

LECTURE - 11

Instruction Level Parallelism

- Pipelining achieves Instruction Level Parallelism (ILP)
 - Multiple instructions in parallel
- But, problems with pipeline hazards
 - $CPI = \text{Ideal CPI} + \text{stalls/instruction}$
 - Stalls = Structural + Data (RAW/WAW/WAR) + Control
- How to reduce stalls?
 - That is, how to increase ILP?

Techniques for Improving ILP

- Loop unrolling
- Basic pipeline scheduling
- Dynamic scheduling, scoreboarding, register renaming
- Dynamic memory disambiguation
- Dynamic branch prediction
- Multiple instruction issue per cycle
 - Software and hardware techniques

Loop-Level Parallelism

- *Basic block*: straight-line code w/o branches
- Fraction of branches: 0.15
- ILP is limited!
 - Average basic-block size is 6-7 instructions
 - And, these may be dependent
- Hence, look for parallelism beyond a basic block
- *Loop-level parallelism* is a simple example of this

Loop-Level Parallelism: An Example

- Consider the loop:

```
for(int i = 1000; i >= 1; i = i-1) {  
    x[i] = x[i] + C; // FP  
}
```

- Each iteration of the loop is independent of other iterations
 - Loop-level parallelism
- To convert it into ILP:
 - Loop unrolling (**static**, dynamic)
 - Vector instructions

The Loop, in DLX

- In DLX, the loop looks like:

```
Loop: LD      F0, 0(R1) // F0 is array element
      ADDD    F4, F0, F2 // F2 has the scalar 'C'
      SD      0(R1), F4 // Stored result
      SUBI    R1, R1, 8 // For next iteration
      BNEZ    R1, Loop // More iterations?
```

- Assume:
 - R1 is the initial address
 - F2 has the scalar value 'C'
 - Lowest address in array is '8'

How Many Cycles per Loop?

CC1	Loop: LD	F0, 0(R1)
CC2	stall	
CC3	ADDD	F4, F0, F2
CC4	stall	
CC5	stall	
CC6	SD	0(R1), F4
CC7	SUBI	R1, R1, 8
CC8	stall	
CC9	BNEZ	R1, Loop
CC10	stall	

Reducing Stalls by Scheduling

CC1	Loop: LD	F0, 0(R1)
CC2	SUBI	R1, R1, 8
CC3	ADDD	F4, F0, F2
CC4	stall	
CC5	BNEZ	R1, Loop
CC6	SD	8(R1), F4

- Realizing that SUBI and SD can be swapped is non-trivial!
- Overhead versus actual work:
 - 3 cycles of work, 3 cycles of overhead

Unrolling the Loop

```
Loop: LD      F0, 0(R1)
      ADDD    F4, F0, F2
      SD      0(R1), F4    // No SUBI, BNEZ
      LD      F6, -8(R1)   // Note diff FP reg, new offset
      ADDD    F8, F6, F2
      SD      -8(R1), F8
      LD      F10, -16(R1) // Note diff FP reg, new offset
      ADDD    F12, F10, F2
      SD      -16(R1), F8
      LD      F14, -24(R1) // Note diff FP reg, new offset
      ADDD    F16, F14, F2
      SD      -24(R1), F16
      SUBI    R1, R1, 32
```

How Many Cycles per Loop?

Loop:	LD	F0, 0(R1)	// 1 stall
	ADDD	F4, F0, F2	// 2 stalls
	SD	0(R1), F4	
	LD	F6, -8(R1)	// 1 stall
	ADDD	F8, F6, F2	// 2 stalls
	SD	-8(R1), F8	
	LD	F10, -16(R1)	// 1 stall
	ADDD	F12, F10, F2	// 2 stalls
	SD	-16(R1), F8	
	LD	F14, -24(R1)	// 1 stall
	ADDD	F16, F14, F2	// 2 stalls
	SD	-24(R1), F16	
	SUBI	R1, R1, 32	// 1 stall

28 cycles per
unrolled loop

==

7 cycles per
original loop

Scheduling the Unrolled Loop

Loop: LD F0, 0(R1)
 LD F6, -8(R1)
 LD F10, -16(R1)
 LD F14, -24(R1)
 ADDD F4, F0, F2
 ADDD F8, F6, F2
 ADDD F12, F10, F2
 ADDD F16, F14, F2
 SD 0(R1), F4
 SD -8(R1), F8
 SUBI R1, R1, 32
 SD 16(R1), F8
 BNEZ R1, Loop

14 cycles per
unrolled loop

==

3.5 cycles per
original loop

Observations and Requirements

- Gain from scheduling is even higher for unrolled loop!
 - More parallelism is exposed on unrolling
- Need to know that 1000 is a multiple of 4
- Requirements:
 - Determine that loop can be unrolled
 - Use different registers to avoid conflicts
 - Determine that SD can be moved after SUBI, and find the offset adjustment
- Understand *dependences*

Dependences

- Dependent instructions ==> cannot be in parallel
- Three kinds of dependences:
 - Data dependence (RAW)
 - Name dependence (WAW and WAR)
 - Control dependence

Dependences (continued)

- Dependences are properties of *programs*
- Stalls are properties of the *pipeline*
- Two possibilities:
 - Maintain dependence, but avoid stalls
 - Eliminate dependence by code transformation

Data Dependence

- Data dependence represents data flow from one instruction to another
 - One instruction uses the result of another
 - Take transitive closure

• In our example: **Loop:** **LD** **F0, 0(R1)**

Note: dependence in
memory is hard to detect

100(R4) and 80(R6) may be
the same

20(R1) and 20(R1) may be
different at different times

ADDD **F4, F0, F2**

SD **0(R1), F4**

SUBI **R1, R1, 8**



Name Dependence

- Two instructions use the same register/memory (name), but there is no flow of data
 - Anti-dependence: WAR hazard
 - Output dependence: WAW hazard
- Can do register renaming – statically, or dynamically

Name Dependence in our Example

Loop: LD F0, 0(R1)
ADDD F4, F0, F2
SD 0(R1), F4
LD F0, -8(R1)
ADDD F4, F0, F2
SD -8(R1), F4
LD F0, -16(R1)
ADDD F4, F0, F2
SD -16(R1), F4
LD F0, -24(R1)
ADDD F4, F0, F2
SD -24(R1), F4
SUBI R1, R1, 32

Register
renaming

Loop: LD F0, 0(R1)
ADDD F4, F0, F2
SD 0(R1), F4
LD F6, -8(R1)
ADDD F8, F6, F2
SD -8(R1), F8
LD F10, -16(R1)
ADDD F12, F10, F2
SD -16(R1), F8
LD F14, -24(R1)
ADDD F16, F14, F2
SD -24(R1), F16
SUBI R1, R1, 32

Control Dependence

- An example:

```
T1;  
if p1 {  
    S1;  
}
```

- Statement S1 is *control-dependent* on p1, but T1 is not
- What this means for execution
 - S1 cannot be moved before p1
 - T1 cannot be moved after p1

Control Dependence in our Example

Loop: LD F0, 0(R1)
ADDD F4, F0, F2
SD 0(R1), F4
SUBI R1, R1, 8
BEQZ R1, exit
LD F6, 0(R1)
ADDD F8, F6, F2
SD 0(R1), F8
SUBI R1, R1, 8
BEQZ R1, exit
// Two more such...
SUBI R1, R1, 8
BNEZ R1, Loop



Loop: LD F0, 0(R1)
ADDD F4, F0, F2
SD 0(R1), F4
LD F6, -8(R1)
ADDD F8, F6, F2
SD -8(R1), F8
LD F10, -16(R1)
ADDD F12, F10, F2
SD -16(R1), F8
LD F14, -24(R1)
ADDD F16, F14, F2
SD -24(R1), F16
SUBI R1, R1, 32