EECS 370

Control Hazards and Performance

Reminders

- Lab meets Friday
  - Don’t forget pre-lab quiz (due today)!
- P2R + P2L due tonight
- Midterm scores published
  - Submit regrade requests by Friday 11:55 pm

Pipelining - What can go wrong?

- Data hazards: since register reads occur in stage 2 and register writes occur in stage 5 it is possible to read an old / stale value before the correct value is written back.
- Control hazards: A branch instruction may change the PC, but not until stage 4. What do we fetch before that?
- Exceptions: Sometimes we need to pause execution, switch to another task (maybe the OS), and then resume execution… how to we make sure we resume at the right spot
- Now – control hazards

Other issues

- What other instruction(s) have we been ignoring so far??
- Branches!! (Let's not worry about jumps yet)
- Sequence for BEQ:
  - Fetch: read instruction from memory
  - Decode: read source operands from registers
  - Execute: calculate target address and test for equality
  - Memory: **Send target to PC** if test is equal
  - Writeback: nothing
  - **Branch Outcomes**
    - Not Taken
      - PC = PC + 1
    - Taken
      - PC = Branch Target Address

Control Hazards

```
beq   1   1   10
add   3   4   5
```



Approaches to handling control hazards

- 3 strategies – similar to handling data hazards

1. Avoid
   - Make sure there are no hazards in code
2. Detect and stall
   - Delay fetch until branch resolved
3. Speculate and squash-if-wrong
   - Guess outcome of branch
   - Fetch instructions assuming we're right
   - Stop them if they shouldn't have been executed

Avoiding Control Hazards

- Don't have branch instructions!
  - Possible, but not practical
  - ARM offers **predicated** instructions (instructions that throw away result if some condition is not met)
    - Allows replacement of if/else conditions
    - Hard to use for everything
    - Not covered more in this class

Detect and Stall

- Detection
  - Wait until decode
  - Check if opcode == beq or jalr
- Stall
  - Keep current instruction in fetch
  - Insert noops
  - Pass noop to decode stage, not execute!


M
U
X
1
+
PC
Inst
mem
beq
M
U
X
regA
regB
data
Register file
R0 0
R1 14
R2 7
R3 10
R4 11
R5 77
R6 1
R7 8
Control
+
M
U
X
A
L
U
Data
memory
M
U
X
beq disables PC update and inserts noop into IF/ID
IF/
ID
ID/
EX
EX/
Mem
Mem/
WB


M
U
X
1
+
PC
Inst
mem
noop
regA
regB
M
U
X
data
Register file
R0 0
R1 14
R2 7
R3 10
R4 11
R5 77
R6 1
R7 8
Control
beq
+
M
U
X
A
L
U
Data
memory
M
U
X
beq disables PC update and inserts noop into IF/ID
IF/
ID
ID/
EX
EX/
Mem
Mem/
WB

beq DOESN'T disable PC and sends target, but still inserts NOOP



Target PC is now sent to memory, everything moves forward as normal




M
U
X
1
+
PC
Inst
mem
add
regA
regB
M
U
X
data
Register file
R0 0
R1 14
R2 7
R3 10
R4 11
R5 77
R6 1
R7 8
Control
noop
+
M
U
X
A
L
U
noop
Data
memory
noop
M
U
X
IF/
ID
ID/
EX
EX/
Mem
Mem/
WB

Control Hazards

beq 1 1 10
add 3 4 5



beq	**fetch**	**decode**	**execute**	**memory**	**writeback**
add		**fetch**	**fetch**	**fetch**	**fetch**
					or
Target:					**fetch**

Problems with Detect and Stall

- CPI increases every time a branch is detected!
- Is that necessary? Not always!
  - Branch not always taken
  - Let's assume it is NOT taken…
    - In this case, we can ignore the beq (treat it like a noop)
    - Keep fetching PC + 1
  - What if we're wrong?
  - OK, as long as we do not COMPLETE any instruction we mistakenly execute
  - I.e. DON'T write values to register file or memory

Agenda

- Control Hazards and Basic Approaches
- Detect-and-Stall
- **Speculate-and-Squash**
- Exceptions
- Practice Performance Problems
  - Problem 1
  - Problem 2
  - Problem 3
- Improving Performance with Branch Predicting
- Simple Direction Predictor
- Improving Direction Predictor

Speculate and Squash

- Speculate: assume not equal
  - Keep fetching from PC+1 until we know that the branch is really taken
- Squash: stop bad instructions if taken
  - Send a noop to Decode, Execute, and Memory
  - Sent target address to PC

Resolve branch in execute stage



Send target to PC in Mem stage, squash previous 3 instructions



3 noops inserted, correct PC being sent to memory



Classic performance problem

- Program with following instruction breakdown:

lw	10%
sw	15%
beq	25%
R-type	50%

- Speculate “always not-taken” and squash. 80% of branches not-taken
- Full forwarding to execute stage. 20% of loads stall for 1 cycle
- What is the CPI of the program?
- What is the total execution time per instruction if clock frequency is 100MHz?

Classic performance problem

- Program with following instruction breakdown:

lw	10%
sw	15%
beq	25%
R-type	50%

- Speculate “always not-taken” and squash. 80% of branches not-taken
- Full forwarding to execute stage. 20% of loads stall for 1 cycle
- What is the CPI of the program?
- What is the total execution time per instruction if clock frequency is 100MHz?

CPI = 1 + 0.10 (loads) * 0.20 (load use stall)*1

+ 0.25 (branch) * 0.20 (miss rate)*3

CPI = 1 + 0.02 + 0.15 = 1.17

Time = 1.17 * 10ns =11.7ns per instruction

Agenda

- Control Hazards and Basic Approaches
- Detect-and-Stall
- Speculate-and-Squash
- Exceptions
- Practice Performance Problems
  - Problem 1
  - **Problem 2**
  - Problem 3
- Improving Performance with Branch Predicting
- Simple Direction Predictor
- Improving Direction Predictor

Classic performance problem (cont.)

- Assume branches are resolved in EX instead of MEM
  - What is the CPI?
  - What happens to cycle time?

Classic performance problem (cont.)

- Assume branches are resolved in EX instead of MEM
  - What is the CPI?
  - What happens to cycle time?

CPI = 1 + 0.10 (loads) *0.20 (load use stall)*1
+ 0.25 (branch) * 0.20 (miss rate)*2
CPI = 1 + 0.02 + 0.1 = 1.12

Cycle time might go up as we are doing more work at the end of EX

Is it worth it? Depends on whether CPI * clock period is overall lower

Agenda

- Control Hazards and Basic Approaches
- Detect-and-Stall
- Speculate-and-Squash
- Exceptions
- Practice Performance Problems
  - Problem 1
  - Problem 2
  - **Problem 3**
- Improving Performance with Branch Predicting
- Simple Direction Predictor
- Improving Direction Predictor

Performance with deeper pipelines

- Assume the setup of the previous problem.
- What if we have a 10 stage pipeline?
  - Instructions are fetched at stage 1.
  - Register file is read at stage 3.
  - Execution begins at stage 5.
  - Branches are resolved at stage 7.
  - Memory access is complete at end of stage 9.
- What's the CPI of the program?
- If the clock rate was doubled by doubling the pipeline depth, is performance also doubled?

Performance with deeper pipelines

- Assume the setup of the previous problem.
- What if we have a 10 stage pipeline?
  - Instructions are fetched at stage 1.
  - Register file is read at stage 3.
  - Execution begins at stage 5.
  - Branches are resolved at stage 7.
  - Memory access is complete at end of stage 9.
- What's the CPI of the program?
- If the clock rate was doubled by doubling the pipeline depth, is performance also doubled?

CPI = 1 + 0.10 (loads) *0.20 (load use stall)*4 + 0.25 (branch) * 0.20 (N stalls)*6

CPI = 1 + 0.08 + 0.30 = 1.38

Time = 1.38 * 5ns = 6.9 ns per instruction

Agenda

- Control Hazards and Basic Approaches
- Detect-and-Stall
- Speculate-and-Squash
- Exceptions
- Practice Performance Problems
  - Problem 1
  - Problem 2
  - Problem 3
- **Improving Performance with Branch Predicting**
- Simple Direction Predictor
- Improving Direction Predictor

Can We Improve Branch Performance?

- CPI increases every time a branch is taken!
  - About 50%-66% of time
- Is that necessary?

Poll: If you had to guess, in real programs, what's the ratio of taken to not-taken branches?

a) Very rarely taken
b) Slightly biased towards not taken
c) Slightly biased towards taken
d) Very rarely not taken

- **No!** We can try to predict when branch is taken
  - But we would need to send target PC to memory before decoding branch
  - How do we:
    1. Know an instruction is a branch before decoding?
    2. Reliably guess whether it should be taken?
    3. Figure out the target PC before executing the branch?

Sometimes predict taken?

- When fetching an instruction, need to predict 3 things:
  1. Whether the fetched instruction is a branch
  2. Branch direction (if conditional)
  3. Branch target address (if direction is taken)

- Observation: Target address remains the same for conditional branch across multiple executions
  - Idea: store the target address of branch once we execute it, along with PC of instruction
  - Called Branch Target Buffer (BTB)




Here's how we could implement a "predict taken" scheme
1
+
target
Inst mem
eq?
bpc
target
REG file
sign ext
Control
+
M U X
A L U
Data memory
M U X
beq
IF/ ID
ID/ EX
EX/ Mem
Mem/ WB

Sometimes predict taken?



"Cache" of Target Addresses (BTB: Branch Target Buffer)

Branch Direction Prediction

Poll: Overall, which do you expect to be more accurate?

- "Branch direction" refers to whether the branch was taken or not
- Two methods for predicting direction:
  - Static - We predict once during compilation, and that prediction never changes
  - Dynamic - We predict (potentially) many times during execution, and the prediction may change over time

- *Static vs dynamic strategies are a very common topic in computer architecture*

Branch Direction Prediction (Static)

- Always not-taken
  - Simple to implement: no need for BTB, no direction prediction
  - Low accuracy: ~30-40%
  - Compiler can layout code such that the likely path is the “not-taken” path

- Always taken
  - No direction prediction
  - Better accuracy: ~60-70%
    - Backward branches (i.e. loop branches) are usually taken
    - Backward branch: target address lower than branch PC

- Backward taken, forward not taken (BTFN)
  - Predict backward (loop) branches as taken, others not-taken

Branch Direction Prediction (Dynamic)

- Last time predictor
  - Single bit per branch (stored in BTB)
  - Indicates which direction branch went last time it executed
    TTTTTTTTTTNNNNNNNNNN → 90% accuracy

- Always mispredicts the last iteration and the first iteration of a loop branch
  - Accuracy for a loop with N iterations = (N-2)/N

+ Loop branches for loops with large number of iterations

-- Loop branches for loops will small number of iterations

TNTNTNTNTNTNTNTNTNTN → 0% accuracy

State Machine for Last-Time Prediction



Improving the Last Time Predictor

- Problem: A last-time predictor changes its prediction from T→NT or NT→T too quickly
  - Even though the branch may be mostly taken or mostly not taken

- Solution Idea: Add hysteresis to the predictor so that prediction does not change on a single different outcome
  - Use two bits to track the history of predictions for a branch instead of a single bit
  - Can have 2 states for T or NT instead of 1 state for each

State Machine for 2-bit Saturating Counter



Two-Bit Counter Based Prediction

Poll: How many branches do we get wrong?

- What's the prediction accuracy of a branch with the following sequence of taken/not taken outcomes:
  - T T T T N T T N N N T N T N N



Can We Do Better?

- Absolutely… take 470
  - Tons of sophisticated branch predictor designs

- I've worked on a few that found their way into some Chromebooks!

Branch Prediction

- Predict not taken: ~50% accurate
- Predict backward taken: ~65% accurate
- Predict same as last time: ~80% accurate

- Realistic designs: ~96% accurate

Remember this Example from Lecture 1?

- We know understand why sorting improves the inner-loop so much
  - The branch predictor is better at guessing what's gonna happen when data is sorted!

```
for (unsigned c = 0; c < arraySize; ++c)
    data[c] = std::rand() % 256;
std::sort(data, data + arraySize);

// Test
clock_t start = clock();
long long sum = 0;
// Primary loop
for (unsigned c = 0; c < arraySize; ++c)
{
    if (data[c] >= 128)
        sum += data[c];
}

double elapsedTime =
  static_cast<double>(clock() - start);
```

Next time

- Into to caches

Advanced Pipelining

Not on the exam.

Creating more pipelines

- Instruction Level Parallelism – Superscalar Pipeline
  - Have two or more pipelines in same processor
  - pipelines need to work in tandem to improve single program performance
- Thread Level Parallelism – Multi-core
  - Have two or more processors (Independent Pipelines)
  - Need more programs or a parallel program
  - does not improve single program performance
- Data Level Parallelism – Single Inst. Multiple Data (SIMD)
  - Have two or more execution pipelines (ID->WB)
  - Share the same fetch and control pipeline to save power (IF+cont.)
  - Similar to GPU's

ILP Techniques: Superscalar



Other Techniques for ILP: Out of Order Execution

- Eliminating stall conditions decreases CPI
- Reorder instructions to avoid stalls
- Example (5-stage LC2K pipeline):

```
add   1 2 3          add   1 2 3
lw    3 2 16         lw    3 2 16
nor   2 6 7          add   4 5 1
add   4 5 1          nor   2 6 7
```



Why Use Out of Order Execution?

- Some instructions take a long time to execute
  - Floating point operations
  - Some loads and stores (more when we talk about memory hierarchy)
- Options:
  - Increase cycle time
  - Increase number of pipeline stages
  - Execute other instructions while you wait

TLP Techniques: Multiprocessors



Other Techniques for TLP: Multi-Threading



- Virtual Multiprocessor (Multi-Threading or HyperThreading)
  - Duplicate the state (PC, Registers) but time share hardware
  - User/Operating system see 2 cores, but only one execution
  - Used to hide long latencies (i.e. memory access to disk)

DLP Techniques: Single Instr. Multiple Data (SIMD)



Building a GPU



- Add special functional units in EX
- Combine Techniques
  - SIMD + MP + MT= SIMT
- MT used to hide memory latencies
- SIMD used to decrease power of fetch/control
- MP used to improve throughput