ECE 4750 Computer Architecture, Fall 2016 T09 Advanced Processors: Superscalar Execution

School of Electrical and Computer Engineering Cornell University

revision: 2016-11-28-17-33

| 1 | In-C | In-Order Dual-Issue Superscalar TinyRV1 Processor2 | | | | | | | |
|---|------|--|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | Sup | erscalar Pipeline Hazards | 4 | | | | | | |
| | 2.1. | RAW Hazards | 4 | | | | | | |
| | 2.2. | Control Hazards | 6 | | | | | | |
| | 2.3. | Structural Hazards | 10 | | | | | | |
| | 2.4. | WAW and WAR Name Hazards | 10 | | | | | | |
| 3 | Ana | lyzing Performance of Superscalar Processors | 11 | | | | | | |

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 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| B-Pipe | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |

Example pipeline diagram for dual-issue superscalar processor

| addi x1, x2, 1 | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| addi x3, x4, 1 | | | | | | | | |
| addi x5, x6, 1 | | | | | | | | |
| mul x7, x8, x9 | | | | | | | | |
| mul x10, x11, x12 | 2 | | | | | | | |
| addi x13, x14, 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 x1, x2, | 1 | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| addi x3, x4, | 1 | | | | | | | |
| add x5, x1, | x3 | | | | | | | |
| addi x6, x5, | 1 | | | | | | | |
| addi x7, x8, | 1 | | | | | | | |
| addi x9, x8, | 1 | | | | | | | |

A fully-bypassed superscalar processor is possible, but expensive



Revisit previous assembly sequence with full bypassing

| addi x1, x2, | 1 | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| addi x3, x4, | 1 | | | | | | | |
| add x5, x1, | xЗ | | | | | | | |
| addi x6, x5, | 1 | | | | | | | |
| addi x7, x8, | 1 | | | | | | | |
| addi x9, x8, | 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.

| 1 | 0x1000 | addi | x1, | x2, | 1 | 1 | # assum | ne R[z | x1] | != R | [x2] |
|---|--------|---------|-----|-----|---|---|---------|--------|-----|------|------|
| 2 | 0x1004 | jal | x0, | foo | | 2 | 0x1000 | bne | x1, | x2, | foo |
| 3 | ••• | | | | | 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | foo: | | | | | 4 | foot | | | | |
| 5 | 0x2000 | addi | x3. | x4. | 1 | | | | _ | | |
| | 00004 | - 1 1 - | | , | - | 5 | 0x2000 | addi | x3, | x4, | 1 |
| 6 | 0x2004 | addi | хэ, | хo, | T | 6 | 0x2004 | addi | x5, | x6, | 1 |

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

0x000 opA 1 Layout of fetch blocks in instruction cache. 2 0x004 opB Numbers indicate which instructions belong 3 0x008 opC to which fetch block. 0x00c jal x0, 0x100 4 5 . . . 01000 0x100 opD 6 ... 0x104 jal x0, 0x204 7 0,100 8 0x204 opE 9 0,200 0x208 jal x0, 0x30c 10 - 11 0x30c opF 0,300 12 0x310 opG 0,310 13 0x314 opH 14

- 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



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.

```
add x1, x2, x3
1
                     # causes illegal instruction exception
 XXX
2
3 addi x4, x5, 1
4 addi x6, x7, 1
5
 . . .
6 exception_handler:
  орХ
7
 opY
8
 opZ
9
```



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 | x4, | x5, x6 | | | | | | | |
| 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 x1, x2, 1 | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| addi x1, x3, 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 x1, x2, 1 | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| addi x2, x3, 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 | x5, | 0(x13 | 3) |
| | lw | x6, | 0(x14 | 1) |
| | add | x7, | x5, | x6 |
| | SW | x7, | 0(x12 | 2) |
| | addi | x13, | x12, | 4 |
| | addi | x14, | x14, | 4 |
| | addi | x12, | x12, | 4 |
| | addi | x15, | x15, | -1 |
| | bne | x15, | x0, | loop |
| | jr | x1 | | |
| | | | | |

1

