F2, F4

4 SUB.D F8, F6, F2

5 DIV.D F10, F0, F6

6 ADD.D F6, F8, F2
```

? Why are SUBD and DIVD merged into ADDD and MULD units?

ADDD and SUBD are both **floating-point addition operations**, differing only in the operation:

- ullet ADDD F6, F2, F4 ightarrow F6 = F2 + F4
- ullet SUBD F6, F2, F4 o F6 = F2 F4 = F2 + (-F4)

They both use the same operand types, have the same input/output behavior and can be performed by the same kind of floating-point adder/subtractor unit. Therefore, a single ADD unit and its reservation stations can be reused for both operations. That's why in the RS table, SUBD uses an ADD-type RS (e.g., ADD1, ADD2).

Same for MULD and DIVD. These are both multiplicative FP operations. Architecturally, many processors use a shared pipeline or RS pool for:

- MULD (fastest latency)
- DIVD (slower latency but same operand structure)

So MULD and DIVD share MUL reservation stations and a shared execution unit or Functional Unit slot. That's why we see:

- MULD FO, F2, F4 issued to MUL1
- DIVD F10, F0, F6 is waiting in MUL2 for F0

They both use the **same RS pool**, because they're functionally similar in structure, and sharing resources saves hardware area. Also note that in floating-point arithmetic we have:

$$\mathtt{A} \div \mathtt{B} = \mathtt{A} \times \left(\frac{1}{\mathtt{B}}\right)$$

Instead of implementing a full-blown divider, many systems compute the **reciprocal of** B $(\frac{1}{B})$ and then multiply:

```
1 DIV.D F10, F0, F6 ; F10 \leftarrow F0 \div F6

2 \approx

3 RECIP F12, F6 ; F12 \leftarrow 1 \div F6

4 MULD F10, F0, F12 ; F10 \leftarrow F0 \times F12
```

This transformation is:

- Valid numerically, though it may lose precision.
- Common in vector processors, GPUs, and some scalar floating-point pipelines (e.g., ARM, GPUs).
- Used when latency and area are more important than perfect accuracy.

This allows the processor to **reuse the multiplier** (which is fast and compact) instead of having a separate, slow divider.

1. Cycle 1

- LD F6, 34(R2) is issued.
 - LoadBuffer1 allocated.
 - F6.Qi = Load1
- \bullet Base address R2 assumed ready \to can start address calculation in next cycle.

| Instruction | Issue | Start Execute | Write Result |
|------------------|-------|---------------|--------------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | | |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | | | |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | | | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | |

Instruction status.

| Name | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------|----|----|-------|----|
| Load1 | 34 | | v(R2) | |
| Load2 | | | | |
| EXLoad | | | | |

EXLoad (or EX_LD). Tracks the status of the Load Buffer(LB) and Load execution units.

| Name | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|-------|----|----|----|----|
| ADD1 | | | | |
| ADD2 | | | | |
| ExADD | | | | |

ExADD. Tracks the use of the addition arithmetic Functional Unit (FU).

| Name | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|-------|----|----|----|----|
| MUL1 | | | | |
| MUL2 | | | | |
| ExMUL | | | | |

 ${\tt ExMUL}.$ Tracks the use of the ${\tt multiplication}$ arithmetic ${\tt Functional}$ ${\tt Unit}$ (FU).

| $\overline{\text{RF} \mid 0}$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 31 |
|-------------------------------|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|--------|
| Qi | Qi Load1 | | | | | | | | | | |

Register Result Status. Shows the state of **register renaming** during execution. In other words, it shows the state of each floating-point register (F0-F31). It is a **snapshot of the Qi field** for each register in the floating-point register file.

- \bullet LD F2, 45(R3) is issued
 - LoadBuffer2 allocated
 - F2.Qi = Load2
- LD F6 (Instr. 1) starts execution:
 - Address calculated (R2 + 34)
 - Memory load begins

| Instruction | Issue | Start Execute | Write Result |
|------------------|-------|---------------|--------------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 2 | | |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | | | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | |

 ${\bf Instruction\ status.}$

| Name | y Vj | | Vk | Qk | | | |
|--------|------|----------|-------|----|--|--|--|
| Load1 | 34 | 34 v(R2) | | | | | |
| Load2 | 45 | 45 v(R3) | | | | | |
| EXLoad | 34 | | v(R2) | | | | |

 ${\tt EXLoad}~({\rm or}~{\tt EX_LD}).$

| | Nan | ne | ۷j | Qj | V | k | Qk | | Nan | ne | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------------------------|--------|----|-----|-----|---|---|----|-------|-----|----|------|----|----|----|
| | ADD | 1 | | | | | | | MUL | 1 | | | | |
| | ADD | 2 | | | | | | | MUL | 2 | | | | |
| | ExAl | DD | | | | | | | ExM | UL | | | | |
| | ExADD. | | | | | | | | | Ex | MUL. | | | |
| $\overline{\mathrm{RF}}$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | ? | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | | 31 |
| Qi | | | Loa | id2 | | | | Load1 | | | | | | |

Register Result Status.

- MULTD FO, F2, F4 is issued
 - Reservation Station = MUL1
 - Needs
 - * $F2 \rightarrow still pending from Load2 \rightarrow Qj = Load2$
 - * F4 \rightarrow assumed ready \rightarrow Vk = value = v(F4)
 - F0.Qi = MUL1
- LD F2 (Instr. 2) starts execution: Address calculated (R3 + 45); Memory load begins.
- Load (LD F6) has a delay and is still not finished. This is important because it causes **dependent instructions to wait**. However, this is the brilliance of Tomasulo's dataflow: these **instructions don't block the pipeline**, they just **wait for the tag (Load1) to appear in the CDB**.

| Instruction | Issue | Start Execute | Write Result |
|------------------|-------|---------------|--------------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 2 | | |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 3 | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | | | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | |

Instruction status.

| Name | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk | | |
|--------|----|----------|-------|----|--|--|
| Load1 | 34 | | v(R2) | | | |
| Load2 | 45 | 45 v(R3) | | | | |
| EXLoad | 34 | | v(R2) | | | |

EXLoad (or EX_LD).

| Name | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|-------|----|----|----|----|
| ADD1 | | | | |
| ADD2 | | | | |
| ExADD | | | | |

| Name Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|-----------|-------|-------|----|
| MUL1 | Load2 | v(F4) | |
| MUL2 | | | |
| ExMUL | | | |

ExADD. ExMUL.

| RF | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 31 |
|----|------|---|-------|---|---|---|-------|---|---|---|----|--------|
| Qi | MUL1 | | Load2 | | | | Load1 | | | | | |

Register Result Status.

- SUBD F8, F6, F2 is issued
 - Reservation Station = SUB1
 - Needs
 - * F6 → pending from Load1 → Qj = Load1 But the RS Load listens to the CDB for the Load1 tag. It sees the result of the CDB broadcast and overwrites its state:

$$\Rightarrow$$
 Qj = 0 Vj = v(F6)

- * F2 \rightarrow pending from Load2 \rightarrow Qk = Load2
- F8.Qi = SUB1
- No execution start yet for MUL or SUB, still waiting on operands. BUT, the result of loading the first instruction (value from memory) is sent on the Common Data Bus (CDB). And the SUB instruction has grabbed it and is now ready to start executing.

Also, in the register result status table, we insert the value of F6 (v(F6)) instead of leaving the Load1 tag. This is because the CDB sends the result to all listeners.

| Instruction | Issue | Start Execute | Write Result |
|------------------|-------|---------------|--------------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 2 | | |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 3 | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 4 | | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | |

Instruction status.

| Name | ۷j | Qj | Qk | | | | |
|--------|----|-------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| Load1 | 34 | | v(R2) | | | | |
| Load2 | 45 | v(R3) | | | | | |
| EXLoad | 34 | | v(R2) | | | | |

EXLoad (or EX_LD).



 ${\tt ExADD}.$

| Name | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|-------|----|-------|-------|----|
| MUL1 | | Load2 | v(F4) | |
| MUL2 | | | | |
| ExMUL | | | | |

 ${\tt ExMUL}.$

| RF | 0 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 31 |
|--------|-----|-------|---|---|---|-------|---|------|---|----|--------|
| Qi M | UL1 | Load2 | | | | v(F6) | | ADD1 | | | |

 ${\bf Register}\ {\bf Result}\ {\bf Status}.$

5. **Cycle 5**

RFQi

- DIVD F10, F0, F6 is issued
 - Reservation Station = DIV1
 - Needs:
 - * F0 \rightarrow pending from MUL1 \rightarrow Qj = MUL1
 - $\ast\,$ F6 is available thanks to the CDB
 - F10.Qi = DIV1
- LD F2 (Instr. 2) starts execution:
 - Addressed calculated (R3 + 45)
 - Memory load begins

| Instruction | Issue | Start Execute | Write Result |
|------------------|----------|----------------|--------------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 2 | <mark>5</mark> | |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 3 | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 4 | | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 5 | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | |

Instruction status.

| Name | ne Vj Qj | | Vk | Qk |
|--------|------------|--|-------|----|
| Load1 | | | | |
| Load2 | 45 | | v(R3) | |
| EXLoad | 45 | | v(R3) | |

EXLoad (or EX_LD).

| Name | V_ | j | Qj | Vk | Ç |)k | Name | Vj | Qj | | Vk | Qk |
|--------|-----|-------|----|----|----|------|-------|------|------|------|-------|----|
| ADD1 | v(F | 6) | | | Lo | ad2 | MUL1 | | Load | 12 | v(F4) | |
| ADD2 | | | | | | | MUL2 | | MUL | 1 | v(F6) | |
| ExADD | | | | | | | ExMUL | | | | | |
| ExADD. | | | | | | | | ExMU | IL. | | | |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | | 31 |
| MUL1 | L | .oad2 | 2 | | | v(F6 |) | ADD1 | | MUL2 | | |

Register Result Status.

- ADDD F6, F8, F2 is issued
 - Reservation Station = ADD2
 - Needs:
 - * F8 \rightarrow pending from ADD1 (SUB1) \rightarrow Qj = ADD1
 - * F2 \rightarrow pending from Load2 \rightarrow Qk = Load2
 - $\text{ F6.Qi} = \text{Lead1}^{\widetilde{\text{ADD2}}}$
- WAR on F6 has been eliminated:
 - Tomasulo renames the destination register of the ADDD instruction: F6 will now be written by ADD2, not by Load1 (cycle 1).
 - But crucially, DIVD was issued earlier (previous cycle); it already read F6's value from the Reservation Station of the Load1. It stored that value in Vk inside its RS (tag MUL2).
 - So even though ADDD will overwrite F6 later, it doesn't matter:
 DIVD already took what it needed and moved on.

The same rule is applied to SUBD.

| Instruction | Issue | Start Execute | Write Result |
|------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 2 | 5 | |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 3 | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 4 | | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 5 | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | <mark>6</mark> | | |

Instruction status.

| Name | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------|----|----|-------|----|
| Load1 | | | | |
| Load2 | 45 | | v(R3) | |
| EXLoad | 45 | | v(R3) | |

EXLoad (or EX_LD).



 ${\tt ExADD}.$

| Name Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|-----------|-------|-------|----|
| MUL1 | Load2 | v(F4) | |
| MUL2 | MUL1 | v(F6) | |
| ExMUL | | | |

ExMUL.

| $\overline{RF} \mid 0$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 31 |
|------------------------|---|-------|---|---|---|------|---|------|---|------|--------|
| Qi MUL1 | | Load2 | | | | ADD2 | | ADD1 | | MUL2 | |

Register Result Status.

- LD F2 completes execution. It broadcasts its result (value of F2) via the Common Data Bus (CDB). Forwarding takes place to both:
 - Register File: if Qi = Load2, then $F2 = value \Rightarrow Qi = 0$
 - Reservation Stations:
 - * MULD (MUL1): Qj = Load2 $\rightarrow \ \mathrm{now} \ \text{Vj} \ = \ \text{v(F2)} \ \mathrm{and} \ \text{Qj} \ = \ 0$
 - * SUBD (ADD1): Qk = Load2 \rightarrow now Vk = v(F2) and Qk = 0
 - * ADDD (ADD2): Qk = Load2 \rightarrow now Vk = v(F2) and Qk = 0
- ➤ DIVD F10, F0, F6 still waiting. Needs F0, which is being computed by MULD (Tag = MUL1). Can't execute yet.
- ★ ADDD F6, F8, F2 still waiting. Needs F0, but still waiting on F8, tag = ADD1 (result of SUBD).

| Instruction | Issue | Start Execute | Write Result |
|------------------|-------|---------------|--------------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 3 | | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 4 | | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 5 | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 6 | | |

Instruction status.

| Name | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------|----|----|-------|----|
| Load1 | | | | |
| Load2 | 45 | | v(R3) | |
| EXLoad | 45 | | v(R3) | |

EXLoad (or EX_LD).

| Name | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|-------|-------|------|-------|----|
| ADD1 | v(F6) | | v(F2) | |
| ADD2 | | ADD1 | v(F2) | |
| ExADD | | | | |

ExADD.



 ${\tt ExMUL}.$

| $\overline{\text{RF} \mid 0}$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 31 |
|-------------------------------|---|-------|---|---|---|------|---|------|---|------|--------|
| Qi MUL1 | | v(F2) | | | | ADD2 | | ADD1 | | MUL2 | |

Register Result Status.

- MULTD FO, F2, F4 starts execution in MUL1:
 - It was waiting on F2 (now received via CDB) and F4 was already ready
 - Now: Qj = 0, Qk = 0 \rightarrow ready to execute
 - Executing in MUL1 Functional Unit
- SUBD F8, F6, F2 starts execution in ADD1:
 - F6 was already ready from Cycle 4 (CDB)
 - F2 now arrives, both operands are ready
 - Executing in ADD1 Functional Unit

| Instruction | Issue | Start Execute | Write Result |
|------------------|-------|---------------|--------------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 3 | 8 | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 4 | 8 | |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 5 | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 6 | | |

Instruction status.

| Name | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------|----|----|----|----|
| Load1 | | | | |
| Load2 | | | | |
| EXLoad | | | | |

 ${\tt EXLoad} \ ({\rm or} \ {\tt EX_LD}).$

| Name | Vj | Qј | Vk | Qk | Name Vj | Qj | Vk | (|
|-------|-------|------|-------|----|---------------|------|-------|---|
| ADD1 | v(F6) | | v(F2) | | MUL1 v(F2) | | v(F4) | |
| ADD2 | | ADD1 | v(F2) | | MUL2 | MUL1 | v(F6) | |
| ExADD | v(F6) | | v(F2) | | ExMUL v(F2) | | v(F4) | |

ExADD. ExMUL. 2 7 RF0 3 5 6 8 1 4 10 31 MUL1 MUL2 Qi v(F2) ADD2 ADD1

Register Result Status.

- SUBD F8, F6, F2 finishes execution and writes result:
 - The result of F8 = F6 F2 is now available
 - Broadcasts on the CDB:
 - * Tag = ADD1 (RS that held SUBD)
 - * Value = result of F6 F2
- Forwarding from CDB occurs:
 - Register File:
 - * F8.Qi == ADD1, then write result in F8 and set F8.Qi = 0
 - Reservation Stations:
 - * ADDD F6, F8, F2 is waiting for F8;
 - * If Qj == ADD1, then Vj = v(F8) and Qj = 0
- The current execution MULD is still running (latency is 10 cycles) and will finish around cycle 17.

| Instruction | Issue | Start Execute | Write Result |
|------------------|-------|---------------|--------------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 3 | 8 | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 4 | 8 | 10 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 5 | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 6 | | |

Instruction status.

| Name | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------|----|----|----|----|
| Load1 | | | | |
| Load2 | | | | |
| EXLoad | | | | |

EXLoad (or EX_LD).

| Name | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|-------|-------|----|-------|----|
| ADD1 | v(F6) | | v(F2) | |
| ADD2 | v(F8) | | v(F2) | |
| ExADD | v(F6) | | v(F2) | |

| Name | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|-------|-------|------|-------|----|
| MUL1 | v(F2) | | v(F4) | |
| MUL2 | | MUL1 | v(F6) | |
| ExMUL | v(F2) | | v(F4) | |

ExADD. ExMUL.

| 3 | Instruction | Level | Parallelism |
|---|-------------|-------|-------------|
| | | | |

3.7 Tomasulo's Algorithm

| $\overline{\text{RF }\mid \ \ 0}$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 31 |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------|---|---|---|------|---|-------|---|------|--------|
| Qi MUL1 | | v(F2) | | | | ADD2 | | v(F8) | | MUL2 | |

Register Result Status.

Name

۷j

Qj

Vk

- ADDD F6, F8, F2 starts execution.
- MULTD F0, F2, F4 continues execution.
- DIVD still waiting.

| Instruction | Issue | Start Execute | Write Result |
|------------------|-------|---------------|--------------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 3 | 8 | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 4 | 8 | 10 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 5 | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 6 | 11 | |

Instruction status.

| Name | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------|----|----|----|----|
| Load1 | | | | |
| Load2 | | | | |
| EXLoad | | | | |

 ${\tt EXLoad} \ ({\rm or} \ {\tt EX_LD}).$

Qk

Name

۷j

Qj

Vk

Qk

| ADD | 1 | | | | | | MUL | 1 v(F | 2) | | v(F4) | |
|----------|-------------------|------|---|-----|----|------|-----|----------|----|------|-------|----|
| ADD | 2 v(| (F8) | 7 | (F2 | ?) | | MUL | 2 | | MUL1 | v(F6) | |
| ExA | ExADD v(F8) v(F2) | | | | | | ExM | UL v(F | 2) | | v(F4) | |
| ExADD. | | | | | | | | | Ex | MUL. | | |
| RF 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | | 31 |
| Qi MUI | _1 | v(F2 |) | | | ADD2 | | v(F8) | | MUL2 | | |

Register Result Status.

- ADDD F6, F8, F2 completes execution and write result.
- WAW hazard on F6 is avoided:
 - LD F6, 34(R2) originally wrote to F6 \rightarrow F6.Qi = Load1
 - ADDD F6, F8, F2 overwrites F6 \rightarrow F6.Qi = ADD2
 - But DIVD, which uses F6, was issued in cycle 5:
 - * It read the value of F6 at that time from Load 1
 - * It stored it into its reservation station
 - * So even if F6 gets overwritten later by ADDD, it doesn't matter
 - * DIVD already has the value it needed

| Instruction | Issue | Start Execute | Write Result |
|------------------|-------|---------------|--------------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 3 | 8 | |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 4 | 8 | 10 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 5 | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 6 | 11 | 13 |

Instruction status.

| Name | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------|----|----|----|----|
| Load1 | | | | |
| Load2 | | | | |
| EXLoad | | | | |

EXLoad (or EX_LD).

| Name | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk | Name | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|-------|-------|------|-------|----|-------|-------|-------|-------|----|
| ADD1 | | | | | MUL1 | v(F2) | | v(F4) | |
| ADD2 | v(F8) | | v(F2) | | MUL2 | | MUL1 | v(F6) | |
| ExADD | v(F8) | | v(F2) | | ExMUL | v(F2) | | v(F4) | |
| | Ex | ADD. | _ | | | E | xMUL. | | |

| $\overline{\mathrm{RF}}$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 31 |
|--------------------------|------|---|-------|---|---|---|-------|---|-------|---|------|--------|
| Qi | MUL1 | | v(F2) | | | | v(F6) | | v(F8) | | MUL2 | |

Register Result Status.

- MULTD F0, F2, F4 completes execution. Executed in MUL1 from cycle 8 to 18 (10 cycles total latency) and now broadcasts result on the Common Data Bus (CDB).
- DIVD is waiting for F0, but it is **now fully ready to start execution** in the next cycle.

| Instruction | Issue | Start Execute | Write Result |
|------------------|-------|---------------|--------------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 3 | 8 | 18 |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 4 | 8 | 10 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 5 | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 6 | 11 | 13 |

Instruction status.

| Name | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------|----|----|----|----|
| Load1 | | | | |
| Load2 | | | | |
| EXLoad | | | | |

EXLoad (or EX_LD).

| Name | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk | Name | Vi | Q.j | Vk | Qk |
|-------|----|----|----|----|-------|-------|-----|-------|----|
| ADD1 | | | | | MUL1 | v(F2) | -13 | v(F4) | |
| ADD2 | | | | | MUL2 | v(F0) | | v(F6) | |
| ExADD | | | | | ExMUL | v(F2) | | v(F4) | |

 ${\tt ExADD}.$

| RF | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 31 |
|----|-------|---|-------|---|---|---|-------|---|-------|---|------|--------|
| Qi | v(F0) | | v(F2) | | | | v(F6) | | v(F8) | | MUL2 | |

Register Result Status.

- DIVD F10, F0, F6 begins execution in MUL2.
- Division latency is not shown, but based on typical values in FP pipelines (and possibly earlier context), it may be **up to 20 cycles**. Therefore, DIVD will likely finish in a later cycle (e.g., 38+ depending on design).

| Instruction | Issue | Start Execute | Write Result |
|------------------|-------|---------------|--------------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 3 | 8 | 18 |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 4 | 8 | 10 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 5 | 19 | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 6 | 11 | 13 |

Instruction status.

| Name | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------|----|----|----|----|
| Load1 | | | | |
| Load2 | | | | |
| EXLoad | | | | |

EXLoad (or EX_LD).

| Name | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk | Name | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|-------|----|----|----|----|-------|-------|----|-------|----|
| ADD1 | | | | | MUL1 | | | | |
| ADD2 | | | | | MUL2 | v(F0) | | v(F6) | |
| ExADD | | | | | ExMUL | v(FO) | | v(F6) | |

 ${\tt ExMUL}.$

ExADD.

| $\overline{\mathrm{RF}}$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 31 |
|--------------------------|-------|---|-------|---|---|---|-------|---|-------|---|------|--------|
| Qi | v(F0) | | v(F2) | | | | v(F6) | | v(F8) | | MUL2 | |

Register Result Status.

Name

 $\frac{\mathrm{RF}}{\mathtt{Qi}}$

۷j

Qj

Vk

Qk

- DIVD F10, F0, F6 completes execution and writes result after a long 40-cycle latency.
- All instructions have issued, executed and written their results. No hazards occured, and Tomasulo's algorithm correctly handled:
 - ✓ RAW (by waiting with tags).
 - ✓ WAR and WAW (by renaming registers with Qi, Qj, Qk).
 - ✓ Long execution delays (like the 40-cycle DIVD) without blocking unrelated instructions.

| Instruction | Issue | Start Execute | Write Result |
|------------------|-------|---------------|---------------|
| LD F6, 34(R2) | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| LD F2, 45(R3) | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | 3 | 8 | 18 |
| SUBD F8, F6, F2 | 4 | 8 | 10 |
| DIVD F10, F0, F6 | 5 | 19 | 59 |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | 6 | 11 | 13 |

Instruction status.

| Name | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------|----|----|----|----|
| Load1 | | | | |
| Load2 | | | | |
| EXLoad | | | | |

EXLoad (or EX_LD).

| ADI | 01 | | | | | | MUL: | 1 | | | | |
|-------|-----|-------|----|---|---|-------|------|--------|------|--------|------|----|
| ADI | 02 | | | | | | MUL | 2 v | (F0) | v | (F6) | |
| ExA | ADD | | | | | - | ExM | UL v | (F0) | V | (F6) | |
| | | ExADI | D. | | | | | | E | xMUL. | | |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | | 31 |
| v(F0) | | v(F2) | | | | v(F6) | | v(F8) | | v(F10) | | |

Name

۷j

Qj

Vk

Qk

Register Result Status.

3.7.7 Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding

Both Tomasulo's algorithm and Scoreboarding (introduced in the CDC 6600) are **dynamic instruction scheduling** techniques designed to:

- Improve Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP)
- Allow out-of-order execution
- Handle data hazards without compiler involvement

But they differ in:

- How they track operands
- Where renaming happens
- How results are forwarded
- How decentralized the logic is

11 How Tomasulo improves over Scoreboarding

- 1. Eliminates WAR and WAW hazards. Scoreboarding can only resolve RAW hazards, WAR and WAW cause stalls in Scoreboarding. Tomasulo's register renaming via RS tags removes these conflicts entirely.
- Allows hardware-level dataflow execution. Scoreboarding relies on centralized logic to check operand availability. Tomasulo allows instructions to execute as soon as operands are available, independently. This creates a data-driven execution model, more similar to modern superscalar and out-of-order CPUs.
- 3. Forwarding via the Common Data Bus (CDB)
 - In Scoreboarding: instructions must wait for register file updates
 - In Tomasulo: values are **broadcast to all RSs and RF** as soon as they're computed
- 4. Reservation Stations = Smarter Instruction Buffers.

Hold operands, operation type, and source RS tags. Track readiness locally and act like **mini control units**, freeing up the need for centralized logic (Scoreboard).

However, despite its limitations, Scoreboarding:

- Simpler to implement
- Historically foundational (used in the CDC 6600)
- More hardware-economical for small-scale or embedded designs

But for high-performance out-of-order execution, Tomasulo's model is the clear winner.

| Scoreboarding | Tomasulo's Algorithm | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Operan | d Tracking | | | | | | | |
| Uses register availability | Uses tag-based tracking via RS | | | | | | | |
| Register Renaming | | | | | | | | |
| × None | ✓ Implicit via RSs (Qi/Qj/Qk) | | | | | | | |
| WAR/WAW Hazards | | | | | | | | |
| ★ Must be stalled explicitly | ✓ Eliminated by renaming | | | | | | | |
| Operand 1 | Read Timing | | | | | | | |
| At execution start | At issue (or when available) via CDB | | | | | | | |
| Operand | Forwarding | | | | | | | |
| $\boldsymbol{\times}$ No, must wait for register write-back | ✓ Yes, uses Common Data Bus (CDB) | | | | | | | |
| Contr | ol Model | | | | | | | |
| Centralized Scoreboard | Decentralized logic at each RS $+$ FU | | | | | | | |
| Function | onal Units | | | | | | | |
| Check Scoreboard for availability | RS check tags and readiness locally | | | | | | | |
| Instruction | on Readiness | | | | | | | |
| RAW only (no renaming) | RAW + renamed operands (data-driven) | | | | | | | |
| Com | non Bus | | | | | | | |
| $\boldsymbol{\times}$ No shared result forwarding | \checkmark Shared broadcast on CDB | | | | | | | |
| Con | plexity | | | | | | | |
| Simpler renaming logic | More complex, but higher performance | | | | | | | |

Table 19: Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding.

▲ Drawbacks of Tomasulo's Algorithm

While Tomasulo's algorithm was a **revolutionary advancement** in dynamic scheduling, especially for floating-point pipelines, it is not without **limitations**. As computer architecture evolved into superscalar and multithreaded designs, certain drawbacks of Tomasulo's original formulation became more evident.

- 1. Complex Hardware Implementation. Tomasulo's distributed, tagdriven control system requires:
 - Reservation Stations (RS) with operand tracking logic
 - \bullet Register File with tag fields (Qi)
 - A Common Data Bus (CDB) that broadcasts to many destinations
 - Logic to match tags and grab values dynamically

While this provides high performance, it increases hardware area, control complexity and power consumption.

In particular, **scaling the CDB** becomes harder with many Functional Units and many RSs, since broadcasting to all of them becomes a bottleneck.

- 2. Centralized Common Data Bus (CDB) Bottleneck. Tomasulo relies on a single CDB to broadcast results to all waiting RSs and update the register file. But:
 - Only one instruction can write on the CDB per cycle
 - This limits write throughput
 - It becomes a **bottleneck** in wide-issue (superscalar) processors

Modern designs mitigate this with multiple CDBs, local bypassing networks, and reorder buffers (ROB) with centralized commit stages (advanced topics).

- 3. Lack of Support for Precise Exceptions. Tomasulo as originally designed does not support precise exceptions.⁶ This problem is due to the structure of the algorithm:
 - Tomasulo allows **out-of-order completion** and **in-place register** writes
 - Once a value is written to the register file via CDB, it's hard to "undo" it.

Scoreboarding can handle precise exceptions more gracefully. However, modern CPUs integrate Tomasulo-style scheduling with ROB (Reorder Buffer) to restore precise exceptions.

- 4. Limited Scalability for Superscalar Designs. Original Tomasulo was built for one instruction per cycle pipelines (like IBM 360/91). But in superscalar processors:
 - Multiple instructions issue and retire each cycle;
 - The CDB and tag-matching logic must scale accordingly;
 - Reservation Stations structures become more complex with many FUs and wider pipelines.

Modern out-of-order cores use advanced techniques such as Register Alias Tables (RAT), physical register files, and ROB-based commit logic. These ideas **evolved from Tomasulo**, but allow better scaling and modularity.

⁶In precise exception handling, all instructions **before the faulting one** must complete, and none **after it** should affect the architectural state.

3.7.8 Register Renaming

The Register Renaming techniques have already been discussed in the previous sections. In section 3.1.2 (page 71) we gave a very short presentation dedicated to understand how to solve name dependencies, and in section 3.7.2 (page 136) we have seen what is the difference between static register renaming and implicit register renaming. In this section we will go deeper and understand how to apply this technique to the tomasulo algorithm.

3.7.8.1 Introduction

In modern out-of-order execution processors, one of the most significant bottle-necks to exploiting Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP) lies in false data dependencies. Among these, WAR (Write After Read) and WAW (Write After Write) hazards can severely restrict the freedom to reorder instructions during execution. These are not true dependencies (like RAW, Read After Write), but are constraints imposed by the limited number of registers visible in the Instruction Set Architecture (ISA).

To tackle these issues, **Register Renaming** is employed, a mechanism that dynamically or statically **replaces architectural registers with a larger set of physical registers**, breaking these false dependencies and enabling more parallel execution.

Types of Register Renaming

There are two primary approaches to register renaming:

- Static Register Renaming, handled at compile-time, often via techniques like loop unrolling and aggressive register allocation. This relies on ISA-visible registers and requires the compiler to explicitly assign new register names to avoid reuse conflicts.
- Implicit (Dynamic) Register Renaming, which is employed in hardware at runtime, often as part of advanced scheduling mechanisms such as Tomasulo's algorithm. This method uses structures like reservation stations and reorder buffers to rename registers implicitly and track dependencies through tags instead of register names.

? Why Register Renaming is important?

Without register renaming, WAR and WAW hazards can stall instruction issue unnecessarily:

- A WAR hazard arises when an instruction wants to write to a register that a previous instruction still needs to read.
- A WAW hazard occurs when two instructions write to the same register, and their order must be preserved to maintain correctness.

By decoupling the programmer-visible registers from the physical storage used in the microarchitecture, renaming allows:

- ✓ Multiple instructions writing to the "same" architectural register to execute out of order.
- **✓ Concurrent execution** of independent iterations of loops.
- ✓ Elimination of false dependencies, improving pipeline utilization and throughput.

Register renaming is a fundamental enabler of modern ILP exploitation. Whether implemented statically via compiler transformations or dynamically through hardware mechanisms like Tomasulo's algorithm, it allows us to **overlap instruction execution** aggressively and avoid performance penalties due to naming limitations of the architectural register file.

3.7.8.2 Loop Unrolling and Code Scheduling

Tomasulo's algorithm is a classic dynamic scheduling method that **naturally incorporates implicit register renaming**. It is designed to **overlap instruction execution** even when instructions involve true or false dependencies, by dynamically resolving hazards at runtime.

In this section, we focus specifically on **how Tomasulo's algorithm deals** with a single loop, showing the issues of data hazards and motivating why renaming, even if implicit, is critical. Furthermore, we show three techniques, included register renaming, to reach the best optimization. We also show three techniques, including register renaming, to achieve the best optimization.

Note that these topics are already covered in the Tomasulo section (3.7.2, page 137).

? Why Renaming?

Consider the following floating-point loop:

```
1 Loop: LD F0, O(R1) ; Load word into F0 from address O+R1
2 MULTD F4, F0, F2 ; Multiply F0 and F2, result into F4
3 SD F4, O(R1) ; Store word from F4 to address O+R1
4 SUBI R1, R1, #8 ; Decrement R1 by 8
5 BNEZ R1, Loop ; Branch to Loop if R1 ≠ 0
```

Each loop iteration consists of five instructions. We assume branch prediction correctly predicts the loop branch as taken. But are there dependencies? Yes, several hazards arise:

- 1. RAW (Read After Write) on F0 and F4
- 2. WAW (Write After Write) on F0 and F4 across iterations
- 3. WAR (Write After Read) on R1 due to address updates and branching

These hazards limit how aggressively we can overlap loop iterations. Let's break down the hazard types across consecutive iterations:

- Within a single iteration:
 - MULTD depends on the result of LD (needs F0).
 - SD depends on the result of MULTD (needs F4).
 - BNEZ depends on SUBI to determine the loop condition.
- Across iterations:
 - LD of next iteration writes F0, creating a WAW hazard with the previous LD.
 - MULTD of next iteration writes F4, also leading to WAW hazard.
 - SUBI and BNEZ reuse R1, creating WAR hazards.

Without renaming, these hazards would serialize iterations, nullifying any gain from speculative execution.

■ Tomasulo's Contribution: Implicit Register Renaming

Tomasulo's algorithm automatically resolves these hazards by **renaming registers dynamically**:

- It uses **reservation stations** that hold **tags** instead of register names.
- When an instruction needs a value, it can either:
 - Use the value directly if it's ready;
 - Or wait for a tag associated with the producing reservation station.
- WAW and WAR hazards are naturally eliminated because **register** names are no longer the synchronization point, tags are!

Thus, each iteration of the loop can proceed independently as soon as its operands are available, even if they involve the same architectural register names.

2 Loop Unrolling combined with Register Renaming

While Tomasulo's algorithm handles implicit renaming at runtime, an alternative strategy to reduce the impact of dependencies, particularly across loop iterations, is to act at compile time, through a technique called **Loop Unrolling** combined with **Register Renaming**.

Loop Unrolling is a compiler optimization technique (or sometimes a manual optimization) that expands the loop body by replicating its operations multiple times in sequence, reducing the number of iterations and minimizing the overhead of branch instructions. Instead of executing a small amount of work many times, we "stretch out" multiple loop iterations into a single, larger block of straight-line code.

In our context, Loop Unrolling aims to expose more parallelism statically and to reduce the loop overhead by executing multiple iterations at once. Register Renaming in this context is crucial: it eliminates artificial WAW and WAR dependencies that would otherwise serialize execution.

Let's revisit the same loop we discussed before:

```
Loop: LD F0, O(R1)

MULTD F4, F0, F2

SD F4, O(R1)

SUBI R1, R1, #8

BNEZ R1, Loop
```

If we simply replicate this loop multiple times without renaming registers, WAW and WAR hazards would prevent full exploitation of the increased instruction stream. To eliminate such hazards, we must rename the registers properly during unrolling.

Here's the unrolled version of the loop, unrolled four times, with **explicit register renaming** to avoid hazards:

```
Loop: LD
                  F0, 0(R1)
           MULTD F4, F0, F2
                  F4, 0(R1)
           T.D
                  F6, -8(R1)
           MULTD F8, F6, F2
6
                  F8, -8(R1)
           SD
           LD F10, -16(R1)
MULTD F12, F10, F2
9
10
                  F12, -16(R1)
12
                  F14, -24(R1)
           T.D
13
           MULTD F16, F14, F2
14
                  F16, -24(R1)
           SD
16
           SUBI R1, R1, #32
17
           BNEZ R1, Loop
18
```

Observations

- New registers are introduced: F6, F8, F10, F12, F14, F16.
- No two iterations reuse the same destination register.
- WAW hazards between iterations are eliminated.
- More operations are ready to issue independently.
- Original loop: 5 instructions per iteration. Unrolled loop: 14 instructions for 4 iterations, so 3.5 instructions per iteration on average.
 Thus, unrolling not only exposes parallelism but also increases code density efficiency.

Benefits

- Higher ILP: Each iteration's operations are now largely independent.
- ✓ Reduced Loop Overhead: The branch and counter updates are performed once every 4 iterations, decreasing control dependencies.
- ✓ Efficient Use of Hardware: Multiple functional units can work simultaneously, better exploiting available execution bandwidth.
- ✓ **Preparation for Further Optimizations**: The code can now be *rescheduled* to minimize stalls (we'll see this in future sections).

Finally, Tomasulo's algorithm does not perform loop unrolling by itself. Loop Unrolling is a compiler optimization. However, thanks to dynamic register renaming and scheduling, Tomasulo can overlap multiple loop iterations even without unrolling. This behavior mimics some of benefits of loop unrolling at runtime, but it doesn't physically unroll the code or replicate instructions.

7 Even more performance: Code Scheduling with Register Renaming

Once we have unrolled a loop and renamed registers to avoid false dependencies, the next logical optimization is code scheduling. The goal is now to rearrange the unrolled instructions to minimize stalls, especially those caused by true RAW (Read After Write) dependencies or long execution latencies (e.g., memory loads or floating-point operations). Thus, even with register renaming, the order in which instructions are issued still matters to achieve maximum parallelism.

Code Scheduling is the process of reordering the instructions in a program (especially after loop unrolling and register renaming) to maximize parallelism during execution. It is a compiler-level or sometimes hardware-level optimization. The goal is to feed the CPU continuously with ready-to-execution instructions.

Let's look at the previous code again, and by unrolling the loop by a factor of 4 and renaming the registers correctly, we had this sequence:

```
F0, 0(R1)
2 MULTD F4, F0, F2
        F4, 0(R1)
3 SD
        F6, -8(R1)
4 LD
5 MULTD F8, F6, F2
        F8, -8(R1)
6 SD
        F10, -16(R1)
8 MULTD F12, F10, F2
9 SD
        F12, -16(R1)
10 LD
        F14, -24(R1)
11 MULTD F16, F14, F2
12 SD
        F16, -24(R1)
        R1, R1, #32
13 SUBI
14 BNEZ R1, Loop
```

⚠ Problem: if we execute this exactly in order, some instructions will have to wait unnecessarily for their operands because of true dependencies (particularly between LD and MULTD). So the **key idea** of code scheduling is:

- Group independent instructions together as much as possible.
- **Delay dependent instructions** just enough to satisfy their true data dependencies.
- Hide long latencies (e.g., waiting for a memory load) by doing useful work in parallel.

After careful rescheduling, the reordered code looks like:

```
1 LD F0, 0(R1)
2 LD F6, -8(R1)
3 LD F10, -16(R1)
4 LD F14, -24(R1)
5 MULTD F4, F0, F2
6 MULTD F8, F6, F2
7 MULTD F12, F10, F2
8 MULTD F16, F14, F2
9 SD F4, 0(R1)
```

```
10 SD F8, -8(R1)
11 SD F12, -16(R1)
12 SUBI R1, R1, #32
13 BNEZ R1, Loop
14 SD F16, -24(R1) ; In branch delay slot
```

The changes are:

- All **loads** are moved upfront, memory latency can be hidden while computing.
- Multiplications (dependent on loads) are grouped next.
- Stores happen only after the corresponding multiply is finished, respecting the RAW dependency.
- SUBI and BNEZ are moved right before the branch to reduce branching penalties.
- The last store (SD F16) is placed in the branch delay slot, making clever use of a wasted cycle.

And the benefits are:

- ✓ Load latency hidden. Loads start early while compute units are idle.
- Maximal Floating Point unit usage. Multiple MULTDs can be issued in parallel.
- ✓ Minimal pipeline stalls. Operands ready when needed.
- ✓ Reduced branch penalties. Good use of branch delay slot.

| Technique | How Tomasulo handles it |
|-------------------|---|
| Register Renaming | ✓ Yes, dynamic, using RSs and tags. |
| Code Scheduling | ✓ Yes, dynamic, based on operand availability. |
| Loop Unrolling | X No, but it can dynamically overlap iterations thanks |
| | to renaming $+$ scheduling. |

Table 20: Does Tomasulo's algorithm adopt Loop Unrolling, Register Renaming, and Code Scheduling?

3.7.8.3 How Tomasulo Overlaps Iterations of Loops

Tomasulo's algorithm can **dynamically overlap multiple iterations** of a loop **even without unrolling the code**, thanks to **three main tricks**:

- Implicit Register Renaming via Reservation Stations. Tomasulo does not use the architectural register names (like F0, F4) to track data anymore. Instead, it replaces every operand with a dynamic tag that points to a Reservation Station (RS). This means: two iterations that both write to F0 are treated separately, because each LD or MULTD producing F0 will have its own RS tag.
 - **♥** WAR and WAW hazards disappear.
- Each instruction gets its own Reservation Station. In Tomasulo, each new instruction (even from a new loop iteration) gets its own Reservation Station. So multiple instances of LD, MULTD, etc., from different loop iterations can be active at the same time. Even if the instructions all logically use F0, F4, etc., hardware sees them as completely different because they are tied to different RS entries.
 - **⊘** Dynamic loop unrolling effect: many loop iterations proceed in parallel without modifying the loop code.
- Multiple Functional Units and Branch Prediction. To exploit this properly, we must have:
 - 1. **Multiple Functional Units** (e.g., several FP multipliers and memory load units).
 - 2. Branch Prediction that allows speculative execution beyond the loop control instruction (like BNEZ).

Thus, Tomasulo speculatively fetches, issues, and schedules instructions from many iterations ahead, even before knowing if the loop will finish.

✓ Instruction issuing moves faster than control flow.

Tomasulo overlaps loop iterations by making the Reservation Stations act like an extended virtual register file, where each operation, even from different iterations, can proceed independently and dynamically, breaking naming limitations. This is sometimes called: Dynamic Loop Unrolling, Dynamic Specualtive Execution, Dynamic Out-of-Order Parallelism. All enabled automatically by Tomasulo's mechanism.

3.7.8.4 Tomasulo Loop Execution

We now analyze a **concrete example** of how Tomasulo's algorithm **dynamically overlaps multiple loops iterations**, using **register renaming** and **out-of-order execution**.

The loop we consider is:

```
1 Loop:

2 LD F0, 0(R1)

3 MULTD F4, F0, F2

4 SD F4, 0(R1)

5 SUBI R1, R1, #8

6 BNEZ R1, Loop
```

X Setup Assumptions

- Cache miss on the first LD \rightarrow 8 clock cycles.
- Cache hit on the second LD \rightarrow 1 clock cycles.
- FP MULTD operation latency \rightarrow 4 clock cycles.
- Branch Prediction \rightarrow branch assumed taken (so iterations continue).
- Only SUBI and BNEZ clock times are shown explicitly for clarity.
- 5 instructions per loop iteration.

Thus, memory accesses are slow, and floating-point operations are moderately slow compared to integer operations.

A Hazards

- X RAW hazards on F0, F4, R1.
- ✓ (eliminated dynamically, thanks to Tomasulo's implicit register renaming) WAW hazards mainly on R1.
- ✓ (eliminated dynamically, thanks to Tomasulo's implicit register renaming) WAW hazards on F0 and F4 across iterations.

E Structures in Tomasulo's algorithm

- Instruction Status Table (or Instruction Queue, or Tracking Table), tracks the status of each issued instruction through its three major stages: issue, execute and write result. Allow us to monitor the instruction flow cycle-by-cycle.
- Reservation Stations Table, temporarily hold instructions waiting to execute, along with operand values or operand tags if values are not yet available. Performs dynamic register renaming and resolve dependencies internally before issuing instructions to functional units.

- Register Result Status Table, tells which Reservation Station (RS) is responsible for generating the current value of each architectural register. Allows forwarding and prevents WAR/WAW hazards, by making reads wait for the right instruction to finish.
- Load and Store Buffers (Memory Buffers), manage memory operations separately, since memory addresses take time to compute and loads/stores have different latencies. Supports out-of-order memory access while ensuring correct memory ordering when necessary.

- The first instruction from iteration 1, LD F0, O(R1), is issued. It is assigned to Load Buffer 1 (Load1), marked as busy. The memory address to load from is calculated: R1 = 80, so the load address is 80
- F0 is now associated with Load1 in the register status table. This
 means:
 - Any instruction that wants to read F0 must wait for Load1 to complete and broadcast its result.
 - Tomasulo does not write to F0 immediately, tag Load1 is what matters now.
- The other instructions (MULTD, SD, etc.) are **not issued yet** in this cycle. They are waiting because their source operands depend on FO (the load result), which is **not ready** yet. Only the first load is active at this point.

At cycle 1, we **prepare the first data** to flow through Tomasulo's architecture: we **rename** F0 dynamically, **assign** it to a load buffer, and **start the memory access** (which will take 8 cycles because of cache miss). All following instructions **must track this tag** (Load1) to know when F0 will be ready.

| Iter. | Instruction | Issue | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|-------|------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 1 | | |
| 1 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | | | |
| 1 | SD F4, 0(R1) | | | |
| 2 | LD F0, 0, R1 | | | |
| 2 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | | | |
| 2 | SD F4, O(R1) | | | |

Instruction status.



Load and Store Buffers.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | ۷j | Vk | Qj | Qk |
|------|-------|------|----|----|----|----|----|
| | Add1 | No | | | | | |
| | Add2 | No | | | | | |
| | Add3 | No | | | | | |
| | Mult1 | No | | | | | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | |

Reservation Stations.

| Clock | R1 | FO | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|-------|----|-------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----------|
| 1 | 80 | Load1 | | | | | | | |

Register result status.

- Instruction MULTD F4, F0, F2 (from iteration 1) is **issued**. It is assigned to Mult1 (a multiplication Reservation Station). Operands:
 - F2 is ready, its value is available \rightarrow Vj $\,=$ R(F2)
 - F0 is not ready, waiting on Load1 to produce it $\rightarrow Qj = Load1$.
- F0 is still pending, being loaded by Load1. F4 will eventually be produced by the MULTD operation (currently waiting for F0 to complete).

| Iter. | Instruction | Issue | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|-------|------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 1 | | |
| 1 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 2 | | |
| 1 | SD F4, 0(R1) | | | |
| 2 | LD F0, 0, R1 | | | |
| 2 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | | | |
| 2 | SD F4, O(R1) | | | |

Instruction status.

| | Busy | Addr | FU |
|--------|------|------|----|
| Load1 | Yes | 80 | \ |
| Load2 | No | | \ |
| Load3 | No | | \ |
| Store1 | No | | |
| Store2 | No | | |
| Store3 | No | | |

Load and Store Buffers.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | ۷j | Vk | Qj | Qk |
|------|-------|------|-------|----|-------|-------|----|
| | Add1 | No | | | | | |
| | Add2 | No | | | | | |
| | Add3 | No | | | | | |
| | Mult1 | Yes | MULTD | | R(F2) | Load1 | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | |

| Clock R1 | FO | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|------------|-------|----|-------|----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2 80 | Load1 | | Mult1 | | | | | |

Register result status.

• Instruction SD F4, O(R1) (store) from iteration 1 is **issued**. It is assigned to Store1 (store buffer). The store buffer must wait for F4 to be computed by Mult1. We record the tag of the functional unit that will produce the needed value F4.

| Iter. | Instruction | Issue | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|-------|------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 1 | | |
| 1 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 2 | | |
| 1 | SD F4, O(R1) | 3 | | |
| 2 | LD F0, 0, R1 | | | |
| 2 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | | | |
| 2 | SD F4, 0(R1) | | | |

Instruction status.

| | Busy | Addr | FU |
|--------|------|------|-------|
| Load1 | Yes | 80 | \ |
| Load2 | No | | \ |
| Load3 | No | | \ |
| Store1 | Yes | 80 | Mult1 |
| Store2 | No | | |
| Store3 | No | | |

Load and Store Buffers.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | ۷j | Vk | Qj | Qk |
|------|-------|------|-------|----|-------|-------|----|
| | Add1 | No | | | | | |
| | Add2 | No | | | | | |
| | Add3 | No | | | | | |
| | Mult1 | Yes | MULTD | | R(F2) | Load1 | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | |

Reservation Stations.

| Clock R1 | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|------------|-------|----|-------|----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 3 80 | Load1 | | Mult1 | | | | | |

Register result status.

- We have skipped cycle 4 and 5 because we are only waiting for LD, MULTD or SD updates. In cycle 5, register R1 becomes 72 due to the operation SUBI R1, R1, #8.
- Instruction LD F0, O(R1) from iteration 2 is now issued into Load2 buffer. This new load has a cache hit (remember: only the first load had a cache miss).
- F0 is again associated with Load2 (the second load). The previous F0 result (from Load1) is **overwritten** by the new F0 pending load. Even though the logical register F0 is overwritten, the data dependency graph remains correct, because **Tomasulo tracks data flow by tags**, not register names. Thus:
 - MULTD F4, F0, F2 (iteration 1): waits for Load1 to complete (old F0)
 - MULTD F4, F0, F2 (iteration 2): will wait for Load2 to complete (new F0)

⊘ WAW hazard avoided by dynamic renaming. New instructions get the new F0 and old instructions already locked the old value.

| Iter. | Instruction | Issue | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|-------|------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 1 | | |
| 1 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 2 | | |
| 1 | SD F4, O(R1) | 3 | | |
| 2 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 6 | | |
| 2 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | | | |
| 2 | SD F4, 0(R1) | | | |

Instruction status.

| | Busy | Addr | FU |
|--------|------|-----------------------|-------|
| Load1 | Yes | 80 | \ |
| Load2 | Yes | 72 | \ |
| Load3 | No | | \ |
| Store1 | Yes | 80 | Mult1 |
| Store2 | No | | |
| Store3 | No | | |

Load and Store Buffers.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | ۷j | Vk | Qj | Qk |
|------|-------|------|-------|----|-------|-------|----|
| | Add1 | No | | | | | |
| | Add2 | No | | | | | |
| | Add3 | No | | | | | |
| | Mult1 | Yes | MULTD | | R(F2) | Load1 | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | |

Reservation Stations.

| Clock R1 | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|------------|-------|----|-------|----|----|-----|-----|---------|
| 6 72 | Load2 | | Mult1 | | | | | |

Register result status.

• Even though the second load is ready (cache hit, 1 cycle latency, and issued in cycle 6), it must wait for the first load to complete because they share the same architectural address and could have aliasing or store/load order dependencies. So unless advanced speculation is used, loads and stores to the same address must be done in program order.

This is called **Memory Disambiguation**. In out-of-order processors, memory disambiguation is the logic that **decides whether two loads/stores/loads can safely reorder**. Tomasulo in its original form **does not perform aggressive disambiguation**.

• MULTD F4, F0, F2 (iteration 2) is issued.

| Iter. | Instruction | Issue | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|-------|------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 1 | | |
| 1 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 2 | | |
| 1 | SD F4, O(R1) | 3 | | |
| 2 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 6 | | |
| 2 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 7 | | |
| 2 | SD F4, O(R1) | | | |

Instruction status.

| | Busy | Addr | FU |
|--------|------|------|-------|
| Load1 | Yes | 80 | \ |
| Load2 | Yes | 72 | \ |
| Load3 | No | | \ |
| Store1 | Yes | 80 | Mult1 |
| Store2 | No | | |
| Store3 | No | | |

Load and Store Buffers.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Vj | Vk | Qj | Qk |
|------|-------|------|-------|----|-------|-------|----|
| | Add1 | No | | | | | |
| | Add2 | No | | | | | |
| | Add3 | No | | | | | |
| | Mult1 | Yes | MULTD | | R(F2) | Load1 | |
| | Mult2 | Yes | MULTD | | R(F2) | Load2 | |

| Clock R1 | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|------------|-------|----|-------|----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 7 72 | Load2 | | Mult2 | | | | | |

Register result status.

- SD F4, O(R1) (iteration 2) is issued. It is assigned to Store2 (store buffer). The store buffer must wait for F4 to be computed by Mult2. We record the tag of the functional unit that will produce the needed value F4.
- WAW (Write After Write) hazards on registers F0 and F4 have been resolved, meaning the first and second iterations are now fully overlapped.

| Iter. | Instruction | Issue | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|-------|------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 1 | | |
| 1 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 2 | | |
| 1 | SD F4, O(R1) | 3 | | |
| 2 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 6 | | |
| 2 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 7 | | |
| 2 | SD F4, 0(R1) | 8 | | |

Instruction status.

| | Busy | Addr | FU |
|--------|------|---------------|-------|
| Load1 | Yes | 80 | \ |
| Load2 | Yes | 72 | \ |
| Load3 | No | | \ |
| Store1 | Yes | 80 | Mult1 |
| Store2 | Yes | 72 | Mult2 |
| Store3 | No | | |

Load and Store Buffers.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | ۷j | Vk | Qj | Qk |
|------|-------|------|-------|----|-------|-------|----|
| | Add1 | No | | | | | |
| | Add2 | No | | | | | |
| | Add3 | No | | | | | |
| | Mult1 | Yes | MULTD | | R(F2) | Load1 | |
| | Mult2 | Yes | MULTD | | R(F2) | Load2 | |

| Clock R1 | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|----------|-------|----|-------|----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 8 72 | Load2 | | Mult2 | | | | | |

Register result status.

- LD F0, O(R1) (iteration 1, address 80, cache miss) finally completes and writes back in the next cycle (1 cycle latency). Now the LD F0, O(R1) from iteration 2 can start its execution.
- Even though we don't track the SUBI instruction, it is issued in this cycle (iteration 2).

| Iter. | Instruction | Issue | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|-------|------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 1 | 9 | |
| 1 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 2 | | |
| 1 | SD F4, O(R1) | 3 | | |
| 2 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 6 | | |
| 2 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 7 | | |
| 2 | SD F4, O(R1) | 8 | | |

Instruction status.

| | Busy | Addr | FU |
|--------|------|------|-------|
| Load1 | Yes | 80 | \ |
| Load2 | Yes | 72 | \ |
| Load3 | No | | \ |
| Store1 | Yes | 80 | Mult1 |
| Store2 | Yes | 72 | Mult2 |
| Store3 | No | | |

Load and Store Buffers.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | ۷j | Vk | Qj | Qk |
|------|-------|------|-------|----|-------|-------|----|
| | Add1 | No | | | | | |
| | Add2 | No | | | | | |
| | Add3 | No | | | | | |
| | Mult1 | Yes | MULTD | | R(F2) | Load1 | |
| | Mult2 | Yes | MULTD | | R(F2) | Load2 | |

| Clock R1 | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|------------|-------|----|-------|----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 9 72 | Load2 | | Mult2 | | | | | |

Register result status.

• LD F0, O(R1) (iteration 1) now writes back (1 cycle latency). It also sends the result through the CDB. The value written can be represented as M[80], indicating the location of memory at address 80.

Mult1 was listening in the CDB for the Load1 value; now it receives the update, so it sets the Qj entry to zero and updates its Vj value with the value in memory at address 80 (M[80]).

- The second load (Load2) completes its execution in 1 cycle thanks to the cache hit. In the next cycle, the result is written back. This instruction was blocked by the previous load to avoid too aggressive memory disambiguation.
- Even though we don't track the BNEZ instruction, it is issued in this cycle (iteration 2). This updates the value in register R1 from 72 to 64 (minus 8).

| Iter. | Instruction | Issue | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|-------|------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 1 | 9 | 10 |
| 1 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 2 | | |
| 1 | SD F4, 0(R1) | 3 | | |
| 2 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 6 | 10 | |
| 2 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 7 | | |
| 2 | SD F4, O(R1) | 8 | | |

Instruction status.

| | Busy | Addr | FU |
|--------|------|-----------------------|-------|
| Load1 | No | | \ |
| Load2 | Yes | 72 | \ |
| Load3 | No | | \ |
| Store1 | Yes | 80 | Mult1 |
| Store2 | Yes | 72 | Mult2 |
| Store3 | No | | |

Load and Store Buffers.



Reservation Stations.

| Clock R1 F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|-----------------|----|-------|----|----|-----|-----|---------|
| 10 64 Load2 | 2 | Mult2 | | | | | |

Register result status.

• LD F0, O(R1) (iteration 2) now writes back (1 cycle latency). It also sends the result through the CDB. The value written can be represented as M[72], indicating the location of memory at address 72.

Mult2 was listening in the CDB for the Load2 value; now it receives the update, so it sets the Qj entry to zero and updates its Vj value with the value in memory at address 72 (M[72]).

- The third load (Load3) starts its execution because the cycle continues to execute. So we are now at iteration number 3, at the first load command: LD F0, O(R1). So we add the entry Load3 to the table Load and Store Buffers.
- Mult1 continues its execution, it has 3 cycles left to complete.

| Iter. | Instruction | Issue | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|-------|------------------|-------|-----------|-----------------|
| 1 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 1 | 9 | 10 |
| 1 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 2 | | |
| 1 | SD F4, O(R1) | 3 | | |
| 2 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 6 | 10 | <mark>11</mark> |
| 2 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 7 | | |
| 2 | SD F4, O(R1) | 8 | | |
| | | | | |

Instruction status.

| | Busy | Addr | FU |
|--------|-------------------------|------|-------|
| Load1 | No | | \ |
| Load2 | No | | \ |
| Load3 | $\overline{\text{Yes}}$ | 64 | \ |
| Store1 | Yes | 80 | Mult1 |
| Store2 | Yes | 72 | Mult2 |
| Store3 | No | | |

Load and Store Buffers.



Reservation Stations.

| Clock | R1 | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 11 | 64 | Load3 | | Mult2 | | | | | |

Register result status.

• MULTD F4, F0, F2 (iteration 3) cannot be issued, because in Tomasulo's algorithm, to issue a new instruction there must be a free Reservation Station available for that operation type (here, floating-point multiply). If no RS is free, the instruction cannot be issued and must wait.

Since both Mult1 and Mult2 are occupied executing previous multiplies, the third multiply (from iteration 3) cannot issue yet.

- Mult1 continues its execution, it has 2 cycles left to complete.
- Mult2 continues its execution, it has 3 cycles left to complete.

| Iter. | Instruction | Issue | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|-------|------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 1 | 9 | 10 |
| 1 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 2 | | |
| 1 | SD F4, O(R1) | 3 | | |
| 2 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 6 | 10 | 11 |
| 2 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 7 | | |
| 2 | SD F4, O(R1) | 8 | | |

Instruction status.

| | Busy | Addr | FU |
|--------|------|------|-------|
| Load1 | No | | \ |
| Load2 | No | | \ |
| Load3 | Yes | 64 | \ |
| Store1 | Yes | 80 | Mult1 |
| Store2 | Yes | 72 | Mult2 |
| Store3 | No | | |

Load and Store Buffers.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | ۷j | Vk | Qj | Qk |
|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|----|----|
| | Add1 | No | | | | | |
| | Add2 | No | | | | | |
| | Add3 | No | | | | | |
| 2 | Mult1 | Yes | MULTD | M[80] | R(F2) | | |
| 3 | Mult2 | Yes | MULTD | M[72] | R(F2) | | |

| Clock R1 | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|------------|-------|----|-------|----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 12 64 | Load3 | | Mult2 | | | | | |

Register result status.

- LD F0, 0(R1) completes its execution and writes the result back to the CDB (M[64]).
- Mult1 continues its execution, it has 1 cycle left to complete.
- Mult2 continues its execution, it has 2 cycles left to complete.

| Iter. | Instruction | Issue | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|-------|------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 1 | 9 | 10 |
| 1 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 2 | | |
| 1 | SD F4, O(R1) | 3 | | |
| 2 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 6 | 10 | 11 |
| 2 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 7 | | |
| 2 | SD F4, O(R1) | 8 | | |

Instruction status.

| | Busy | Addr | FU |
|--------|------|------|-------|
| Load1 | No | | \ |
| Load2 | No | | \ |
| Load3 | No | | \ |
| Store1 | Yes | 80 | Mult1 |
| Store2 | Yes | 72 | Mult2 |
| Store3 | No | | |

Load and Store Buffers.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Vj | Vk | Qj | Qk |
|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|----|----|
| | Add1 | No | | | | | |
| | Add2 | No | | | | | |
| | Add3 | No | | | | | |
| 1 | Mult1 | Yes | MULTD | M[80] | R(F2) | | |
| 2 | Mult2 | Yes | MULTD | M[72] | R(F2) | | |

Reservation Stations.

| Clock R1 F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|-----------------|----|-------|----|----|-----|-----|---------|
| 13 64 M[64] | | Mult2 | | | | | |

Register result status.

- Mult1 finishes its execution at the end of this cycle! This will allow the Store1 to write the result in memory at the address 80, and also to the MULTD instruction in the iteration 3 to be issued.
- Mult2 continues its execution, it has 1 cycle left to complete.

| Iter. | Instruction | Issue | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|-------|------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 1 | 9 | 10 |
| 1 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 2 | 14 | |
| 1 | SD F4, O(R1) | 3 | | |
| 2 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 6 | 10 | 11 |
| 2 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 7 | | |
| 2 | SD F4, 0(R1) | 8 | | |

Instruction status.

| | Busy | Addr | FU |
|--------|------|------|-------|
| Load1 | No | | \ |
| Load2 | No | | \ |
| Load3 | No | | \ |
| Store1 | Yes | 80 | Mult1 |
| Store2 | Yes | 72 | Mult2 |
| Store3 | No | | |

Load and Store Buffers.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Vj | Vk | Qj | Qk |
|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|----|----|
| | Add1 | No | | | | | |
| | Add2 | No | | | | | |
| | Add3 | No | | | | | |
| 0 | Mult1 | Yes | MULTD | M[80] | R(F2) | | |
| 1 | Mult2 | Yes | MULTD | M[72] | R(F2) | | |

Reservation Stations.

| Clock | R1 | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|----|-----|-----|---------|
| 14 | 64 | M[64] | | Mult2 | | | | | |

Register result status.

- MULTD (iteration 1) writes the result to the CDB; this triggers the Store1 listener, which waits for the result to be stored in memory (the result of the load, M[80], multiplied by the value of register F2), and the MULTD of iteration 3, which waits for a free reservation station to be issued.
- Mult2 finishes its execution at the end of this cycle! This will allow the Store2 to write the result in memory at the address 72.

| Iter. | Instruction | Issue | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|-------|------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 1 | 9 | 10 |
| 1 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 2 | 14 | 15 |
| 1 | SD F4, O(R1) | 3 | | |
| 2 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 6 | 10 | 11 |
| 2 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 7 | 15 | |
| 2 | SD F4, 0(R1) | 8 | | |

Instruction status.

| | Busy | Addr | FU |
|--------|------|------|------------|
| Load1 | No | | \ |
| Load2 | No | | \ |
| Load3 | No | | \ |
| Store1 | Yes | 80 | M[80] × F2 |
| Store2 | Yes | 72 | Mult2 |
| Store3 | No | | |

Load and Store Buffers.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Vj | Vk | Qj | Qk |
|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|----|----|
| | Add1 | No | | | | | |
| | Add2 | No | | | | | |
| | Add3 | No | | | | | |
| 4 | Mult1 | Yes | MULTD | M[64] | R(F2) | | |
| 0 | Mult2 | Yes | MULTD | M[72] | R(F2) | | |

| Clock R1 | F0 F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|-------------|-------|-------|----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 15 64 M | [64] | Mult1 | | | | | |

Register result status.

• MULTD (iteration 2) writes the result to the CDB; this triggers the Store2 listener, which waits for the result to be stored in memory (the result of the load, M[72], multiplied by the value of register F2).

| Iter. | Instruction | Issue | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|-------|------------------|-------|-----------|-----------------|
| 1 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 1 | 9 | 10 |
| 1 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 2 | 14 | 15 |
| 1 | SD F4, O(R1) | 3 | 16 | |
| 2 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 6 | 10 | 11 |
| 2 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 7 | 15 | <mark>16</mark> |
| 2 | SD F4, 0(R1) | 8 | | |

Instruction status.

| | Busy | Addr | FU | |
|--------|------|------|-------------------|--|
| Load1 | No | | \ | |
| Load2 | No | | \ | |
| Load3 | No | | \ | |
| Store1 | Yes | 80 | M[80] × F2 | |
| Store2 | Yes | 72 | $M[72] \times F2$ | |
| Store3 | Yes | 64 | Mult1 | |

Load and Store Buffers.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Vj | Vk | Qj | Qk |
|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|----|----|
| | Add1 | No | | | | | |
| | Add2 | No | | | | | |
| | Add3 | No | | | | | |
| 3 | Mult1 | Yes | MULTD | M[64] | R(F2) | | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | |

Reservation Stations.

| Clock R1 | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|------------|-------|----|-------|----|----|-----|-----|---------|
| 16 64 | M[64] | | Mult1 | | | | | |

Register result status.

- \bullet SD (iteration 1) writes the result of the expression M[80] \times F2 to memory at address 80.
- Since the SD instruction (iteration 1) has finished its execution, the second store (iteration 2) can start its execution and send the result to memory between M[72] and F2.

| Iter. | Instruction | Issue | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|-------|------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 1 | 9 | 10 |
| 1 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 2 | 14 | 15 |
| 1 | SD F4, O(R1) | 3 | 16 | <u>17</u> |
| 2 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 6 | 10 | 11 |
| 2 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 7 | 15 | 16 |
| 2 | SD F4, 0(R1) | 8 | 17 | |

Instruction status.

| | Busy | Addr | FU | | |
|--------|------|------|-------------------|--|--|
| Load1 | No | | \ | | |
| Load2 | No | | \ | | |
| Load3 | No | | \ | | |
| Store1 | No | | | | |
| Store2 | Yes | 72 | $M[72] \times F2$ | | |
| Store3 | Yes | 64 | Mult1 | | |

Load and Store Buffers.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Vj | Vk | Qj | Qk |
|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|----|----|
| | Add1 | No | | | | | |
| | Add2 | No | | | | | |
| | Add3 | No | | | | | |
| 2 | Mult1 | Yes | MULTD | M[64] | R(F2) | | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | |

| Clock R1 F | 0 F2 F | 4 F6 F8 | F10 F12 | F30 |
|----------------|---------|---------|---------|-----|
| 17 64 M[6 | 64] Mu] | lt1 | | |

Register result status.

 \bullet SD (iteration 2) writes the result of the expression M[72] \times F2 to memory at address 72.

| Iter. | Instruction | Issue | Exec Comp | Write Res |
|-------|------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 1 | 9 | 10 |
| 1 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 2 | 14 | 15 |
| 1 | SD F4, 0(R1) | 3 | 16 | 17 |
| 2 | LD F0, 0, R1 | 6 | 10 | 11 |
| 2 | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | 7 | 15 | 16 |
| 2 | SD F4, O(R1) | 8 | 17 | 18 |

 $Instruction\ status.$

| | Busy | Addr | FU |
|--------|------|------|-------|
| Load1 | No | | \ |
| Load2 | No | | \ |
| Load3 | No | | \ |
| Store1 | No | | |
| Store2 | No | | |
| Store3 | Yes | 64 | Mult1 |

Load and Store Buffers.

| Time | Name | Busy | 0p | Vj | Vk | Qj | Qk |
|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|----|----|
| | Add1 | No | | | | | |
| | Add2 | No | | | | | |
| | Add3 | No | | | | | |
| 1 | Mult1 | Yes | MULTD | M[64] | R(F2) | | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | |

Reservation Stations.

| Clock R1 F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|-----------------|----|-------|----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 18 64 M[64] |] | Mult1 | | | | | |

Register result status.

3.7.9 Reorder Buffer (ROB)

3.7.9.1 Hardware-based Speculation

Speculation in hardware is a foundational technique in high-performance processors, used to execute instructions **before it is know whether they are needed**. This is especially relevant when instructions are **control-dependent** on unresolved branches.

In particular, hardware-based speculation enables:

- Speculative instruction execution before knowing branch outcomes.
- Rollback in case a mispredicted path was taken.

This approach increases Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP), allowing more instructions to be in-flight, even if some turn out to be unnecessary.

? Why speculation needs the ROB

Executing instructions speculatively introduces a challenge: "how do we prevent side effects (e.g., register or memory updates) from mispredicted instructions?". The solution: defer the architectural state update until it's safe to commit.

This is exactly what the **Reorder Buffer (ROB)** is for:

- ✓ It holds results of instructions that have finished execution but are not yet committed.
- ✓ It allows instruction results to be written in-order, preserving program semantics.
- ✓ In case of a misprediction, the ROB enables the processor to **flush invalid speculative results** quickly and precisely.

But the ROB is **critical** for:

- ⚠ Decoupling execution completion from state update (commit).
- ▲ Supporting **precise exceptions** (so the CPU can cleanly stop at the last correct instruction).
- A Managing speculative and non-speculative instruction tracking.

3.7.9.2 Why ROB is really needed

Modern high-performance processors use **out-of-order execution (OoO)** to improve instruction-level parallelism. However, they must still ensure **in-order commit** to preserve correct program behavior. This is where the **Reorder Buffer (ROB)** comes into play.

? Why Out-of-Order Execution and In-Order Commit?

Out-of-Order execution because:

- **➤ Dependencies** (e.g., RAW hazards) and **delays** (e.g., memory access) prevent some instructions from being executed immediately.
- ✓ OoO execution allows the processor to bypass stalled instructions and execute independent ones earlier.
- This helps keep functional units busy and improves throughput.

For example, if an instruction is waiting for a memory load, another instruction, for example an ALU op, can execute immediately.

Unfortunately, Out-of-Order execution introduces risk:

- ▲ Executing instructions out of order can break the precise exception model.
- ▲ Also, **speculative** instructions (e.g., those after a branch) could be **incorrect**.

To preserve program correctness, instructions must commit (retire) in order, exactly as they appear in the original program.

ROB's role in bridging OoO and In-Order Commit

The Reorder Buffer (ROB) is a hardware structure used in modern outof-order processors to: support out-of-order execution while enforcing in-order commitment of instructions, ensuring correct architectural state and precise exception handling.

The ROB is the key mechanism enabling this balance:

- During issue: allocate an entry in the ROB, marking the instruction's place in program order.
- During **execution**: store the result in the ROB as soon as the instruction finishes.
- During **commit**: only commit the instruction (i.e., update architectural registers or memory) if:
 - 1. It is **at the head** of the ROB
 - 2. Its execution has completed

3. It is **not speculative**

This design ensures:

- ✓ Architectural state (register file, memory) is updated in program order only.
- ✓ **Speculative results** are kept in the ROB until validated.
- ✓ It is possible to **undo speculated instructions** if needed (e.g., branch misprediction).

The ROB allows a processor to execute instructions as soon as their operands are ready, regardless of program order, while ensuring they commit their results in-order.

? What about Precise Exception support?

An exception is *precise* if:

- 1. The processor can **stop** at a well-defined **point**, corresponding to a specific instruction.
- 2. All previous instructions are fully committed, and
- 3. No subsequent instruction has modified the architectural state.

This allows the OS or exception handler to reliably identify and handle the error. In **out-of-order execution**, instructions complete in a different order than they appear in the program. **Without careful control** instructions *after* the faulting one could have modified registers or memory and this would **leave** the system in an **inconsistent state**.

The Reorder Buffer (ROB) solves this by:

- ✓ Storing all results temporarily: Instructions write their output to the ROB instead of the register file or memory.
- ✓ Committing results in-order: Only when an instruction is at the head of the ROB and marked completed, its result is written to the architectural state.
- **✓** Rejecting speculative results: If an exception or misprediction occurs:
 - (a) The ROB flushes all speculative entries after the faulting instructions.
 - (b) Execution restarts from the faulting instruction or the exception handler.

This rollback is clean because the architectural state remains untouched beyond the last committed instruction.

Example 11: Precise Exception support

Imagine a sequence:

```
1 Instr 1 \rightarrow 0K

2 Instr 2 \rightarrow 0K

3 Instr 3 \rightarrow Exception (e.g., divide by zero)

4 Instr 4 \rightarrow Executed early (000), wrote to reg R5
```

X Without the ROB:

- \bullet Instruction 4 might modify R5 before the exception at Instr~3 is recognized.
- This makes the exception imprecise, corrupting the state.
- ✓ With the ROB:
 - Instruction 4's result is held in the ROB.
 - Since Instr 3 caused an exception, no later instruction commits.
 - R5 is unaffected, precise state is preserved.

* Functional Roles of the ROB

- 1. Result Buffering. Holds results of instructions that:
 - Have completed execution.
 - But have **not yet committed** to the architectural state (e.g., register file or memory).
- 2. Speculative Result Propagation. ROB acts as a buffer to pass results among instructions that have started speculatively after a branch. This allows speculative instructions (e.g., those after a predicted branch) to forward their results internally via the ROB without prematurely updating architectural registers.
- 3. Precise Interrupt Support. Originally introduced in 1988, the ROB was created to:
 - Preserve the **precise interrupt model**.
 - Guarantee that **only committed instructions affect** the architectural **state**.
 - Enable rollback on branch misprediction or exceptions by flushing speculative ROB entries.

The ROB is not merely a commit buffer, it is also a **speculation-aware result forwarding structure**, enabling safe communication among instructions that may never actually commit.

3.7.9.3 ROB as a Data Communication Mechanism

In Tomasulo's original algorithm, Reservation Stations (RSs) handled register renaming and operand forwarding. However, with the introduction of the ROB, it replaces the renaming and forwarding function of RSs. Before we explain how, we need to understand some *basic* concepts of ROB.

? What are ROB numbers?

A ROB number is simply an index (or tag, in Tomasulo's algorithm) identifying a specific entry in the Reorder Buffer. Each instruction that is issued receives a <u>unique</u> ROB number that corresponds to its place in the ROB, its slot identifier (slot ID).

The ROB number is then used in two key ways:

- 1. As a destination tag (Register Renaming). When an instruction is issued and it will write to a register:
 - The destination register is **not renamed to another physical register** (like in a pure register renaming scheme).
 - Instead, the architectural register is mapped to the instruction's ROB number.

It is the identical logic of tag in Tomasulo algorithm.

- 2. For Operand Dependency Resolution. Later instructions that depend on the result of the ROB number do not need to stall:
 - They **record the ROB number** as the operand source.
 - Once the ROB number becomes "ready" (i.e., the value is written to the ROB), dependent instructions can **read the value from the ROB number** and proceed to execution.

In tomasulo algorithm this feature is provided by the CDB, where each instruction listens to that because it waits for the result of the tag.

As happens in tomasulo algorithm, this mechanism:

- ✓ Avoids **WAR** and **WAW** hazards.
- ✓ Enables data forwarding even before instructions commit.

| Tomasulo | ROB-based Tomasulo |
|--|------------------------------------|
| $\overline{\text{Tags}} = \text{RS entry IDs}$ | Tags = ROB entry numbers |
| Values broadcast via CDB | Same, but identified by ROB number |
| RS buffers result locally | ROB stores result globally |
| Commit on write-back | Commit delayed and via ROB head |

Table 21: Quick comparison between Tomasulo with and without ROB.

> Updated Role of Reservation Stations

The ROB not only buffers instruction results but also **propagates those results to dependent instructions** as soon as they are ready, even if not yet committed. So, with the ROB managing renaming and data forwarding:

- **X** Reservation Stations are no longer responsible for naming/tagging.
- ✓ Their role is now focused on:
 - Buffering decoded instructions before they're issued to the Functional Units (FUs);
 - Holding operand values (or ROB tags) temporarily;
 - Helping reduce structural hazards.

Reservation Stations now act like staging areas, not tracking results or resolving dependencies directly.

| Function | Tomasulo | ROB-based Tomasulo |
|-------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| Register Renaming | RS | ROB |
| Data forwarding | RS | ROB |
| Instruction buffering | RS | RS (same) RS (via ROB tags) |
| Operand availability tracking | RS | RS (via ROB tags) |

Table 22: Summary of architectural changes.

In modern speculative Tomasulo architectures, the ROB becomes the central structure for both result tracking and inter-instruction communication. RSs are demoted to lightweight instruction and operand buffers.

3.7.9.4 Architecture



Figure 27: The basic structure of a FP unit using Tomasulo's algorithm and extended to handle speculation (ROB). [1]

This architecture shows a **speculative version of Tomasulo's algorithm**, integrating a Reorder Buffer (ROB) and eliminating the classic **store buffer**. It's designed for **floating-point**, but the same design applies to general OoO pipelines.

- Instruction Queue. Holds fetched instructions awaiting issue. Supplies instructions to reservation stations and the ROB in parallel.
- Reservation Stations. Acts as temporary buffers between issue and execution. Each FP unit (adder, multiplier) has dedicated RSs. Stores instructions with operand tags or values. Unlike the classic Tomasulo, renaming is handled via the ROB.
- Floating-Point Units. Includes FP Adders and FP Multipliers. Execution units receive instructions from RSs when operands are ready.

- Common Data Bus (CDB). Used to broadcast result values and their corresponding ROB tag. All waiting instructions and ROB entries listen to the CDB.
- Reorder Buffer (ROB). Central to this architecture, replaces:
 - 1. Register renaming logic
 - 2. Store buffers

Each ROB entry holds critical metadata about one in-flight instruction:

- Busy field. Indicates whether the ROB entry is currently active (busy) or free (available).
- Instruction type field. Specifies the instruction category:
 - * Branch (no destination result),
 - * Store (destination is memory address),
 - * Load/ALU (destination is a register).

- Destination field

- * For load and ALU instructions: target register number.
- * For store instructions: **memory address** where the value must be written.
- Value field. Holds the result of the instruction after execution, kept until commit.
- Ready Bit. Set when execution has completed and the result is valid.
- **Speculative Flag**. Shows whether the instruction is executed speculatively (e.g., after a predicted branch) or not.

• Load Buffers & Address Unit.

Load Buffers is a queue or small table that holds load instructions waiting to access memory. It temporarily buffers loads *after issue* and *before* they actually perform a memory access. Its purpose is shown in the example on page 188.

Address Unit is a specialized hardware block dedicated to calculating effective addresses for loads and stores. Given a base register value and an offset, it computes an effective address.

? How Load Buffers and Address Unit Work Together?

- 1. **Issue Stage**: the instruction is issued. Allocates an entry in the ROB and Load Buffer.
- 2. Address Calculation: Address Unit computes the effective address.
- Memory Access Decision: if there is no preceding store to the same address (or speculation allows), the load can access memory early. If not, the load must wait until memory disambiguation clears it.
- 4. **Load Execution**: read data from memory. Write the result into the ROB entry. When ready and safe, commit to the architectural register file.

• Register File (FP Registers): not updated directly after execution. Instead, it is updated only when instructions commit via the ROB, preserving the precise state model.

? Key Innovations in this design

- ROB replaces store buffers: the store buffer doesn't exist anymore, now memory writes are delayed until commit.
- Register renaming is moved from RSs to ROB: simplifies dependency tracking.
- Precise exceptions and speculative execution are both supported via ROB tracking and flushing.
- CDB remains critical for result forwarding and readiness detection.

Ready Bit

The **Ready Bit** is a control bit that indicates whether the instruction associated with this ROB entry has **completed execution** and its **result is available**. It is **set to true** when:

- 1. The instruction finishes execution.
- 2. The result is written into the ROB.

Its purpose is to inform dependent instructions that they can now read this value (via the CDB or directly from the ROB). Also, it enables commit: an instruction can only commit if its ready bit is set.

In other words, the ready bit tracks the availability of the computed result.

Speculative Flag

The **Speculative Flag** is a control bit that indicates whether the **instruction** was issued after an unresolved branch prediction (or other speculative control decision). It is:

- Set to true only when the instruction is issued speculatively, <u>before</u> the control flow is confirmed.
- Cleared when the speculation is resolved (e.g., branch prediction validated).

Its purpose is to ensure that **speculative instructions do not prematurely update** the architectural state. Allows all speculative instructions to be **flushed** upon misprediction or exception.

In other words, the speculative flag tracks whether the instruction is **tentative** or **safe**.

X ROB Structure and Operation: Circular Buffer

The Reorder Buffer (ROB) is implemented as a **circular buffer** (circular FIFO, First-In-First-Out, queue), managed with **two pointers**:

• **Head pointer**. Points to the **oldest instruction** that is **next to commit** (i.e., retire).

The head advances when instructions commit.

• Tail pointer. Points to the next free entry, where a new issued instruction will be inserted.

The tails **advances** when new instructions are issued.

| | Exampl | le 12: | ROB | Circular | Buffer |
|--|--------|--------|-----|----------|--------|
|--|--------|--------|-----|----------|--------|

| ROB# | BUSY | INSTR. TYPE | READY | DEST | VALUE | SPEC |
|------|------|-------------|-------|------|-------|------|
| ROBO | Yes | In | No | F0 | _ | No |
| ROB1 | No | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ |
| ROB2 | No | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ |
| ROB3 | No | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ |

- **Head** points at ROBO (first to commit once ready).
- Tail points at ROB1 (next free entry for a new instruction).

? Why Two Pointers?

The head and tail pointers allow the ROB to **efficiently manage** dynamic instruction issue and commit while **preserving program order**, and they **minimize hardware complexity** by avoiding costly entry movement.

1. Sequential Insertion at the Tail (Issue Stage). When a new instruction issues, it needs a free ROB entry. The tail pointer indicates where to insert the new instruction. After insertion, the tail advances to the next free slot. This preserves the program order at issue time.

New instructions always go at the tail.

2. Sequential Retirement from the Head (Commit Stage). When an instruction completes and satisfies all commit conditions (ready, not speculative, prior instructions retired), it retires. The head pointer shows which instruction should commit next. After commit, the head advances to the next oldest instruction.

Commit always happens starting from the head, ensuring inorder commit.

- 3. Circular Buffer Efficiency. Memory and hardware are limited: we don't want an infinitely growing ROB. Using a circular buffer:
 - When the tail reaches the end of the buffer, it wraps around to position 0.
 - Same for the head.

This reuses space efficiently without needing to shift entries manually.

Circular structure avoids expensive data movement and saves silicon area.

- 4. Detecting Full and Empty Conditions. With just head and tail:
 - If head = tail and entry busy \rightarrow ROB is full (cannot issue more instructions).
 - If head = tail and entry not busy \rightarrow ROB is empty (no instructions to retire).

Simple hardware checks based on two pointers.

Example 13: ROB and Rename Table

The Rename Table is a small hardware table that records where the *most recent* value of each register will come from, while the instruction is still speculative or not yet committed. It connects logical (architecture) registers (like F0, F2, etc.) to ROB entries that are producing their updated value.

It works like this:

- When an instruction is issued that **writes** a register:
 - The Rename Table maps that register to its new ROB number.
- When an instruction needs to **read** a register:
 - It checks the Rename Table:
 - \ast If an ROB entry is mapped: the instruction reads the pending value from the ROB.
 - * If no mapping: the instruction reads from the architectural register file.

Now we present an example using the ROB and the Rename Table. At the beginning of this example, we have a ROB almost empty and a Rename Table partially filled.

1. Cycle 1, first step.

| ROB# | BUSY | INSTR. TYPE | READY | DEST | VALUE | SPEC |
|------|------|-------------|-------|------|-------|------|
| ROBO | Yes | In | No | F0 | _ | No |
| ROB1 | Yes | In+1 | No | F2 | _ | No |
| ROB2 | No | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ |
| ROB3 | No | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ |

Head is at ROBO and Tail is at ROB2.

Two instructions were issued:

- In writes to F0, mapped to ROBO.
- In+1 writes to F2, mapped to ROB1.

Both are non-speculative (SPEC = No)

| Register | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 |
|----------|------|------|----|----|----|
| Pointer | ROB0 | ROB1 | | | |

F0 and F2 are now renamed: if anyone uses F0/F2, they will look at the respective ROB entry, not the old register.

2. Cycle 2, second step.

| ROB# | BUSY | INSTR. TYPE | READY | DEST | VALUE | SPEC |
|------|------|-------------|------------------------|------|-------|------|
| ROBO | Yes | In | No | F0 | | No |
| ROB1 | Yes | In+1 | No | F2 | _ | No |
| ROB2 | Yes | In+2 | $\overline{\text{No}}$ | F4 | _ | No |
| ROB3 | No | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ |

Head is still at ROBO and Tail is now at ROB3.

Another instruction issued:

 $\bullet\,$ In+2 writes to F4, mapped to R0B2.

Still non-speculative.

| Register | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 |
|----------|------|------|------|----|----|
| Pointer | ROB0 | ROB1 | ROB2 | | |

3. Cycle 3, speculative instruction issued.

| ROB# | BUSY | INSTR. TYPE | READY | DEST | VALUE | SPEC |
|------|------|-------------|------------------------|------|-------|------|
| ROBO | Yes | In | No | F0 | _ | No |
| ROB1 | Yes | In+1 | No | F2 | _ | No |
| ROB2 | Yes | In+2 | No | F4 | _ | No |
| ROB3 | Yes | In+3 | $\overline{\text{No}}$ | F6 | _ | Yes |

Head is still at ROBO. As for Tail, since all four entries (ROBO through ROB3) are occupied and there are no free entries, Tail cannot move forward until there is a free ROB entry. Tail must logically "point" to the next free entry, but since there is none available, it "hovers" behind or at ROBO, waiting for a free entry after a commit. So Tail is *stalled* at ROBO because the ROB is full.

A new instruction (In+3) was issued and allocated into ROB3. In+3 writes to register F6. The speculative bit is set to "Yes", so this instruction depends on an unresolved branch (it's speculative).

| Register | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 |
|----------|------|------|------|------|----|
| Pointer | ROB0 | ROB1 | ROB2 | ROB3 | |

4. Cycle 4, first execution result ready.

| ROB# | BUSY | INSTR. TYPE | READY | DEST | VALUE | SPEC |
|------|------|-------------|-------------------------|------|-------|------|
| ROBO | Yes | In | $\overline{\text{Yes}}$ | F0 | 10 | No |
| ROB1 | Yes | In+1 | No | F2 | _ | No |
| ROB2 | Yes | In+2 | No | F4 | _ | No |
| ROB3 | Yes | In+3 | No | F6 | _ | Yes |

Head is still at ROBO. Tail is still waiting.

The instruction at ROBO (In) completed execution: it is ready (Yes) and the result is 10. But it has not yet committed because commits happen separately.

The value 10 is still in the ROB, not yet in the register file. F0 is still mapped to ROBO (waiting commit).

| Register | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 |
|----------|------|------|------|------|----|
| Pointer | ROB0 | ROB1 | ROB2 | ROB3 | |

5. Cycle 5, first commit happens.

| ROB# | BUSY | INSTR. TYPE | READY | DEST | VALUE | SPEC |
|------|------|-------------|-------|------|-------|------|
| ROBO | No | _ | _ | - | _ | - |
| ROB1 | Yes | In+1 | No | F2 | _ | No |
| ROB2 | Yes | In+2 | No | F4 | _ | No |
| ROB3 | Yes | In+3 | No | F6 | _ | Yes |

Head is now at ROB1. Tail finally finds an empty entry and points to it (ROB0).

Instruction In (ROBO) committed:

- ✓ It was ready (Ready = Yes);
- ✓ Not speculative (Spec = No);
- \checkmark Head pointer advanced from ROB0 \rightarrow ROB1.

Register File updated:

• F0 now officially = 10 (not pending anymore).

Rename Table updated:

• F0 no longer points to a ROB entry, but to the **final committed value** (10).

| Register | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 |
|----------|----|------|------|------|----|
| Pointer | 10 | ROB1 | ROB2 | ROB3 | |

6. Cycle 6, new instructions, partial execution.

| ROB# | BUSY | INSTR. TYPE | READY | DEST | VALUE | SPEC |
|------|------|-------------|-------------------------|------|-------|------|
| ROBO | Yes | In+4 | N_{0} | F8 | _ | Yes |
| ROB1 | Yes | In+1 | $\overline{\text{Yes}}$ | F2 | 20 | No |
| ROB2 | Yes | In+2 | No | F4 | _ | No |
| ROB3 | Yes | In+3 | No | F6 | _ | Yes |

Head is still at ROB1. Tail stalled because ROB is full.

A new instruction (In+4) was issued and allocated to ROBO:

- Destination: F8
- Marked speculative (SPEC = Yes)

Meanwhile the instruction In+1 (in ROB1) has completed execution (READY = Yes) with the value 20.

| Register | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 |
|----------|----|----|----|----|----|
| Pointer | | | | | |

7. Cycle 7, commit of a non-speculative instruction.

| ROB# | BUSY | INSTR. TYPE | READY | DEST | VALUE | SPEC |
|------|------|-------------|-------|------|-------|------|
| ROBO | Yes | In+4 | No | F8 | _ | Yes |
| ROB1 | No | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ |
| ROB2 | Yes | In+2 | No | F4 | _ | No |
| ROB3 | Yes | In+3 | No | F6 | _ | Yes |

Head is now at ROB2. Tail is now at ROB1.

Instruction In+1 in ROB1 has committed, and its destination register F2 now holds the value 20. ROB1 is now free (BUSY = No) and the head moves forward to ROB2.

| Register | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 |
|----------|----|-----------------|------|------|------|
| Pointer | 10 | <mark>20</mark> | ROB2 | ROB3 | ROBO |

8. Cycle 8, misprediction.

| ROB# | BUSY | INSTR. TYPE | READY | DEST | VALUE | SPEC |
|------|------|-------------|-------|------|-------|------|
| ROBO | Yes | In+4 | No | F8 | _ | Yes |
| ROB1 | No | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ |
| ROB2 | Yes | In+2 | No | F4 | _ | No |
| ROB3 | Yes | In+3 | No | F6 | _ | Yes |

Head is still at ROB2. Tail is still at ROB1.

ROBO and ROBS still contain **speculative instructions** waiting for execution. ROBS contains non-speculative instruction but not ready yet.

At some point, **misprediction detected!** The branch speculation fails and all speculative instructions must be **flushed** (discarded).

| Register | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 |
|----------|----|----|------|------|------|
| Pointer | 10 | 20 | ROB2 | ROB3 | ROBO |

8. Cycle 8, after misprediction flush.

| ROB# | BUSY | INSTR. TYPE | READY | DEST | VALUE | SPEC |
|------|------|-------------|-------|------|-------|------|
| ROBO | No | _ | _ | - | _ | – |
| ROB1 | No | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ |
| ROB2 | Yes | In+2 | No | F4 | _ | No |
| ROB3 | No | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ |

Head is still at ROB2. Tail is moved to ROB3 because after a misprediction, the tail must move to the next free ROB entry *after* the last non-speculative instruction, maintaining strict program order.

<code>ROBO</code> (In+4) and <code>ROB3</code> (In+3) were speculative \rightarrow flushed immediately. Only <code>ROB2</code> remains:

- It is non-speculative (safe);
- Still waiting to execute or ready.

| Register | FO | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 |
|----------|----|----|------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Pointer | 10 | 20 | ROB2 | ROB3 $(obsolete)$ | ROBO $(obsolete)$ |

3.7.9.5 Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB

The speculative Tomasulo architecture extends the original Tomasulo's algorithm by integrating a Reorder Buffer (ROB). This allows:

- ✓ Dynamic register renaming using ROB entries;
- ✓ In-order commit;
- ✓ Precise exception handling;
- ✓ Efficient speculative execution with safe rollback.

✓ Main Innovations Introduced by the ROB

- 1. Pointers towards ROB Entries. Operands are no longer tracked via Reservation Stations. Instead, operands are identified by ROB numbers. This ensures centralized tracking of instruction dependencies.
- 2. Implicit Register Renaming. When a destination register is renamed:
 - It is mapped to a **ROB entry**;
 - This removes **WAR** and **WAW** hazards automatically;
 - Enables **dynamic loop unrolling** without conflicts.
- 3. Delayed Update of Architectural State. Registers and memory are not updated at execution time. They are updated only when the instruction is at the head of the ROB and is ready to commit. This guarantees correct program state even in speculative execution.
- 4. Easy Speculation Management. By holding all results inside the ROB until commit:
 - Mispredictions can be handled by flushing speculative entries;
 - **Precise exceptions** are maintained, ensuring a clean rollback mechanism.

Operating phases of the Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm

The execution flow is divided into four main stages:

1. Issue: Fetch and Prepare the Instruction

The **Issue phase** is the step where an instruction is fetched from the **Instruction Queue** and prepared for execution. In this phase:

- The processor checks if there are **resources available** to allow the instruction to proceed.
- It allocates both a Reservation Station (RS) slot and a ROB entry.

Only if both are available, the instruction can continue.

- (a) Check for Available Slots. The issue logic checks:
 - Is there a free Reservation Stations?
 - Is there a free ROB entry?

If yes, the instruction is issued into the pipeline. If no, the instruction stalls in the Instruction Queue and waits.

- (b) Fetch Operands. Once issued, the instruction's source operands are fetched. If an operand is:
 - Ready in the Register File \rightarrow send it immediately to the Reservation Station.
 - Pending in the ROB → send the ROB number (tag) to the Reservation Station instead (to wait for the value).

Thus, the RS either: receives the actual operand value (if available), or a tag (ROB number) pointing to where the value will appear later.

(c) Allocate ROB Entry for the Result. A ROB entry is assigned to the instruction. The ROB number is sent to the Reservation Station. This number will later be used to tag the result on the Common Data Bus (CDB) after execution. This ROB number replaces the register name during speculative execution.

⚠ What Happens If No Space? If either no RS slot is free, or no ROB entry is free, then the instruction cannot issue and must stall. This ensures the system never overflows the ROB or Reservation Stations, maintaining control over execution resources.

2. Execution Started

After the instruction is successfully issued and resides in a **Reservation Station (RS)**, the next step is **starting execution**. Execution can start only when all required operands are available.

- (a) Check Operand Availability. The Reservation Station monitors the availability of operands. If both operands are available (i.e., no more pending data hazards):
 - Instruction immediately starts execution on its operands.
 - This stage is called **EX** (Execute).

?? RAW hazards (Read After Write) must already be solved to start execution.

- (b) Monitoring for Pending Operands. If one or more operands are **not yet ready** (e.g., still waiting for a previous instruction to produce them):
 - The RS listens to the Common Data Bus (CDB).
 - As soon as the missing operand appears on the CDB, it captures it and becomes ready.

② Dynamic readiness: the RS waits without blocking the pipeline.

- (c) Special Case: Store Instructions. For store instructions:
 - Only the base register (address computation) must be available to start execution.
 - At this point, the **effective memory address** is computed.
 - The store value itself can still arrive later, closer to the commit phase.

Instructions don't wait statically, they dynamically listen and proceed as soon as they can, maximizing execution overlap.

3. Execution Completed & Write Result

Once the execution of the instruction finishes, the result must be broadcast and stored so that dependent instructions can proceed and the instruction can eventually commit.

- (a) Broadcast the Result on the Common Data Bus (CDB). The completed instruction places its result on the Common Data Bus. This broadcasts the result to:
 - All **Reservation Stations** that are waiting for it;
 - The corresponding **ROB** entry (updating its Value field).
 - **22** Any instruction that was stalled waiting for this operand can now proceed.
- (b) **Update the ROB Entry**. The **Value** field of the instruction's **ROB entry** is updated with the computed result. The instruction's **Ready bit** inside the ROB is set to **true**, meaning the instruction is now completed and awaiting commit.
 - The ROB now safely holds the completed result, ready for in-order retirement.
- (c) Release the Reservation Station. The Reservation Station that held this instruction is now marked as free. It becomes available for issuing new instructions.
 - This keeps the hardware resource usage efficient and avoids blocking incoming instructions.
- (d) Special Case: Store Instructions. For store operations:
 - The data to be stored (not just the address) is written into the ROB's Value field.
 - If the value wasn't ready at the start of the store's execution, the RS monitors the CDB until the data is captured.
 - This ensures the store operation has both address and data ready by the time it needs to commit.

Results are not immediately written to registers; they are buffered safely into the ROB and forwarded to dependent instructions dynamically.

4. Commit: Updating the Architectural State

The Commit phase is when the result of an instruction is safely written into the Register File or memory, and the instruction is retired from the ROB. Commit happens strictly in program order:

- Only the instruction at the **head of the ROB** can be considered for commit.
- The instruction must have finished execution and have its result ready.
- (a) **Normal Commit**. If the instruction at the head is **completed** (Ready bit = true):
 - Its **result is written into the Register File** (if it's a computational instruction);
 - The ROB entry is freed.
 - The architectural state is updated in strict program order
- (b) **Store Commit**. If the instruction at the head is a **store**:
 - Instead of updating the Register File, it writes the data into memory;
 - Afterward, the instruction is removed from the ROB.
 - Memory operations happen precisely at the correct point, preserving correct memory ordering.
- (c) Branch Commit and Misprediction Handling. If the instruction at the head is a branch:
 - ✓ If the branch was **predicted correctly**, it is committed normally, no special action.
 - X If the branch was mispredicted:
 - The ROB is flushed, all speculative instructions after the branch are discarded.
 - Execution **restarts** at the correct successor (true path).
 - Mispredictions are corrected cleanly, and speculative damage is avoided.

This flushing process is sometimes called **graduation** in technical literature⁷.

Only when the instruction is at the ROB head, completed, and non-speculative, it can safely update the real architectural state (register file or memory). This phase ensures that the processor maintains a **precise state** even under heavy speculation and out-of-order execution.

⁷Graduation is the final commit of an instruction from the ROB into the architectural state (registers or memory), happening in program order after execution is completed and speculation has been validated. In literature like *Computer Architecture: A Quantitative Approach* [1], graduation and commit are used interchangeably.

In other words, it is another technical term for instruction commit in speculative out-of-order processors.

Example 14: Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm with ROB - Execution Overlap

We are executing this loop:

```
Loop:

LD F0, O(R1)

MULTD F4, F0, F2 # RAW hazard on F0

SD F4, O(R1) # RAW hazard on F4

SUBI R1, R1, #8

BNEZ R1, Loop # RAW and WAR hazards on R1
```

- LD loads from memory address pointed by R1 into F0.
- \bullet MULTD depends on F0 being ready \rightarrow must wait for the LD.
- ullet SD depends on F4 o must wait for MULTD.
- SUBI modifies R1 (address computation for next iteration).
- BNEZ depends on the result of SUBI to decide whether to branch.
- First iteration issued

| ROB# | BUSY | INSTR. TYPE | READY | DEST. | VALUE | SPEC. |
|------|------|------------------|------------------|-----------|-------|-------|
| ROBO | Yes | LD F0, 0(R1) | No (exec. start) | F0 | - | No |
| ROB1 | Yes | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | No (issued) | F4 | _ | No |
| ROB2 | Yes | SD F4, 0(R1) | No (issued) | M[O+[R1]] | _ | No |
| ROB3 | Yes | SUBI R1, R1, #8 | No (issued) | R1 | _ | No |
| ROB4 | Yes | BNEZ R1, Loop | No (issued) | _ | _ | No |
| ROB5 | No | | | | | |
| ROB6 | No | | | | | |
| ROB7 | No | | | | | |

The head is at ROBO and the tail is at ROB5.

| Register # | F0 | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 |
|------------|------|----|------|----|----|-----|
| Pointer | ROB0 | | ROB1 | | | |

The actions are:

- All these 5 instructions are issued one after another.
- Each gets a **ROB entry**.
- The **Rename Table** is updated:
 - * FO is renamed to ROBO;
 - * F4 to ROB1;
 - * Memory address for SD points to ROB2;
 - * R1 to ROB3 (because SUBI modifies R1).

ROB entries are allocated from ROBO to ROB4.

• After Some Cycles (ROB Full)

| ROB# | BUSY | INSTR. TYPE | READY | DEST. | VALUE | SPEC. |
|------|------|------------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| ROBO | Yes | LD F0, 0(R1) | Ready to Commit | F0 | M[0+[R1]] | No |
| ROB1 | Yes | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | No (issued) | F4 | - | No |
| ROB2 | Yes | SD F4, 0(R1) | No (issued) | M[0+[R1]] | - | No |
| ROB3 | Yes | SUBI R1, R1, #8 | Exec. Started | R1 | - | No |
| ROB4 | Yes | BNEZ R1, Loop | No (issued) | - | - | No |
| ROB5 | Yes | LD F0, 0(R1) | No (issued) | F0 | - | Yes |
| ROB6 | Yes | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | No (issued) | F4 | - | Yes |
| ROB7 | Yes | SD F4, 0(R1) | No (issued) | M[0+[R1]] | _ | Yes |

The head is still at ROBO and the tail is stall.

| Register # | FO | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 |
|------------|------|----|------|----|----|-----|
| Pointer | ROB5 | | ROB6 | | | |

Now, after some execution, the situation is:

- ROB is full: we used all 8 entries (ROBO to ROB7).
- Meanwhile:
 - * LD (ROBO) has completed (Ready = Yes).
 - * MULTD (ROB1) is still waiting to execute (waiting on FO).
 - * SUBI (ROB3) has started executing (updating R1).
- Second iteration of the loop started speculative issuing:
 - * A new LD into FO (ROB5);
 - * A new MULTD into F4 (ROB6);
 - * A new SD (ROB7).

Speculative entries being appearing (ROB5-ROB7 marked speculative). New renamings happen:

- F0 is now renamed to ROB5 (overriding previous ROBO).
- F4 is renamed to ROB6.

The processor allows speculative execution past the BNEZ, but only under the assumption that the branch prediction was correct.

• First Commit and Progress

| ROB# | BUSY | INSTR. TYPE | READY | DEST. | VALUE | SPEC. |
|------|------|------------------|---------------|-----------|-------|-------|
| ROB0 | No | | | | | |
| ROB1 | Yes | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | Exec. Started | F4 | * | No |
| ROB2 | Yes | SD F4, O(R1) | No (issued) | M[0+[R1]] | _ | No |
| ROB3 | Yes | SUBI R1, R1, #8 | Exec. Started | R1 | _ | No |
| ROB4 | Yes | BNEZ R1, Loop | No (issued) | _ | _ | No |
| ROB5 | Yes | LD F0, O(R1) | No (issued) | F0 | _ | Yes |
| ROB6 | Yes | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | No (issued) | F4 | _ | Yes |
| ROB7 | Yes | SD F4, 0(R1) | No (issued) | M[0+[R1]] | _ | Yes |

*: the value M[0+[R1]]*F2 is under computation. The head is at ROB1 and the tail is at ROB0.

Next cycle:

- ROBO commits:
 - * LD completed \rightarrow value is written to the Register File (F0 updated).
 - * ROBO is freed (Busy = No).
- MULTD at ROB1 finally starts execution (*): now that F0 is available, it can compute F4 = F0 \times F2.
- SUBI at ROB3 also continues execution.

Instructions are allowed to move forward even if speculative ones are pending behind.

• ROB Remains Full (and Critical Situation)

| ROB# | BUSY | INSTR. TYPE | READY | DEST. | VALUE | SPEC. |
|------|------|------------------|---------------|-----------|-------|-------|
| ROBO | Yes | SUBI R1, R1, #8 | No (issued) | R1 | - | Yes |
| ROB1 | Yes | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | Exec. Started | F4 | * | No |
| ROB2 | Yes | SD F4, O(R1) | No (issued) | M[0+[R1]] | _ | No |
| ROB3 | Yes | SUBI R1, R1, #8 | Exec. Started | R1 | _ | No |
| ROB4 | Yes | BNEZ R1, Loop | No (issued) | - | _ | No |
| ROB5 | Yes | LD F0, O(R1) | No (issued) | F0 | _ | Yes |
| ROB6 | Yes | MULTD F4, F0, F2 | No (issued) | F4 | _ | Yes |
| ROB7 | Yes | SD F4, 0(R1) | No (issued) | M[0+[R1]] | _ | Yes |

*: the value M[0+[R1]]*F2 is still under computation. The head is still at ROB1 and the tail is stall.

The situation is:

ROB remains fully occupied because new speculative instructions filled it (ROB5 to ROB7).

- The ongoing speculative execution relies heavily on correct branch prediction (BNEZ).
- Problem: If the branch was mispredicted, all speculative instructions (ROB5, ROB6, ROB7) must be flushed.

This example shows how the ROB manages execution overlap, hazard resolution, speculation, and in-order commit even under complex dependencies.

4 Performance Evaluation

All formulas and metrics can be found in the Index section, page 349, under the word F (Formula).

4.1 Basic Concepts and Performance Metrics

Performance can be considered from two key viewpoints:

- Purchasing Perspective. Given multiple machines, the goal is to determine:
 - Which machine has the **best performance**.
 - Which machine has the lowest cost.
 - Which machine offers the **best performance-to-cost ratio**.
- **Design Perspective**. When facing different architectural or technological options, the aim is to identify:
 - Which design achieves the greatest performance improvement.
 - Which design minimizes cost.
 - Which design optimize the performance-to-cost balance.

Both perspective require a basic for comparison and clear performance metrics. The main goal is to understand how architectural choices impact both performance and cost.

Two Fundamental Notions of Performance

1. Execution Time (Latency, Response Time): refers to the time needed to complete a task.

 $\frac{\text{Lower execution time}}{\text{Lower execution time}} = \frac{\text{better}}{\text{Lower}}.$

2. Throughput (Bandwidth): measures the number of tasks completed per unit of time (e.g., jobs per hour).

 $\frac{\text{Higher}}{\text{throughput}} = \frac{\text{better}}{\text{better}}.$

Response time and throughput often **oppose** each other. Optimizing for one can degrade the other.

Example 1: Planes Comparison, Concorde vs Boeing 747

Concorde is a supersonic airliner.

- Speed: Concorde is faster (1350 mph vs 610 mph).
- Execution Time: Concorde takes less time to fly Washington DC to Paris (3h vs 6.5h).
- **Throughput**: Boeing transports more passengers per mile (higher "passenger-miles per hour").

Basic Definitions and Calculations

• Performance Formula

$$Performance = \frac{1}{Execution Time}$$
 (10)

• Relative Performance. If X is n% faster than Y, then:

$$\operatorname{Performance}\left(X\right) = \left(1 + \frac{n}{100}\right) \times \operatorname{Performance}\left(Y\right) \tag{11}$$

Or:

Execution Time
$$(Y) = \left(1 + \frac{n}{100}\right) \times \text{Execution Time}(X)$$
 (12)

Example 2

If machine A executes a program in 10 sec and machine B executes same program in 15 sec: A is 50% faster than B or A is 33% faster than B? Using equation 12, if A is 50% faster than B, then it should be true that:

Execution Time
$$(B)$$
 = $\left(1 + \frac{n}{100}\right) \times$ Execution Time (A)

$$15 = \left(1 + \frac{50\%}{100}\right) \times 10$$

$$15 = \frac{3}{2} \times 10$$

$$15 = \frac{30}{2} \checkmark$$

Clock Cycles and Clock Frequency

Modern processors operate by executing instructions synchronously according to a **clock signal**:

- Clock Cycle Time T_{CLK} : the duration of a single clock cycle, measured in seconds (s).
- Clock Frequency f_{CLK} : the number of clock cycles per second, measured in Hertz (Hz). Defined as:

$$f_{\rm CLK} = \frac{1}{T_{\rm CLK}} \tag{13}$$

Some examples:

$$- f_{\rm CLK} = 500 \,\text{MHz} \Leftrightarrow T_{\rm CLK} = \frac{1}{500 \times 10^6} = \frac{1}{500'000'000} = 2 \,\text{ns}$$
$$- f_{\rm CLK} = 1 \,\text{GHz} \Leftrightarrow T_{\rm CLK} = \frac{1}{1 \times 10^9} = \frac{1}{1'000'000'000} = 1 \,\text{ns}$$

• Execution Time (CPU Time)

The execution time (also called **CPU** time) is the total time needed by a processor to complete a given program. Two main ways to compute CPU time:

• Basic form:

CPU Time = Clock Cycles
$$\times T_{\text{CLK}} = \frac{\text{Clock Cycles}}{f_{\text{CLK}}}$$
 (14)

• Expanded form based on instructions:

CPU Time = Instruction Count \times Cycles Per Instruction \times T_{CLK}

$$= \frac{\text{Instruction Count} \times \text{Cycles Per Instruction}}{f_{\text{CLK}}}$$
(15)

• Weighted CPU Time. If the program is composed of different instruction types, with different CPI values, the total CPU time must be weighted by how much each instruction type contributes:

CPU Time =
$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\text{CPI}_i \times \mathbf{I}_i)\right) \times T_{CLK}$$
 (16)

Where:

- I_i is the number of instructions of type i.
- T_{CLK} is the clock cycle time.

The total CPU time is the sum of the CPU times for each class of instruction, weighted by how many times each instruction appears.

Note that weighted CPU time can be calculated using the classic formula, but using a weighted CPI (shown on page 243):

$$\text{CPU Time} = \frac{\text{IC} \times \text{CPI Weighted}}{f_{\text{CLK}}}$$

2 Cycles Per Instruction (CPI) and Instructions Per Cycle (IPC)

• Clocks Per Instruction (CPI) (clock cycles per instruction or clocks per instruction) is the average number of clock cycles each instruction requires.

$$CPI = \frac{Total \ Clock \ Cycles}{Instruction \ Count \ (IC)}$$
 (17)

Where the Total CLock Cycles is:

Total Clock Cycles =
$$IC + 4 + Stall$$
 Cycles

And the Instruction Count is the total number of instructions executed.

• Instructions Per Cycle (IPC) is the reciprocal of CPI:

$$IPC = \frac{1}{CPI} \tag{18}$$

- Mixed Programs. In a real program, we have a mix of operations. Each instruction type can have a different CPI, thus the **total average** performance depends on:
 - 1. How often each instruction type appears (its frequency).
 - 2. How many cycles each type needs (its CPI).

Because **not** all instructions appear equally, we must give **more** weight to instructions that appear more frequently. The Weighted Average CPI formula is:

$$CPI = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (CPI_i \times F_i)$$
 (19)

Where:

- CPI_i is the CPI of instruction type i.
- F_i is the **frequency of instruction** type i (percentage). It is calculated as:

$$F_i = \frac{I_i}{IC} \tag{20}$$

Where:

- * I_i is the number of instructions of type i.
- * IC is the total **Instruction Count** (total number of instructions in the program).

Example 3: CPI and CPU Time Calculation

Given a program with **100 instructions** and the following instruction mix (500 MHz clock frequency):

| Instruction Type | Frequency | CPI |
|------------------|-----------|-----|
| ALU | 43% | 1 |
| Load | 21% | 4 |
| Store | 12% | 4 |
| Branch | 12% | 2 |
| Jump | 12% | 2 |

First, convert frequencies to decimals:

- $43\% \to 0.43$
- $21\% \to 0.21$
- $12\% \rightarrow 0.12$
- $12\% \rightarrow 0.12$
- $12\% \rightarrow 0.12$

Now apply the CPI weighted formula 19:

CPI =
$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\text{CPI}_i \times F_i)$$

= $(0.43 \cdot 1) + (0.21 \cdot 4) + (0.12 \cdot 4) + (0.12 \cdot 2) + (0.12 \cdot 2)$
= $0.43 + 0.84 + 0.48 + 0.24 + 0.24$
= 2.23

Thus, the average CPI is 2.23. For CPU time, we can use the weighted CPI, but we must calculate the Clock Cycle Time $T_{\rm CLK}$:

CPU Time = IC × CPI Weighted ×
$$T_{\text{CLK}}$$

= $100 \times 2.23 \times \frac{1}{(500 \times 10^6)}$
= $223 \times \frac{1}{(500 \times 10^6)}$
= $223 \times 0.000'000'002 \text{ sec}$
= $223 \times 2 \text{ ns}$
= 446 ns

MIPS (Millions of Instructions Per Second)

MIPS measures how many millions of instructions a processor can execute per second. Two equivalent formulas:

• Using frequency and CPI:

$$MIPS = \frac{f_{CLK}}{CPI \times 10^6}$$
 (21)

• Using instruction count and execution time:

$$MIPS = \frac{Instruction\ Count}{Execution\ Time \times 10^6}$$
 (22)

Where the Execution Time is the CPU Time.

Higher MIPS does not necessarily mean better performance, because MIPS does not account for instruction complexity or actual work done.

4.2 Amdahl's Law

Amdahl's Law describes the **limits** of performance improvement when only **part of a system** is enhanced. Key principles are:

- Speedup of a program is limited by the part of the program that cannot be improved.
- Making the common case fast gives the best returns.

Thus, no matter how much we optimize a part of a system, the total speedup is bounded.

Formal Definition

Let:

- F: fraction of execution time **affected** by the enhancement.
- S: speedup **factor** for the enhanced part.

Then:

• New Execution Time:

$$\operatorname{ExTime}(\mathbf{w}/\mathbf{E}) = \left((1 - F) + \frac{F}{S} \right) \times \operatorname{ExTime}(\mathbf{w}/\mathbf{o} \mathbf{E})$$
 (23)

Where:

- "w/ E" = "with Enhancement"
- "w/o E" = "without Enhancement"
- Overall Speedup:

$$Speedup(E) = \frac{1}{(1-F) + \frac{F}{S}}$$
 (24)

Where:

- -(1-F) is a portion of execution time **not improved**.
- $-\frac{F}{S}$ is the improved portion, now **accelerated**.

In many books, we also see:

- FractionE: fraction of computation time accelerated.
- **SpeedupE**: speedup factor for the enhanced portion.

Thus:

$$Speedup_{overall} = \frac{1}{(1 - FractionE) + \frac{FractionE}{SpeedupE}}$$
(25)

Example 4: Amdahl's Law

Let us consider an enhancement for a CPU resulting 10 time faster on computation than the original one but the original CPU is busy with computation only 40% of the time. What is the overall speedup gained by introducing the enhancement?

Given:

- FractionE: 0.4 (40% of the time can be accelerated).
- SpeedupE: 10 (enhancement is 10x faster)

Apply Amdahl's Law:

Speedup_{overall} =
$$\frac{1}{(1 - 0.4) + \frac{0.4}{10}}$$

= $\frac{1}{0.6 + 0.04}$
= $\frac{1}{0.64}$
= 1.56

Thus, even if the improvement is 10x, the overall speedup is only about 1.56x.

If we only speed up a small part (small F), the impact is small. To achieve large speedup, we must:

- Speed up a large fraction of the execution time.
- Or make the enhancement extremely fast $(S \to \infty)$.

To reach the maximum theoretical speedup, if $S \to \infty$ (perfect acceleration), then:

$$Speedup_{max} = \frac{1}{1 - F}$$
 (26)

For example if only 40% can be improved, even with infinite speedup, the maximum is:

$$\mathrm{Speedup_{max}} = \frac{1}{1-0.4} = \frac{1}{0.6} \approx 1.67$$

This shows the real bottleneck: the non-improved part.

4.3 Pipelined Processors

Pipelining affects CPU performance **differently** than simple frequency or instruction count.

- ✓ Pipelining increases instruction Throughput (number of instructions completed per unit time).
- **X** Pipelining does not reduce Execution Time (latency) of a single instruction.

In fact slight latency increase can happen due to:

- Imbalance among pipeline stages (some stages are slower, limiting the clock frequency).
- Overhead from pipeline control (registers, clock skew, pipeline latch delays).

Also, we must remember that the **clock cycle time must be long enough** for the slowest stage to finish. Otherwise, the slowest stage will not finish its work before the clock ticks again, and the pipeline will become inconsistent or crash. So:

$$T_{\rm CLK} >$$
time of the slowest stage

So, if we want to make the CPU faster, we must balance the stages (make all stages take about the same time). Otherwise, one slow stage will limit the entire clock speed, even if other stages are very fast. This is why sometimes CPU designers split a slow stage into two smaller stages to balance the pipeline better!

■ Performance Metrics for Pipelining

Define:

- IC as Instruction Count
- CPI as Cycles Per Instruction
- IPC as Instructions Per Clock $\frac{1}{\text{CPI}}$

We have:

• Number of clock cycles in pipelined execution:

For a 5-stage pipeline like MIPS or RISC-V. And the CPI is:

$$CPI = \frac{Clock \ Cycles}{IC} = \frac{(IC + Stall \ Cycles + 4)}{IC}$$
(28)

• MIPS calculation:

$$MIPS = \frac{f_{clock}}{CPI \times 10^6}$$
 (29)

Example 5

Given:

- IC = 5 instructions
- Stall cycles = 2
- Clock = 500 MHz

Step-by-step:

• Clock cycles:

$$5 + 2 + 4 = 11$$

• CPI:

$$\frac{11}{5} = 2.2$$

• MIPS:

$$\frac{500 \times 10^6}{2.2 \times 10^6} \approx 227$$

Thus, the effective throughput is about 227 MIPS.

? Performance in Loops

Suppose we have:

- n iterations
- ullet Loop of m instructions per iteration
- \bullet k stalls per iteration

Formulas per iteration:

• IC per iteration:

$$IC_{per iter} = m$$
 (30)

• Clock Cycles per iteration:

Clock Cycles_{per iter} =
$$m + k + 4$$
 (31)

• Cycles Per Instruction per iteration:

$$CPI_{per iter} = \frac{(m+k+4)}{m}$$
 (32)

• MIPS per iteration:

$$MIPS = \frac{f_{clock}}{CPI_{per iter} \times 10^6}$$
 (33)

∞ Asymptotic Performance (Many Iterations)

If the loop runs for $n \to \infty$ iterations:

• Total Instruction Count per iteration:

$$IC_{AS} = Instruction\ Count_{AS} = m \times n$$
 (34)

• Total Clock Cycles per iteration:

$$\# \text{ Clock Cycles}_{AS} = \text{IC}_{AS} + \# \text{ Stall Cycles}_{AS} + 4$$

$$= (m \times n) + (k \times n) + 4$$
(35)

• Cycles Per Instruction per iteration:

$$CPI_{AS} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\# \text{ Clock Cycles}_{AS}}{IC_{AS}} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{m \times n + k \times n + 4}{m \times n} = \frac{m + k}{m}$$
(36)

The fixed 4 cycles become irrelevant when n becomes very large.

• MIPS per iteration:

$$MIPS_{AS} = \frac{f_{clock}}{CPI_{AS} \times 10^6}$$
 (37)

44 Ideal vs Realistic Pipelining

The ideal CPI on a pipelined processor would be 1, but stalls cause the pipeline performance to degrade form the ideal performance, so we have:

• Ideal pipelining:

$$Ideal CPI = 1 (38)$$

1 instruction per cycle after filling the pipeline.

• Realistic pipelining:

$$CPI = 1 + (stall cycles per instruction)$$
 (39)

Stalls are caused by:

- Structural Hazards (e.g., hardware resources conflict)
- Data Hazards (e.g., instruction dependencies)
- Control Hazards (e.g., branches)
- Memory Stalls (e.g., cache misses)

▶ Pipeline Speedup

Speedup measures how much **pipelining** performance compared to **unpipelined execution**. General formula:

Pipeline Speedup =
$$\frac{\text{Avg Exec Time Unpipelined}}{\text{Avg Exec Time Pipelined}} = \frac{\text{CPI}_{\text{unp}} \times T_{\text{clk, unp}}}{\text{CPI}_{\text{pipe}} \times T_{\text{clk, pipe}}}$$
 (40)

If we **ignore the cycle time overhead** of pipelining and we assume the **stages are perfectly balanced**, the clock cycle time of unpipelined/pipelined processors can be equal, so:

$$Pipeline Speedup = \frac{CPI_{unp}}{1 + CPI_{pipe}} = \frac{CPI_{unp}}{1 + Stall Cycles per Instruction}$$
 (41)

If we assume that each instruction takes the same number of cycles, which must be equal to the number of pipeline stages (called pipeline depth):

Pipeline Speedup =
$$\frac{\text{Pipeline Depth}}{1 + \text{Stall Cycles per Instruction}}$$
(42)

If there were **no pipeline stalls (ideal case)**, this leads to the intuitive result that pipelining improves performance by the depth of the pipeline:

$$Speedup = Pipeline Depth (43)$$

Thus, a 5-stage pipeline could at best achieve 5x speedup only if there are no stalls.

! Impact of Branches

Branches cause **pipeline stalls**, and their effect is quantified as:

$$Pipeline Speedup = \frac{Pipeline Depth}{1 + Branch Frequency \times Branch Penalty}$$
 (44)

- Branch Frequency: fraction of instructions that are branches.
- Branch Penalty: number of stall cycles per branch.

Where the Pipeline Stall Cycles per Instruction due to Branches (PSCIB) is:

$$PSCIB = Branch Frequency \times Branch Penalty$$
 (45)

4.4 Memory Hierarchy

In modern processors we organize memories as a hierarchy.

- At the **top**, **smallest** but **fastest** memories (e.g., L1 cache, CPU registers).
- At the **bottom**, **largest** but **slowest** memories (e.g., DRAM, disk storage).

The idea is to keep most data in fast memories for efficiency.

- **Hit**. The data we want is **found** in the upper (faster) memory level.
- Hit Rate. Probability (fraction) of memory accesses that result in a hit.

$$Hit Rate = \frac{\# hits}{\# memory accesses}$$
 (46)

- **Hit Time**. Time to **access** the upper memory level and check whether it's a hit.
- Miss. The data is **not found** in the upper memory, we must access the slower level.
- Miss Rate. Probability (fraction) of accesses that result in a miss.

$$Miss Rate = \frac{\# misses}{\# memory accesses}$$
 (47)

Important property:

$$Hit Rate + Miss Rate = 1 (48)$$

• Miss Time. Total time when there is a miss:

$$Miss Time = Hit Time + Miss Penalty$$
 (49)

Where Miss Penalty is extra time needed to fetch data from the lower level and update upper cache.

AMAT (Average Memory Access Time)

AMAT (Average Memory Access Time) measures the average time the processor needs to access memory (whether there's a hit or a miss).

$$AMAT = Hit \ Rate \times Hit \ Time + Miss \ Rate \times Miss \ Time$$

It combines both: the fast accesses (hits) and the slow accesses (misses). Since equation 49, we can substitute into the AMAT formula:

$$AMAT = Hit Rate \times Hit Time + Miss Rate \times (Hit Time + Miss Penalty)$$

But by definition:

Hit Rate
$$+$$
 Miss Rate $= 1$

Thus:

$$AMAT = Hit Time + Miss Rate \times Miss Penalty$$
 (50)

This is the most important and most used AMAT formula!

M How to improve cache performance?

To reduce AMAT (and improve system speed), we can:

- 1. Reduce Hit Time: Make the cache smaller, simpler, or closer to the CPU.
- Reduce Miss Rate: Improve cache organization (better replacement, associativity, prefetching).
- 3. Reduce Miss Penalty: Use faster lower levels (e.g., add an L2 or L3 cache).

4 Unified Cache vs Separate Instruction

There are two major architectures for L1 cache:

- Unified Cache: Same L1 cache for both instructions and data.
- Separate I\$ and D\$ (Harvard Architecture): Different L1 caches for instructions (I\$) and data (D\$).

For separate caches (Harvard Architecture):

- Instruction cache and Data cache have different miss rates.
- Accesses are divided between instruction and data operations.

This is the AMAT (Average Memory Access Time) for Harvard architectures:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{AMAT_{Harvard}} &= & (\%\mathrm{Instr}) \times \\ & & (\mathrm{Hit\ Time} + \mathrm{Miss\ Rate_{I\$}} \times \mathrm{Miss\ Penalty}) + \\ & & (\%\mathrm{Data}) \times \\ & & (\mathrm{Hit\ Time} + \mathrm{Miss\ Rate_{D\$}} \times \mathrm{Miss\ Penalty}) \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Example 6: Harvard Architecture

Assumptions:

- 16 KB I\$ with Miss Rate = 0.64%
- 16 KB D\$ with Miss Rate = 6.47%
- 32 KB Unified Cache with Aggregate Miss Rate = 1.99%
- 33% of accesses are loads/stores, so:
 - 75% accesses are instructions
 - -25% accesses are data
- \bullet Hit Time = 1 cycle, Miss Penalty = 50 cycles
- Data hit has 1 more stall for Unified cache (only one port)

Which cache is better?

Calculate Harvard AMAT (equation 51):

$$AMAT_{Harvard} = 0.75 \times (1 + 0.0064 \times 50) + 0.25 \times (1 + 0.0647 \times 50)$$

$$= 0.75 \times (1 + 0.32) + 0.25 \times (1 + 3.235)$$

$$= 0.75 \times 1.32 + 0.25 \times 4.235$$

= 0.99 + 1.05875

 $= 2.04875 \approx 2.05 \,\mathrm{cycles}$

Calculate AMAT (Unified cache):

$$AMAT = 0.75 \times (1 + 0.0199 \times 50) + 0.25 \times (1 + 1 + 0.0199 \times 50)$$

$$= 0.75 \times (1 + 0.995) + 0.25 \times (2 + 0.995)$$

$$= \quad 0.75 \times 1.995 + 0.25 \times 2.995$$

= 1.49625 + 0.74875

 $= 2.245 \approx 2.24 \,\mathrm{cycles}$

So Harvard (separate I\$ and D\$) gives better performance than Unified Cache, because AMAT (Average Memory Access Time) is less.

♦ Miss Penalty Reduction: Second Level Cache (L2)

L1 cache must be very small and fast (to match the fast CPU cycle time). But small cache, relatively high miss rate. Every miss in L1 would normally mean access to slow main memory (very expensive!).

The solution is to **insert a larger**, **slower L2 cache** between L1 and main memory. Thus:

- If L1 misses, we first try to find the data in L2.
- Only if L2 also misses, we go to **main memory**.

This reduces the effective miss penalty seen by the CPU.

Processor

L1 cache

L2 cache

Main Memory

When using both L1 and L2 caches, first:

$$AMAT = Hit Time_{L1} + Miss Rate_{L1} \cdot Miss Penalty_{L1}$$

where:

Miss $\operatorname{Penalty}_{L1} = \operatorname{Hit} \operatorname{Time}_{L2} + \operatorname{Miss} \operatorname{Rate}_{L2} \cdot \operatorname{Miss} \operatorname{Penalty}_{L2}$

Thus, expanding:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{AMAT} = & \text{Hit } \text{Time}_{L1} + \text{Miss } \text{Rate}_{L1} \cdot \\ & (\text{Hit } \text{Time}_{L2} + \text{Miss } \text{Rate}_{L2} \cdot \text{Miss } \text{Penalty}_{L2}) \end{aligned}$$

or simplified the **AMAT** is:

AMAT = Hit
$$\operatorname{Time}_{L1} +$$

Miss $\operatorname{Rate}_{L1} \cdot \operatorname{Hit} \operatorname{Time}_{L2} +$ (52)
Miss $\operatorname{Rate}_{L1} \cdot \operatorname{Miss} \operatorname{Rate}_{L2} \cdot \operatorname{Miss} \operatorname{Penalty}_{L2}$

Each term captures: immediate L1 access, possible L2 access, and final access to main memory if L2 also misses.

Local vs Global Miss Rates

- Local Miss Rate: misses divided accesses at that specific cache level. For example:
 - L1 Local Miss Rate = Misses at L1 ÷ Accesses to L1
 - L2 Local Miss Rate = Misses at L2 ÷ Accesses to L2
- Global Miss Rate: misses at a level relative to total CPU accesses.
 - For L1:

Global Miss
$$Rate_{L1} = Miss Rate_{L1}$$
 (53)

- For L2:

Global Miss
$$Rate_{L2} = Miss Rate_{L1} \cdot Miss Rate_{L2}$$
 (54)

Global miss rate is what really matters, because it tells us **what percentage of memory accesses are so unlucky** that they: miss in L1 (fast small cache), miss in L2 (bigger slower cache), go down to main memory (very slow).

Example 7: Local vs Global Miss Rates

Let us consider a computer with a L1 cache and L2 cache memory hierarchy. Suppose that in 1000 memory references there are 40 misses in L1 and 20 misses in L2. What are the various miss rates?

• L1 Miss Rate:

$$\frac{40}{1000} = 4\%$$

• L2 Local Miss Rate:

$$\frac{20}{40} = 50\%$$

• L2 Global Miss Rate:

Miss
$$Rate_{L1} \cdot Miss Rate_{L2} = 4\% \cdot 50\% = 2\%$$

Thus, only 2% of all CPU memory accesses end up reaching main memory.

Adding an L2 cache:

- ✓ Increases hit rate (fewer accesses to slow main memory),
- ✓ Reduces effective miss penalty,
- ✓ Improves CPU performance by reducing memory stall cycles.

Impact of Memory Hierarchy on CPU Execution Time

Without cache every memory access would go directly to main memory (very slow). With cache:

- Most accesses are **fast** (cache hits),
- Only a few accesses are **slow** (cache misses).

Thus, **memory stalls** (waiting for memory) become part of the CPU execution time. Therefore, the CPU total execution time depends on:

- CPU execution cycles (doing normal instruction work),
- Memory stall cycles (waiting for slow memory).

The formal formula for CPU time is:

CPU Time = (CPUexec Cycles + Memory Stall Cycles)
$$\times T_{\text{CLK}}$$

Where:

- T_{CLK} : clock cycle time.
- **CPUexec Cycles**: cycles needed for normal instruction execution (ALU operations, Load/Store assuming all hits).

$$CPUexec Cycles = IC \times CPI_{exec}$$
 (55)

Where:

- IC: Instruction Count.
- CPI_{exec}: ideal CPI without considering cache misses.
- Memory Stall Cycles: extra cycles lost because of memory misses. Memory stall cycles are caused by misses times penalty per miss. Specifically:

Memory Stall Cycles = $IC \times Misses$ per Instruction $\times Miss$ Penalty (56)

And:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Misses per Instruction} &= & \frac{\# \text{ misses}}{\text{IC}} \times \frac{\# \text{ mem. accesses}}{\text{IC}} \times \text{Miss Rate} \\ &= & \text{MAPI} \times \text{Miss Rate} \end{aligned}$$

(57)

(where MAPI is Memory Accesses per Instruction); Therefore:

Memory Stall Cycles =
$$IC \times MAPI \times Miss Rate \times Miss Penalty$$
 (58)

Putting it all together, we get the Full CPU Time formula:

CPU Time =
$$IC \cdot (CPI_{exec} + MAPI \cdot Miss Rate \cdot Miss Penalty) \cdot T_{CLK}$$
 (59)

This formula shows **both**: the "normal" CPU work, and the "extra time" lost due to cache misses. These are also (ideal) special cases:

✓ Ideal cache (100% hits):

CPU Time = IC × CPI_{exec} ×
$$T_{CLK}$$

X No cache (100% misses):

CPU Time = IC × (CPI_{exec} + MAPI × Miss Penalty) ×
$$T_{CLK}$$

▲ Including Pipeline Stalls. If we also want to consider pipeline stalls (caused by hazards like data dependencies), the full CPU Time becomes:

CPU Time = IC × (CPI_{exec} + Stalls per Instruction +
$${\rm MAPI} \times {\rm Miss~Rate} \times {\rm Miss~Penalty}) \times$$
 (60)
$$T_{CLK}$$

Where Stalls per Instruction is the average extra cycles lost per instruction due to pipeline hazards. So we can see that pipeline hazards and memory "misses" both contribute to processor slowdowns.

This is important because even if we build the fastest CPU core in the world, if our memory system is slow, our real performance will be bad! Memory system design (good caches, good pipelines) is **essential** for real CPU performance.

▲ Memory Stalls in L1 and L2 Caches

In a hierarchical cache system:

- A memory access first tries L1,
- If L1 misses, tries L2,
- If **L2 also misses**, goes to **main memory** (very slow).

Each level of cache can introduce extra stall cycles:

- Stall cycles after an L1 miss \rightarrow time to access L2.
- Stall cycles after an L2 miss \rightarrow time to access main memory.

Average memory stall cycles per instruction (considering both L1 and L2) is:

Memory stall cycles per instruction =
$$(\text{Misses}_{L1} \cdot \text{Hit Time}_{L2}) + (\text{Misses}_{L2} \cdot \text{Miss Penalty}_{L2})$$
 (61)

Where:

- Misses L_1 = Misses per instruction at L1.
- Misses_{L2} = Misses per instruction at L2.
- Hit $Time_{L2} = Time$ to access L2 cache (after L1 miss).
- Miss Penalty_{L2} = Time to access main memory (after L2 miss).
- (Misses_{L1} · Hit Time_{L2}) = The **first term** is for accesses that hit in L2 (still slower than L1 but faster than main memory).
- (Misses_{L2} · Miss Penalty_{L2}) = The **second term** is for accesses that miss in both L1 and L2 (very slow).

If we want to **find misses per instruction**, they depend on MAPI (Memory Accesses Per Instruction) and miss rates:

• Misses at L1 per instruction

$$Misses_{L1} = MAPI \times Miss Rate_{L1}$$

• Misses at L2 per instruction

$$Misses_{L2} = MAPI \times Global Miss Rate_{L2}$$

Where:

Global Miss $Rate_{L2} = Miss Rate_{L1} \times Miss Rate_{L2}$

Considering everything, the Final Full CPU Time Formula is:

CPU Time =
$$IC \times (CPI_{exec} + Memory stall cycles per instruction) \times T_{CLK}$$
 (62)

Where:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Memory stall cycles per instruction} = & (\text{MAPI} \times \\ & \text{Miss Rate}_{L1} \times \\ & \text{Hit Time}_{L2}) + \\ & (\text{MAPI} \times \\ & \text{Miss Rate}_{L1} \times \\ & \text{Miss Rate}_{L2} \times \\ & \text{Miss Penalty}_{L2}) \end{array} \tag{63}$$

Putting it all together, the CPU Time is:

$$IC \cdot (CPI_{exec} + MAPI \cdot (MR_{L1} \cdot HT_{L2} + MR_{L1} \cdot MR_{L2} \cdot MP_{L2})) \cdot T_{CLK} \quad (64)$$

This is the most complete formula that accounts for:

- L1 and L2 cache effects,
- Main memory access,
- How memory stalls degrade CPU performance.

5 VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word)

5.1 Introduction

Traditional **compilers** use **static code scheduling** to exploit Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP). Key tasks of the compiler:

- Detect **parallelizable** instructions considering: Hardware resource constraints and Data dependencies.
- Schedule instructions to execute in parallel when possible.
- Otherwise, **insert NOPs** (No Operations) if no safe parallel execution is possible.

Statically scheduled processors trust the compiler to "fill the pipeline" and avoid hazards at compile time.

■ VLIW Processors: Alternative Way to Extract ILP

VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) processors are a class of architectures designed to execute multiple operations in parallel during a single clock cycle, but unlike superscalar processors, they rely on the compiler rather than on dynamic hardware mechanisms to detect and schedule parallelism.

The fundamental idea behind VLIW is to group several independent operations together into a single long instruction word, called a bundle. This bundle is composed of several fixed slots, each one corresponding to a different functional unit in the processor, such as an integer ALU, a floating-point unit, a load/store unit, or a branch unit.

For example, in a 5-issue VLIW processor, a single bundle would typically carry up to five operations: integer, floating-point, load/store, branch, etc.

The **key difference** compared **to traditional superscalar** processors lies in who decides what can run in parallel. In superscalar designs, the hardware dynamically analyzes dependencies between instructions at runtime, which requires complex circuitry for hazard detection and scheduling. In VLIW architectures, this analysis is performed entirely at compile time. The **compiler is responsible for:**

- Statically identify independent operations.
- Solve structural hazards (e.g., two operations trying to use the same hardware unit).
- Solve data hazards (dependencies between instructions).
- Insert **NOPs** when necessary.

When no useful instruction is available for a particular slot, the compiler inserts a NOP (no-operation). In cases where conflicts cannot be avoided, NOPs are inserted into the bundle to fill empty slots.

? Why move to Compiler?

The problem with Superscalar is that the hardware requires complex dynamic scheduling and dependency checking, which **costs area and power**.

VLIW Idea is:

- Push complexity to the compiler.
- Compiler groups parallel operations into a single bundle.
- No need for runtime dependency checking anymore.

The VLIW paradigm is characterized by the use of **very wide instruction** words, each containing multiple independent operations ("syllables"). A multiple-issue VLIW processor typically features specialized units for integer, floating-point, memory access, and branch instructions. For example, a 4-issue VLIW processor will have four operation slots per bundle, each connected to a different unit.

≅ Multiple-issue VLIW: Operation Latencies

An important aspect in VLIW scheduling is the **management of operation** latencies. Each operation type may require a **different number of clock** cycles to complete. Integer operations, memory accesses, and floating-point computations may all have varying latencies, and these differences must be carefully considered during scheduling. The **compiler must plan the execution** so that operations complete in the correct order and without causing unnecessary stalls in the pipeline.

In summary, VLIW architectures represent a shift of complexity from the hard-ware to the compiler, aiming for more efficient and simpler processor designs while demanding sophisticated compiler techniques to fully exploit available parallelism.

Single Program Counter and Branch Management

In a VLIW processor, even though multiple operations are issued simultaneously, the architecture still uses a **single program counter** to fetch instructions. Each instruction fetched corresponds to a **bundle**, which can contain multiple parallel operations.

Importantly, within each bundle, there can be at most one branch instruction that affects control flow. This constraint simplifies the handling of branches, making it easier for the processor to predict and manage the program's execution path.

■ Shared Multi-Ported Register File

Since a VLIW processor issues multiple operations in parallel, the **register file** must support multiple simultaneous reads and writes. In a typical 4-issue VLIW machine, the register file needs to have enough ports to read **eight** source operands and write four destination results every clock cycle.

This requirement implies a **shared**, **multi-ported register file**, which is one of the non-trivial aspects of the hardware design. It ensures that all functional units can access their operands without creating bottlenecks.

■ Importance of Parallelism and the Use of NOPs

To achieve high performance, the **compiler must ensure that the source code has enough parallelism** to fill all the available operation slots in each bundle. When **sufficient independent instructions are not available**, **NOPs are inserted** into the empty slots. This insertion preserves the fixed structure of the bundle but can lead to inefficiencies if the application does not expose enough ILP.

Pipeline Organization

VLIW processors often use a **pipelined execution model** similar to traditional RISC architectures. A standard pipeline might include stages like **Instruction Fetch (IF)**, **Instruction Decode (ID)**, **Register Read (RR)**, **Execution (EX)**, and **Write Back (WB)**.



In the previous figure, a **5-stage pipeline** is used, with each bundle passing through these stages. Each operation within a bundle proceeds independently through the functional units connected to the pipeline.

■ Operation Dispatch and Decode

If the architecture dedicates **one functional unit per slot**, the decode stage becomes relatively simple. Each operation is directed straight to its corresponding functional unit for execution without the need for complex arbitration.

However, if there are **more functional units than slots**, meaning there is a surplus of parallel hardware resources, the architecture must include a **dispatch network**. This network is responsible for forwarding each operation, along with its operands, to the appropriate available functional unit. In this way, the design of the dispatch system depends heavily on the organization of functional units relative to the number of issue slots defined by the instruction bundle format.

5.2 Data dependencies

In VLIW architectures, data dependencies:

- True dependencies (RAW: Read After Write)
- Anti-dependencies (WAR: Write After Read)
- Output dependencies (WAW: Write After Write)

Are handled entirely by the compiler. During the compilation process, the compiler analyzes the functional unit latencies and rearranges the instruction sequence to eliminate conflicts. When dependencies cannot be resolved by reordering, the compiler inserts NOPs to delay operations and maintain correct execution order.

This static management of hazards is **crucial** because the hardware in VLIW processors does not dynamically detect or resolve data hazards during execution.

■ Operation Latency Management

In order to correctly schedule instructions, the compiler must also consider **operation latencies**.

If an **operation**, such as a multiplication, **requires multiple cycles** to complete, the **compiler must account for this delay explicitly**. It can either rearrange independent instructions to fill the delay or insert NOPs to stall dependent instructions until the result is ready.

For instance, if an instruction C = A * B has a latency of two cycles, the compiler may schedule a NOP after it, before allowing an instruction that depends on C to execute. This **careful latency management ensures that data hazards are avoided** and that results are available when needed, even when using pipelined functional units.

A WAR, WAW, and Structural Hazards

Besides true dependencies, anti-dependencies (WAR) and output dependencies (WAW) are also statically resolved at compile time. The compiler can manage these by:

- ✓ Appropriately choosing the timing of operations.
- ✓ Using **register renaming** techniques to avoid conflicts.

Structural hazards, such as two operations trying to use the same hardware resource simultaneously, are similarly resolved by the compiler, either through scheduling decisions or resource management strategies.

In addition to data and structural hazards, the compiler may provide **static branch prediction hints**. However, if the **prediction is wrong**, it is the **hardware's responsibility** to detect the misprediction and flush the pipeline, just as in *traditional architectures*.

■ Maintaining In-Order Write-Back

An important constraint in VLIW processors is that all operations in a bundle should complete their write-back stage at the same clock cycle. This synchronization prevents structural hazards in accessing the register file and avoids WAR and WAW hazards during register writes.

If operations within a bundle have different latencies, they are all forced to align to the longest latency operation among them. Otherwise, if operations were allowed to complete independently, out-of-order write-backs would occur, and the processor would require additional hardware to track and resolve register file conflicts, precisely the kind of complexity VLIW designs try to avoid.

A Register Pressure

One important issue in VLIW architectures is the problem of **register pressure**. Because VLIW bundles can issue multiple operations simultaneously, and because many **operations have multicycle latencies**, a **large number of registers may be occupied at the same time by intermediate results waiting to complete**.

For instance, if a bundle contains two floating-point operations, each requiring five clock cycles to complete, their destination registers remain occupied for the entire duration of those five cycles. Since a VLIW processor continues issuing new bundles each cycle, this quickly accumulates a large number of active registers. In the given example, five bundles are issued while the first two results are still pending, resulting in up to twenty operations competing for register resources.

The situation is further exacerbated by **register renaming**, a technique used by the compiler to solve WAR (Write After Read) and WAW (Write After Write) hazards statically. Register renaming:

✓ Avoids conflicts

X Increases the number of physical register needed, thereby amplifying register pressure.

★ Increases the number of physical register needed, thereby amplifying register pressure.

Managing register pressure is therefore a **crucial task** for the compiler, often requiring careful allocation strategies or even **spilling values temporarily to memory** when the **register file becomes saturated**.

▲ Dynamic Events in VLIW

Although VLIW processors rely heavily on static compilation, some dynamic events cannot be fully predicted or controlled at compile time.

- A common example is the data cache miss. While the latency of a cache miss is known in general terms (e.g., memory access delay), whether a particular memory access will cause a miss depends on runtime conditions. If a cache miss occurs, the processor experiences a stall, which was not anticipated during static scheduling.
- Another dynamic event is the **branch misprediction**. Although the compiler may provide static branch hints, actual program execution might differ. When a **branch is mispredicted**, the **processor must dynamically flush the pipeline** to discard speculative instructions that were fetched and partially executed under the wrong control flow assumption.

In both cases, while VLIW simplifies hardware by eliminating dynamic scheduling for regular instruction flow, it still requires mechanisms to handle these unpredictable runtime events.

5.3 Statically Scheduled Processors

In statically scheduled architectures, the compiler is responsible for arranging instructions to exploit Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP). By carefully analyzing data dependencies and resource constraints, the compiler reorders operations to maximize parallel execution and minimize stalls.

A Basic Block is the main unit considered during static scheduling. It consists of a straight-line code sequence without branches except at the entry and exit points. However, in practice, basic blocks tend to be small: for typical programs, only around 4 to 7 instructions are found between branches. Moreover, even within a basic block, true data dependencies (RAW, Read After Write) further limit the amount of exploitable parallelism, forcing some instructions to be issued sequentially.

As a result, achieving substantial performance improvements requires techniques that go **beyond individual basic blocks**, aiming to exploit ILP across larger regions of code.

♥ VLIW Processors: Main Advantages

- VLIW architectures represent a **powerful solution for statically exploiting ILP**. The extensive use of compiler optimizations enables VLIW processors to achieve **high performance**, even **without the complex runtime scheduling hardware** used in superscalar designs.
- Since the compiler performs dependency checking and scheduling at compile time, it has the advantage of analyzing the program with a much larger instruction window than would be feasible in hardware. This allows more opportunities to detect parallelism, especially when aggressive code transformations, such as loop unrolling or software pipelining, are applied.
- By transferring complexity from hardware to software, VLIW processors achieve a significant reduction in hardware complexity. Smaller die areas lead to cheaper production costs and lower power consumption, making VLIWs attractive for embedded applications.
 - Moreover, the fixed format of VLIW instructions simplifies the decode logic, and scaling to a larger number of functional units becomes easier.

▲ Open Challenges of VLIW Architectures

Despite these advantages, VLIW designs face several open challenges:

First, they rely heavily on strong compiler technology. Sophisticated
compilation techniques are necessary not only to detect parallelism within
basic blocks but also to manage parallelism across larger code regions, which increases the complexity of compiler design.

- Another issue is the **increase in code size**. Because the instruction bundles have a fixed structure, and NOPs must be inserted to handle scheduling gaps, **increase in code size**. While code compression techniques can mitigate this effect, they add extra decoding complexity to the processor.
- Register management is also a concern. The extensive use of register renaming to avoid WAR and WAW hazards increases the number of required registers and complicates the organization of the register file. Clustered VLIW designs have been proposed to partially address this problem.
- Finally, binary incompatibility is a major limitation.

Even small changes in the number of slots, the types of functional units, or their latencies can render code compiled for one VLIW processor incompatible with another, even if they share the same instruction set architecture.

This lack of portability contrasts with more dynamic architectures, where binary compatibility is preserved across generations.

Although solutions such as **Just-In-Time compilation** have been explored, they **introduce additional complexity and are rarely adopted in practice**. For this reason, VLIW processors are primarily **employed in embedded systems**, where binaries can be compiled specifically for the target hardware and do not require high portability.

5.4 Code Scheduling

As we saw on page 185, Code Scheduling is the process of rearranging program instructions to maximize parallelism during execution. The **primary goal** of **Code Scheduling** is to **statically reorder instructions** within object code in such a way that:

- ✓ Execution time is minimized.
- ✓ Semantic correctness is preserved.

In simple terms, we want the program to run as **fast as possible without changing what it computes**. This is essential because in architectures like VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word), the hardware doesn't handle instruction reordering dynamically. Instead, the **compiler is fully responsible** for finding parallelism and deciding the scheduling.

? Motivation in VLIW Architectures

In VLIW architectures, the **responsibility of exploiting** instruction-level parallelism (**ILP**) is **shifted from the hardware to the compiler**. This shift implies several things:

- The hardware is simpler: no complex dynamic scheduling (like Tomasulo or Scoreboarding).
- Parallel instructions are issued together as part of a wide instruction word.
- Each instruction slot in a VLIW word maps to a specific functional unit.
- Why do we need scheduling in this context? Because a VLIW machine expects parallel instructions to be packed statically in the same bundle. If the compiler fails to schedule efficiently, the result is many NOPs and a waste of hardware resources.

▲ Semantic Correctness and Performance

It's not enough to just reorder instructions for performance. We must also preserve:

- True data dependencies (RAW), instructions must respect the order of reads after writes.
- Avoid introducing errors by violating:
 - Anti-dependencies (WAR)
 - Output dependencies (WAW)

The scheduler (compiler) must:

- ✓ Carefully analyze the dependency graph of the instructions.
- ✓ Reorder only when it's safe.
- Possibly apply renaming or other transformations to eliminate false dependencies.

5.4.1 Scheduling Basics

A Basic Block is the smallest unit of code for scheduling purposes. It's a straight-line code sequence that has:

- One single entry point (i.e., no jumps into the middle).
- One single exit point (i.e., only the last instruction may jump elsewhere).

In practice:

- No branches except at the start (entry) and end (exit).
- All instructions inside a basic block execute sequentially and always together.
- Used by compilers to isolate code regions where **safe reordering** can be performed.

This isolation is essential for local scheduling techniques like loop unrolling and software pipelining.

Dependence Graph (DAG, Directed Acyclic Graph)

Once a basic block is identified, the compiler builds a dependence graph to model how instructions depend on each other.

- Each **node** in the graph represents an **instruction**.
- Each edge denotes a data dependence between two instructions.
- The **type of edge** can correspond to:
 - **RAW** (true dependence).
 - WAR, WAW (name dependencies, can often be eliminated via register renaming).

This graph helps determine:

- ✓ Which instructions are **ready to execute**.
- ✓ Which instructions must wait for others to complete.
- ✓ The longest dependency chain, which limits parallelism.

? Why is this graph useful?

There are two main reasons:

- 1. It **exposes parallelism**: independent instructions can be scheduled in the same cycle or in parallel execution units.
- 2. It defines the **Critical Path** of execution: the **longest path from a source to a sink node** (i.e., sequential dependencies that can't be parallelized).

5.4.2 Dependence Graph and Critical Path

A Dependence Graph (also called a Data Dependence Graph or Instruction Dependence Graph) is a directed acyclic graph (DAG) used by the compiler to represent data dependencies among instructions in a basic block. It is fundamental in instruction scheduling, especially in VLIW and other statically scheduled architectures.

? How to Build the Dependence Graph

To build a Dependence Graph from a basic block:

- 1. Create a node for each individual instruction in the basic block.
- 2. Add edges between nodes based on dependencies: an edge from instruction $I_1 \to I_2$, means that I_2 depends on the results of I_1 , and I_2 cannot execute before I_1 .
- 3. **Label each edge** with the type of dependency (usually RAW is critical, WAR/WAW can often be resolved by renaming).
- 4. **Annotate each node** with the instruction **latency** (how long it takes to execute) and other scheduling metadata (like priority).

Each path in the graph shows which instructions must wait for which. The deeper the graph, the more serialization is required.

X Longest Path Computation

Each node is annotated with:

Longest Path
$$(i) = \max [\text{Longest Path}(p)] + \text{Latency}(i)$$
 (65)

Where p are all the **predecessors** of instruction i.

- ullet This gives the **maximum cumulative latency** needed to reach instruction i.
- It reflects how deep a node is in terms of data dependencies.

Once all node values are computed, the maximum among them gives the Critical Path.

Example 1: Exam - 11 february 2025

Let's consider the following LOOP code:

```
1 LOOP: LD F1, A(R1)
2 LD F2, A(R2)
3 LD F3, A(R3)
4 FADD F1, F1, F2
5 FADD F2, F2, F3
6 FMUL F1, F1, F2
7 FADD F3, F3, F3
8 ADDUI R2, R1, 8
9 ADDUI R2, R1, 8
10 SD F1, B(R1)
11 ADDUI R1, R1, 4
12 BNE R1, R6, LOOP
```

The DAG is:



An oriented line indicates a RAW dependency. A dashed line indicates a WAR or WAW dependency. For this reason, labels are not inserted. Additionally, since the latency is calculated by hand, no text is inserted to avoid confusion in the graph. The asterisk indicates that these nodes were redrawn for readability.

? What is the Critical Path?

The **Critical Path** is the **longest path** through the dependence graph, starting from an entry instruction and ending at an instruction with no successors.

- It represents the minimum number of clock cycles needed to execute the basic block, even with unlimited resources.
- Any attempt to **speed up execution** (through scheduling or parallelism) **cannot beat this lower bound**.

If our goal is to schedule instructions as efficiently as possible, the critical path is our **primary constraint**.

6 Exams

6.1 2025

6.1.1 Midterm - May 5

Exercise 1.A - Software Pipelining

Consider the following software pipelined loop SP_LOOP and the corresponding start-up and finish-up code:

```
LD F0, 0 (R1)
  START_UP:
                 LD F2, 0 (R2)
                 FADD F4, F0, F0
                 FADD F6, F2, F2
                 LD F0, 8 (R1)
                 LD F2, 8 (R2)
  SP_LOOP:
                 SD F4, 0 (R1)
                 SD F6, 0 (R2)
9
                 FADD F4, F0, F0
10
                 FADD F6, F2, F2
                LD F0, 16 (R1)
LD F2, 16 (R2)
12
13
                 ADDUI R1, R1, 8
14
                 ADDUI R2, R2, 8
15
16
                 ADD R3, R2, R1
                 BNE R3, R4, SP_LOOP
17
19 FINISH-UP:
                SD F4, 8 (R1)
                 SD F6, 8 (R2)
20
21
                 {\tt FADD} {\tt F4}, {\tt F0}, {\tt F0}
                 FADD F6, F2, F2
22
                 SD F4, 16 (R1)
23
                 SD F6, 16 (R2)
```

Reconstruct the original (non-pipelined) version of the code.

Answer: Software Pipelining is a loop optimization technique. Instead of processing iterations strictly sequentially, it overlaps instructions from multiple iterations. So in the pipelined version:

- The loop body does parts of multiple iterations at the same time.
- Because of this, we need extra **start-up** code (to prime the pipeline) and **finish-up** code (to flush the remaining operations).

The original loop must do **one iteration at a time**. In the original **non-pipelined loop**, we:

- Load the data for the current iteration.
- Do the computation.
- Store the results.
- Update pointers.
- Check whether you are done.
- Repeat.

In software pipelining we always have:

- 1. Start-up code
- 2. Steady-state loop
- 3. Finish-up code

Because the pipeline overlaps parts of different iterations. So we need:

- ullet Extra code at the **start** to *prime* the pipeline with partial work.
- The main loop which does the steady overlapping work for all *middle* iterations.
- Extra code at the **end** to *drain* the pipeline, to finish the partial work left from the last overlapping iterations.

In other words, we need to reverse engineer the original code for this exercise.

The software pipelined loop usually overlaps:

- Load for **next** iteration.
- Compute for current iteration.
- Store for **previous** iteration.

The goal is trace the dependency chain:

- Which LD feeds which FADD.
- Which FADD feeds which SD.

So the key is to identify the loop-carried data flow and align addresses to match.

General 5-step method:

1. Mark what the pipelined loop does. In our case:

```
1 SP_LOOP:
2 SD F4, O(R1)  # Store result of previous iteration?
3 SD F6, O(R2)
4
5 FADD F4, F0, F0  # Compute for current iteration?
6 FADD F6, F2, F2
7
8 LD F0, 16(R1)  # Load for next iteration
9 LD F2, 16(R2)
10
11 ADDUI R1, R1, 8  # Increment base pointers
12 ADDUI R2, R2, 8
```

2. Figure out the purpose

- LD: prefetch next input.
- FADD: do the math for the loaded input.
- SD: store the result from previous iteration.

3. Sketch the timeline. Think conceptually:

| Pipeline Stage | Operation |
|----------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Load | Loads new data for $i + 1$ |
| 2. Compute | Uses old load for i |
| 3. Store | Saves result for i -1 |

4. Match start-up and finish-up

- Start-up: primes the pipeline, so gets first F0, F2 ready.
- Loop: repeats the middle chunk.
- Finish-up: drains the leftover results.

5. Write the original loop. For each iteration:

- Load F0, F2 \leftarrow data for i
- Compute F4 = F0 + F0, F6 = F2 + F2 \leftarrow process for i
- \bullet Store F4, F6 \leftarrow save result for i
- ullet Increment pointers
- Check loop condition

So, here's the final solution:

```
1 LOOP: LD F0, 0 (R1)
2 LD F2, 0 (R2)
3 FADD F4, F0, F0
4 FADD F6, F2, F2
5 SD F4, 0 (R1)
6 SD F6, 0 (R2)
7 ADDUI R1, R1, 8
8 ADDUI R2, R2, 8
9 ADD R3, R2, R1
10 BNE R3, R4, LOOP
```

Exercise 1.B - Software Pipelining

Give the same software pipelined loop of Exercise 1.A:

```
1 SP_LOOP: SD F4, 0 (R1)
2 SD F6, 0 (R2)
3 FADD F4, F0, F0
4 FADD F6, F2, F2
5 LD F0, 16 (R1)
6 LD F2, 16 (R2)
7 ADDUI R1, R1, 8
8 ADDUI R2, R2, 8
9 ADD R3, R2, R1
BNE R3, R4, SP_LOOP
```

Consider a 3-issue VLIW machine with fully pipelined functional units:

- 1 Memory Units with 3 cycles latency
- 1 FP ALUs with 3 cycles latency
- 1 Integer ALU with 1 cycle latency to next Int/FP & 2 cycle latency to next Branch

The branch is completed with 1 cycle delay slot (branch solved in ID stage). **No branch prediction**. In the Register File, it is possible to read and write at the same address at the same clock cycle.

1. Considering one iteration of the SP_LOOP, complete the following table by using the list-based scheduling (do NOT introduce any loop unrolling and modifications to loop indexes) on the 3-issue VLIW machine including the BRANCH DELAY SLOT. Please do not write in NOPs.

Answer: In a VLIW architecture (Very Long Instruction Word), a single instruction word encodes multiple operations that execute in parallel. The compiler does the heavy lifting: it schedules independent instructions side by side in the same very long instruction word. The hardware just fires all operations in parallel, it does not dynamically check for dependencies at runtime (unlike out-of-order superscalar).

- **?** What does *3-issue* mean? It is the issue width and is the number of operations the processor *fetches*, *decodes*, *and executes* in parallel **per cycle**. So, with 3-issue, the processor can execute up to **3 instructions per clock cycles**. They must be **independent** enough for the compiler to pack them together.
- What does fully pipelined functional units mean? Each type of operation is done in its own functional unit (e.g., integer ALU, floating-point adder, load/store unit, etc.). Fully pipelined means multiple operations can be in different pipeline stages of the same unit simultaneously. So, every clock cycle a new operation can start, even if a previous one isn't finished yet. For example, if an FADD unit is fully pipelined and the FADD takes 4 cycles to complete, it can accept one new FADD per cycle, the result pops our 4 cycles later.

What is *list-based scheduling*? List-based scheduling is a classic compiler scheduling algorithm used to assign operations to *time slots* (cycles) and *resources* (e.g., functional units) while respecting dependencies.

- It tries to pack as many independent instructions as possible into each cycle.
- It tries to fill all slots of a wide-issue machine (VLIW, superscalar).
- It tries to respect resource limits (e.g., 1 integer ALU, 1 FP adder).

It is called list-based because the compiler first builds a **dependency graph** (where the nodes are the operations and the edges are the dependencies) and then creates a **list** of **ready operations**. These are instructions **whose inputs are ready** and **whose predecessors have been completed**. Each cycle:

- It picks operations from the list.
- It assigns them to available slots/resources.
- It marks successors ready when dependencies clear.

A What does In the Register File, it is possible to read and write at the same address in the same clock cycle mean? The register file supports simultaneous read and write to the same register. So, in one cycle:

- We might **read register** F0 to feed an FADD.
- AND write back a result to F0 in the same cycle.

The hardware guarantees the read gets the **old value**, the write updates it for **later cycles**.

If the register file did not allow this, we'd have to schedule dependent instructions in separate cycles to avoid conflict (e.g., we couldn't read FO to feed FADD while overwriting FO with a new LD). Otherwise, if it is allowed, in same cycle we can:

- LD F0, ... (writes F0)
- FADD F4, F0, F0 (reads old F0)


Here are some notes about the solution:

- We are using software pipelining, so the SD and FADD operators can start together because the SD operator stores the results of the previous iteration (or the initial loop, if it is the first iteration).
- The ADDUI operator starts when the first SD store finishes, thanks to the register file. In the same cycle, the load operation begins, as it loads the operands for the next iteration.
- Cycle 6 stalls because the BNE operator must wait for the result of the previous ADD and cannot start in cycle 6 because it reads old values.

? What should we do about our loop?

(a) Build the **DAG** for one iteration. A Data Dependency Graph (DAG) for scheduling has nodes, which are operations or instructions, and edges, which are directed and show true dependencies (RAW). For example, an edge from A to B means that B must wait for A to finish.

- (b) Draw a dashed line if there are WAR or WAW hazards. This means we can perform these two instructions in the same cycle if a FU free is available.
- (c) In the table, write the instructions from start to finish.



| | Memory Unit | Floating Point Unit | Integer Unit |
|------------------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| $\overline{\text{C1}}$ | SD F4, 0 (R1) | FADD F4, F0, F0 | |
| C2 | SD F6, 0 (R2) | FADD F6, F2, F2 | |
| C3 | LD FO, 16 (R1) | | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 |
| C4 | LD F2, 16 (R2) | | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 |
| C5 | | | ADD R3, R2, R1 |
| C6 | | | |
| C7 | | | BNE R3, R4, SP_LOOP |
| C8 | | | (branch delay) |

2. How long is the critical path for a single iteration?

Answer: in instruction scheduling, the critical path is the longest chain of dependent operations that must be executed in sequence because of true data dependencies (RAW). It determines the minimum possible latency to complete one full logical iteration. The critical path length depends on the data dependencies and the assumed functional unit latencies, not the scheduling algorithm.

In our case, there are 8 cycles for each iteration, so the **critical path is 8**.

3. What performance did you achieve in CPI?

Answer: The Clock Per Instruction (CPI) can be calculated using the following formula:

$$CPI = \frac{\# \ Clock \ Cycles}{IC} = \frac{\# \ Clock \ Cycles}{\# \ Instructions} = \frac{8}{10} = 0.8$$

4. What performance did you achieve in FP ops per cycles?

Answer: FP ops per cycle measures how well we are utilizing the FP functional units. Here, there are 2 floating-point additions (FADD F4, FADD F6):

FP ops / cycle =
$$\frac{\text{\# Floating-Point ops}}{\text{\# Instructions}} = \frac{2}{8} = 0.25$$

5. How much is the code efficiency?

Answer: When asked for **code efficiency** in this VLIW/ILP context, they usually mean:

$$\label{eq:efficiency} \text{Efficiency} = \frac{\text{Achieved IPC}}{\text{Maximum Theoretical IPC}}$$

So we measure how much of the machine's peak parallelism we actually use. The achieved Instruction Per Cycle (IPC) is:

Achieved IPC =
$$\frac{\text{\# Instructions}}{\text{\# Clock Cycles}} = \frac{10}{8} = 1.25$$

Here, VLIW is 3-issue, so it can execute up to **3 ops per cycle** if there's no data or resource limit (Peak IPC = 3). So, code efficiency is:

Efficiency =
$$\frac{1.25}{3}$$
 = 0.4167 \approx 41.67\% \approx 42\%

We're achieving about 41.67% ($\approx 42\%$) of the maximum possible execution parallelism.

Exercise 2.A - Dependency Analysis

Consider the same software pipelined loop of **Exercise 1.A** containing multiple types of intra-loop dependences. Complete the following table by inserting all types of true-data-dependences, anti-dependences and output dependences for each instruction:

Answer:

| I# | Type of instruction | Analysis of dependences: |
|---------|---------------------|---|
| | | 1. True data dependence with ${\tt I\#}$ for ${\tt \$Fx}$ |
| | | 2. Anti-dependence with I# for \$Fy |
| | | 3. Output-dependence with I# for \$Fz |
| <u></u> | SD F4, 0 (R1) | None |
| I2 | SD F6, 0 (R2) | None |
| I3 | FADD F4, F0, F0 | Anti-dependence with I1 for F4 |
| I4 | FADD F6, F2, F2 | Anti-dependence with 12 for F6 |
| I5 | LD F0, 16 (R1) | Anti-dependence with 13 for F0 |
| I6 | LD F2, 16 (R2) | Anti-dependence with 14 for F2 |
| I7 | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | Anti-dependence with I1 for R1 Anti-dependence with I5 for R1 |
| I8 | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | Anti-dependence with I2 for R2 Anti-dependence with I6 for R2 |
| I9 | ADD R3, R2, R1 | True data dependence with I7 for R1 True data dependence with I8 for R2 |
| I10 | BNE R3, R4, SP_LOOP | True data dependence with I9 for R3 |

Exercise 2.B - Tomasulo

Consider the same assembly code to be executed on a CPU with dynamic scheduling based on **Tomasulo algorithm** with all cache HITS, a single Common Data Bus and:

- 2 RESERVATION STATIONS (RS1, RS2) with 2 LOAD/STORE units (LDU1, LDU2) with latency 4
- 2 RESERVATION STATIONS (RS3, RS4) with 1 FP unit (FPU1) with latency 4
- 2 RESERVATION STATIONS (RS5, RS6) with 2 INT_ALU/BR units (ALU1, ALU2) with latency 2

Please complete the following table:

Answer: Before solving the Tomasulo, we need to remember how it is composed (see page 143).

| Inst | $\operatorname{ruction}$ | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | \mathbf{RSi} | \mathbf{Unit} |
|-------------|--------------------------|-------|------------|-----------|--------|----------------|-----------------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| 12: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | | | | | | |
| I4 : | FADD F6, F2, F2 | | | | | | |
| I5: | LD F0, 16 (R1) | | | | | | |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | | | | | | |
| 17: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | | | | | | |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | | | | | | |
| I9: | ADD R3, R2, R1 | | | | | | |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | | | | | | |

1. **Cycle 1**:

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS1 | F4 | | _ | |
| RS2 | | | | |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |

| | | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|---|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | | | | | |
| RS6 | | | | | |
| ALU1 | İ | | | | |
| ALU2 | | | | | |

2. **Cycle 2**:

| Inst | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|----------------|------------------|-------|------------|-----------|--------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | | | | | | |
| I4: | FADD F6, F2, F2 | | | | | | |
| I5: | LD FO, 16 (R1) | | | | | | |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | | | | | | |
| 17: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | | | | | | |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | | | | | | |
| <pre>19:</pre> | ADD R3, R2, R1 | | | | | | |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | | | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS1 | F4 | | - | |
| RS2 | F6 | | _ | |
| LDU1 | F4 | | _ | |
| LDU2 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| RS5 | | | | |
| RS6 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |
| ALU2 | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|-----|-------|-------|------|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Unit | Rer | naini | ng cy | cles |
| LDU1 | | 4 | 4 | |
| LDU2 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |
| ALU2 | | | | |

3. Cycle 3: Here, we have a anti-dependence hazard (WAR) because the third instruction writes the sum to register F4 and the first instruction reads F4. In Tomasulo, though, we don't care about this because the issue stage stalls if and only if there are no reservation stations, the Load/Store queue is full (for memory ops), or for speculative instructions (for prediction, which is not our case). Therefore, we issue and start execution. At the end of execution, we will determine whether to write the result or wait.

| Inst | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-------------|------------------|---------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | $\frac{3}{2}$ | | | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | |
| I4 : | FADD F6, F2, F2 | | | | | | |
| I5: | LD FO, 16 (R1) | | | | | | |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | | | | | | |
| I7: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | | | | | | |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | | | | | | |
| I9: | ADD R3, R2, R1 | | | | | | |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | | | | | | |

| | Vj | Qј | Vk | Qk |
|------------|----|----|----|----|
| RS1 | F4 | | - | |
| RS2 | F6 | | - | |
| LDU1 | F4 | | - | |
| LDU2 | F6 | | - | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| RS5 | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| RS5 RS6 | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| RS6 | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |

| RS3 | FO | FO |
|------|------|--------------|
| RS4 | | |
| FPU1 | | |
| | | |
| Unit | Rema | ining cycles |
| LDU1 | | 3 |
| LDU2 | | 4 |
| FPU1 | | |
| ALU1 | | |
| ALU2 | | |

Qј

Vk

Qk

۷j

4. **Cycle 4**: It's the same situation as before with the hazard (WAR), but now it's I4 with I2.

| Inst | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-------------|------------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | 3 | 4 | | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| I4: | FADD F6, F2, F2 | 4 | | | WAR I2, F6 | RS4 | |
| I5: | LD F0, 16 (R1) | | | | | | |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | | | | | | |
| I7 : | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | | | | | | |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | | | | | | |
| I9 : | ADD R3, R2, R1 | | | | | | |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | | | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS1 | F4 | | - | |
| RS2 | F6 | | - | |
| LDU1 | F4 | | - | |
| LDU2 | F6 | | - | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| LDU2 | F6 | | - | |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| | | | | |
| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| RS5 | | | | |
| RS6 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |
| ALU2 | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS3 | F0 | | FO | |
| RS4 | F2 | | F2 | |
| FPU1 | F0 | | F0 | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | 2 |
| LDU2 | 3 |
| FPU1 | 4 |
| ALU1 | |
| ALU2 | |

5. Cycle 5: Instruction 4 cannot begin because there are no available functional units. Therefore, it remains idle at reservation station 4. Instructions 5 and 6 cannot start either because there are no load/store reservation units available. ADDUI operations cannot start because instructions 5 and 6 need to read the R1 and R2 registers (WAR hazard).

| Inst | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|------|------------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | 3 | 4 | | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| I4: | FADD F6, F2, F2 | 4 | | | WAR I2, F6 | RS4 | |
| I5: | LD FO, 16 (R1) | | | | WAR I3, FO | | |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | | | | WAR I4, F2 | | |
| 17: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | | | | WAR I5, R1 | | |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | | | | WAR I6, R2 | | |
| I9: | ADD R3, R2, R1 | | | | RAW R1, R2 | | |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | | | | RAW 19, R3 | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS1 | F4 | | - | |
| RS2 | F6 | | - | |
| LDU1 | F4 | | - | |
| LDU2 | F6 | | - | |
| | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | | | | |
| RS6 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |
| ALU2 | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS3 | FO | | FO | |
| RS4 | F2 | | F2 | |
| FPU1 | F0 | | F0 | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | 1 |
| LDU2 | 2 |
| FPU1 | 3 |
| ALU1 | |
| ALU2 | |

6. **Cycle 6**:

| Instr | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-------------|------------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | 3 | 4 | | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| I4 : | FADD F6, F2, F2 | 4 | | | WAR I2, F6 | RS4 | |
| I5: | LD FO, 16 (R1) | | | | WAR I3, FO | | |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | | | | WAR I4, F2 | | |
| I7: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | | | | WAR I5, R1 | | |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | | | | WAR 16, R2 | | |
| I9 : | ADD R3, R2, R1 | | | | RAW R1, R2 | | |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | | | | RAW 19, R3 | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS1 | F4 | | - | |
| RS2 | F6 | | - | |
| LDU1 | F4 | | - | |
| LDU2 | F6 | | - | |
| - | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | | | | |
| RS6 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |
| ALU2 | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS3 | FO | | FO | |
| RS4 | F2 | | F2 | |
| FPU1 | F0 | | FO | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | 0 |
| LDU2 | 1 |
| FPU1 | 2 |
| ALU1 | |
| ALU2 | |

7. **Cycle 7**:

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|------------|----------------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | <mark>7</mark> | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: FADD F4, F0, F0 | 3 | 4 | | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| I4: FADD F6, F2, F2 | 4 | | | WAR I2, F6 | RS4 | |
| I5: LD FO, 16 (R1) | 7 | | | WAR I3, FO | RS1 | |
| I6: LD F2, 16 (R2) | | | | WAR 14, F2 | | |
| I7: ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | | | | WAR I5, R1 | | |
| I8: ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | | | | WAR 16, R2 | | |
| I9: ADD R3, R2, R1 | | | | RAW R1, R2 | | |
| I10: BNE R3, R4, LOOP | | | | RAW 19, R3 | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|-----------------|----|----|----|
| RS1 | <mark>16</mark> | | R1 | |
| RS2 | F6 | | - | |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | F6 | | - | |
| | | | | |
| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| RS5 | | | | |
| RS6 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |
| ALU2 | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS3 | F0 | | FO | |
| RS4 | F2 | | F2 | |
| FPU1 | F0 | | FO | |
| | | | | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | |
| LDU2 | 0 |
| FPU1 | 1 |
| ALU1 | |
| ALU2 | |

8. **Cycle 8**:

| Inst | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-------------|------------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| I4 : | FADD F6, F2, F2 | 4 | | | WAR I2, F6 | RS4 | |
| I5: | LD F0, 16 (R1) | 7 | 8 | | WAR I3, FO | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | 8 | | | WAR 14, F2 | RS2 | |
| I7: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | | | | WAR I5, R1 | | |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | | | | WAR 16, R2 | | |
| I9 : | ADD R3, R2, R1 | | | | RAW R1, R2 | | |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | | | | RAW 19, R3 | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|-----------------|----|----|----|
| RS1 | 16 | | R1 | |
| RS2 | <mark>16</mark> | | R2 | |
| LDU1 | 16 | | R1 | |
| LDU2 | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | | | | |
| RS6 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |
| ALU2 | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS3 | F0 | | FO | |
| RS4 | F2 | | F2 | |
| FPU1 | F0 | | F0 | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | 4 |
| LDU2 | |
| FPU1 | 0 |
| ALU1 | |
| ALU2 | |

9. **Cycle 9**:

| Inst | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|------|------------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| I4: | FADD F6, F2, F2 | 4 | 9 | | WAR I2, F6 | RS4 | FPU1 |
| I5: | LD FO, 16 (R1) | 7 | 8 | | WAR I3, FO | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | 8 | 9 | | WAR I4, F2 | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I7: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | 9 | | | WAR I5, R1 | RS5 | |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | | | | WAR 16, R2 | | |
| I9: | ADD R3, R2, R1 | | | | RAW R1, R2 | | |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | | | | RAW I9, R3 | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------------|-----------------|----|----|----|
| RS1 | 16 | | R1 | |
| RS2 | 16 | | R2 | |
| LDU1 | 16 | | R1 | |
| LDU2 | <mark>16</mark> | | R2 | |
| | | | | |
| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| | | | | |
| RS5 | R1 | | 8 | |
| RS5 RS6 | R1 | | 8 | |
| | R1 | | 8 | |
| RS6 | R1 | | 8 | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk | |
|-----------------------|-----|-------|-------|------|--|
| RS3 | | | | | |
| RS4 | F2 | | F2 | | |
| FPU1 | F2 | | F2 | | |
| | | | | | |
| Unit | Rer | naini | ng cy | cles | |
| LDU1 | | ; | 3 | | |
| LDU2 | 4 | | | | |
| FPU1 | 4 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | | |
| ALU2 | | | | | |

 $6.1 \quad 2025$ 6 Exams

10. **Cycle 10**:

| Inst | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-------------|------------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| I4 : | FADD F6, F2, F2 | 4 | 9 | | WAR I2, F6 | RS4 | FPU1 |
| I5: | LD FO, 16 (R1) | 7 | 8 | | WAR I3, FO | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | 8 | 9 | | WAR 14, F2 | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I7: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | 9 | 10 | | WAR I5, R1 | RS5 | ALU1 |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | 10 | | | WAR 16, R2 | RS6 | |
| I9: | ADD R3, R2, R1 | | | | RAW R1, R2 | | |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | | | | RAW 19, R3 | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS1 | 16 | | R1 | |
| RS2 | 16 | | R2 | |
| LDU1 | 16 | | R1 | |
| LDU2 | 16 | | R2 | |
| | | | | |
| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| RS5 | R1 | | 8 | |
| | | | | |

| LDU2 | 16 | | R2 | |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| | | | | |
| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| RS5 | R1 | | 8 | |
| RS6 | R2 | | 8 | |
| ALU1 | R1 | | 8 | |
| ALU2 | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | F2 | | F2 | |
| FPU1 | F2 | | F2 | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | 2 |
| LDU2 | 3 |
| FPU1 | 3 |
| ALU1 | 2 |
| ALU2 | |

11. **Cycle 11**:

| Inst | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-------------|------------------|-------|-----------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| 12: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| I4 : | FADD F6, F2, F2 | 4 | 9 | | WAR 12, F6 | RS4 | FPU1 |
| I5: | LD FO, 16 (R1) | 7 | 8 | | WAR I3, FO | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | 8 | 9 | | WAR 14, F2 | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I7: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | 9 | 10 | | WAR I5, R1 | RS5 | ALU1 |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | 10 | <mark>11</mark> | | WAR 16, R2 | RS6 | ALU2 |
| I9: | ADD R3, R2, R1 | | | | RAW R1, R2 | | |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | | | | RAW 19, R3 | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS1 | 16 | | R1 | |
| RS2 | 16 | | R2 | |
| LDU1 | 16 | | R1 | |
| LDU2 | 16 | | R2 | |
| | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | R1 | | 8 | |
| RS6 | R2 | | 8 | |
| ALU1 | R1 | | 8 | |
| ALU2 | R2 | | 8 | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | F2 | | F2 | |
| FPU1 | F2 | | F2 | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | 1 |
| LDU2 | 2 |
| FPU1 | 2 |
| ALU1 | 1 |
| ALU2 | 2 |

12. **Cycle 12**: "The instruction 7 has finished executing, and it wants to write the result back. Why can't it do that?" Because instruction 5 has higher priority, being the first in chronological order, and the common data bus can host only one value at a time.

| Inst | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|------------|------------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| I4: | FADD F6, F2, F2 | 4 | 9 | | WAR I2, F6 | RS4 | FPU1 |
| I5: | LD FO, 16 (R1) | 7 | 8 | 12 | WAR I3, FO | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | 8 | 9 | | WAR 14, F2 | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I7: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | 9 | 10 | | WAR I5, R1 | RS5 | ALU1 |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | 10 | 11 | | WAR 16, R2 | RS6 | ALU2 |
| I9: | ADD R3, R2, R1 | | | | RAW R1, R2 | | |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | | | | RAW 19, R3 | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS1 | 16 | | R1 | |
| RS2 | 16 | | R2 | |
| LDU1 | 16 | | R1 | |
| LDU2 | 16 | | R2 | |
| | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | R1 | | 8 | |
| RS6 | R2 | | 8 | |
| ALU1 | R1 | | 8 | |
| ALU2 | R2 | | 8 | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | F2 | | F2 | |
| FPU1 | F2 | | F2 | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | 0 |
| LDU2 | 1 |
| FPU1 | 1 |
| ALU1 | 0 |
| ALU2 | 1 |

13. **Cycle 13**: Each functional unit has finished executing and is ready to write back the result. Again, since there is only one common data bus, we issue each instruction in chronological order. In this case, it is instruction 4.

| Inst | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|----------------|------------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| I4: | FADD F6, F2, F2 | 4 | 9 | 13 | WAR I2, F6 | RS4 | FPU1 |
| I5: | LD F0, 16 (R1) | 7 | 8 | 12 | WAR I3, FO | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | 8 | 9 | | WAR 14, F2 | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I7: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | 9 | 10 | | WAR I5, R1 | RS5 | ALU1 |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | 10 | 11 | | WAR 16, R2 | RS6 | ALU2 |
| <pre>19:</pre> | ADD R3, R2, R1 | | | | RAW R1, R2 | | |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | | | | RAW 19, R3 | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS1 | | | | |
| RS2 | 16 | | R2 | |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | 16 | | R2 | |
| | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | R1 | | 8 | |
| RS6 | R2 | | 8 | |
| ALU1 | R1 | | 8 | |
| ALU2 | R2 | | 8 | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | F2 | | F2 | |
| FPU1 | F2 | | F2 | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | |
| LDU2 | 0 |
| FPU1 | 0 |
| ALU1 | 0 (-1) |
| ALU2 | 0 |
| | |

14. **Cycle 14**:

| Inst | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|------------|------------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| I4: | FADD F6, F2, F2 | 4 | 9 | 13 | WAR I2, F6 | RS4 | FPU1 |
| I5: | LD F0, 16 (R1) | 7 | 8 | 12 | WAR I3, FO | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | 8 | 9 | 14 | WAR 14, F2 | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I7: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | 9 | 10 | | WAR I5, R1 | RS5 | ALU1 |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | 10 | 11 | | WAR 16, R2 | RS6 | ALU2 |
| I9: | ADD R3, R2, R1 | | | | RAW R1, R2 | | |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | | | | RAW 19, R3 | | |

| | - | | | |
|------------|----|----|---------|----|
| RS1 | | | | |
| RS2 | 16 | | R2 | |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | 16 | | R2 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| RS5 | Vj | Qj | Vk 8 | Qk |
| RS5 RS6 | | Qj | | Qk |
| | R1 | Qj | 8 | Qk |

Vj Qj Vk Qk

| | ۷j | Qј | Vk | Qk |
|------|-----|-------|-------------|------|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Unit | Rei | naini | ng cy | cles |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | 0 (| -1) | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | 0 (| -2) | |
| ALU2 | | 0 (| -1) | |

15. **Cycle 15**:

| Inst | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-------------|------------------|-------|------------|---------------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| I4 : | FADD F6, F2, F2 | 4 | 9 | 13 | WAR I2, F6 | RS4 | FPU1 |
| I5: | LD FO, 16 (R1) | 7 | 8 | 12 | WAR I3, FO | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | 8 | 9 | 14 | WAR I4, F2 | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I7: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | 9 | 10 | 15 | WAR I5, R1 | RS5 | ALU1 |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | 10 | 11 | | WAR 16, R2 | RS6 | ALU2 |
| I9: | ADD R3, R2, R1 | | | | RAW R1, R2 | | |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | | | | RAW 19, R3 | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS1 | | | | |
| RS2 | | | | |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| RS5 | R1 | | 8 | |
| RS6 | R2 | | 8 | |
| ALU1 | R1 | | 8 | |

ALU2 R2

| | ۷j | Qј | Vk | Qk |
|--------|-----|-------|-------|------|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Unit | Rer | naini | ng cy | cles |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | 0 (| -3) | |
| CII IA | | 0.6 | _2) | |

16. **Cycle 16**:

| Inst | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|------|------------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| I4: | FADD F6, F2, F2 | 4 | 9 | 13 | WAR I2, F6 | RS4 | FPU1 |
| I5: | LD FO, 16 (R1) | 7 | 8 | 12 | WAR I3, FO | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | 8 | 9 | 14 | WAR I4, F2 | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I7: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | 9 | 10 | 15 | WAR I5, R1 | RS5 | ALU1 |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | 10 | 11 | 16 | WAR 16, R2 | RS6 | ALU2 |
| I9: | ADD R3, R2, R1 | 16 | | | RAW R1, R2 | RS5 | |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | | | | RAW 19, R3 | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------------|----|----|----|----|
| RS1 | | | | |
| RS2 | | | | |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| RS5 | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| RS5 RS6 | | Qj | | Qk |
| | R2 | Qj | R1 | Qk |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|-----|-------|-------|------|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Unit | Rer | naini | ng cy | cles |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |
| ALU2 | | 0 (| -3) | |

17. Cycle 17: This is the power of Tomasulo and its tag. This algorithm doesn't block the tenth instruction because it lacks the operand R3. Instead, it says, "You cannot retrieve the value of register R3. No problem. Meanwhile, you can issue the instruction. When the R3 value is ready, it will be sent to the Common Data Bus." Thus, instruction 10 waits on the Common Data Bus for the value of register R3. "But how does it know when the value is ready?" Simple. Use the tag logic. The value will be sent on the Common Data Bus with the key ALU1. Instruction 10 writes the tag "ALU1" to the reservation station, and when the Common Data Bus sends that tag, it takes the value.

| Inst | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|------|------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| I4: | FADD F6, F2, F2 | 4 | 9 | 13 | WAR 12, F6 | RS4 | FPU1 |
| I5: | LD FO, 16 (R1) | 7 | 8 | 12 | WAR I3, FO | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | 8 | 9 | 14 | WAR 14, F2 | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I7: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | 9 | 10 | 15 | WAR I5, R1 | RS5 | ALU1 |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | 10 | 11 | 16 | WAR 16, R2 | RS6 | ALU2 |
| I9: | ADD R3, R2, R1 | 16 | 17 | | RAW R1, R2 | RS5 | ALU1 |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | 17 | | | RAW 19, R3 | RS6 | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS1 | | | | |
| RS2 | | | | |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| RS5 | R2 | | R1 | |
| | | | | |

ALU1

R4

R1

RS6

ALU1

ALU2

R2

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|-----|-------|-------|------|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Unit | Rei | naini | ng cy | cles |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | 4 | 2 | |
| ALU2 | | | | |

19. **Cycle 19**: We skip cycle 18 because no operations have been performed. In instruction 10, the reservation station reads the value from the common data bus and stores it in memory. It is now ready to be executed!

| Inst | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-------------|------------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| I4 : | FADD F6, F2, F2 | 4 | 9 | 13 | WAR I2, F6 | RS4 | FPU1 |
| I5: | LD FO, 16 (R1) | 7 | 8 | 12 | WAR I3, FO | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | 8 | 9 | 14 | WAR I4, F2 | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I7: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | 9 | 10 | 15 | WAR I5, R1 | RS5 | ALU1 |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | 10 | 11 | 16 | WAR 16, R2 | RS6 | ALU2 |
| I9: | ADD R3, R2, R1 | 16 | 17 | 19 | RAW R1, R2 | RS5 | ALU1 |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | 17 | | | RAW 19, R3 | RS6 | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS1 | | | | |
| RS2 | | | | |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| RS5 | R2 | | R1 | |
| RS6 | R3 | | R4 | |
| ALU1 | R2 | | R1 | |
| ALU2 | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|-------|-------|------|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Unit | Re | maini | ng cy | cles |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | (| 0 | |
| ALU2 | | | | |

20. **Cycle 20**:

| Inst | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-------------|------------------|-------|-----------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| I4 : | FADD F6, F2, F2 | 4 | 9 | 13 | WAR I2, F6 | RS4 | FPU1 |
| I5: | LD FO, 16 (R1) | 7 | 8 | 12 | WAR I3, FO | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | 8 | 9 | 14 | WAR I4, F2 | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I7: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | 9 | 10 | 15 | WAR I5, R1 | RS5 | ALU1 |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | 10 | 11 | 16 | WAR 16, R2 | RS6 | ALU2 |
| I9: | ADD R3, R2, R1 | 16 | 17 | 19 | RAW R1, R2 | RS5 | ALU1 |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | 17 | <mark>20</mark> | | RAW 19, R3 | RS6 | ALU2 |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS1 | | | | |
| RS2 | | | | |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| RS5 | | | | |
| RS6 | R3 | | R4 | |
| ALU1 | | | | |
| ALU2 | R3 | | R4 | |
| | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|-----|-------|-------|------|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Unit | Rer | naini | ng cy | cles |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |
| ALU2 | | • | 2 | |

22. **Cycle 22**:

| Inst | ruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-------------|------------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| I1: | SD F4, 0 (R1) | 1 | 2 | 6 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I2: | SD F6, 0 (R2) | 2 | 3 | 7 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I3: | FADD F4, F0, F0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | WAR I1, F4 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| I4 : | FADD F6, F2, F2 | 4 | 9 | 13 | WAR I2, F6 | RS4 | FPU1 |
| I5: | LD FO, 16 (R1) | 7 | 8 | 12 | WAR I3, FO | RS1 | LDU1 |
| I6: | LD F2, 16 (R2) | 8 | 9 | 14 | WAR 14, F2 | RS2 | LDU2 |
| I7: | ADDUI R1, R1, 8 | 9 | 10 | 15 | WAR I5, R1 | RS5 | ALU1 |
| I8: | ADDUI R2, R2, 8 | 10 | 11 | 16 | WAR 16, R2 | RS6 | ALU2 |
| I9: | ADD R3, R2, R1 | 16 | 17 | 19 | RAW R1, R2 | RS5 | ALU1 |
| I10: | BNE R3, R4, LOOP | 17 | 20 | 22 | RAW 19, R3 | RS6 | ALU2 |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS1 | | | | |
| RS2 | | | | |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
| RS5 | | | | |
| RS6 | R3 | | R4 | |
| ALU1 | | | | |
| ALU2 | R3 | | R4 | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|-----|-------|-------|------|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Unit | Rei | naini | ng cy | cles |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |
| ALU2 | | (| 0 | |
| | | | | |

 $Calculate\ the\ CPI.$

Answer:

$$\text{CPI} = \frac{\# \text{ Clock Cycles}}{\# \text{ Instructions}} = \frac{22}{10} = 2.2$$

Question 3: Loop Unrolling

Let's consider the following loop code where registers **R1** and **R2** are initialized to **0** and **R3** is initialized to **400**:

```
LOOP: LD F2, 0 (R1)
LD F4, 0 (R2)
FADD F6, F2, F4
SD F6, 0 (R1)
ADDUI R1, R1, 4
ADDUI R2, R2, 4
BNE R1, R3, LOOP
```

Answer to the following questions:

• How many iterations of the loop?

Answer: 100 iterations. This is because register R1 is initialized to 0 and is incremented by 4 each iteration until it reaches 400:

Iterations =
$$\frac{400}{4} = 100$$

So the loop executes 100 iterations before R1 equals R3 and the loop exits. Note that the SD F6, O(R1) instruction stores F6 back into memory at the address in R1; it does not write to R1. Therefore, only the ADDUI operator modifies the R1 register.

• How many instructions per iteration?

Answer: The number of instructions per iteration equals the number of instructions in the loop block, which is 7.

• How many instructions due to the loop overhead per iteration?

Answer: When we write a loop in assembly, some instructions do useful work, and some instructions are only there to control the loop.

- Useful work: instructions that do the actual computation we want (load data, do the calculation, store result).
- Overhead: instructions that only exist to keep the loop going; updating counters, changing pointers, checking conditions, branching.

In our case, we have 4 useful operations (2 loads, 1 add, and 1 store), and 3 that *only* exist to make the loop repeat: incrementing pointers/counters (ADDUI R1, ADDUI R2) and testing the loop condition (BNE). Loop overhead is extra work we must do every iteration to **make the loop repeat**, but it does not contribute to the real useful computation.

• How many instructions are executed globally?

Answer: There are 7 instructions for each iteration. Since there are 100 iterations, **700 instructions** (7×100) are executed globally.

• How many branch instructions are executed globally?

Answer: There is 1 branch instruction for each iteration, so 100 branch instructions (1×100) are executed globally.

Let's consider a loop unrolling version of the code with unrolling factor 2.

• How many iterations of the unrolled loop?

Answer: Instead of repeating a small body many times, we manually replicate the body multiple times inside the loop; so each iteration does more useful work, but we run the loop fewer times (loop unrolling).

If we unroll by a factor of 2, the loop body is rewritten to do 2 operations per iteration:

```
LOOP_UNROLLING_2: LD F2, O(R1)
LD F4, O(R2)
FADD F6, F2, F4
DD F6, O(R1)

LD F8, 4(R1)
LD F10, 4(R2)
FADD F12, F8, F10
DF10, 4(R1)

ADDUI R1, R1, 8
ADDUI R2, R2, 8
BNE R1, R3, LOOP_UNROLLING_2
```

So each iteration now does twice as much useful work and we only need half as many loop iterations:

New Iteration Count =
$$\frac{\text{Original Iteration Count}}{\text{Unrolling Factor}} = \frac{100}{2} = 50$$

• How many instructions per iteration?

Answer: The instructions are now 11.

How many instructions due to the loop overhead per iteration?
 Answer: There are always 3 because we have unrolled useful work, not overhead work.

• How many instructions are executed globally?

Answer: There are 11 instructions for each iteration. We repeat the cycle 50 times, so a total of 550 instructions are executed.

• How many branch instructions are executed globally?

Answer: There is only one branch instruction per cycle and 50 iterations, so a total of 50 branch instructions are executed globally.

• How many more registers are needed due to register renaming?

Answer: Original loop has 3 FP registers (F2 holds first operand, F4 holds second operand, and F6 holds result). When we unroll the loop by factor 2, we do two sums at the same time. If we use the same registers, we overwrite the result of the first sum before we store it. So we need new registers for the second pair.

Therefore, we can conclude that:

- For the first sum: F2, F4, F6.
- For the second sum: F8, F10, F12.

So we need 3 more FP registers. In general, with an unrolling factor X, we need:

$$(X-1) \times (\text{number of live registers per body})$$
 more registers

• What are the registers that need to be renamed?

Answer: As mentioned earlier, the registers that need to be renamed are F2, F4, and F6.

• How much is the global instruction count decrease?

Answer: Before unrolling, the global instructions to execute was 700, and now 550. So we have 150 instructions less than before, that correspond to:

$$700:100=150:x\quad\Rightarrow\quad\frac{150\cdot 100}{700}=21.428571429=21.43\%$$

Let's consider a loop unrolling version of the code with unrolling factor 4.

• How many iterations of the unrolled loop?

Answer: If we unroll by a factor of 4, the loop body is rewritten to do 4 operations per iteration:

```
LOOP_UNROLLING_4:
                         LD F2, O(R1)
                         LD F4, O(R2)
                         FADD F6, F2,
                                        F4
                         SD F6, 0(R1)
                         LD F8, 4(R1)
                         LD F10, 4(R2)
                         FADD F12, F8, F10
                         SD F12, 4(R1)
10
                         LD F14, 8(R1)
11
12
                         LD F16, 8(R2)
                         FADD F18, F14, F16
                         SD F18, 8(R1)
14
15
                         LD F20, 12(R1)
LD F22, 12(R2)
16
17
                         FADD F24, F20, F22
18
                         SD F24, 12(R1)
19
20
                         ADDUI R1, R1, 16
21
                         ADDUI R2, R2, 16
22
23
                         BNE R1, R3, LOOP_UNROLLING_4
```

$$\mbox{New Iteration Count} = \frac{\mbox{Original Iteration Count}}{\mbox{Unrolling Factor}} = \frac{100}{4} = 25$$

How many instructions per iteration?
 Answer: The instructions are now 19.

- How many instructions due to the loop overhead per iteration?

 Answer: There are always 3 instructions due to the loop overhead per iteration.
- How many instructions are executed globally?

Answer:

19 instructions \cdot 25 iterations = 475

How many branches are executed?
 Answer: There is always 1 branch for each iteration, so a total of 25 branches are executed.

How many more registers are needed due to register renaming?
 Answer:

$$(4-1) \cdot 3 = 9$$
 more registers

• What are the registers that need to be renamed?

Answer: It's always the three registers F2, F4, and F6, but three times.

How much is the global instruction count decrease?
 Answer:

$$700:100 = (700 - 475): x \Rightarrow \frac{225 \cdot 100}{700} = 32.142857143 = 32.14\%$$

• What is the best unrolling factor between 2 and 4? Explain why.

Answer: Factor 4 is preferable to Factor 2 because it reduces loop control overhead per useful operation even further. The number of iterations is halved again, from 50 to 25, and the overhead instructions per sum drop from 1.5 to 0.75.

However, a higher unrolling factor requires more register names due to overlapping live values. In this case, factor 4 increases the demand for floating-point registers from 3 to 12. This increase must be handled by the hardware's register renaming; otherwise, spilling will occur. Therefore, factor 4 is preferable if the register file and rename logic are large enough to store all live values in registers without spilling to memory. Otherwise, factor 2 may be safer.

6.1 2025

Quiz 4 - Branch Prediction

During the execution of a program, the number of mispredictions depends on the initialization and the size of the Branch History Table (BHT). True or False? Motivate.

Answer: A BHT stores the *history* (past behavior) of branches, usually with *n*-bit saturating counters. The size of the BHT determines **how many unique** branches can be tracked independently

- Small BHT → more aliasing → different branches share the same entry → more chance of misprediction.
- Large BHT \rightarrow fewer collisions \rightarrow better prediction accuracy.

At program start, the BHT entries are **initialized** (often all taken or all not take, or all weakly taken). If the actual branch pattern is opposite to the initialization, we'll have **mispredictions** until the counters adapt. So initialization affects startup behavior (how many initial mispredictions we get) and size of BHT affects aliasing (whether unrelated branches interfere with each other, more or fewer mispredictions overall).

The correct answer is: **True**, because the number of mispredictions depends on how the BHT entries are initialized and on the size of the BHT, which determines how many branches can be tracked without aliasing.

Quiz 5 - Branch Prediction

Consider the following assembly code executed by a processor with 1-entry 1-bit Branch History Table initialized as Taken:

```
ADDI R1, R0, 0
ADDI R2, R0, 100
LOOP: BEQ R1, R2, DONE
ADD R5, R5, R4
ADDI R1, R1, 1
J LOOP
DONE:
```

Assuming **only** the branch instruction accesses the BHT:

- How many accesses to the Branch History Table?
- How many mispredictions?

True or False? Motivate.

Answer: R1 starts at 0. Each loop iteration: R1 is incremented by 1, and the loop stops when R1 equals 100. Therefore, BEQ is executed 101 times: One hundred times when R1 is not equal to R2 (the branch is not taken), and one time when R1 is equal to R2 (the branch is taken). For the first 100 iterations: The BEQ condition is false, so the branch is not taken. Therefore, the predictor's Taken prediction is incorrect, resulting in a mispredict. For the 101st BEQ, BHT predicts "Not Taken", but the branch is taken because R1 is equal to R2, so there is a mispredict.

Quiz 6 - Superscalar Processors

Considering superscalar processors, answer TRUE or FALSE to the following questions, motivating your answers.

• Doubling the number of issues reduces the CPI metric.

 $\boldsymbol{Answer:}$ True. In superscalar processors, the CPI (Cycles Per Instruction) is ideally:

$$\mathrm{CPI}_{\mathrm{ideal}} = \frac{1}{\mathrm{issue\ width}}$$

So if we double the issue width, theoretical CPI reduces. This is true only under the assumption of perfect conditions: infinite ILP, no hazards, no cache misses, no branch mispredictions, perfect decode, dispatch, execution bandwidth.

• Out-of-order execution can be generated by data cache misses.

Answer: True. Cache misses introduce stalls for dependent instructions; out-of-order execution allows independent instructions to bypass stalled loads, maximizing utilization of execution units.

• The introduction of dynamic branch predictors improves the CPI metric.

Answer: True. Dynamic branch predictors reduce the number of branch mispredictions by learning from past branch behavior. Fewer mispredictions mean fewer pipeline flushes and stalls, which directly lowers the average Cycles Per Instruction (CPI) and improves overall processor performance.

6.1.2 February 11

Exercise 1 - Dependency Analysis + Tomasulo

Let's consider the following assembly code containing multiple types of intra-loop dependences. Complete the following table by inserting all types of true-data-dependences, anti-dependences and output dependences for each instruction:

Answer:

| I# | Type of instruction | Analysis of dependences: |
|------------|-----------------------|--|
| | | 1. True data dependence with ${\tt I\#}$ for ${\tt \$Fx}$ |
| | | 2. Anti-dependence with I# for \$Fy |
| | | 3. Output-dependence with I# for \$Fz |
| <u></u> | LD \$FO, A(\$RO) | None |
| I1 | LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | None |
| I2 | FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | True data dependence with I0 for \$F0 True data dependence with I1 for \$F2 |
| I3 | FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | True data dependence with I2 for \$F4 |
| I 4 | SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | True data dependence with I2 for \$F4 |
| I5 | SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | True data dependence with I3 for \$F6 |
| I6 | ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | Anti-dependence with I0 for \$R0 Anti-dependence with I1 for \$R0 Anti-dependence with I4 for \$R0 Anti-dependence with I5 for \$R0 |
| I7 | BNE \$RO, \$R1, LOOP | True data dependence with 16 for \$R0 |

Let's consider the previous assembly code to be executed on a CPU with dynamic scheduling based on TOMASULO algorithm with all cache HITS, a single Common Data Bus and:

- 2 RESERVATION STATIONS (RS1, RS2) with 2 LOAD/STORE units (LDU1, LDU2) with latency 6
- 2 RESERVATION STATION (RS3, RS4) with 2 FP unit12 (FPU1, FPU2) with latency 2
- 1 RESERVATION STATION (RS5) with 1 INT_ALU/BR unit (ALU1) with latency 1

Answer:

1. **Cycle 1**:

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|------------|-----------|--------|-----|------|
| LD \$FO, A(\$RO) | 1 | 2 | 8 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | 2 | 3 | 9 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | | | | | | |
| FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | | | | | | |
| SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | | | | | | |
| SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | | | | | | |
| ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | | | | | | |
| BNE \$RO, \$R1, LOOP | | | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|------|----|
| RS1 | A | | \$RO | |
| RS2 | | | | |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|-------|-----|-------|-------|------|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| FPU2 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Unit | Rei | naini | ng cy | cles |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| FPU2 | | | | |
| AT.U1 | | | | |

2. **Cycle 2**:

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|------------|-----------|--------|-----|------|
| LD \$FO, A(\$RO) | 1 | 2 | 8 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | 2 | 3 | 9 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | | | | | | |
| FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | | | | | | |
| SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | | | | | | |
| SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | | | | | | |
| ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | | | | | | |
| BNE \$RO, \$R1, LOOP | | | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|------|----|
| RS1 | A | | \$RO | |
| RS2 | B | | \$RO | |
| LDU1 | A | | \$RO | |
| LDU2 | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------------|-----|-------|-------|------|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| FPU2 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Unit | Rer | naini | ng cy | cles |
| Unit LDU1 | Ren | | ng cy | cles |
| | Ren | | | cles |
| LDU1 | Ren | | | cles |
| LDU1 LDU2 | Ren | | | cles |

3. Cycle 3: Here, instruction 2 has a RAW hazard with instructions 0 and 1 for registers F0 and F2. Therefore, it uses the tag mechanism to wait for their values. In other words, the instruction is issued, but will not start until the values of F0 and F2 are forwarded to the Common Data Bus.

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | \mathbf{RSi} | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|----------------|------|
| LD \$FO, A(\$RO) | 1 | 2 | 8 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | 2 | 3 | 9 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | 3 | | | RAW IO, I1 | RS3 | |
| FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | | | | | | |
| SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | | | | | | |
| SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | | | | | | |
| ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | | | | | | |
| BNE \$RO, \$R1, LOOP | | | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|------|----|
| RS1 | A | | \$RO | |
| RS2 | В | | \$RO | |
| LDU1 | A | | \$RO | |
| LDU2 | B | | \$RO | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|------|----|------|
| RS3 | | LDU1 | | LDU2 |
| RS4 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| FPU2 | | | | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | 5 |
| LDU2 | 6 |
| FPU1 | |
| FPU2 | |
| ALU1 | |

4. Cycle 4: It's a similar situation to before. The second addition cannot be completed because it requires the result of the previous instruction. Therefore, it waits for the result on the common data bus.

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| LD \$FO, A(\$RO) | 1 | 2 | 8 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | 2 | 3 | 9 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | 3 | | | RAW IO, I1 | RS3 | |
| FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | 4 | | | RAW I2, F6 | RS4 | |
| SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | | | | | | |
| SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | | | | | | |
| ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | | | | | | |
| BNE \$RO, \$R1, LOOP | | | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|------|----|
| RS1 | A | | \$RO | |
| RS2 | В | | \$RO | |
| LDU1 | A | | \$RO | |
| LDU2 | В | | \$RO | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|------|----|------|
| RS3 | | LDU1 | | LDU2 |
| RS4 | | FPU1 | | FPU1 |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| FPU2 | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | 4 |
| LDU2 | 5 |
| FPU1 | |
| FPU2 | |
| ALU1 | |

5. Cycle 5: The fourth instruction cannot be issued here because there are no reservation stations available, which constitutes a structural hazard. This means Tomasulo stops execution because it guarantees in-order issuance, meaning the instructions are issued in order. Some updates will be seen at the end of the first instruction (cycle 8).

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| LD \$FO, A(\$RO) | 1 | 2 | 8 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | 2 | 3 | 9 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | 3 | | | RAW IO, I1 | RS3 | |
| FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | 4 | | | RAW I2, F6 | RS4 | |
| SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | | | | STRUCTURAL | | |
| SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | | | | | | |
| ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | | | | | | |
| BNE \$RO, \$R1, LOOP | | | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|------|----|
| RS1 | A | | \$RO | |
| RS2 | В | | \$RO | |
| LDU1 | A | | \$RO | |
| LDU2 | В | | \$RO | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|------|----|------|
| RS3 | | LDU1 | | LDU2 |
| RS4 | | FPU1 | | FPU1 |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| FPU2 | | | | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | 3 |
| LDU2 | 4 |
| FPU1 | |
| FPU2 | |
| ALU1 | |

8. **Cycle 8**:

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|-----|------|
| LD \$FO, A(\$RO) | 1 | 2 | 8 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | 2 | 3 | 9 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | 3 | | | RAW IO, I1 | RS3 | |
| FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | 4 | | | RAW I2, F6 | RS4 | |
| SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | | | | STRUCTURAL | | |
| SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | | | | | | |
| ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | | | | | | |
| BNE \$RO, \$R1, LOOP | | | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|------|----|
| RS1 | A | | \$RO | |
| RS2 | В | | \$RO | |
| LDU1 | A | | \$RO | |
| LDU2 | В | | \$RO | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|------|----|------|
| RS3 | \$FO | | | LDU2 |
| RS4 | | FPU1 | | FPU1 |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| FPU2 | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | 0 |
| LDU2 | 1 |
| FPU1 | |
| FPU2 | |
| ALU1 | |

9. **Cycle 9**:

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|------------|-----------|--------------------|-----|------|
| LD \$F0, A(\$R0) | 1 | 2 | 8 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | 2 | 3 | 9 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | 3 | | | RAW IO, I1 | RS3 | |
| FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | 4 | | | RAW I2, F6 | RS4 | |
| SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | 9 | | | STR., RAW I2, \$F4 | RS1 | |
| SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | | | | | | |
| ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | | | | | | |
| BNE \$RO, \$R1, LOOP | | | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|-----|------|----|
| RS1 | | RS3 | \$RO | |
| RS2 | В | | \$RO | |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | В | | \$RO | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| RS3 | \$F0 | | \$F2 | |
| RS4 | | FPU1 | | FPU1 |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| FPU2 | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | |
| LDU2 | 0 |
| FPU1 | |
| FPU2 | |
| ALU1 | |

10. **Cycle 10**:

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|------------|-----------|--------------------|-----|------|
| LD \$FO, A(\$RO) | 1 | 2 | 8 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | 2 | 3 | 9 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | 3 | 10 | | RAW IO, I1 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | 4 | | | RAW I2, F6 | RS4 | |
| SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | 9 | | | STR., RAW 12, \$F4 | RS1 | |
| SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | 10 | | | RAW I3, \$F6 | RS2 | |
| ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | | | | | | |
| BNE \$RO, \$R1, LOOP | | | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|-----|------|----|
| RS1 | | RS3 | \$RO | |
| RS2 | | RS4 | \$RO | |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| RS3 | \$F0 | | \$F2 | |
| RS4 | | FPU1 | | FPU1 |
| FPU1 | \$FO | | \$F2 | |
| FPU2 | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | |
| LDU2 | |
| FPU1 | 2 |
| FPU2 | |
| ALU1 | |

11. **Cycle 11**:

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|------------|-----------|--------------------|-----|------|
| LD \$FO, A(\$RO) | 1 | 2 | 8 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | 2 | 3 | 9 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | 3 | 10 | | RAW IO, I1 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | 4 | | | RAW I2, F6 | RS4 | |
| SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | 9 | | | STR., RAW 12, \$F4 | RS1 | |
| SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | 10 | | | RAW I3, \$F6 | RS2 | |
| ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | 11 | | | | RS5 | |
| BNE \$RO, \$R1, LOOP | | | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|-----|------|----|
| RS1 | | RS3 | \$RO | |
| RS2 | | RS4 | \$RO | |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| RS3 | \$F0 | | \$F2 | |
| RS4 | | FPU1 | | FPU1 |
| FPU1 | \$F0 | | \$F2 | |
| FPU2 | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|----|----|----|
| RS5 | \$RO | | 4 | |
| ALU1 | | | | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | |
| LDU2 | |
| FPU1 | 1 |
| FPU2 | |
| ALU1 | |

12. **Cycle 12**: The last operation cannot be issued due to a structural hazard in the ALU1 functional unit. Note: The professor's solution has an error. The structural hazard must be on the RS5 because it is the only one capable of performing the operation.

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|------------|-----------|--------------------|-----|------|
| LD \$FO, A(\$RO) | 1 | 2 | 8 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | 2 | 3 | 9 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | 3 | 10 | 12 | RAW IO, I1 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | 4 | | | RAW I2, F6 | RS4 | |
| SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | 9 | | | STR., RAW 12, \$F4 | RS1 | |
| SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | 10 | | | RAW 13, \$F6 | RS2 | |
| ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | 11 | 12 | | | RS5 | ALU1 |
| BNE \$RO, \$R1, LOOP | | | | STRUCTURAL | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|-----|------|----|
| RS1 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |
| RS2 | | RS4 | \$RO | |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------|------|----|----|----|
| RS5 | \$RO | | 4 | |
| ΔΤ.ΤΤ1 | \$RO | | 4 | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|----|-------------------|----|
| RS3 | \$F0 | | \$F2 | |
| RS4 | \$F4 | | <mark>\$F4</mark> | |
| FPU1 | \$F0 | | \$F2 | |
| FPU2 | | | | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | |
| LDU2 | |
| FPU1 | 0 |
| FPU2 | |
| ALU1 | 1 |

13. **Cycle 13**:

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|---------------|-----------|--------------------|-----|------|
| LD \$F0, A(\$R0) | 1 | 2 | 8 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | 2 | 3 | 9 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | 3 | 10 | 12 | RAW IO, I1 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | 4 | 13 | | RAW I2, F6 | RS4 | FPU2 |
| SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | 9 | 13 | | STR., RAW 12, \$F4 | RS1 | LDU1 |
| SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | 10 | | | RAW 13, \$F6 | RS2 | |
| ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | 11 | 12 | 13 | | RS5 | ALU1 |
| BNE \$RO, \$R1, LOOP | | | | STRUCTURAL | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|-------------------|-----|------|----|
| RS1 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |
| RS2 | | RS4 | \$RO | |
| LDU1 | <mark>\$F4</mark> | | \$RO | |
| LDU2 | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|----|------|----|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | \$F4 | | \$F4 | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| FPU2 | \$F4 | | \$F4 | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|----|----|----|
| RS5 | \$RO | | 4 | |
| ALU1 | \$RO | | 4 | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | 6 |
| LDU2 | |
| FPU1 | |
| FPU2 | 2 |
| ALU1 | 0 |

14. **Cycle 14**:

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|------------|-----------|--------------------|-----|------|
| LD \$F0, A(\$R0) | 1 | 2 | 8 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | 2 | 3 | 9 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | 3 | 10 | 12 | RAW IO, I1 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | 4 | 13 | | RAW I2, F6 | RS4 | FPU2 |
| SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | 9 | 13 | | STR., RAW 12, \$F4 | RS1 | LDU1 |
| SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | 10 | | | RAW 13, \$F6 | RS2 | |
| ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | 11 | 12 | 13 | | RS5 | ALU1 |
| BNE \$RO, \$R1, LOOP | 14 | | | STRUCTURAL | RS5 | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|-----|------|----|
| RS1 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |
| RS2 | | RS4 | \$RO | |
| LDU1 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |
| LDU2 | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|----|------|----|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | \$F4 | | \$F4 | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| FPU2 | \$F4 | | \$F4 | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|----|------|----|
| RS5 | \$RO | | \$R1 | |
| ALU1 | | | | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | 5 |
| LDU2 | |
| FPU1 | |
| FPU2 | 1 |
| ALU1 | |

15. **Cycle 15**:

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----|------|
| LD \$F0, A(\$R0) | 1 | 2 | 8 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | 2 | 3 | 9 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | 3 | 10 | 12 | RAW IO, I1 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | 4 | 13 | <mark>15</mark> | RAW I2, F6 | RS4 | FPU2 |
| SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | 9 | 13 | | STR., RAW 12, \$F4 | RS1 | LDU1 |
| SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | 10 | | | RAW 13, \$F6 | RS2 | |
| ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | 11 | 12 | 13 | | RS5 | ALU1 |
| BNE \$RO, \$R1, LOOP | 14 | <mark>15</mark> | | STRUCTURAL | RS5 | ALU1 |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|----|------|----|
| RS1 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |
| RS2 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |
| LDU1 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |
| LDU2 | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|----|------|----|
| RS5 | \$RO | | \$R1 | |
| ALU1 | \$RO | | \$R1 | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|----|------|----|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | \$F4 | | \$F4 | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| FPU2 | \$F4 | | \$F4 | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | 4 |
| LDU2 | |
| FPU1 | |
| FPU2 | 0 |
| ALU1 | 1 |

16. **Cycle 16**:

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|-----|------|
| LD \$F0, A(\$R0) | 1 | 2 | 8 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | 2 | 3 | 9 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | 3 | 10 | 12 | RAW IO, I1 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | 4 | 13 | 15 | RAW I2, F6 | RS4 | FPU2 |
| SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | 9 | 13 | | STR., RAW 12, \$F4 | RS1 | LDU1 |
| SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | 10 | 16 | | RAW 13, \$F6 | RS2 | LDU2 |
| ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | 11 | 12 | 13 | | RS5 | ALU1 |
| BNE \$RO, \$R1, LOOP | 14 | 15 | 16 | STRUCTURAL | RS5 | ALU1 |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|----|------|----|
| RS1 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |
| RS2 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |
| LDU1 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |
| LDU2 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |

| - | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|----|------|----|
| RS5 | \$RO | | \$R1 | |
| ALU1 | \$RO | | \$R1 | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| FPU2 | | | | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | 3 |
| LDU2 | 6 |
| FPU1 | |
| FPU2 | |
| ALU1 | 0 |
| | 0 |

17. Cycle 17:

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|------------|-----------|--------------------|-----|------|
| LD \$F0, A(\$R0) | 1 | 2 | 8 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | 2 | 3 | 9 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | 3 | 10 | 12 | RAW IO, I1 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | 4 | 13 | 15 | RAW I2, F6 | RS4 | FPU2 |
| SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | 9 | 13 | | STR., RAW I2, \$F4 | RS1 | LDU1 |
| SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | 10 | 16 | | RAW 13, \$F6 | RS2 | LDU2 |
| ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | 11 | 12 | 13 | | RS5 | ALU1 |
| BNE \$R0, \$R1, LOOP | 14 | 15 | 16 | STRUCTURAL | RS5 | ALU1 |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|----|------|----|
| RS1 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |
| RS2 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |
| LDU1 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |
| LDU2 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| FPU2 | | | | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | 2 |
| LDU2 | 5 |
| FPU1 | |
| FPU2 | |
| ALU1 | |

19. **Cycle 19**:

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|------------|-----------|--------------------|-----|------|
| LD \$F0, A(\$R0) | 1 | 2 | 8 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | 2 | 3 | 9 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | 3 | 10 | 12 | RAW IO, I1 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | 4 | 13 | 15 | RAW I2, F6 | RS4 | FPU2 |
| SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | 9 | 13 | 19 | STR., RAW 12, \$F4 | RS1 | LDU1 |
| SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | 10 | 16 | | RAW 13, \$F6 | RS2 | LDU2 |
| ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | 11 | 12 | 13 | | RS5 | ALU1 |
| BNE \$RO, \$R1, LOOP | 14 | 15 | 16 | STRUCTURAL | RS5 | ALU1 |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|------|----|------|----|
| RS1 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |
| RS2 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |
| LDU1 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |
| LDU2 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| FPU2 | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | 0 |
| LDU2 | 3 |
| FPU1 | |
| FPU2 | |
| ALU1 | |

22. **Cycle 22**:

| Instruction | Issue | Start Exec | Write Res | Hazard | RSi | Unit |
|-----------------------|-------|------------|-----------|--------------------|-----|------|
| LD \$F0, A(\$R0) | 1 | 2 | 8 | None | RS1 | LDU1 |
| LD \$F2, B(\$R0) | 2 | 3 | 9 | None | RS2 | LDU2 |
| FADD \$F4, \$F0, \$F2 | 3 | 10 | 12 | RAW IO, I1 | RS3 | FPU1 |
| FADD \$F6, \$F4, \$F4 | 4 | 13 | 15 | RAW I2, F6 | RS4 | FPU2 |
| SD \$F4, C(\$R0) | 9 | 13 | 19 | STR., RAW 12, \$F4 | RS1 | LDU1 |
| SD \$F6, D(\$R0) | 10 | 16 | 22 | RAW I3, \$F6 | RS2 | LDU2 |
| ADDI \$RO, \$RO, 4 | 11 | 12 | 13 | | RS5 | ALU1 |
| BNE \$RO, \$R1, LOOP | 14 | 15 | 16 | STRUCTURAL | RS5 | ALU1 |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Ql |
|------|------|----|------|----|
| RS1 | | | | |
| RS2 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |
| LDU1 | | | | |
| LDU2 | \$F4 | | \$RO | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS3 | | | | |
| RS4 | | | | |
| FPU1 | | | | |
| FPU2 | | | | |

| | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| RS5 | | | | |
| ALU1 | | | | |

| Unit | Remaining cycles |
|------|------------------|
| LDU1 | |
| LDU2 | 0 |
| FPU1 | |
| FPU2 | |
| ALU1 | |

 $Calculate \ the \ \textbf{CPI}.$

Answer:

$$\mathrm{CPI} = \frac{\# \; \mathrm{Clock} \; \mathrm{Cycles}}{\# \; \mathrm{Instructions}} = \frac{22}{8} = 2.75$$

Exercise 2 - VLIW Scheduling

Let's consider the following LOOP code:


```
1 LOOP: LD F1, A(R1)
2 LD F2, A(R2)
3 LD F3, A(R3)
4 FADD F1, F1, F2
5 FADD F2, F2, F3
6 FMUL F1, F1, F2
7 FADD F3, F3, F3
8 ADDUI R2, R1, 8
9 ADDUI R3, R1, 8
10 SD F1, B(R1)
11 ADDUI R1, R1, 4
12 BNE R1, R6, LOOP
```

Given a 3-issue VLIW machine with fully pipelined functional units:

- 1 Memory Unit with 3 cycles latency
- 1 FP ALU with 2 cycles latency
- \bullet 1 Integer ALU with 1 cycle latency to next Int/FP & 2 cycle latency to next Branch

The branch is completed with 1 cycle delay slot (branch solved in ID stage). No branch prediction. In the Register File, it is possible to read and write at the same address at the same clock cycle. Considering one iteration of the loop, complete the following table by using the list-based scheduling (do NOT introduce any software pipelining, loop unrolling and modifications to loop indexes) on the 4-issue VLIW machine including the BRANCH DELAY SLOT. Please do not write in NOPs.

Answer:



| | Memory Unit | Floating Point Unit | Integer Unit |
|------------------------|--------------|---------------------|------------------|
| $\overline{\text{C1}}$ | LD F1, A(R1) | | |
| C2 | LD F2, A(R2) | | ADDUI R2, R1, 8 |
| C3 | LD F3, A(R3) | | ADDUI R3, R1, 8 |
| C4 | | | |
| C5 | | FADD F1, F1, F2 | |
| C6 | | FADD F2, F2, F3 | |
| C7 | | FADD F3, F3, F3 | |
| C8 | | FMUL F1, F1, F2 | |
| C9 | | | |
| C10 | SD F1, B(R1) | | ADDUI R1, R1, 4 |
| C11 | | | |
| C12 | | | BNE R1, R2, LOOP |
| C13 | | | (delay slot) |
| C14 | | | |
| C15 | | | |

1. How long is the critical path?

Answer: The critical path is determined by the latency of the last instruction, BNE, so it is ${\bf 13}.$

2. How much is the code efficiency?

Answer: Efficiency is measured as follows:

$$\text{Efficiency} = \frac{\text{Instruction Count}}{\# \text{ cycles} \times \# \text{ issues}} = \frac{12}{13 \cdot 3} = 0.307692308 = 30.77\%$$

Exercise 3 - MESI Protocol

Let's consider the following access patterns on a **4-processor** system with a direct-mapped, write-back cache with one cache block per processor and a two-cache block memory.

Assume the **MESI protocol** is used with **write-back** caches, **write-allocate**, and **write-invalidate** of other caches. *Please COMPLETE the following table:*

| Cycle | After Op. | P0 cache block state | P1 cache block state | P2 cache block state | P3 cache block state | Mem. at bl. 0 up to date? | Mem. at bl. 1 up to date? |
|-------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | P0: Read Bl. 1 | Excl (1) | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Yes | Yes |
| 2 | P2: Read Bl. 0 | Excl (1) | Invalid | $\operatorname{Excl}(0)$ | Invalid | Yes | Yes |
| 3 | P3: Read Bl. 0 | | | | | | |
| 4 | P1: Write Bl. 0 | | | | | | |
| 5 | P0: Write Bl. 1 | | | | | | |
| 6 | P3: Read Bl. 1 | | | | | | |

Answer: MESI is a cache coherence protocol. It guarantees that multiple caches in a shared-memory multiprocessor see a coherent view of main memory.

? Why is it needed? When multiple processors have private caches and share a memory space, they may each hold *local copies* of the same memory block. If one processor modifies its copy, the other copies may become **stale** (incoherent). The MESI protocol ensures that all copies are kept consistent, meaning we never use an old value when we shouldn't.

MESI States Each block in a cache can be in one of 4 states:

- M (Modified): Block is valid, dirty (modified). It differs from main memory. This cache owns the latest value.
- **E** (**Exclusive**): Block is valid, *clean*. It matches memory. This cache is the *only* owner.
- **S** (**Shared**): Block is valid, clean, and may be in *multiple* caches. All have the same value as memory.
- I (Invalid): Block is *not* valid in this cache. Must be fetched on access.

Coherence is enforced by invalidating or updating other caches:

- If a cache writes to a block, it must invalidate all other caches that have that block (Write-Invalidate).
- If a cache needs a block held dirty by another, that cache must supply the up-to-date data (and possibly write back to memory).

? What is Direct-Mapped Cache? Direct-Mapped is the simplest cache mapping:

- Each memory block maps to **exactly one** cache block.
- There's only one place in the cache where a given memory block can go.

In this exercise, each processor has a direct-mapped cache with **only one block**, so each processor can store **only one block at a time**.

- What does Write-Back mean? Caches can be:
 - Write-Through: Every write to the cache is also immediately written to main memory. Simpler, but more traffic.
 - Write-Back: Writes go only to the cache at first. The block is marked dirty. The updated block is written back to main memory only when it is evicted or needed by another processor.

In MESI: The **Modified** (M) state marks blocks that are *dirty*. These blocks must be written back before eviction or when another processor requests them.

- **?** What does Write-Allocate mean? Write-Allocate means that when a processor writes to a block that is not present in its cache (write miss), it:
 - Allocates: It *loads* the block into its cache.
 - Then performs the write in the cache.

This is typical with write-back caches: the block must be in the cache so that it can later be written back to memory if needed.

- What does "One cache block per processor" mean? In this exercise:
 - Each processor has one slot in its cache.
 - That slot can hold one memory block at a time.
 - So if a processor needs to read/write a new block, it may need to *evict* the old one (and write it back if it's dirty).
- What does "Two-cache-block memory" mean? This means that main memory has only 2 data blocks available: block 0 and block 1. So:
 - The whole example focuses only on those two blocks.
 - Any cache action involves either block 0 or block 1.
 - The goal is to track how these two blocks move between the processors' caches and the main memory.

In summary, the entire scenario is as follows:

- A tiny system with 4 processors.
- Each has a tiny cache (1 block).
- The system has only 2 memory blocks.
- Using MESI, caches cooperate to keep shared blocks consistent.
- Write-back: modified blocks may not immediately update memory.
- Write-allocate: writes on misses bring the block in.
- 0. In the **initial state**, everything is up to date, but each block is invalid.
- Operation 1: "P0: Read block 1". Since all the blocks are invalid, this is a *cache miss* operation. Therefore, processor 0 (P0) loads block 1 from memory. Since no one else has it, the state is Exclusive. The memory is still up to date because it was "read-by", not "written-to".

| Cycle | After Op. | P0 cache block state | P1 cache block state | P2 cache block state | P3 cache block state | | Mem. at bl. 1 up to date? |
|-------|----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----|---------------------------|
| 0 | | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Yes | Yes |
| 1 | P0: Read Bl. 1 | Excl (1) | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Yes | Yes |

2. **Operation 2:** "P2: Read B1. 0". Processor 2 has an invalid cache block, resulting in a *cache miss*. Since nobody else has block 0, processor 2 loads it. It gets it in **Exclusive** mode. Again, the memory is up to date because it was read.

| Cycle | After Op. | P0 cache block state | P1 cache block state | P2 cache block state | P3 cache block state | Mem. at bl. 0 up to date? | Mem. at bl. 1 up to date? |
|-------|----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0 | | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Yes | Yes |
| 1 | P0: Read Bl. 1 | Excl (1) | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Yes | Yes |
| 2 | P2: Read Bl. 0 | Excl (1) | Invalid | Excl (0) | Invalid | Yes | Yes |

3. Operation 3: "P3: Read B1. 0". Processor 3 has an invalid cache block, resulting in a *cache miss*. This time, however, a copy of block 0 is in processor 2's cache, so processor 3 can request a copy of it. Now, since the value of block 0 is shared by different caches, we transition from Exclusive to Shared. Finally, the memory remains updated (no writes).

| Cycle | After Op. | P0 cache block state | P1 cache block state | P2 cache block state | P3 cache block state | Mem. at bl. 0 up to date? | Mem. at bl. 1 up to date? |
|-------|----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0 | | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Yes | Yes |
| 1 | P0: Read Bl. 1 | Excl (1) | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Yes | Yes |
| 2 | P2: Read Bl. 0 | Excl (1) | Invalid | $\operatorname{Excl}(0)$ | Invalid | Yes | Yes |
| 3 | P3: Read Bl. 0 | Excl (1) | Invalid | Shr(0) | Shr(0) | Yes | Yes |

- 4. **Operation 4**: "P1: Write B1. 0". Since Processor 1 does not have Block 0, there is a cache miss. Block 0 is in processors 2 and 3's caches in Shared mode. So, MESI:
 - (a) P1 needs exclusive access, so it invalidates all other copies.
 - (b) P2 and P3 are invalidated by P1 and become invalid.
 - (c) P1 loads block 0, writes it, and transitions from Exclusive to Modified.

Since it's write-back, the memory for block 0 becomes stale (marked as out-of-date).

| Cycle | After Op. | P0 cache block state | P1 cache block state | P2 cache block state | P3 cache block state | Mem. at bl. 0 up to date? | Mem. at bl. 1 up to date? |
|-------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0 | | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Yes | Yes |
| 1 | P0: Read Bl. 1 | Excl (1) | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Yes | Yes |
| 2 | P2: Read Bl. 0 | Excl (1) | Invalid | $\operatorname{Excl}(0)$ | Invalid | Yes | Yes |
| 3 | P3: Read Bl. 0 | Excl (1) | Invalid | Shr(0) | Shr(0) | Yes | Yes |
| 4 | P1: Write Bl. 0 | Excl (1) | Mod(0) | Invalid | Invalid | No | Yes |

5. Operation 5: "P0: Write Bl. 1". Processor 0 already has Block 1 in Exclusive mode. When it writes, it switches from Exclusive to Modified mode. Because a write was made, the memory is no longer up to date. Since no one has block 1, it doesn't invalidate the other caches.

| Cycle | After Op. | P0 cache block state | P1 cache block state | P2 cache block state | P3 cache block state | Mem. at bl. 0 up to date? | Mem. at bl. 1 up to date? |
|-------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0 | | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Yes | Yes |
| 1 | P0: Read Bl. 1 | Excl (1) | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Yes | Yes |
| 2 | P2: Read Bl. 0 | Excl (1) | Invalid | $\operatorname{Excl}(0)$ | Invalid | Yes | Yes |
| 3 | P3: Read Bl. 0 | Excl (1) | Invalid | Shr(0) | Shr(0) | Yes | Yes |
| 4 | P1: Write Bl. 0 | Excl (1) | Mod(0) | Invalid | Invalid | No | Yes |
| 5 | P0: Write Bl. 1 | Mod(1) | Mod(0) | Invalid | Invalid | No | No |

- 6. **Operation 6**: "P3: Read B1. 1". Since processor 3 does not have block 1, there is a *cache miss*. Processor 0 has block 1 in modified mode.
 - (a) Another processor needs the data.
 - (b) P0 must supply the *latest value*, so P0 does *write-back* or sends directly.
 - (c) Result: P3 loads up-to-date block, and both now have it in **Shared**. Now the memory for block 1 is clean again (assuming P0 did a write-back).

| Cycle | After Op. | P0 cache block state | P1 cache block state | P2 cache block state | P3 cache block state | Mem. at bl. 0 up to date? | Mem. at bl. 1 up to date? |
|-------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0 | | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Yes | Yes |
| 1 | P0: Read Bl. 1 | Excl (1) | Invalid | Invalid | Invalid | Yes | Yes |
| 2 | P2: Read Bl. 0 | Excl (1) | Invalid | $\operatorname{Excl}(0)$ | Invalid | Yes | Yes |
| 3 | P3: Read Bl. 0 | Excl (1) | Invalid | Shr(0) | Shr(0) | Yes | Yes |
| 4 | P1: Write Bl. 0 | Excl (1) | Mod(0) | Invalid | Invalid | No | Yes |
| 5 | P0: Write Bl. 1 | Mod(1) | Mod(0) | Invalid | Invalid | No | No |
| 6 | P3: Read Bl. 1 | Shr(1) | Mod(0) | Invalid | Shr(1) | No | Yes |

Note: Read from **Modified** forces a write-back (or direct transfer) to maintain consistency.

Exercise 4 - Reordered Buffer

Let's consider the following assembly loop where registers \$\mathbb{R1}\$ and \$\mathbb{R2}\$ are initialized at 0 and 40 respectively:

```
1 LO: LD $F2, 0 ($R1)
2 L1: ADDD $F4, $F2, $F2
3 L2: SD $F4, 0 ($R1)
4 L3: ADDI $R1, $R1, 4
5 L4: BNE $R1, $R2, L0 # branch predicted as taken
```

• How many loop iterations?

Answer: The register R1 is incremented by 4 at each iteration:

Iterations =
$$\frac{40}{4} = 10$$

• How many instructions per iteration?

Answer: 5 instructions.

• How many control vs datapath instructions?

Answer: To answer the question, we count **how many instructions in** the loop control the flow vs how many do actual data processing. In our loop:

```
1 LO: LD $F2, O($R1)  # datapath: load data

2 L1: ADDD $F4, $F2, $F2  # datapath: compute

3 L2: SD $F4, O($R1)  # datapath: store data

4 L3: ADDI $R1, $R1, 4  # control: index update

5 L4: BNE $R1, $R2, LO  # control: conditional branch
```

- Data path instructions: LD, ADDD, SD, 3 instructions.
- Control instructions: ADDI (updates loop index), BNE (branch), 2 instructions.

So, the answer is 2 control vs 3 datapath instructions. In general:

- Control instructions: branches, jumps, index updates.
- Datapath instructions: load, store, ALU/FPU operations that compute or move data.

Write the unrolled version of the loop with unrolling factor 2 by using Register Renaming.

Answer:

```
1 LO:
        LD $F2, 0($R1)
                               # datapath: load data
2 L1:
         ADDD $F4, $F2, $F2
                                 # datapath: compute
3 L2:
         SD $F4, 0($R1)
                                 # datapath: store data
4 L3:
         LD $F6, 4($R1)
                                 # datapath: load data
         ADDD $F8, $F6, $F6
5 L4:
                                 # datapath: compute
6 L5:
         SD $F8, 0($R1)
                                 # datapath: store data
 L6:
         ADDI $R1, $R1, 8
                                 # control: index update
8 L7:
         BNE $R1, $R2, L0
                                 # control: conditional branch
```

• How many loop iterations?

Answer: The register R1 is incremented by 8 at each iteration:

Iterations =
$$\frac{40}{8} = 5$$

• How many instructions per iteration?

Answer: 8 instructions.

• How many control vs datapath instructions?

Answer: 2 control vs 6 datapath instructions.

Execute the unrolled version of the loop by the **Speculative Tomasulo** architecture with a 10-entry ROB and:

- 4 Load Buffers (Load1, Load2, Load3, Load4);
- 4 FP Reservation Stations (FP1, FP2, FP3, FP4)
- 2 Integer Reservation Stations (Int1, Int2)

Complete the ROB and the Rename Table until the ROB becomes **full** while the first instruction is still in execution due to a cache miss (*):

| ROB# | Inst | ruction | Dest. | Res. Alloc. | ${\bf Ready/Status}$ | Spec. |
|------|------|-----------------------|-------|-------------|----------------------|-------|
| ROBO | LO: | LD \$F2, 0 (\$R1) | \$F2 | Load1 | No, exec.(*) | No |
| ROB1 | L1: | ADDD \$F4, \$F2, \$F2 | \$F4 | FP1 | No, issued | No |
| ROB2 | | | | | | |
| ROB3 | | | | | | |
| ROB4 | | | | | | |
| ROB5 | | | | | | |
| ROB6 | | | | | | |
| ROB7 | | | | | | |
| ROB8 | | | | | | |
| ROB9 | | | | | | |

ROB Table

| Reg | # | ROB | # |
|------|---|-----|---|
| \$F0 | | - | |
| \$F2 | | | |
| \$F4 | | | |
| \$F6 | | | |
| \$F8 | | | |
| | | | |

Rename Table

Answer:

1. First, we allocate the entries given by the exercise in the Rename Table:

| # | ROB | # |
|---|------|--------------|
| | - | |
| | ROBO |) |
| | ROB | 1 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | # | # ROB - ROB: |

 $Rename\ Table$

2. We issue the L2 instruction. The operation's destination is memory. The status has not been issued yet because we are filling the ROB due to a cache miss, and the processor is waiting for the result of the operation.

| ROB# | Inst | Instruction | | Res. Alloc. | ${\bf Ready/Status}$ | Spec. |
|------|------|-----------------------|------|-------------|----------------------|-------|
| ROBO | LO: | LD \$F2, 0 (\$R1) | \$F2 | Load1 | No, exec.(*) | No |
| ROB1 | L1: | ADDD \$F4, \$F2, \$F2 | \$F4 | FP1 | No, issued | No |
| ROB2 | L2: | SD \$F4, 0(\$R1) | Mem | _ | No, issued | No |
| ROB3 | | | | | | |
| ROB4 | | | | | | |
| ROB5 | | | | | | |
| ROB6 | | | | | | |
| ROB7 | | | | | | |
| ROB8 | | | | | | |
| ROB9 | | | | | | |

ROB Table

3. We issue the L3 instruction. The destination is the left operand, register F6. We use Load 2 as the functional unit.

| ROB# | Inst | ruction | Dest. | Res. Alloc. | Ready/Status | Spec. |
|------|------|-----------------------|-------|-------------|--------------|-------|
| ROBO | LO: | LD \$F2, 0 (\$R1) | \$F2 | Load1 | No, exec.(*) | No |
| ROB1 | L1: | ADDD \$F4, \$F2, \$F2 | \$F4 | FP1 | No, issued | No |
| ROB2 | L2: | SD \$F4, 0(\$R1) | Mem | - | No, issued | No |
| ROB3 | L3: | LD \$F6, 4(\$R1) | \$F6 | Load2 | No, issued | No |
| ROB4 | | | | | | |
| ROB5 | | | | | | |
| ROB6 | | | | | | |
| ROB7 | | | | | | |
| ROB8 | | | | | | |
| ROB9 | | | | | | |

 $ROB\ Table$

| Reg # | ROB a | # | |
|-------|-------|---|--|
| \$F0 | - | | |
| \$F2 | ROB0 | | |
| \$F4 | ROB1 | | |
| \$F6 | ROB3 | | |
| \$F8 | | | |

Rename Table

4. We issue the L4 instruction.

| ROB# | Inst | ruction | Dest. | Res. Alloc. | Ready/Status | Spec. |
|------|------|-----------------------|-------|-------------|--------------|-------|
| ROBO | LO: | LD \$F2, 0 (\$R1) | \$F2 | Load1 | No, exec.(*) | No |
| ROB1 | L1: | ADDD \$F4, \$F2, \$F2 | \$F4 | FP1 | No, issued | No |
| ROB2 | L2: | SD \$F4, 0(\$R1) | Mem | - | No, issued | No |
| ROB3 | L3: | LD \$F6, 4(\$R1) | \$F6 | Load2 | No, issued | No |
| ROB4 | L4: | ADDD \$F8, \$F6, \$F6 | \$F8 | FP2 | No, issued | No |
| ROB5 | | | | | | |
| ROB6 | | | | | | |
| ROB7 | | | | | | |
| ROB8 | | | | | | |
| ROB9 | | | | | | |

$ROB\ Table$

| Reg # | ROB # | | |
|-------|-------|--|--|
| \$F0 | - | | |
| \$F2 | ROB0 | | |
| \$F4 | ROB1 | | |
| \$F6 | ROB3 | | |
| \$F8 | ROB4 | | |

Rename Table

5. We issue the L5 instruction.

| ROB# | Inst | ruction | Dest. | Res. Alloc. | ${\bf Ready/Status}$ | Spec. |
|------|------|-----------------------|-------|-------------|----------------------|-------|
| ROBO | LO: | LD \$F2, 0 (\$R1) | \$F2 | Load1 | No, exec.(*) | No |
| ROB1 | L1: | ADDD \$F4, \$F2, \$F2 | \$F4 | FP1 | No, issued | No |
| ROB2 | L2: | SD \$F4, O(\$R1) | Mem | - | No, issued | No |
| ROB3 | L3: | LD \$F6, 4(\$R1) | \$F6 | Load2 | No, issued | No |
| ROB4 | L4: | ADDD \$F8, \$F6, \$F6 | \$F8 | FP2 | No, issued | No |
| ROB5 | L5: | SD \$F8, 0(\$R1) | Mem | - | No, issued | No |
| ROB6 | | | | | | |
| ROB7 | | | | | | |
| ROB8 | | | | | | |
| ROB9 | | | | | | |

 $ROB\ Table$

6. We issue the L6 instruction.

| ROB# | Inst | ruction | Dest. | Res. Alloc. | ${\bf Ready/Status}$ | Spec. |
|------|------|-----------------------|-------|-------------|----------------------|-------|
| ROBO | LO: | LD \$F2, 0 (\$R1) | \$F2 | Load1 | No, exec.(*) | No |
| ROB1 | L1: | ADDD \$F4, \$F2, \$F2 | \$F4 | FP1 | No, issued | No |
| ROB2 | L2: | SD \$F4, O(\$R1) | Mem | _ | No, issued | No |
| ROB3 | L3: | LD \$F6, 4(\$R1) | \$F6 | Load2 | No, issued | No |
| ROB4 | L4: | ADDD \$F8, \$F6, \$F6 | \$F8 | FP2 | No, issued | No |
| ROB5 | L5: | SD \$F8, 0(\$R1) | Mem | _ | No, issued | No |
| ROB6 | L6: | ADDI \$R1, \$R1, 8 | \$R1 | Int1 | No, issued | No |
| ROB7 | | | | | | |
| ROB8 | | | | | | |
| ROB9 | | | | | | |

ROB Table

7. We issue the L7 instruction.

| ROB# | Inst | ruction | Dest. | Res. Alloc. | Ready/Status | Spec. |
|------|------|-----------------------|-------|-------------|--------------|-------|
| ROBO | LO: | LD \$F2, 0 (\$R1) | \$F2 | Load1 | No, exec.(*) | No |
| ROB1 | L1: | ADDD \$F4, \$F2, \$F2 | \$F4 | FP1 | No, issued | No |
| ROB2 | L2: | SD \$F4, 0(\$R1) | Mem | - | No, issued | No |
| ROB3 | L3: | LD \$F6, 4(\$R1) | \$F6 | Load2 | No, issued | No |
| ROB4 | L4: | ADDD \$F8, \$F6, \$F6 | \$F8 | FP2 | No, issued | No |
| ROB5 | L5: | SD \$F8, 0(\$R1) | Mem | - | No, issued | No |
| ROB6 | L6: | ADDI \$R1, \$R1, 8 | \$R1 | Int1 | No, issued | No |
| ROB7 | L7: | BNE \$R1, \$R2, L0 | - | Int2 | No, issued | No |
| ROB8 | | | | | | |
| ROB9 | | | | | | |

ROB Table

8. We issue L0 and L1. Since we need to fill out the entire ROB table and we don't know whether the branch will be true or false, we made a prediction. Therefore, each speculative entry will be set to true.

| ROB# | Inst | ruction | Dest. | Res. Alloc. | Ready/Status | Spec. |
|------|------|-----------------------|-------|-------------|--------------|-------|
| ROBO | LO: | LD \$F2, 0 (\$R1) | \$F2 | Load1 | No, exec.(*) | No |
| ROB1 | L1: | ADDD \$F4, \$F2, \$F2 | \$F4 | FP1 | No, issued | No |
| ROB2 | L2: | SD \$F4, 0(\$R1) | Mem | _ | No, issued | No |
| ROB3 | L3: | LD \$F6, 4(\$R1) | \$F6 | Load2 | No, issued | No |
| ROB4 | L4: | ADDD \$F8, \$F6, \$F6 | \$F8 | FP2 | No, issued | No |
| ROB5 | L5: | SD \$F8, 0(\$R1) | Mem | _ | No, issued | No |
| ROB6 | L6: | ADDI \$R1, \$R1, 8 | \$R1 | Int1 | No, issued | No |
| ROB7 | L7: | BNE \$R1, \$R2, L0 | - | Int2 | No, issued | No |
| ROB8 | LO: | LD \$F2, 0(\$R1) | \$F2 | Load3 | No, issued | Yes |
| ROB9 | L1: | ADDD \$F4, \$F2, \$F2 | \$F4 | FP3 | No, issued | Yes |

ROB Table

| Reg # | ROB # |
|-------|-----------|
| \$F0 | - |
| \$F2 | ROBO ROB8 |
| \$F4 | ROB1 ROB9 |
| \$F6 | ROB3 |
| \$F8 | ROB4 |

Rename Table

Question 1: Instruction-Level and Thread-Level Parallelism

Modern processors exploit Instruction Level Parallelism and Thread Level Parallelism. Answer to the following questions:

• Explain the main concepts for each approach (Instruction Level Parallelism ILP, Thread Level Parallelism TLP).

Answer:

Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP). ILP means executing multiple independent instructions from a single instruction stream in parallel. The goal is to exploit fine-grain parallelism within a single thread.

Many instructions in a program do not depend on each other, so they can be executed simultaneously if the hardware can exploit this.

- * **Pipelining**: Overlap the execution of multiple instructions by dividing execution into stages (fetch, decode, execute, memory, write-back). While one instruction is being decoded, the next can be fetched, and so on.
- * Superscalar execution: Issue multiple instructions per clock cycle. A superscalar processor has multiple pipelines.
- * Out-of-order execution: Hardware reorders instructions dynamically to maximize parallelism while preserving correctness.
- * **Speculation**: Predict branches and execute along the predicted path before knowing if it is correct.
- * Register renaming: Remove false dependencies (WAW, WAR hazards) by dynamically mapping logical registers to physical registers.

ILP aims to increase *single-thread performance*. Performance improvement depends on the amount of independent instructions and on how well the hardware can extract and schedule them.

Thread-Level Parallelism (TLP). TLP means executing multiple independent instruction streams (threads) in parallel.
 This exploits coarse-grain parallelism between threads.

Many programs or tasks can be decomposed into multiple independent threads. If there are multiple cores, these threads can run simultaneously.

- * Multithreading: Hardware executes instructions from multiple threads on a single core to better utilize pipeline resources (e.g., SMT, Simultaneous Multithreading).
- * Multiprocessing (Multicore): Multiple cores, each with its own pipeline(s), execute different threads.
- * Clusters or Shared Memory Multiprocessors: Multiple processors/cores share memory; they communicate and synchronize to solve larger problems.

To coordinate threads, programmers use synchronization primitives (locks, barriers). Memory consistency models define how memory updates become visible.

TLP increases throughput and/or responsiveness. It is the main driver behind modern multicore processors. It shifts the burden to software: the program must be parallelized.

| Aspect | ILP | TLP |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Parallelism granularity | Fine-grain: within a single thread | Coarse-grain: multiple threads |
| Handled by | Mostly hardware | Both hardware $\&$ software |
| Example | Pipelining, superscalar, out-of-order | Multicore CPUs, multithreading |
| Goal | Speed up single program thread | Speed up multi-threaded workload |

Table 23: Comparison ILP vs TLP.

• Which type of technique can be applied in superscalar processors to combine both ILP and TLP?

Answer: In a superscalar processor, the main technique to combine both ILP and TLP is Simultaneous Multithreading (SMT).

- A superscalar processor can issue multiple instructions per cycle, this exploits Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP).
- However, sometimes a single thread cannot supply enough independent instructions to keep all issue slots busy (due to data dependencies, cache misses, or control hazards).
- To keep the pipelines full, Simultaneous Multithreading allows instructions from multiple hardware threads to be fetched and issued in the same cycle.
- In other words, SMT interleaves instructions from different threads into the same superscalar pipeline, and this combines ILP (issuing multiple instructions per cycle) with TLP (multiple threads).

The most common SMT implementation is Intel's Hyper-Threading technology.

In summary, **SMT** leverages the *wide superscalar pipeline* to execute instructions from multiple threads *at the same time*. This effectively *combines ILP and TLP* on a singole core.

• Explain what type of instruction scheduling is used in superscalar processors to combine both ILP and TLP?

Answer: In superscalar processors, instruction scheduling is about deciding when and in what order instructions issue to the multiple pipelines. Scheduling ensures that dependencies are respected and hardware resources are efficiently used.

- Static scheduling: The compiler reorders instructions before runtime. Used in simple in-order superscalar pipelines (like early RISC designs).
- Dynamic scheduling: The processor reorders instructions at runtime to exploit more ILP. This is the standard for modern highperformance superscalar cores.

6.1 2025

Almost all modern PC superscalar cores (Intel, AMD, ARM) do dynamic scheduling, with out-of-order execution. The most common algorithm for dynamic scheduling is the Tomasulo algorithm, which uses register renaming to eliminate false dependencies.

When the processor implements **Simultaneous Multithreading** (SMT):

- The **instruction window** holds instructions from *multiple hardware* threads simultaneously.
- The **dynamic scheduling logic** treats all the instructions *from all active threads* together.
- At each cycle, it issues the ready instructions, from whichever threads have instructions ready, to the available execution units.

This means the same dynamic out-of-order scheduler works across multiple threads.

• What are the main hardware modifications required for a generic superscalar processor to support both ILP and TLP?

Answer: To combine ILP and TLP within each core, we typically add Simultaneous Multithreading (SMT). So, what we need is:

- Multiple architectural register sets. Each hardware thread needs its own copy of program-visible registers:
 - * Every thread needs its own program counter (PC).
 - * Every thread needs its own architectural registers (e.g. x86 has 16 GPRs, ARM has 31 GPRs, plus FP regs).

If we didn't keep these separate, two threads would overwrite each other's registers.

- **?** How is this solved in hardware? The physical register file is big enough to hold many physical registers. Each thread has a logical map that says: "My ISA register RAX is currently mapped to physical register #45". This is the register renaming table. **SMT adds one** register map per hardware thread. This lets the hardware:
 - * Track which physical registers belong to which thread's logical registers.
 - * Keep architectural state for each thread separate, but reuse the same physical register file.

This is needed so the processor can fetch, decode, and track multiple *independent* contexts. For example, Intel's SMT (Hyper-Threading) duplicates only the architectural state per thread, but the physical register file is shared and dynamically renamed.


Thread ID tagging in pipeline. Each instruction must carry a Thread ID (TID) through the pipeline. Reservation stations, reorder buffer (ROB), load-store queues, all must track which thread each instruction belongs to. The commit logic uses the TID to retire instructions into the correct thread's architectural state.

Thread-aware instruction fetch. The front-end fetch unit must support fetching from multiple program counters (PCs) in the same cycle or round-robin across active threads. For example, Intel Hyper-Threading allows two threads, front-end selects which one to fetch from each cycle (based on fairness, resource usage, branch miss, stalls).

- Larger shared resources. Instruction window, reservation stations, ROB, rename table, all must be larger to hold more total in-flight instructions. E.g., if a single thread can fill 200 μ ops in the ROB, with SMT we might need to handle $2\times$ or $4\times$ as many μ ops in-flight to maintain high throughput.
- Thread scheduling logic. The issue logic must pick instructions not just by readiness and dependencies, but also across multiple threads. This keeps execution units busy when one thread stalls (e.g., on a cache miss).
- Shared cache + coherent pipeline queues. L1/L2 caches must be shared among the SMT threads to allow fine-grained switching. Coherence is easier than in multicore because threads share the same core and same cache hierarchy.
- Interrupt/exception support per thread. Exceptions and interrupts must be tracked per thread. The pipeline must be able to squash/rollback only the instructions belonging to the faulting thread.

Question 2: Vector Processors

Consider a vector processor architecture, as VMIPS shown in the figure.



- Present the main concepts;
- Present the main advantages of vector execution with respect to scalar execution, detailing the features of the vector architecture that provide the advantage.

Answer:

Deepening: What is VMIPS?

Vector MIPS is an educational extension of the classic MIPS RISC architecture, designed to illustrate how a vector processor works. The "V" means it extends the scalar MIPS with vector instructions, vector registers, and vector functional units. The core idea is one vector instruction applies an operation to all elements of a vector register (element-wise) in hardware. For example, let's say we have a vector register V1 holding 64 floating point numbers, a scalar register F2 holding the scalar value 10, then we could write: VADDVS V2, V1, F2; that it corresponds to:

```
for i = 0 to V1_length-1:
V2[i] = V1[i] + F2
```

The hardware streams the elements of V1 through a pipelined adder. Each cycle, one pair: (V1[i], scalar) is read, added, and the result is written to V2[i]. After an initial pipeline latency, we get one result per cycle, so throughput is very high.

The figure shows a *vector processor datapath*, this type of architecture is typical of Cray-style supercomputers and is the basis for modern SIMD units.

- Vector Registers: Large registers that hold whole *vectors*, each vector register stores multiple elements (e.g. 64 or 128 floats). This enables operations on entire arrays in a single instruction.
- Scalar Registers: Hold normal single-word scalar values (e.g., loop bounds, offsets).
- Vector Load/Store Unit: Moves entire vectors between main memory and the vector registers. Memory is accessed in *strided* or *sequential* patterns.
- Multiple Vector Functional Units: Specialized vector ALUs: FP add/subtract unit, FP multiply unit, FP divide unit, Integer unit, Logical unit. These execute vector operations in parallel, multiple elements flow through the pipeline concurrently.
- Pipelined Execution: Each functional unit is deeply pipelined, one element per cycle throughput after an initial latency.

A single **vector instruction** specifies an operation on an entire vector register, the hardware pipelines iterate over the elements automatically. Advantages of vector execution vs. scalar execution:

✓ High throughput via data-level parallelism

- − Scalar: One instruction operates on one element at a time \rightarrow many instructions \rightarrow high instruction bandwidth needed.
- Vector: One vector instruction does N operations \rightarrow reduces instruction fetch, decode, and issue overhead.
- ✓ Better memory bandwidth efficiency. Vector loads/stores transfer entire contiguous blocks → hardware can stream efficiently. Strided accesses help with matrices. Memory latency is amortized over large transfers.
- ✓ Deep pipelining with high utilization. Pipelines stay full because the same operation repeats over many elements. High utilization of functional units → no pipeline bubbles for loop overhead.
- ✓ Compact code → fewer branch hazards. Fewer loop control instructions → fewer branches. Branch misprediction cost is lower. Control flow overhead (loop index increments, tests) is eliminated for the vector part.
- ✓ Easier to overlap computation and memory. Because operations are predictable and regular, hardware can prefetch next vectors while current computation runs. Software and hardware together can schedule operations to hide memory latency.

A vector processor like VMIPS is specialized for data-level parallelism: a single instruction describes operations on many data elements. This reduces instruction overhead, improves pipeline utilization, maximizes memory throughput, and delivers higher performance than scalar execution for the same silicon area when data-parallel problems are available.

Quizzes

1. Question 1 (format Multiple Choice - Single answer). Let's consider the following code executed by a Vector Processor with:

- Vector Register File composed of 32 vectors of 8 elements per 64 bits/element;
- Scalar FP Register File composed of 32 registers of 64 bits;
- One Load/Store Vector Unit with operation chaining and memory bandwidth 64 bits;
- One ADD/SUB Vector Unit with operation chaining;
- One MUL/DIV Vector Unit with operation chaining.

```
L.V V1, RA  # Load vector from memory address RA into V1
L.V V3, RB  # Load vector from memory address RB into V3
MULVS.D V1, V1, F0 # FP multiply vector V1 to scalar F0
ADDVV.D V2, V1, V1 # FP add vectors V1 and V1
MULVS.D V2, V2, F0 # FP multiply vector V2 to scalar F0
ADDVV.D V3, V2, V3 # FP add vectors V2 and V3
S.V V1, RX  # Store vector V3 into memory address RX
S.V V2, RY  # Store vector V3 into memory address RY
S.V V3, RZ  # Store vector V3 into memory address RZ
```

How many convoys? How many clock cycles to execute the code? (SIN-GLE ANSWER)

- **X** Answer 1: 2 convoys; 16 clock cycles
- **★** Answer 2: 3 convoys; 24 clock cycles
- **★** Answer 3: 4 convoys; 32 clock cycles
- ✓ **Answer 4**: 5 convoys; 40 clock cycles
- **X** Answer 5: 6 convoys; 48 clock cycles

A Convoy is a group of vector instructions that can be issued together in the same cycle, respecting structural and data dependency constraints, so that the vector processor's functional units are fully utilized without conflicts.

- A convoy is **like a bundle of operations** that run **in lock-step** on different functional units.
- The vector processor may have separate pipelines for Load/Store, Vector Add/Subtract, Vector Multiply/Divide, etc.
- If there is **no resource conflict** (e.g., we don't need two loads at the same time if we only have one load unit) **and no data hazard** (e.g., we don't need the result of an instruction that hasn't finished yet), we can **pack them into the same convoy**.
- Convoys are executed sequentially, but the instructions within a convoy execute in parallel, overlapping their pipelines.

Chaining is a hardware feature in vector processors that allows different vector functional units to overlap execution on dependent vector operations, by directly forwarding partial results element by element, without waiting for the entire vector result to be written back to the vector register file first.

Vector pipelines are deep, and each vector operation processes one element per cycle once the pipeline is full. Normally, if Instruction B depends on Instruction A:

- Without chaining: B must wait until A computes the entire vector result and writes it back to a vector register.
- With chaining: B can start as soon as the first element from A is produced, passing the result directly between functional units for each element.

So we get element-wise overlap \rightarrow more parallelism, shorter total execution time, fewer convoys.

Motivate your answer by completing the following table:

| | Load/Store Vector Unit | Add/Sub Vector Unit | Mul/Div Vector Unit |
|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1^ convoy | L.V V1, RA | | |
| 2 [^] convoy | L.V V3, RB | | MULVS.D V1, V1, F0 |
| 3^ convoy | S.V V1, RX | ADDVV.D V2, V1, V1 | |
| 4^ convoy | | | MULVS.D V2, V2, F0 |
| 5^ convoy | S.V V2, RY | ADDVV.D V3, V2, V3 | |
| 6^ convoy | S.V V2, RY | | |

Without chaining.

| | Load/Store Vector Unit | Add/Sub Vector Unit | Mul/Div Vector Unit |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1^ convoy | L.V V1, RA | ADDVV.D V2, V1, V1 | MULVS.D V1, V1, F0 |
| 2^ convoy | S.V V1, RX | | |
| 3^ convoy | L.V V3, RB | ADDVV.D V3, V2, V3 | MULVS.D V2, V2, F0 |
| 4^ convoy | S.V V2, RY | | |
| [.3em] 6 ^ convoy | | | |
| 5^ convoy | S.V V3, RZ | | |

With chaining (solution).

2. Question 2 (format True/False). In VLIW architectures, the compiler can detect parallelism only in basic blocks of the code.

Answer: False. A basic block is a straight-line piece of code with no branches in except the entry, and no branches out except the exit. In a basic block, the compiler easily sees all data dependencies. But real programs have branches, loops, and procedure calls, so a compiler that only detects ILP inside each basic block finds very limited parallelism.

VLIW compilers do:

• Basic block scheduling: VLIW machines rely on static compiletime scheduling. They issue wide instructions with many slots (e.g., 4-8 operations in one VLIW bundle). Most basic blocks in normal code are small, often only 5-15 instructions.

- Global code scheduling:
 - Trace scheduling (Fisher): Combines multiple basic blocks along the most likely execution paths to form a longer region → reorders instructions globally.
 - Software pipelining (modulo scheduling): Especially in loops, overlaps iterations → exposes more ILP than is visible in a single basic block.
 - Loop unrolling and reordering: same idea, bigger region, more ILP to fill the VLIW slots.
- 3. Question 3 (format True/False). A 4-issue VLIW processor requires 4 Program Counters to load the necessary instructions in the 4 parallel lanes

Answer: False. Because in VLIW, we don't have multiple independent program counters. We have one program counter that points to a very wide instruction word which contains all the parallel operations to be issued together.

- 4. Question 4 (format Multiple Choice Single answer). In the Speculative Tomasulo Architecture, what type of hardware block is used to undo speculative instructions in case of a mispredicted branch?
 - ✓ Answer 1: Reorder Buffer;
 - **X** Answer 2: Instruction Dispatcher;
 - **X** Answer 3: Store Buffer;
 - **X** Answer 4: Reservation Stations;
 - **X** Answer 5: Load Buffers;

Motivate your answer by explaining what happens in the case of a mispredicted branch.

Answer: The hardware block is the ROB (Reorder Buffer). During a misprediction, the hardware can simply invalidate all ROB entries younger than the branch because all results are only in the ROB. The renaming table shows instructions made thanks to a prediction because they have a speculative flag set to true. Finally, the PC is reset to the correct target.

References

- [1] J.L. Hennessy and D.A. Patterson. Computer Architecture: A Quantitative Approach. ISSN. Elsevier Science, 2017.
- [2] Cristina Silvano. Lesson 1, pipelining. Slides from the HPC-E master's degree course on Politecnico di Milano, 2024.
- [3] Cristina Silvano. Advanced computer architecture. Slides from the HPC-E master's degree course on Politecnico di Milano, 2024-2025.

Index

| Symbols 1-bit Branch History Table (1-bit BHT) 2-bit Branch History Table (BHT) 2-level Predictors | 54 56 60 |
|---|---|
| A Address Unit AMAT (Average Memory Access Time) Amdahl's Law Anti-Dependence (Write After Read - WAR) | 223 251 95, 245 70 |
| B Backward Taken Forward Not Taken (BTFNT) Basic Block Branch Always Not Taken Branch Delay Slot Branch History Register (BHR) Branch History Table (BHT) Branch Outcome Branch Outcome Predictor (BOP) Branch Prediction Branch Prediction Buffer Branch Target Address (BTA) Branch Target Buffer (BTB) | 42 267, 270 37 44 66 54 28 52 35 54 28 39, 52, 58 |
| Cache Write-Back Cache Write-Invalidate Cache Write-Through Chaining Code Scheduling Common Data Bus (CDB) Compiler Scheduling Control Dependencies Control Hazards Convoy Correlating Predictors Critical Path | 328 327 328 346 185, 269 139, 144 23 73 18, 19, 30 345 60 270, 272 |
| D Data Dependence Graph Data Dependencies Data Hazards Delayed Branch Delayed Branch Scheduling: From After Delayed Branch Scheduling: From Before Delayed Branch Scheduling: From Fall-Through Delayed Branch Scheduling: From Target Dependence Graph | 271 69 18, 19 44 51 46 49 47 271 |

| | Index |
|---|----------|
| | |
| Miss | 251 |
| Miss Penalty | 251 |
| Multi-Cycle In-Order Pipeline | 75 |
| Multi-Cycle Out-of-Order (OoO) Pipeline | 78 |
| Multiple-Issue Processors | 83 |
| Multiple-Issue Width | 89 |
| N | |
| Name Dependencies | 70 |
| 0 | |
| Output Dependence (Write After Write - WAW) | 70 |
| P | |
| Pattern History Table (PHT) | 66 |
| Pipeline Registers | 17 |
| Pipelining | 6 |
| Predicted Target Address (PTA) | 52 |
| Profile-Driven Prediction | 43 |
| Pseudo-Dependencies | 70 |
| R | |
| RAW (Read After Write) | 19 |
| Read After Write (RAW) | 69 |
| Read Operands Stage (Out-of-Order) | 104 |
| Read Operands Stage (RR) | 99 |
| Ready Bit | 224 |
| Register File (RF) | 144 |
| Register Renaming | 71, 180 |
| Register Result Status Table | 107 |
| Rename Table | 226 |
| Reorder Buffer (ROB) | 216, 217 |
| Reservation Station (RS) | 140 |
| Reservation Stations | 138 |
| Reservation Stations (RS) | 137 |
| Reservation Stations (RSs) | 143 |
| RISC-V Data Path | 8 |
| ROB Head pointer | 225 |
| ROB number | 220 |
| ROB Tail pointer | 225 |
| \mathbf{S} | |
| Scoreboard | 97 |
| Simultaneous Multithreading (SMT) | 340 |
| Software Pipelining | 273 |
| Speculative Flag | 224 |
| Static Branch Prediction Techniques | 35 |
| Static Renaming | 136 |
| Static Renaming - Software-side | 72 |
| Store Buffers | 141 |
| Strongly Not Taken (SNT) | 56 |

| | Index |
|---|---------|
| | |
| Strongly Taken (ST) | 56 |
| Structural Hazards | 18, 19 |
| Superscalar Processor | 89 |
| \mathbf{T} | |
| Temporary Names (tags) | 137 |
| Thread-Level Parallelism (TLP) | 339 |
| Throughput (Bandwidth) | 240 |
| Tomasulo's Algorithm | 134 |
| True Data Dependencies | 69 |
| Two-Level Adaptive Branch Predictors | 66 |
| ${f V}$ | |
| VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) | 92, 260 |
| VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word) Processor | 89 |
| \mathbf{W} | |
| WAR (Write After Read) | 19 |
| WAW (Write After Write) | 19 |
| WB (Write Back) | 7 |
| Weakly Not Taken (WNT) | 56 |
| Weakly Taken (WT) | 56 |
| Write Result Stage (Out-of-Order) | 104 |
| Write-Allocate | 328 |