INTEL'S NEW CHIP: THE ATOM PROCESSOR!

Designed for the "mobile internet" i.e., handheld devices, it has 45 million transistors, is as fast as the CPU in a 4 year old laptop, but uses only ~0.3 watts! The chips in today's laptops use 90 watts. The key is its adaptive power states and the ability to adjust the clock speed and CPU voltage depending on usage. Very cool!

www.technologyreview.com/Infotech/20525/

Problems for Pipelining CPUs

- Limits to pipelining: Hazards prevent next instruction from executing during its designated clock cycle
  - Structural hazards: HW cannot support some combination of instructions (single person to fold and put clothes away)
  - Control hazards: Pipelining of branches causes later instruction fetches to wait for the result of the branch
  - Data hazards: Instruction depends on result of prior instruction still in the pipeline (missing sock)
- These might result in pipeline stalls or "bubbles" in the pipeline.

Review

- Pipelining is a BIG idea
- Optimal Pipeline
  - Each stage is executing part of an instruction each clock cycle.
  - One instruction finishes during each clock cycle.
  - On average, execute far more quickly.
- What makes this work?
  - Similarities between instructions allow us to use same stages for all instructions (generally).
  - Each stage takes about the same amount of time as all others: little wasted time.

Structural Hazard #1: Single Memory (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (clock cycles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Read same memory twice in same clock cycle

Structural Hazard #1: Single Memory (2/2)

- Solution:
  - infeasible and inefficient to create second memory
  - (We'll learn about this more Friday/next week)
  - ...so simulate this by having two Level 1 Caches
    - (a temporary smaller [of usually most recently used] copy of memory)
  - have both an L1 Instruction Cache and an L1 Data Cache
  - need more complex hardware to control when both caches miss

Structural Hazard #2: Registers (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (clock cycles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can we read and write to registers simultaneously?
Structural Hazard #2: Registers (2/2)

- Two different solutions have been used:
  1. RegFile access is VERY fast: takes less than half the time of ALU stage
     - Write to Registers during first half of each clock cycle
     - Read from Registers during second half of each clock cycle
  2. Build RegFile with independent read and write ports
- Result: can perform Read and Write during same clock cycle

Control Hazard: Branching (1/8)

- We had put branch decision-making hardware in ALU stage
  - therefore two more instructions after the branch will always be fetched, whether or not the branch is taken
- Desired functionality of a branch
  - if we do not take the branch, don't waste any time and continue executing normally
  - if we take the branch, don't execute any instructions after the branch, just go to the desired label

Control Hazard: Branching (2/8)

- Initial Solution: Stall until decision is made
  - insert “no-op” instructions (those that accomplish nothing, just take time) or hold up the fetch of the next instruction (for 2 cycles).
  - Drawback: branches take 3 clock cycles each (assuming comparator is put in ALU stage)

Control Hazard: Branching (3/8)

- Optimization #1:
  - insert special branch comparator in Stage 2
  - as soon as instruction is decoded (Opcode identifies it as a branch), immediately make a decision and set the new value of the PC
  - Benefit: since branch is complete in Stage 2, only one unnecessary instruction is fetched, so only one no-op is needed
  - Side Note: This means that branches are idle in Stages 3, 4 and 5.

Control Hazard: Branching (4/8)

- Initial Solution: Stall until decision is made
  - insert “no-op” instructions (those that accomplish nothing, just take time) or hold up the fetch of the next instruction (for 2 cycles).
  - Drawback: branches take 3 clock cycles each (assuming comparator is put in ALU stage)

Control Hazard: Branching (5/8)

- Branch comparator moved to Decode stage.
Control Hazard: Branching (6a/8)

- User inserting no-op instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Time (clock cycles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>add</td>
<td>IS Reg D Reg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beq</td>
<td>IS Reg D Reg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nop</td>
<td>IS Reg D Reg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact: 2 clock cycles per branch instruction ⇒ slow

Control Hazard: Branching (6b/8)

- Controller inserting a single bubble

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Time (clock cycles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>add</td>
<td>IS Reg D Reg Sub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beq</td>
<td>IS Reg D Reg Sub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lw</td>
<td>IS Reg Sub</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact: 2 clock cycles per branch instruction ⇒ slow

Example: Nondelayed vs. Delayed Branch

- Nondelayed Branch
  - or $8, $9, $10
  - add $1, $2, $3
  - sub $4, $5, $6
  - beq $1, $4, Exit
  - xor $10, $1, $11

- Delayed Branch
  - add $1, $2, $3
  - sub $4, $5, $6
  - beq $1, $4, Exit
  - or $8, $9, $10
  - xor $10, $1, $11

Data Hazards (1/2)

- Consider the following sequence of instructions

  ```
  add $t0, $t1, $t2
  sub $t4, $t0, $t3
  and $t5, $t0, $t6
  or $t7, $t0, $t8
  xor $t9, $t0, $t10
  ```
Data Hazards (2/2)

- Data-flow backward in time are hazards
  Time (clock cycles)

- Instruction order

  add $t0, $t1, $t2
  sub $t4, $t0, $t3
  and $t5, $t0, $t6
  or $t7, $t0, $t8
  xor $t9, $t0, $t10

  ALU
  I$ Reg
  D$ Reg

  ALU
  I$ Reg
  D$ Reg

Data Hazard Solution: Forwarding

- Forward result from one stage to another

  add $t0, $t1, $t2
  sub $t4, $t0, $t3
  and $t5, $t0, $t6
  or $t7, $t0, $t8
  xor $t9, $t0, $t10

  ALU
  I$ Reg
  D$ Reg

“oz” hazard solved by register hardware

Data Hazard: Loads (1/4)

- Dataflow backwards in time are hazards

  lw $t0, 0($t1)
  sub $t3, $t0, $t2

- Can’t solve all cases with forwarding
- Must stall instruction dependent on load, then forward (more hardware)

Data Hazard: Loads (2/4)

- Hardware stalls pipeline
  Called “Interlock”

  lw $t0, 0($t1)
  sub $t3, $t0, $t2
  and $t5, $t0, $t4
  or $t7, $t0, $t6

  ALU
  I$ Reg
  D$ Reg

  ALU
  I$ Reg
  D$ Reg

  ALU
  I$ Reg
  D$ Reg

  ALU
  I$ Reg
  D$ Reg

  ALU
  I$ Reg
  D$ Reg

  ALU
  I$ Reg
  D$ Reg

Data Hazard: Loads (3/4)

- Instruction slot after a load is called “load delay slot”
- If that instruction uses the result of the load, then the hardware interlock will stall it for one cycle.
- If the compiler puts an unrelated instruction in that slot, then no stall
- Letting the hardware stall the instruction in the delay slot is equivalent to putting a nop in the slot (except the latter uses more code space)

Data Hazard: Loads (4/4)

- Stall is equivalent to nop

  lw $t0, 0($t1)
  nop
  sub $t3, $t0, $t2
  and $t5, $t0, $t4
  or $t7, $t0, $t6
“And in Conclusion..”

- Pipeline challenge is hazards
  - Forwarding helps with many data hazards
  - Delayed branch helps with control hazard in 5 stage pipeline
  - Load delay slot / interlock necessary
- More aggressive performance:
  - Superscalar
  - Out-of-order execution

Bonus slides

- These are extra slides that used to be included in lecture notes, but have been moved to this, the “bonus” area to serve as a supplement.
- The slides will appear in the order they would have in the normal presentation

Historical Trivia

- First MIPS design did not interlock and stall on load-use data hazard
- Real reason for name behind MIPS:
  - Microprocessor without Interlocked Pipeline Stages
  - Word Play on acronym for Millions of Instructions Per Second, also called MIPS

Pipeline Hazard: Matching socks in later load

- A depends on D; stall since folder tied up. Note this is much different from processor cases so far. We have not had a earlier instruction depend on a later one.

Out-of-Order Laundry: Don’t Wait

- A depends on D; stalls continue; need more resources to allow out-of-order

Superscalar Laundry: Parallel per stage

- More resources, HW to match mix of parallel tasks?
Superscalar Laundry: Mismatch Mix

6 PM 7 8 9 10 11 12 1 2 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(light clothing)

(light clothing)

(light clothing)

Task mix underutilizes extra resources

Peer Instruction

A. Thanks to pipelining, I have reduced the time it took me to wash my shirt.

B. Longer pipelines are always a win (since less work per stage & a faster clock).

C. We can rely on compilers to help us avoid data hazards by reordering instrs.

Peer Instruction (1/2)

Assume 1 instr/clock, delayed branch, 5 stage pipeline, forwarding, interlock on unresolved load hazards (after 10^3 loops, so pipeline full).

Loop:

1w $t0, 0($s1)     # 1
addu $t0, $t0, $s2 # 2
sw $t0, 0($s1)    # 3
addiu $s1, $s1, -4 # 4
bne $s1, $zero, Loop # 5
nop # 6

• How many pipeline stages (clock cycles) per loop iteration to execute this code?

Peer Instruction (2/2)

Assume 1 instr/clock, delayed branch, 5 stage pipeline, forwarding, interlock on unresolved load hazards (after 10^3 loops, so pipeline full). Rewrite this code to reduce pipeline stages (clock cycles) per loop to as few as possible.

Loop:

1w $t0, 0($s1) # 1
addu $t0, $t0, $s2 # 2
sw $t0, 0($s1) # 3
addiu $s1, $s1, -4 # 4
bne $s1, $zero, Loop # 5
nop # 6

• How many pipeline stages (clock cycles) per loop iteration to execute this code?