

# Cache Design 2

CS/COE 1541 (Fall 2020)  
Wonsun Ahn

# Cache Design Parameter 5: Write-Through vs. Write-Back

---

# Writes and Cache Consistency

- Assume **&x** is  $111010_2$ , and  $x == 24$  initially

**lw** t0, &x

000

**addi** t0, t0, 1 # x++

001

**sw** t0, &x

010

- How will the **lw** change the cache?

011

- How will the **sw** change the cache?

100

- Uh oh, now the cache is **inconsistent**.  
(Memory still has the old value 24.)

101

110

111

V	Tag	Data
0		
0		
1	111	25
0		
0		
0		
0		
0		

- How can we solve this? Two policies:


- Write-through**: Propagate write all the way through memory
- Write-back**: Write back cache block when it is evicted from cache

# Write-Through Policy

---


# Policy 1: Write-through

- Write-through:
    - On hit, write to cache block and **propagate** write to lower memory
    - On miss, keep on propagating the write to lower memory
  - What happens if we write **25** to address **111010<sub>2</sub>**?
  - What happens if we write **94** to address **000010<sub>2</sub>**?
- Caches are kept consistent at all points in time!



# Write-through: Reads

- What happens if we read from address **000010<sub>2</sub>**?
  - We can just discard the conflicting cache block **111010<sub>2</sub>**
  - It's just an extra copy of the same data
- Note how we allocate blocks only on read misses
  - Write misses don't allocate blocks because it doesn't help anyway
    - writes are propagated to lower memory even on write hits
  - This policy is called **no write allocate**




	L1 Cache				L2 Cache		
	V	Tag	Data		V	Tag	Data
000	0			000	0		
001	0			001	0		
010	1	000	94	010	1	000	94
...		...	...	...		...	...

Memory	
Address	Data
...	...
000010	94
...	...
111010	25
...	...

# Write-through: Drawbacks

- Drawback: **Long write delays** regardless of hit or miss
  - Must always propagate writes all the way to DRAM
- Solution: **Write buffer** maintaining pending writes
  - CPU gets on with work after moving pending write to write buffer
  - But does the write buffer solve all problems?



# Write-through: Drawbacks

- The write buffer does not solve all problems.
  1. Write buffer must be **very big** to store all pending writes
    - May take more than 100 cycles for write to propagate to memory
    - Write buffer is always checked before L1\$ → adds to **hit time**
  2. Write buffer does not solve **bandwidth** problems
    - If memory bandwidth < rate of writes in program, write buffer will fill up quickly, no matter how big it is
- Impractical to write-through all the way to memory
  - Typically only L1 caches are write-through, if any
- We need another strategy that is not so bandwidth-intensive




# Write-Back Policy

---

# Policy 2: Write-back

- **Dirty** block: a block that is temporarily inconsistent with memory
  - On a hit, write to cache block, marking it dirty. **No propagation.**
  - **Write back** dirty block to lower memory only when it is **evicted**  
→ Saves bandwidth since write hits no longer access memory
- A **dirty bit** is added to the cache block metadata (marked "D")
  - Block **000001**<sub>2</sub> is clean → can be discarded on eviction
  - Block **111010**<sub>2</sub> is dirty → needs to be written back on eviction



# Write-back: Write allocate

- What happens on a write miss?
  - If no write allocate like write-through, will miss again on next write
  - And on the next write, and on the next write, ...
  - No bandwidth savings from hitting in cache
- Unlike write-through, write-back has a **write allocate** policy
  - On write miss, block is allocated in cache to stop further misses
  - On **allocation**, the block is **read** in from **lower memory**
- Q: Why the wasted effort?
  - Aren't we going to overwrite the block anyway with new data?
  - Why read in data that is going to be overwritten?

# Write-back: Write allocate


- Because a block is multiple bytes, and you are updating just a few
  - Suppose a cache block is 8 bytes (2 words)
  - Suppose you are writing to only the **first word**

V	D	Tag	Data	
1	1		<b>first word</b> (written)	<b>second word</b> (not written)

- After allocate, the entire cache block is marked **valid**
  - That means **second word** as well as **first word** must be valid
  - That means **second word** must be fetched from lower memory
  - Otherwise if later **second word** is read, it will contain junk data
  - Unavoidable, unless you have a valid bit for each byte
    - That means spending 1 bit for every 8 bits of data
    - That's just too much metadata overhead

# Policy 2: Write-back

- What happens if we write **25** to address **111010<sub>2</sub>**?



**Write Buffer**

V	Tag	Data

000

V	D	Tag	Data
0	0		
0	0		
1	0	111	24
		...	...

000


V	D	Tag	Data
0	0		
0	0		
1	0	000	93
		...	...

**Memory**

Address	Data
...	...
000010	93
...	...
111010	24
...	...

# Policy 2: Write-back

- What happens if we write **25** to address **111010<sub>2</sub>**?
  - L1 Cache **hit!** Update cache block and mark it dirty.
  - That's it! How quick is that compared to write-through?



## Write Buffer

V	Tag	Data

000

0 0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

001

0 0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

010

1 1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

## L1 Cache

V	D	Tag	Data

000

0 0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

001

0 0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

010

1 0

1

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...


...

...

## L2 Cache

# Policy 2: Write-back

- What happens if we write **94** to address **000010<sub>2</sub>**?
  - L1 Cache **miss**! First thing we will do is add store to **Write Buffer**.  
(So that the CPU can continue executing past the store)



## Write Buffer

V	Tag	Data
000	0 0	
001	0 0	
1		94
...		

## L1 Cache

V	D	Tag	Data
000	0 0		
001	0 0		
010	1 1	111	25
...		...	...

## L2 Cache


V	D	Tag	Data
000	0 0		
001	0 0		
010	1 0	000	93
...		...	...

## Memory

Address	Data
...	...
000010	93
...	...
111010	24
...	...

# Policy 2: Write-back

- What happens if we write **94** to address **000010<sub>2</sub>**? (cont'd)
  - Next the L2 Cache is searched and it's a **hit**!
  - To bring in block to L1 Cache, we first need to evict block **25**.
  - It's a dirty block, so we can't just discard it. Need to **write** it **back**!
  - Since block **25** misses in L2, it will take the **long** trip to Memory
  - Is there a way to put it aside and get to it later?



## Write Buffer

V	Tag	Data
1		94

000

001

010

...

## L1 Cache

V	D	Tag	Data
0	0		
0	0		
1	1	111	25
		...	...



## L2 Cache

V	D	Tag	Data
0	0		
0	0		
1	0	000	93
		...	...


## Memory

Address	Data
...	...
000010	93
...	...
111010	24
...	...



# Policy 2: Write-back

- What happens if we write **94** to address **000010<sub>2</sub>**? (cont'd)
  - Yes! Add Write Buffers to caches, just like we did for the pipeline!
  - Move block to L1 Write Buffer so L1 Cache can continue working
  - Pending block will get written back to Memory eventually



**Write Buffer**

V	Tag	Data
1		94

**L1 Cache**

V	D	Tag	Data
0	0		
0	0		
1	1	111	25

**Write Buffer**

V	D	Tag	Data
0	0		
0	0		

**L2 Cache**

V	D	Tag	Data
0	0		
0	0		
1	0	000	93

**Write Buffer**


V	D	Tag	Data
0	0		
0	0		

**Memory**

Address	Data
...	...
000010	93
...	...
111010	24
...	...

# Policy 2: Write-back

- What happens if we write **94** to address **000010<sub>2</sub>**? (cont'd)
  - Now we can finally read in block **93** to the L1 Cache



**Write Buffer**

V	Tag	Data
1		94

**L1 Cache**

V	D	Tag	Data
0	0		
0	0		
0	0		

**Write Buffer**

V	D	Tag	Data
1	1	111	25
0	0		

**L2 Cache**

V	D	Tag	Data
0	0		
0	0		
1	0	000	93

**Write Buffer**


V	D	Tag	Data
0	0		
0	0		

**Memory**

Address	Data
...	...
000010	93
...	...
111010	24
...	...

# Policy 2: Write-back

- What happens if we write **94** to address **000010<sub>2</sub>**? (cont'd)
  - Now we can finally read in block **93** to the L1 Cache
  - And write **94** into the cache block, also marking it dirty
  - Store is finished, so now remove it from pipeline Write Buffer!



**Write Buffer**

V	Tag	Data
1		94

**L1 Cache**

V	D	Tag	Data
0	0		
0	0		
1	1	000	94

**Write Buffer**

V	D	Tag	Data
1	1	111	25
0	0		

**L2 Cache**

V	D	Tag	Data
0	0		
0	0		
1	0	000	93

**Write Buffer**


V	D	Tag	Data
0	0		
0	0		

**Memory**

Address	Data
...	...
000010	93
...	...
111010	24
...	...

# Policy 2: Write-back

- What happens if we write **94** to address **000010<sub>2</sub>**? (cont'd)
  - Eventually, the pending block in L1 Write Buffer will write back
  - But this didn't affect the original store latency



**Write Buffer**

V	Tag	Data

**L1 Cache**

V	D	Tag	Data
000	0	0	
001	0	0	
010	1	1	000

**Write Buffer**

V	D	Tag	Data
1	1	111	25
0	0		

**L2 Cache**

V	D	Tag	Data
000	0	0	
001	0	0	
010	1	0	000

**Write Buffer**


V	D	Tag	Data
0	0		
0	0		

**Memory**

Address	Data
...	...
000010	93
...	...
111010	24
...	...


# Write-back: Reads

- What happens if we read **25** from address **111010<sub>2</sub>**?
  - Misses in L1 and L2 caches and must go all the way to Memory




# Write-back: Reads

- What happens if we read **25** from address **111010<sub>2</sub>**?
  - Misses in L1 and L2 caches and must go all the way to Memory
  - Fills the L2 Cache with **25** on the way back after evicting block **93**  
(Note that block **93** can simply be discarded since it's clean)




# Write-back: Reads

- What happens if we read **25** from address **111010<sub>2</sub>**? (cont'd)
  - Now it needs to evict block **94** in L1 Cache before filling with **25**
  - But block **94** needs to be written back since it's dirty!
  - So move to Write Buffer temporarily to make space.



# Write-back: Reads


- What happens if we read **25** from address **111010<sub>2</sub>**? (cont'd)
  - Now L1 Cache can be filled with block 25





# Write-back: Reads

- What happens if we read **25** from address **111010<sub>2</sub>**? (cont'd)
  - Now L1 Cache can be filled with block **25**
  - Block **94** will eventually be written back to Memory
  - Write buffers in this context are also called **victim caches**



# Impact of Write Policy on AMAT

- $AMAT = \text{hit time} + (\text{miss rate} \times \text{miss penalty})$
- **Write-through** caches can have a **larger write hit time**
  - With write-back, a read hit and write hit take the same amount of time
  - With write-through, a write hit takes the same time as a write miss
- **Write-back** caches can have a **larger miss penalty**
  - Due to write allocate policy on write misses
  - Due to write-backs of dirty blocks when making space for new block
- Both issues can be mitigated using **write buffers** to varying degrees
- All in all, write-back caches usually outperform write-through caches
  - Because write hits are much more frequent compared to misses
  - But write-through sometimes used in L1 cache due to simplicity
    - Plenty of L1  $\rightarrow$  L2 (intra-chip) bandwidth to handle write propagation
    - For L3, L3  $\rightarrow$  DRAM bandwidth cannot support write propagation

# Cache Design Parameter 6: Unified vs. Split

---

# Problem with Split Caches

- If cache is split into two (i-cache and d-cache)
  - Space cannot be flexibly allocated between data and code



If our working set looks like this – say, in a small loop that's accessing a large array – then we run out of data space.



If our working set looks like this – say, in a large function that's only using stack variables – then we run out of code space.

# Impact of Unifying Cache


- The answer to the problem is to simply **unify** the cache into one
- $AMAT = \text{hit time} + (\text{miss rate} \times \text{miss penalty})$
- Impact of unifying cache on miss rate:
  - **Smaller miss rate** due to more flexible use of space
- Impact of unifying cache on hit time:
  - Potentially **longer hit time** due to structural hazard
  - With split caches, i-cache and d-cache can be accessed simultaneously
  - With unified cache, access request must wait until port is available
- **L1** cache is almost always **split**
  - Frequent accesses directly from pipeline trigger structural hazard often
- **Lower level** caches are almost always **unified**
  - Accesses are infrequent (filtered by L1), so structural hazards are rare

# Cache Design Parameter 7: Private vs. Shared


---

# Private vs. Shared Cache

- On a multi-core system, there are two ways to organize the cache
- **Private** caches: each core (processor) uses its own cache




- **Shared** cache: all the cores share one big cache



# Shared Cache can Use Space More Flexibly

- Suppose only 1<sup>st</sup> core is active and other cores are idle
  - How much cache space is available to 1<sup>st</sup> core? (Shown in **red**)
- **Private** caches: 1<sup>st</sup> core can only use its own private cache



- **Shared** cache: 1<sup>st</sup> core can use entire shared cache!






# Banking: Solution to Structural Hazards

- Now what if all the cores are active at the same time?
  - Won't that cause **structural hazards** due to simultaneous access?




- Could add more ports, but adding **banks** is more cost effective



- Each bank has its own read / write port
- As long as two cores do not access same bank, no hazard!

# Banking: Solution to Structural Hazards


- Cache blocks are **interleaved** between banks




- Blocks 0, 4, 8 ... → Bank 0
- Blocks 1, 5, 9 ... → Bank 1
- Blocks 2, 6, 10 ... → Bank 2
- Blocks 3, 7, 11 ... → Bank 3
- That way, blocks are evenly distributed across banks
  - Causes cache accesses to also be distributed → less hazards

# Shared Cache have Longer Access Times

- Again, suppose only 1<sup>st</sup> core is active and other cores are idle
  - The working set data is shown in **red**
- **Private** caches: entire working set data in nearby private cache




- **Shared** cache: data sometimes distributed to remote banks



# Shared Cache have Longer Access Times

- Remember this picture?




# Impact of Shared Cache

- $AMAT = \text{hit time} + (\text{miss rate} \times \text{miss penalty})$
- Impact of shared cache on miss rate:
  - **Smaller miss rate** due to more flexible use of space
- Impact of shared cache on hit time:
  - **Longer hit time** due to sometimes having to access remote banks
- **L1** caches are almost always **private**
  - Hit time is important for L1. Cannot afford access to remote banks.
- **L3 (last level)** caches are almost always **shared**
  - Reducing miss rate is top priority to avoid DRAM access.

# Cache Organization of Broadwell CPU

- This is the cache organization of Broadwell used in our Linux server



- Intel rebrands the shared cache as the "Smart Cache"

# Cache Design Parameter 8: Prefetching

---


# Prefetching

- **Prefetching**: fetching data that is expected to be needed soon
  - Allows you to hide the latency of fetching that data
  - E.g. Web browsers prefetch resources from not-yet-clicked links
    - when user later clicks on link, response is almost instantaneous
  - Caches also prefetch data that is expected to be used soon
    - Can be used to avoid even **cold misses**
- Two ways prefetching can happen:
  - Compiler-driven: compiler emits **prefetch instructions**
    - Can manually insert one in C program: `__builtin_prefetch(addr)`
    - Or rely on compiler to insert them using heuristics
  - Hardware-driven: CPU **prefetcher** emits prefetches dynamically
    - Relies on prefetcher to detect a pattern in memory accesses




# Hardware Prefetching


- What do you notice about both these snippets of code?
- They both access memory **sequentially**. **for**(i = 0 .. 100000) A[i]++;
- The first one data, the next instructions.
- These kinds of access patterns are very common.



Sequential



Reverse sequential




Strided sequential  
(think "accessing one field  
from each item in an array  
of structs")

```
00 lw
04 lw
08 lw
0C addi
10 sub
14 mul
18 sw
1C sw
20 sw
```

# Hardware Prefetching Stride Detection


- What kinds of things would you need?
- A table of the last  $n$  memory accesses would be a good start.



- Some subtractors to calculate the stride
- Some comparators to see if strides are the same
- Some detection logic


# Where Hardware Prefetching Doesn't Work

- **Sequential** accesses are where prefetcher works best
  - E.g. Iterating over elements of an **array**
- Some accesses don't have a pattern or is too **complex** to detect
  - At below is how a typical **linked-list** traversal looks like



- Other pointer-chasing data structures (**graphs**, **trees**) look similar
- Can only rely on naturally occurring locality to avoid misses
- Or, have compiler insert prefetch instructions in middle of traversal

# Mystery Solved



- How come **Array** performed well for even an array 1.28 GB large?
  - No spatial locality since each node takes up two 64-byte cache blocks
  - No temporal locality since working set of 1.28 GB exceeds any cache
- The answer is: **Array** had the benefit of a strided **prefetcher**!
  - Access pattern of **Linked List** was too complex for prefetcher to detect

# Impact of Prefetching

- Prefetcher runs **in parallel** with the rest of the cache hardware
  - Does not slow down any on-demand reads or writes
- What if prefetcher is wrong? It can be wrong in two ways:
  - It fetched a block that was never going to be used
  - It fetched a useful block but fetched it too soon or too late
    - Too soon: the block gets evicted before it can be used
    - Too late: the prefetch doesn't happen in time for the access
- A bad prefetch results in **cache pollution**
  - Unused data is fetched, potentially pushing out other useful data
- On the other hand, good prefetches can reduce misses drastically!