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## 1. In-Order Dual-Issue Superscalar TinyRV1 Processor

- Processors studied so far are fundamentally limited to CPI $>=1$
- Superscalar processors enable CPI $<1$ (i.e., IPC $>1$ ) by executing multiple instructions in parallel
- Can have both in-order and out-of-order superscalar processors, but we will start by exploring in-order

- Continue to assume combinational memories
- F Stage : fetch two instructions at once
- D Stage : 4 read ports, decode 2 inst, "issue" inst to correct pipe
- X/M Stage : separate into A and B pipes (see next page)
- W Stage : 2 write ports

More abstract way to illustrate same dual-issue superscalar pipeline


Different instructions use the A-pipe and/or the B-pipe

|  | add | addi | mul | lw | sw | jal | jr | bne |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A-Pipe | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| B-Pipe | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |

Example pipeline diagram for dual-issue superscalar processor

| addi $x 1, x 2,1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| addi $x 3, x 4,1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| addi $x 5, x, 1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mul $x 7, x 8, x 9$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mul $x 10, x 11, x 12$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| addi $x 13, x 14,1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

- Multiple instructions in stages F, D, W allowed because superscalar processor has duplicated hardware to avoid structural hazards
- Fetch Block - group of instructions fetched as unit
- Swizzle - instructions "swapped" from natural fetch position to appropriate execution pipe


## 2. Superscalar Pipeline Hazards

Seems so easy, but why is pipelining hard?

- RAW Hazards
- Control Hazards
- Structural Hazards
- WAR/WAR Name Hazards


### 2.1. RAW Hazards

Let's first assume we only use stalling to resolve RAW hazards

| addi $x 1, x 2,1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| addi $x 3, x 4,1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| add $x 5, x, x 3$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| addi $x 6, x 5,1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| addi $x 4, x 8,1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| addi $x 9, x 8,1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

A fully-bypassed superscalar processor is possible, but expensive


Revisit previous assembly sequence with full bypassing

| addi x1, x2, 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| addi $\mathrm{x} 3, \mathrm{x} 4, ~ 1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| add $\mathrm{x} 5, \mathrm{x} 1, \mathrm{x} 3$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| addi $\mathrm{x} 6, \mathrm{x} 5,1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| addi $\mathrm{x} 7, \mathrm{x} 8,1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| addi $\mathrm{x} 9, \mathrm{x} 8,1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Activity: Draw a pipeline diagram for following instruction sequence. Include all microarchitectural dependency arrows.

| addi x1, x2, 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| lw x3, 0(x4) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lw x5, 0(x3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| addi x6, x7, 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| addi x8, x5, 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| addi x9, x8, 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### 2.2. Control Hazards

Consider following two static instruction sequences.


Pipeline diagram for left sequence. Jumps are resolved in D stage.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Pipeline diagram for right sequence. Branches are resolved in A0 stage.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Unaligned fetch blocks

Consider the following static instruction sequence

| 1 | 0x000 opA | Layout of fetch blocks in instruction cache. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 0x004 opB | Numbers indicate which instructions belong to which fetch block. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 0x008 opC |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 0x00c jal x0, 0x100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  | $0 \times 000$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 0x100 opD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 0x104 jal x0, 0x204 | $0 \times 100$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | 0x204 opE | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | $0 \times 208 \mathrm{jal} \mathrm{x0} ,0 \times 30 \mathrm{c}$ | $0 \times 200$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 0x30c opF | $0 \times 300$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | 0x310 opG | $0 \times 310$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $0 \times 314 \mathrm{opH}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| $O \rho A$ | $F D A_{0} A 1 W$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| op $B$ | $F D 0101 W$ |
| op $C$ | $F D B 0$ now |
| 〕 | $F D$ AOA1 $\omega$ |
| op D | $F D 1500$ |
| 」 | $F D$ AO A1 $\omega$ |
| op $E$ | $F D$ nosi $\omega$ |
| J | $F D A_{0} A_{1} \omega$ |
| op F | $F D 8041 \omega$ |
| op G | $F D 10 O_{1} W$ |
| op H | FDASAIW |

- Unaligned fetch blocks within a cache line are challenging
- Unaligned fetch blocks across cache lines are very challenging


## Aligned fetch blocks

Only fetch aligned fetch blocks, possibly discarding first instruction. Reconsider the same static instruction sequence

| 1 | $0 \times 000$ | opA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $0 \times 004$ | opB |
| 3 | $0 \times 008$ | opC |
| 4 | $0 \times 00 c$ | jal x 0, | $0 \times 100$

Layout of fetch blocks in instruction cache. Numbers indicate which instructions belong to which fetch block.


| $0 \times 000$ | OPA | FDAOAI W |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0 \times 004$ | op B | $F D$ Bodu |  |
| $0 \times 008$ | op $C$ | FDDOAIW |  |
| O $0 \times 00 \mathrm{C}$ | J | $F D$ 的A1W |  |
| O $\times 100$ | op D | $F D$ DOB1W | BuDdies havding allignment |
| $0 \times 104$ | J | FD AoAlw |  |
| $0 \times 200$ | ? | $F-\cdots$ |  |
| $0 \times 204$ | OPE | $F D$ AO AIW |  |
| $0 \times 208$ | J | FDA0 Al $W$ | - evertrally BACK |
| $\mathrm{O} \times 20 \mathrm{C}$ | ? | $F-\cdots$ | $<\omega$ "sync" |
| $0 \times 308$ | ? | F- - - |  |
| $0 \times 300$ | opF | FDASAIW |  |
| $0 \times 310$ | opg | FDasalw |  |
| $0 \times 314$ | op 4 | FDDosiw |  |

## Supporting precise exceptions

Consider following instruction sequence. Assume commit point is in the A1/B1 stage and the xxx instruction causes an illegal instruction exception originating in the D stage.

```
1 add x1, x2, x3
2 xxx # causes illegal instruction exception
addi x4, x5, 1
addi x6, x7, 1
...
exception_handler:
    opX
    opY
    opZ
```

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

What if add caused an arithmetic overflow exception?

### 2.3. Structural Hazards

Structural hazards are not possible in the canonical single-issue TinyRV1 pipeline, but structural hazards are possible in the canonical dual-issue TinyRV1 pipeline if two instructions in the same fetch block want to use the same pipe.

| mul x1, x2, x3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| mul $\mathrm{x} 4, \mathrm{x} 5, \mathrm{x} 6$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lw x7, 0(x8) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SW x9, 0(x10) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### 2.4. WAW and WAR Name Hazards

WAW name hazards are not possible in the canonical single-issue TinyRV1 pipeline, but WAW name hazards are possible in the canonical dual-issue TinyRV1 pipeline if two instructions in the same fetch block write the same register.

| addi $\mathrm{x} 1, \mathrm{x} 2, \mathrm{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| addi $\mathrm{x} 1, \mathrm{x} 3,1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

WAR name hazards are not possible in the canonical single-issue TinyRV1 pipeline. Are WAR name hazards possible in the canonical dual-issue TinyRV1 pipeline?

| addi $\mathrm{x} 1, \mathrm{x} 2, ~ 1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| addi $\mathrm{x} 2, \mathrm{x} 3,1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 3. Analyzing Performance of Superscalar Processors

Consider the classic vector-vector add loop over arrays with 64 elements. This loop has a CPI of 1.33 on the canonical single-issue TinyRV1 processor. What is the CPI on the canonical dual-issue TinyRV1 processor?
loop:
lw $x 5, \quad 0(x 13)$
lw $\mathrm{x} 6,0(\mathrm{x} 14)$
add $x 7, x 5, x 6$
sw $\quad \mathrm{x} 7, \quad 0(\mathrm{x} 12)$
addi $\mathrm{x} 13, \mathrm{x} 12,4$
addi $x 14, x 14,4$
addi $x 12, x 12,4$
addi $\mathrm{x} 15, \mathrm{x} 15,-1$
bne x15, x0, loop
jr x 1


