Title:

Analysis of Pipeline Execution in Floating-Point Instructions

1. Aim

To analyse the execution of floating-point instructions in a pipelined processor, understand different pipeline stages, and study the impact of data hazards, stalls, and forwarding mechanisms in enhancing instruction throughput.

2. Introduction

In modern processors, instruction pipelining is used to enhance performance by overlapping execution stages of multiple instructions. This report analyses a simulated pipeline execution for floating-point instructions. The key aspects studied include:

- Instruction execution in various pipeline stages.
- Data hazards and their impact on performance.
- The role of data forwarding in minimizing stalls.
- Execution latency of different floating-point instructions.
- Behaviour of instructions under different dependency scenarios.
- The importance of instruction ordering in avoiding performance loss.

3. Methodology

The simulation was performed using an online pipeline simulator (UMass Cache & Pipeline Simulator). The following steps were taken:

- A custom sequence of floating-point instructions was input into the simulator.
- Execution latencies were set for each instruction type (Addition, Subtraction, Division).
- Forwarding was enabled to observe how data is passed between stages.
- Stalls due to RAW (Read After Write) dependencies were analysed.
- The pipeline diagram output was examined to identify delays and overlaps.
- Different configurations were tested (with and without forwarding) to compare performance.

4. Observations

Instructions Executed:

- 1. fp_ld F6, Offset(R2) Loads floating-point register F6 from memory.
- 2. fp_ld F2, Offset(R3) Loads floating-point register F2.
- 3. fp div F1, F2, F4 Performs floating-point division.
- 4. fp_sub F8, F2, F6 Performs floating-point subtraction.
- 5. fp_div F10, F1, F6 Second division dependent on result of previous instruction.
- 6. fp_add F6, F8, F2 Performs floating-point addition.

Key Observations:



Instruction	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
fp_ld (F6, Offset, R2)	IF	ID	EX	MEM	WB						
1 fp_ld (F2, Offset, R3)		IF	ID	EX	MEM	WB					
2 fp_div (F1, F2, F4)			IF	ID	S	/ (p)	MEM	WB			
3 [fp_sub (F8, F2, F6)				IF	S	ID	+ - (f)	MEM	WB		
4 [fp_div (F10, F1, F6)						IF	ID	/ (p)	MEM	WB	
5 fp_add (F6, F8, F2)							IF	ID	+ - (f)	MEM	WB
Step Execute All Instructions											

- Pipeline Stages: Instructions moved through 5 main stages: IF → ID → EX → MEM
 → WB.
- Data Hazards: Instructions like fp_div F10, F1, F6 depended on earlier results (F1, F6) which caused pipeline stalls.
- Forwarding Enabled: Forwarding helped minimize the number of stall cycles by passing results directly from EX or MEM to dependent instructions.
- Execution Latency:
 - Division operations (fp_div) took multiple EX cycles (deep pipelines).
 - Arithmetic operations (fp_add, fp_sub) also required more than one cycle depending on pipeline settings.
- Instruction Dependencies:
 - RAW hazards were identified between fp_div → fp_div, fp_ld → fp_sub, and fp_sub → fp_add.

• Stalls Indicated in Red (S): These represent pipeline stalls where instructions must wait for operand availability.

5. Conclusion

- Pipelining significantly boosts CPU throughput by allowing multiple instructions to overlap in execution.
- Data hazards (especially RAW) are a major cause of performance degradation and require techniques like stalling or forwarding to resolve.
- Data forwarding is effective in reducing pipeline stalls, but it cannot eliminate all hazards, especially in back-to-back dependencies or when instructions require results from multi-cycle operations.
- Floating-point operations are more complex, often requiring multiple cycles to complete (especially division).
- Simulator tools are useful in visualizing pipeline execution and understanding the internal working of processors.
- Proper instruction scheduling and reordering can help reduce stalls and enhance overall performance.
- This analysis provides a foundational understanding of how modern CPUs handle instruction-level parallelism and the challenges they face due to data and control hazards.