ECE 4750 PSET 4

Tim Yao (ty252)

Nov 25, 2015

Worked with Gautam Ramaswamy, Gaurab Bhattacharya, and Sacheth Hegde.

1 Tree Network Topologies

1.a Baseline I3L Microarchitecture

| Cycle: | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 |
|-------------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| mul r1, r2, r3 | F | D | Ι | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| mul r4, r1, r5 | | F | D | I | I | Ι | I | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| div r6, r7, r8 | | | F | D | D | D | D | I | Z | Z | Z | Z | W | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| div r9, r10, r11 | | | | F | F | F | F | D | I | Ι | Ι | Ι | Z | Z | Z | Z | W | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| div r12, r13, r14 | | | | | | | | F | D | D | D | D | Ι | Ι | Ι | Ι | Z | Z | Z | Z | W | | | | | | | | |
| mul r15, r12, r16 | | | | | | | | | F | F | F | F | D | D | D | D | Ι | I | Ι | Ι | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W | | | | |
| mul r17, r15, r18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | F | F | F | D | D | D | D | I | I | I | Ι | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W |

Figure 1: Pipeline Diagram for Baseline I3L Architecture

The total issue to commit cycle count is 27.

1.b Schedule Oldest Ready Instruction First on IO2L Microarchitecture

| Cycle: | 0 | _ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 |
|-------------------|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|--------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| mul r1, r2, r3 | Ι | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W | С | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| mul r4, r1, r5 | | | | | Ι | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W | С | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| div r6, r7, r8 | | Ι | Z | Z | Z | Z | W | r | r | r | r | С | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| div r9, r10, r11 | | | | | | I | Z | Z | Z | Z | W | r | С | | | | | | | | | | | |
| div r12, r13, r14 | | | | | | | | | | Ι | Z | Z | Z | \mathbf{Z} | W | С | | | | | | | | |
| mul r15, r12, r16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ι | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W | С | | | | |
| mul r17, r15, r18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ι | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W | С |

Figure 2: Pipeline Diagram for IO2L Architecture

The total issue to commit cycle count is 24.

1.c Optimal Scheduling on IO2L Microarchitecture

| Cycle: | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |
|-------------------|---|---|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| mul r1, r2, r3 | | Ι | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | l . | | | | | | | | | | | |
| mul r4, r1, r5 | | | | | | I | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W | С | | | | | | |
| div r6, r7, r8 | | | | | I | Z | Z | Z | Z | W | r | r | С | | | | | |
| div r9, r10, r11 | | | | | | | | | Ι | Z | Z | Z | Z | W | С | | | |
| div r12, r13, r14 | Ι | Z | Z | Z | Z | W | r | r | r | r | r | r | r | r | r | С | | |
| mul r15, r12, r16 | | | | | | | Ι | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W | r | r | r | r | С | |
| mul r17, r15, r18 | | | | | | | | | | | Ι | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W | r | С |

Figure 3: Pipeline Diagram for IO2L Architecture with Optimized Scheduling

The total issue to commit cycle count is 18.

1.d Scheduling Comparison

TODO!

2 Register Renaming

2.a Architectural RAW, WAW, and WAR Dependencies

```
1 mul r1, r2, r3
2 mul r4, r1, r5
3 addu r6, r7, r8
4 mul r1, r2, r5
5 addu r6, r6, r9
```

2.b Pipeline Diagram with Register Renaming

| Cycle: | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
|-----------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| mul r1, r2, r3 | F | D | Ι | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W | С | | | | | | | |
| mul r4, r1, r5 | | F | D | i | i | i | I | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W | С | | | |
| addu r6, r7, r8 | | | F | D | I | X | W | r | r | r | r | r | r | С | | |
| mul r1, r2, r5 | | | | F | D | I | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W | r | r | r | С | |
| addu r6, r6, r9 | | | | | F | D | i | I | X | W | r | r | r | r | r | С |

Figure 4: Pipeline Diagram with Register Renaming

2.c Register Renaming with Pointers in the IQ/ROB

| - | | \mathbf{St} | age | | | | |] | RT | | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------|---------------|-----|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|----|-----|----|-----|------------|----|----|---------------------------|---------------|
| Cycle | $\overline{\mathbf{D}}$ | Ι | W | $\overline{\mathbf{C}}$ | $\overline{\mathbf{r1}}$ | $\mathbf{r2}$ | r3 | r4 | r5 | r6 | r 7 | r8 | r9 | Free List | \mathbf{IQ} |
| 0 | | | | | p0 | p1 | p2 | р3 | p4 | p5 | p6 | p7 | p8 | p9,pA,pB,pC,pD | |
| 1 | 1 | | | | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | p9,pA,pB,pC,pD | |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | | | p9* | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | $_{\mathrm{pA,pB,pC,pD}}$ | p9/p1/p2 |
| 3 | 3 | | | | : | : | : | pA* | : | : | : | : | : | $_{ m pB,pC,pD}$ | pA/p9*/p4 |
| 4 | 4 | 3 | | | : | : | : | : | : | pB* | : | : | : | $_{ m pC,pD}$ | pB/p6/p7 |
| 5 | 5 | 4 | | | pC* | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | pD | pC/p1/p4 |
| 6 | | 2 | 3 | | : | : | : | : | : | pD* | : | : | : | | pD/pB*/p8 |
| 7 | | 5 | 1 | | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | |
| 8 | | | | 1 | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | |
| 9 | | | 5 | | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | p0 | |
| 10 | | | 4 | | : | : | : | : | : | pD | : | : | : | p0 | |
| 11 | | | 2 | | рC | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | p0 | |
| 12 | | | | 2 | : | : | : | pΑ | : | : | : | : | : | p0 | |
| 13 | | | | 3 | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | p0,p3 | |
| 14 | | | | 4 | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | p0,p3,p5 | |
| 15 | | | | 5 | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | p0,p3,p5,p9 | |
| 16 | | | | | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | p0,p3,p5,p9,pB | |

Figure 5: Microarchitectural State (RT/FL/IQ) for Reg Renaming with Pointers in the IQ/ROB

| | | | ROB | | |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Cycle | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 0 | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 2 | p9*/r1/p0 | | | | |
| 3 | | pA*/r4/p3 | | | |
| 4 | | | pB*/r6/p5 | | |
| 5 | | | | $pC^*/r1/p9^*$ | |
| 6 | | | | | $pD^*/r6/pB^*$ |
| 7 | | | $\mathrm{pB/r6/p5}$ | | pD*/r6/pB |
| 8 | p9/r1/p0 | | | pC*/r1/p9 | |
| 9 | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | $\mathrm{pD/r6/pB}$ |
| 11 | | | | pC/r1/p9 | |
| 12 | | pA/r4/p3 | | | |
| 13 | | | • | | |
| 14 | | | | • | |
| 15 | | | | | • |

Figure 6: Microarchitectural State (ROB) for Reg Renaming with Pointers in the IQ/ROB

2.d Register Renaming with Values in the IQ/ROB

| | | \mathbf{St} | age | | | | | | RT | | | | | | | | RO | ЭB | | |
|------------------|---|---------------|-----|-------------------------|-----|-----------|----|-----|----|-----|-----------|------------|----|-----------|--------|--------|-----|----------------|--------|--------|
| \mathbf{Cycle} | D | Ι | W | $\overline{\mathbf{C}}$ | r1 | r2 | r3 | r4 | r5 | r6 | r7 | r 8 | r9 | IQ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | | | p0* | | | | | | | | | p0/r2/r3 | p0*/r1 | | | | | |
| 3 | 3 | | | | | | | p1* | | | | | | p1/p0*/r5 | | p1*/r4 | | | | |
| 4 | 4 | 3 | | | | | | | | p2* | | | | p2/r7/r8 | | | p2* | 7r6 | | |
| 5 | 5 | 4 | | | p3* | | | | | | | | | p3/r2/r5 | | | | | p3*/r1 | |
| 6 | | 2 | 3 | | | | | | | p4* | | | | p4/p2*/r9 | | | | | | p4*/r6 |
| 7 | | 5 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | p2, | $/\mathrm{r}6$ | | |
| 8 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | p0/r1 | | | | | |
| 9 | | | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | 4 | | | | | | | p4 | | | | | | | | | | p4/r6 |
| 11 | | | 2 | | р3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | p3/r1 | |
| 12 | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | p1/r4 | | | | |
| 13 | | | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | (| • | | |
| 15 | | | | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | • | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | | | • | | | | | | | | | | • |

Figure 7: Microarchitectural State for Reg Renaming with Values in the IQ/ROB

3 In-Order vs. Out-of-Order Superscalar Processors

3.a Performance of In-Order Dual-Issue Processor

| Cycle: | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|------------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|
| lw r1 , 0(r2) | F | D | Ι | L0 | L1 | W | С | | | | | | | |
| mul r3, r1, r4 | F | D | I | I | I | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W | С | | | |
| sw r3, $0(r5)$ | | F | D | D | D | D | D | D | I | S | W | С | | |
| addiu r2, r2, 4 | | F | D | D | D | D | D | D | I | A | W | С | | |
| addiu r5, r5, 4 | | | F | F | F | F | F | F | D | Ι | A | W | С | |
| addiu r6, r6, -1 | | | F | F | F | F | F | F | D | Ι | В | W | С | |
| bne r6, r0, loop | | | | | | | | | F | D | Ι | A | W | С |
| opA | | | | | | | | | F | * | * | * | * | * |

Figure 8: Pipeline Diagram for In-Order Dual-Issue Processor

As shown by the bold vertical lines, during steady state, each loop takes 9 cycles to execute. The W stage of the lw instruction is included because during looping, the W stages causes an extra cycle of "delay" between the last commit of the previous iteration and the first commit of the current iteration.

Therefore, the total number of cycles it takes to execute 64 iterations is 9*64 = 576 cycles.

3.b Performance of Out-of-Order Dual-Issue Processor

| Cycle: | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
|-------------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| lw r1 , 0(r2) | F | D | Ι | L0 | L1 | W | С | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| mul r3, r1, r4 | F | D | i | i | Ι | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W | С | | | | | | | | | | | |
| sw $r3$, $0(r5)$ | | F | D | i | i | i | i | i | Ι | S | W | С | | | | | | | | | | |
| addiu r2, r2, 4 | | F | D | I | A | W | r | r | r | r | r | С | | | | | | | | | | |
| addiu r5, r5, 4 | | | F | D | i | I | Α | W | r | r | r | r | r | С | | | | | | | | |
| addiu r6, r6, -1 | | | F | D | i | I | В | W | r | r | r | r | r | С | | | | | | | | |
| bne r6, r0, loop | | | | F | D | i | I | Α | W | r | r | r | r | r | C | | | | | | | |
| opA | | | | F | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | | | | | | | |
| lw r1 , 0(r2) | | | | | F | D | I | L0 | L1 | W | r | r | r | r | С | | | | | | | |
| mul r3, r1, r4 | | | | | F | D | i | i | I | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W | r | С | | | | | | |
| sw r3, $0(r5)$ | | | | | | F | D | i | i | i | i | i | I | S | W | С | | | | | | |
| addiu r2, r2, 4 | | | | | | F | D | I | A | W | r | r | r | r | r | r | С | | | | | |
| addiu r5, r5, 4 | | | | | | | F | D | i | I | A | W | r | r | r | r | С | | | | | |
| addiu r6, r6, -1 | | | | | | | F | D | i | I | В | W | r | r | r | r | r | С | | | | |
| bne r6, r0, loop | | | | | | | | F | D | i | I | A | W | r | r | r | r | С | | | | |
| opA | | | | | | | | F | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | | | | | |
| lw r1 , 0(r2) | | | | | | | | | F | D | I | L0 | L1 | W | r | r | r | r | С | | | |
| mul r3, r1, r4 | | | | | | | | | F | D | i | i | I | Y0 | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | W | | | | |
| sw r3, $0(r5)$ | | | | | | | | | | F | D | i | i | i | i | i | I | S | W | С | | |
| addiu $r2, r2, 4$ | | | | | | | | | | F | D | I | A | W | r | r | r | r | r | С | | |
| addiu $r5, r5, 4$ | | | | | | | | | | | F | D | i | I | Α | W | r | r | r | r | С | |
| addiu r6, r6, -1 | | | | | | | | | | | F | D | i | Ι | В | W | r | r | r | r | С | |
| bne r6, r0, loop | | | | | | | | | | | | F | D | i | Ι | A | W | r | r | r | r | С |
| opA | | | | | | | | | | | | F | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | |

Figure 9: Pipeline Diagram for Out-of-Order Dual-Issue Processor

As shown by the bold vertical lines, during steady state, it takes 8 cycles to execute 2 loops. Therefore, the total number of cycles it takes to execute 64 iterations is 8*32 = 256 cycles.

3.c Dual-Issue In-Order versus Dual-Issue Out-of-Order

4 Branch Prediction

4.a Two-Bit Saturating Counter Branch History Table

| | | Bra | nch B | 80 | Bra | nch B | 1 | Bran | ch B | 2 |
|-----------------|--------|-----|-------|--------------|-----|-------|-------------------------|------|------|--------------|
| i | src[i] | BHT | P | \mathbf{A} | BHT | P | $\overline{\mathbf{A}}$ | BHT | P | \mathbf{A} |
| 0 | 0 | WT | Т | Т | WT | Τ | Т | WT | Τ | Т |
| 1 | 0 | ST | Т | Т | ST | Τ | Τ | ST | Τ | Т |
| 2 | 12 | ST | Т | NT | ST | Τ | NT | ST | Τ | Т |
| 3 | 15 | WT | Τ | NT | WT | Τ | NT | ST | Τ | Т |
| 4 | 0 | WNT | NT | Т | WNT | NT | Τ | ST | Τ | Т |
| 5 | 0 | WT | Т | Т | WT | Τ | Τ | ST | Τ | Т |
| 6 | 11 | ST | Т | NT | ST | Τ | NT | ST | Τ | Т |
| 7 | 17 | WT | Т | NT | WT | Τ | NT | ST | Τ | Т |
| 8 | 0 | WNT | NT | Т | WNT | NT | Τ | ST | Τ | Т |
| 9 | 0 | WT | Т | Т | WT | Τ | Т | ST | Τ | Т |
| 10 | 11 | ST | Т | NT | ST | Τ | NT | ST | Τ | Т |
| 11 | 13 | WT | Т | NT | WT | Т | NT | ST | Т | Т |
| 12 | 9 | WNT | NT | Т | WNT | NT | NT | ST | Т | Т |
| 13 | 0 | WT | Т | Т | SNT | NT | Т | ST | Т | Т |
| $\overline{14}$ | 12 | ST | Т | NT | WNT | NT | NT | ST | Т | Т |
| 15 | 15 | WT | Т | NT | SNT | NT | NT | ST | Т | Т |
| 16 | 0 | WNT | NT | Т | SNT | NT | Т | ST | Т | Т |
| 17 | 8 | WT | Т | Т | WNT | NT | NT | ST | Τ | Т |
| 18 | 12 | ST | Т | NT | SNT | NT | NT | ST | Τ | Т |
| 19 | 18 | WT | Τ | NT | SNT | NT | NT | ST | Τ | NT |

Figure 10: Two-Bit Saturating Counter BHT Execution

4.b Two-Level Adaptive Branch Predictor to Exploit Temporal Correlation

| | | B | ranch I | 30 | | В | ranch I | 31 | | Bra | anch B | 2 | |
|-----------------|--------|-------|---------|----|--------------|-------|---------|----|--------------|-------|--------|---|----------------|
| i | src[i] | BHSRT | BHT | P | \mathbf{A} | BHSRT | BHT | P | \mathbf{A} | BHSRT | BHT | P | \mathbf{A} |
| 0 | 0 | 000 | WT | Т | Т | 000 | WT | Т | Т | 000 | WT | Т | Т |
| 1 | 0 | 001 | WT | Т | Т | 001 | WT | Т | Т | 001 | WT | Т | Т |
| 2 | 12 | 011 | WT | Т | NT | 011 | WT | Т | NT | 011 | WT | Т | Т |
| 3 | 15 | 110 | WT | Т | NT | 110 | WT | Т | NT | 111 | WT | Т | Т |
| 4 | 0 | 100 | WT | Т | Τ | 100 | WT | Τ | Τ | 111 | ST | Τ | Т |
| 5 | 0 | 101 | WT | Τ | Τ | 101 | WT | Τ | Τ | 111 | ST | Т | Т |
| 6 | 11 | 011 | WNT | NT | NT | 011 | WNT | NT | NT | 111 | ST | Т | Т |
| 7 | 17 | 110 | WNT | NT | NT | 110 | WNT | NT | NT | 111 | ST | Т | Т |
| 8 | 0 | 100 | ST | Τ | Τ | 100 | ST | Τ | Τ | 111 | ST | Τ | Т |
| 9 | 0 | 101 | ST | Τ | Τ | 101 | ST | Τ | Τ | 111 | ST | Т | Т |
| 10 | 11 | 011 | SNT | NT | NT | 011 | SNT | NT | NT | 111 | ST | Т | T |
| 11 | 13 | 110 | SNT | NT | NT | 110 | SNT | NT | NT | 111 | ST | Т | T |
| $\overline{12}$ | 9 | 100 | ST | Τ | Τ | 100 | ST | Τ | NT | 111 | ST | Т | T |
| 13 | 0 | 101 | ST | Т | Τ | 000 | ST | Τ | Τ | 111 | ST | Т | \overline{T} |
| $\overline{14}$ | 12 | 011 | SNT | NT | NT | 001 | ST | Т | NT | 111 | ST | Т | Т |
| $\overline{15}$ | 15 | 110 | SNT | NT | NT | 010 | WT | Т | NT | 111 | ST | Т | Т |
| 16 | 0 | 100 | ST | Τ | Τ | 100 | WT | Τ | Τ | 111 | ST | Т | Т |
| $\overline{17}$ | 8 | 101 | ST | Τ | Τ | 001 | WT | Τ | NT | 111 | ST | Т | Т |
| 18 | 12 | 011 | SNT | NT | NT | 010 | WNT | NT | NT | 111 | ST | Τ | T |
| 19 | 18 | 110 | SNT | NT | NT | 100 | ST | Т | NT | 111 | ST | Τ | NT |

Figure 11: Two-Level BHT for Temporal Correlation Execution

4.c Two-Level Adaptive Branch Predictor to Exploit Spatial Correlation

| | | В | ranch | B0 | | В | ranch | B1 | | Br | anch E | 32 | |
|----|--------|------|-------|----|--------------|------|-------|----|-------------------------|------|--------|--------------|-------------------------|
| i | src[i] | BHSR | BHT | P | \mathbf{A} | BHSR | BHT | P | $\overline{\mathbf{A}}$ | BHSR | BHT | P | $\overline{\mathbf{A}}$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | WT | Τ | Τ | 1 | WT | Τ | Τ | 1 | WT | Τ | $\overline{\mathrm{T}}$ |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | WT | Т | Т | 1 | ST | Τ | Τ | 1 | ST | Т | $\overline{\mathrm{T}}$ |
| 2 | 12 | 1 | ST | Т | NT | 0 | WT | Τ | NT | 0 | WT | Т | Т |
| 3 | 15 | 1 | WT | Т | NT | 0 | WNT | NT | NT | 0 | ST | Т | Т |
| 4 | 0 | 1 | WNT | NT | Т | 1 | ST | Т | Т | 1 | ST | Τ | Т |
| 5 | 0 | 1 | WT | Τ | Τ | 1 | ST | Τ | Τ | 1 | ST | Т | Т |
| 6 | 11 | 1 | ST | Т | NT | 0 | SNT | NT | NT | 0 | ST | Т | Т |
| 7 | 17 | 1 | WT | Τ | NT | 0 | SNT | NT | NT | 0 | ST | Т | Т |
| 8 | 0 | 1 | WNT | NT | Τ | 1 | ST | Τ | Τ | 1 | ST | Τ | T |
| 9 | 0 | 1 | WT | Τ | Τ | 1 | ST | Τ | Τ | 1 | ST | Τ | Т |
| 10 | 11 | 1 | ST | Τ | NT | 0 | SNT | NT | NT | 0 | ST | \mathbf{T} | Т |
| 11 | 13 | 1 | WT | Τ | NT | 0 | SNT | NT | NT | 0 | ST | \mathbf{T} | Τ |
| 12 | 9 | 1 | WNT | NT | Τ | 1 | ST | Τ | NT | 0 | ST | Τ | Τ |
| 13 | 0 | 1 | WT | Τ | Τ | 1 | WT | Τ | Τ | 1 | ST | Т | Τ |
| 14 | 12 | 1 | ST | Τ | NT | 0 | SNT | NT | NT | 0 | ST | Т | Т |
| 15 | 15 | 1 | WT | Τ | NT | 0 | SNT | NT | NT | 0 | ST | Т | Т |
| 16 | 0 | 1 | WNT | NT | Τ | 1 | ST | Τ | Τ | 1 | ST | Τ | Т |
| 17 | 8 | 1 | WT | Т | Т | 1 | ST | Т | NT | 0 | ST | Т | Т |
| 18 | 12 | 1 | ST | Т | NT | 0 | SNT | NT | NT | 0 | ST | Τ | Т |
| 19 | 18 | 1 | WT | Т | NT | 0 | SNT | NT | NT | 0 | ST | Т | NT |

Figure 12: Two-Level BHT for Spatial Correlation Execution

4.d Branch Predictor Comparison

| | Two-Bit FSM | Two-Level Temporal | Two-Level Spatial |
|--------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | Accuracy | Accuracy | Accuracy |
| Branch B0 | 30% | 90% | 30% |
| Branch B1 | 50% | 65% | 85% |
| Branch B2 | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| All Branches | 58% | 83% | 70% |

Figure 13: Summary of Branch Predictor Accuracies