Advanced Computer Architectures - Notes - v0.7.0

260236

April 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.

Contents

| 1 | Pip | elining | | 5 |
|----------|------|---------|--|----|
| | 1.1 | | Concepts | 5 |
| | 1.2 | | V Pipelining | 10 |
| | | 1.2.1 | Pipelined execution of instructions | 13 |
| | | 1.2.2 | Pipeline Implementation | 15 |
| | 1.3 | Proble | em of Pipeline Hazards | 17 |
| | | 1.3.1 | RISC-V Optimized Pipeline | 19 |
| | | 1.3.2 | Solutions to RAW Hazards | 22 |
| | 1.4 | Perfor | mance evaluation | 24 |
| 2 | Con | ntrol H | lazards and Branch Prediction | 27 |
| | 2.1 | Condi | tional Branch Instructions | 27 |
| | 2.2 | Contro | ol Hazards | 29 |
| | 2.3 | Naïve | Solutions to Control Hazards | 31 |
| | 2.4 | Intro t | to Branch Prediction | 34 |
| | 2.5 | Static | Branch Prediction | 35 |
| | | 2.5.1 | Branch Always Not Taken | 36 |
| | | 2.5.2 | Branch Always Taken | 38 |
| | | 2.5.3 | Backward Taken Forward Not Taken (BTFNT) | 41 |
| | | 2.5.4 | Profile-Driven Prediction | 42 |
| | | 2.5.5 | Delayed Branch | 43 |
| | | | 2.5.5.1 From Before | 45 |
| | | | 2.5.5.2 From Target | 46 |
| | | | 2.5.5.3 From Fall-Through | 48 |
| | | | 2.5.5.4 From After | 50 |
| | 2.6 | Dynar | nic Branch Prediction | 51 |
| | | 2.6.1 | 1-bit Branch History Table | 53 |
| | | 2.6.2 | 2-bit Branch History Table | 55 |
| | | 2.6.3 | Branch Target Buffer | 57 |
| | | 2.6.4 | Correlating Branch Predictors | 59 |
| | | | 2.6.4.1 (1,1) Correlating Predictors | 61 |
| | | | 2.6.4.2 (2,2) Correlating Predictors | 63 |
| | | 2.6.5 | Two-Level Adaptive Branch Predictors | 65 |
| 3 | Inst | ructio | n Level Parallelism | 67 |
| | 3.1 | The p | roblem of dependencies | 67 |
| | | 3.1.1 | Data Dependencies | 68 |
| | | 3.1.2 | Name Dependencies | 69 |
| | | 3.1.3 | Control Dependencies | 72 |
| | 3.2 | Multi- | Cycle Pipelining | 73 |
| | | 3.2.1 | Multi-Cycle In-Order Pipeline | 74 |
| | | 3.2.2 | Multi-Cycle Out-of-Order Pipeline | 77 |
| | 3.3 | Dynar | nic Scheduling | 80 |
| | 3.4 | | ole-Issue Processors | 82 |
| | | 3.4.1 | Introduction to Multiple-Issue Pipelines | 82 |
| | | 3.4.2 | Evolution Towards Superscalar Execution | 85 |
| | | 3.4.3 | Superscalar Processors | 88 |
| | | 3 1 1 | Static vs Dynamic Schoduling | 01 |

| 3.5 | 5 ILP Limitations & Alternatives | | | | | | |
|-------|--|--|-------|--|--|--|--|
| 3.6 | 6 Scoreboard: Dynamic Scheduling Algorithm | | | | | | |
| | 3.6.1 | Assumptions and Architecture | . 96 | | | | |
| | 3.6.2 | Pipeline Stage Refinement | . 98 | | | | |
| | 3.6.3 | Hazard Management (RAW, WAR, WAW) | . 100 | | | | |
| | 3.6.4 | Control Logic and Stages | . 102 | | | | |
| | 3.6.5 | Summary | . 104 | | | | |
| | 3.6.6 | Scoreboard Data Structures | | | | | |
| | 3.6.7 | In-Depth Execution Example | . 108 | | | | |
| 3.7 | Tomas | sulo's Algorithm | . 133 | | | | |
| | 3.7.1 | Introduction | . 133 | | | | |
| | 3.7.2 | Register Renaming: Static vs. Implicit | . 135 | | | | |
| | 3.7.3 | Basic Concepts of Tomasulo's Algorithm | . 137 | | | | |
| | 3.7.4 | Architecture | . 139 | | | | |
| | 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 | . 150 | | | | |
| | 3.7.6 | In-Depth Execution Example | | | | | |
| | 3.7.7 | Tomasulo vs. Scoreboarding | | | | | |
| 3.8 | Regist | er Renaming | . 179 | | | | |
| | 3.8.1 | Introduction | | | | | |
| | 3.8.2 | Tomasulo's Algorithm | . 181 | | | | |
| Index | | | 185 | | | | |

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.

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

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

Store data from register ${\tt rs2}$ to an address formed by adding ${\tt rs1}$ 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.
- 5. 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 | WB |
|---|----|----|----|-----|----|
| 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 |
| $6\mathrm{th}~(10\text{-}12~\mathrm{ns})$ | 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).
- 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 15). 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 27) 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 67) 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.

2 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.

EX

 MEM

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 IF2 ID $_{
m IF}$ 3 EXID4 MEM Stall5 WBStall

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

6

7

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 | 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:

- **✗ 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 19.

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:

$$\texttt{MIPS} = \frac{500 \; \text{MHz}}{2.2 \times 10^6} = 227$$

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:

$$MIPS_{iter} = \frac{f_{clock}}{CPI_{iter} \times 10^6}$$
 (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 32). 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:

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 36): 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 45 From **before** the branch.
- 2. Section 2.5.5.2, page 46 From the ${f target}$ of the branch.
- 3. Section 2.5.5.3, page 48 From the **fall-through path** (i.e., the sequential next instruction).
- 4. Section 2.5.5.4, page 50 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:

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.
- $\bullet \ More \ code = more \ memory = larger \ executable.$
- 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 ⇒ 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

- **▼** 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.
 - 71 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 | T | 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 | С | Т | 10 | 01 | BHT[10] |



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

| Aspect | Description | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|
| $\overline{m=2}$ | 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 27.

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.
- **X** 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:

```
I1: F0 \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 74).

- 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 77).

- 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 82).
- 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.

2 Step 4: Multiple-Issue, Out-of-Order Execution

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

- 1. 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.
- Oynamic 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

- **8** Complex Hardware: Scheduling, renaming, hazard detection logic increases area and power.
- $oxed{S}$ 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

This is a practical limit.

- 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 processor can only exploit what it sees in its current instruction window.
- 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.

3.6 Scoreboard: Dynamic Scheduling Algorithm

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 73). However, once issued, they are allowed to execute and complete out-of-order 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 write-back (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 70) 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 18), 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 18) 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:

RAW (Read After Write) - True Dependency

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 |
|----------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| \mathbf{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.

E 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.

- 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.
- Detect WAR hazards at write-back stage.
- 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:

```
1 LD F6, 34(R2)
2 LD F2, 45(R3)
3 MULTD F0, F2, F4 # RAW on F2
4 SUBD F8, F6, F2 # RAW on F6, F2
5 DIVD F10, F0, F6 # RAW on F0, F6
6 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 106:

- 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 | $\frac{4}{4}$ |
| 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 | 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 |
|-------|----|----|----|---------|----|-----|-----|---------|
| 4 | | | | Integer | | | | |

- \bullet LD F2, 45(R3) is issued and starts execution.
- 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 | Divide | | |

- ✓ 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 | | | |

- \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 | FO | 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 | Divide | | | |

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 | | | |

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

- ✓ 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 <code>F6</code> 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 | 13 | | | |

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.
- f X DIVD is still waiting on F0 (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 | | | | | | | | |
| <mark>5</mark> | 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 | FO | F2 | F4 | F6 | F8 | F10 | F12 | F30 |
|-------|------|----|----|-----|----|--------|-----|---------|
| 14 | Mult | | | 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 WAR hazard active on F6.

 $\mathbf{Execution}$ $\mathbf{parallelism} :$ \mathtt{ADDD} and \mathtt{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 F0 | 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.
- DIVD is **still stalled**, waiting for FO (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 | | | | | | | | |
| $\frac{3}{2}$ | 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).

 $\bf Note : \ WAR \ hazards \ delay \ write-back, not execution.$

| 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 **still 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 | | |

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

- ✓ 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.
- \bullet 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 | $\overline{22}$ |

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 | 61 | |
| 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 | FO | 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 | Qј | Qk | Rj | Rk |
|------|---------|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | Integer | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Mult1 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Mult2 | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Add | No | | | | | | | | |
| | Divide | No | | | | | | | | |

Functional unit status.

| Clock | FO | 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.

V 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 69) 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.

✗ 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 $\mathtt{Qi} \neq \mathtt{0} \to \mathtt{the}$ 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 142), 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.
 - $oxed{3}$ If $\mathbf{no} \to \mathbf{stall}$ inside the RS until FU becomes free.

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 |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| $\overline{\text{Fixed issue} \rightarrow \text{execute}}$ | 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 ← 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 |
|----------------------------------|------|-----------|--|------------------------------|
| $L.D \rightarrow F6$ | 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 |
| $\texttt{MUL.D} \to \texttt{FO}$ | MUL1 | F0 | $\texttt{F0.Qi} \leftarrow \texttt{MUL1}$ | 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 | | | | | | 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) | $\frac{2}{2}$ | | |
| MULTD FO, F2, F4 | | | |
| 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 | v(R3) | | | | | |
| EXLoad | 34 | | v(R2) | | | | |

 ${\tt EXLoad}~({\rm or}~{\tt EX_LD}).$

| N | ame | ۷j | Qj | V | k | Qk | | Nan | ne | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------|--------|-----|-----|---|---|----|-------|-----|----|-------|----|----|----|
| AI | D1 | | | | | | | MUL | 1 | | | | |
| AΓ | D2 | | | | | | | MUL | 2 | | | | |
| Ex | ADD | | | | | | | ExM | UL | | | | |
| | ExADD. | | | | | | | | Εz | cMUL. | | | |
| RF 0 |) 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | | 31 |
| Qi | | Loa | ad2 | | | | 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 | | | |
| 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 | Vk | 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 | | | |

 ${\tt ExMUL}.$

| $\overline{\mathrm{RF}}$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 31 |
|--------------------------|------|---|-------|---|---|---|-------|---|------|---|----|--------|
| Qi | MUL1 | | 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 | <mark>5</mark> | | |
| ADDD F6, F8, F2 | | | |

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 | Name | Vj | Q | j | Vk | Qk |
|-------|---|------|------|----|----|------|-------|------|-----|------|-------|----|
| ADD1 | v | (F6) | | | Lo | ad2 | MUL1 | | Loa | .d2 | v(F4) | |
| ADD2 | | | | | | | MUL2 | | MUI | 1 | v(F6) | |
| ExADD | | | | | | | ExMUL | . | | | | |
| | | Ex | ADD. | | | | | | ExM | UL. | | |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | | 31 |
| MUL1 | | Load | 12 | | | v(F6 |) | ADD1 | | MUL2 | 2 | |

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
 - F6.Qi = Load1 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 | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------|----|----|-------|----|
| Load1 | | | | |
| Load2 | 45 | | v(R3) | |
| EXLoad | 45 | | v(R3) | |

EXLoad (or EX_LD).

| Name | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|-------|-------|------|----|-------|
| ADD1 | v(F6) | | | Load2 |
| ADD2 | | ADD1 | | Load2 |
| ExADD | | | | |

ExADD.

| Name | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|-------|----|-------|-------|----|
| MUL1 | | Load2 | v(F4) | |
| MUL2 | | MUL1 | v(F6) | |
| ExMUL | | | | |

ExMUL.

| RF | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 31 |
|----|------|---|-------|---|---|---|------|---|------|---|------|--------|
| Qi | MUL1 | | Load2 | | | | ADD2 | | ADD1 | | MUL2 | |

 ${\bf Register}\ {\bf Result}\ {\bf Status}.$

- 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 now Vj = v(F2) and 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 | | | | |

 ${\tt ExADD}.$



ExMUL.

| RF | 0 1 | l | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 31 |
|--------|------|---|------|---|---|---|------|---|------|---|------|--------|
| Qi I | /UL1 | 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 | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------|----|----|----|----|
| Load1 | | | | |
| Load2 | | | | |
| EXLoad | | | | |

 ${\tt EXLoad} \ ({\rm or} \ {\tt EX_LD}).$

| Name | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk | Name | Vj | Qj | Vk |
|-------|-------|------|-------|----|-----------|-------|------|-------|
| ADD1 | v(F6) | | v(F2) | | MUL1 v | 7(F2) | | v(F4) |
| ADD2 | | ADD1 | v(F2) | | MUL2 | | MUL1 | v(F6) |
| ExADD | v(F6) | | v(F2) | | ExMUL v | 7(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 I | nstruction | Level | Parallelisn | n |
|-----|------------|-------|-------------|---|
|-----|------------|-------|-------------|---|

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

 $\frac{\mathrm{RF}}{\mathrm{Qi}}$

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 | <mark>11</mark> | |

Instruction status.

| Name | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------|----|----|----|----|
| Load1 | | | | |
| Load2 | | | | |
| EXLoad | | | | |

 ${\tt EXLoad} \ ({\rm or} \ {\tt EX_LD}).$

Qk

| ADD1 | | | | | | MUL | 1 v(F | 2) | | v(F4) | |
|--------|-------|----|------|---|------|-----|----------|----|------|-------|----|
| ADD2 | v(F8) | | v(F2 |) | | MUL | 2 | | MUL1 | v(F6) | |
| ExADD | v(F8) | • | v(F2 |) | | ExM | UL v(F | 2) | | v(F4) | |
| ExADD. | | | | | | Ex | MUL. | | | | |
| 0 | 1 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | | 31 |
| MUL1 | v(F2 | 2) | | | ADD2 | | v(F8) | | MUL2 | | |

Name

۷j

Qј

 ${\tt Vk}$

Qk

Register Result Status.

Name

MUL1

RF

Qi

۷j

v(F2)

Qј

Vk

- 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 | ۷j | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|--------|----|----|----|----|
| Load1 | | | | |
| Load2 | | | | |
| EXLoad | | | | |

 ${\tt EXLoad} \ ({\rm or} \ {\tt EX_LD}).$

Qk

| ADD1 | | | | | | MUL1 | v(F2 |) | | v(F4) | |
|-------|-------|-------|------|----|---|-------|------|-----|------|-------|----|
| ADD2 | v(F8) | | v(F2 | 2) | | MUL2 | | М | IUL1 | v(F6) | |
| ExADD | v(F8) | | v(F2 | 2) | | ExMUL | v(F2 |) | | v(F4) | |
| | Е | xADD. | | | | | | ExM | UL. | | |
| 0 | 1 2 | 2 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | | 31 |

Name

۷j

v(F8)

Qј

MUL2

Vk

Qk

Register Result Status.

v(F6)

- 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 | W÷ | n - | W1z | Qk | | | |
|-------|-----|----------------|-----|----|-------|-------|----|
| | V J | Qj | Vk | | Name | Vj | Qj |
| ADD1 | | | | | MUL1 | v(F2) | |
| ADD2 | | | | | MUL2 | v(F0) | |
| ExADD | | | | | ExMUL | v(F2) | |

ExMUL.

Vk

v(F4) v(F6) v(F4) Qk

| | 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 | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk | Name | Vj | Qj | Vk | Qk |
|-------|-----|-----|----|----|-------|-------|------|-------|----|
| ADD1 | | | | | MUL1 | - | | | |
| ADD2 | | | | | MUL2 | v(F0) | | v(F6) | |
| ExADD | | | | | ExMUL | v(F0) | | v(F6) | |
| | ExA | DD. | | | | Ex | MUL. | | |

| $\overline{RF} \mid 0$ | 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

RF

Qi

v(F0)

۷j

v(F2)

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).

| AD | D1 | | | | | | MUL1 | | | | | |
|--------|-----|---|---|---|---|---|------|---|-------|------|-------|----|
| AD | D2 | | | | | | MUL2 | | v(F0) | | v(F6) | |
| Ex | ADD | | | | | | ExMU | L | v(F0) | | v(F6) | |
| ExADD. | | | | | | | | | ExM | IUL. | | |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | | 31 |

Name

v(F8)

۷j

Qj

v(F10)

Vk

Qk

Register Result Status.

v(F6)

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 | |
|--|---|--|
| Operand 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 Read Timing | | |
| At execution start | At issue (or when available) via CDB | |
| Operand Forwarding | | |
| X No, must wait for register write-back | ✓ Yes, uses Common Data Bus (CDB) | |
| Control Model | | |
| Centralized Scoreboard | Decentralized logic at each RS $+$ FU | |
| Functional Units | | |
| Check Scoreboard for availability | RS check tags and readiness locally | |
| Instruction Readiness | | |
| RAW only (no renaming) | RAW + renamed operands (data-driven) | |
| Common Bus | | |
| × No shared result forwarding | ✓ Shared broadcast on CDB | |
| Complexity | | |
| 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
 - 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.

3.8 Register Renaming

The Register Renaming techniques have already been discussed in the previous sections. In section 3.1.2 (page 70) we gave a very short presentation dedicated to understand how to solve name dependencies, and in section 3.7.2 (page 135) 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.

3.8.1 Introduction

In modern out-of-order execution processors, one of the most significant bottlenecks 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.

3.8.2 Tomasulo's Algorithm

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.

Note that these topics are already covered in the Tomasulo section (3.7.2, page 136).

? Why Renaming?

Consider the following floating-point loop:

```
1 Loop: LD F0, 0(R1) ; Load word into F0 from address 0+R1
2 MULTD F4, F0, F2 ; Multiply F0 and F2, result into F4
3 SD F4, 0(R1) ; Store word from F4 to address 0+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.

⚠ 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:

```
1 Loop: LD F0, 0(R1)
2 MULTD F4, F0, F2
3 SD F4, 0(R1)
4 SUBI R1, R1, #8
5 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)
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).

Unrolling loops and using explicit register renaming during compilation allows modern processors to better leverage their instruction issuing capabilities and reduces the penalty of false dependencies. However, **compiler-driven renaming is limited** by the number of registers available in the ISA. This limitation is why **hardware support for implicit register renaming**, as seen with Tomasulo's algorithm, **remains essential** in high-performance out-of-order processors.

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) | 53 |
| 2-bit Branch History Table (BHT) 2-level Predictors | 55 |
| z-iever Fredictors | 59 |
| A | 0.4 |
| Amdahl's Law Anti-Dependence (Write After Read - WAR) | 94 69 |
| - , | 00 |
| B Rockward Taken Ferward Not Taken (RTFNT) | 41 |
| Backward Taken Forward Not Taken (BTFNT) Branch Always Not Taken | 36 |
| Branch Delay Slot | 43 |
| Branch History Register (BHR) | 65 |
| Branch History Table (BHT) Branch Outcome | 53 27 |
| Branch Outcome Predictor (BOP) | 51 |
| Branch Prediction | 34 |
| Branch Prediction Buffer | 53 |
| Branch Target Address (BTA) | 27 |
| Branch Target Buffer (BTB) | 38, 51, 57 |
| \mathbf{C} | |
| Clocks Per Instruction (CPI) | 120 142 |
| Common Data Bus (CDB) Compiler Scheduling | 138, 143 22 |
| Control Dependencies | 72 |
| Control Hazards | 17, 18, 29 |
| Correlating Predictors | 59 |
| D | |
| Data Dependencies | 68 |
| Data Hazards | 17, 18 |
| Delayed Branch Delayed Branch Scheduling: From After | 43 50 |
| Delayed Branch Scheduling: From Before | 45 |
| Delayed Branch Scheduling: From Fall-Through | 48 |
| Delayed Branch Scheduling: From Target | 46 |
| Dual-Issue Pipeline Dynamic Branch Prediction Techniques | 83 34 |
| Dynamic Renaming - Hardware-side | 71 |
| Dynamic Scheduling | 80 |
| ${f E}$ | |
| Early Branch Evaluation | 32 |
| EX (Execution) | 6 |
| EX/EX Path | 20 |
| Execution Stage | 103 |

| \mathbf{F} | |
|--|----------|
| False Dependencies | 69, 135 |
| Floating Point (FP) | 143 |
| Floating-Point Unit (FPU) | 142 |
| Forwarding | 19 |
| Function Units (FUs) | 143 |
| Functional Unit Status Table | 106 |
| G | |
| Global Adaptive (GA) | 66 |
| Global History Register (GHR) | 59 |
| GShare | 66 |
| Н | |
| Hazard | 17 |
| I | |
| ID (Instruction Decode) | 6 |
| IF (Instruction Fetch) | 6 |
| Imprecise Exceptions | 78 |
| In-Order Issue | 73 |
| Instruction Count (IC) | 24 |
| Instruction Per Clock (IPC) | 24 |
| Instruction Queue | 142 |
| Instruction Status Table | 106 |
| instruction window | 94 |
| Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP) | 34, 67 |
| Issue Stage | 98 |
| Issue Stage (In-Order) | 102 |
| L | |
| Load Buffers | 140 |
| Load/Store Queue | 143 |
| Loop Unrolling | 182 |
| M | |
| ME (Memory Access) | 6 |
| MEM/EX Path | 21 |
| MEM/MEM Path | 21 |
| Millions of Instructions Per Second (MIPS) | 25 |
| Misprediction Multi-Cycle In Order Piceline | 34 |
| Multi-Cycle In-Order Pipeline Multi-Cycle Out-of-Order (OoO) Pipeline | 74 77 |
| Multiple-Issue Processors | 82 |
| Multiple-Issue Width | 88 |
| N | |
| Name Dependencies | 69 |
| Name Dependencies | 09 |
| O | |
| Output Dependence (Write After Write - WAW) | 69 |

55

55

103

Weakly Not Taken (WNT)

Write Result Stage (Out-of-Order)

Weakly Taken (WT)