Chapter 3

Instruction-Level Parallelism and Its Exploitation

Introduction

- Pipelining become universal technique in 1985
  - Overlaps execution of instructions
  - Exploits “Instruction Level Parallelism”
- Beyond this, there are two main approaches:
  - Hardware-based dynamic approaches
    - Used in server and desktop processors
    - Belter than S/W
    - More power, design, and verification time, and more area
  - Compiler-based static approaches
    - Not as successful outside of scientific applications

Instruction-Level Parallelism

- When exploiting instruction-level parallelism, goal is to minimize CPI
  - Pipeline CPI =
    - Ideal pipeline CPI +
    - Structural stalls +
    - Data hazard stalls +
    - Control stalls
- Parallelism with basic block is limited
  - Typical size of basic block = 3-6 instructions
  - Must optimize across branches

Data Dependence

- Loop-Level Parallelism
  - Unroll loop statically or dynamically
  - Use SIMD (vector processors and GPUs)
- Challenges:
  - Data dependency
    - Instruction *j* is data dependent on instruction *i* if
      - Instruction *i* produces a result that may be used by instruction *j*
      - Instruction *j* is data dependent on instruction *k* and instruction *k* is data dependent on instruction *i*
- Dependent instructions cannot be executed simultaneously

Data Dependence

- Dependencies are a property of programs
- Hazards are a property of the pipeline (Hardware in general
- Pipeline organization determines if dependence is detected and if it causes a stall
- Data dependence conveys:
  - Possibility of a hazard
  - Order in which results must be calculated
  - Upper bound on exploitable instruction level parallelism
- Dependencies that flow through memory locations are difficult to detect

MIPS 5-Stage Pipeline



Hazards

- Structural hazards
- Data hazards
- Control hazards

Multiple Function Units



Name Dependence

- Two instructions use the same name but no flow of information
  - Not a true data dependence, *but is a problem when reordering instructions*
  - *Antidependence*: instruction j writes a register or memory location that instruction i reads
    - Initial ordering (i before j) must be preserved
  - *Output dependence*: instruction i and instruction j write the same register or memory location
    - Ordering must be preserved
- To resolve, use renaming techniques

Other Factors

- Data Hazards
  - Read after write (RAW)
  - Write after write (WAW)
  - Write after read (WAR)
- Control Dependence
  - Ordering of instruction i with respect to a branch instruction
    - Instruction control dependent on a branch cannot be moved before the branch so that its execution is no longer controller by the branch
    - An instruction not control dependent on a branch cannot be moved after the branch so that its execution is controlled by the branch

Control Dependence

- Must preserve exception behavior.
- We should not change the exception behavior of the program.
- We often relax this to "reordering of instruction must not raise new exceptions"

```
        DADDU   R2,R3,R4
        BEQZ    R2,L1
        LW      R1,0(R2)
L1:     ……
```

- No data dependence prevents us from exchanging BEQZ and LW, but might result in memory protection exception

Examples

- Example 1:

```
        DADDU   R1,R2,R3
        BEQZ    R4,L
        DSUBU   R1,R1,R6
L:      …
        OR      R7,R1,R8
```

- OR instruction dependent on DADDU and DSUBU
- Preserving the order alone is not sufficient (must have the correct value in R1)

- Example 2:

```
        DADDU   R1,R2,R3
        BEQZ    R12,skip
        DSUBU   R4,R5,R6
        DADDU   R5,R4,R9
skip:
        OR      R7,R8,R9
```

- Assume R4 isn't used after skip
  - Possible to move DSUBU before the branch

Data Dependence

```
Loop:   L.D     F0,0(R1)
        ADD.D   F4,F0,F2
        S.D     F4,0(R1)
        DADDUI  R1,R1,#-8
        BNE     R1,R2,Loop
```


Compiler Techniques for Exposing ILP

- Pipeline scheduling
  - Separate dependent instruction from the source instruction by the pipeline latency of the source instruction
- Example:

```
for (i=999; i>=0; i=i-1)
  x[i] = x[i] + s;
```

No dependence between iterations

MIPS code?

Instruction producing result	Instruction using result	Latency in clock cycles
FP ALU op	Another FP ALU op	3
FP ALU op	Store double	2
Load double	FP ALU op	1
Load double	Store double	0

Assembly Code

```
for(i=1000;i>0;i--)
    x[i]=x[i]+A
```



```
Loop:   L.D     F0,0(R1)        1
        ADD.D   F4,F0,F2        2
        S.D     F4,0(R1)        3
        DADDUI  R1,R1,#-8       4
        BNE     R1,R2,Loop      5
```

Pipeline Stalls

```
for(i=1000;i>0;i--)
    x[i]=x[i]+A
```

Loop:	L.D	F0,0(R1)	1
	stall		2
	ADD.D	F4,F0,F2	3
	stall		4
	stall		5
	S.D	F4,0(R1)	6
	DADDUI	R1,R1,#-8	7
	stall (because the next instruction is branch)		8
	BNE	R1,R2,Loop	9
	stall		10

Instruction producing result	Instruction using result	Latency in clock cycles
FP ALU op	Another FP ALU op	3
FP ALU op	Store double	2
Load double	FP ALU op	1
Load double	Store double	0

Pipeline Scheduling

Scheduled code:

Loop:	L.D	F0,0(R1)	1
	DADDUI	R1,R1,#-8	2
	ADD.D	F4,F0,F2	3
	stall		4
	stall		5
	S.D	F4,8(R1)	6
	BNE	R1,R2,Loop	7

Now 6

Instruction producing result	Instruction using result	Latency in clock cycles
FP ALU op	Another FP ALU op	3
FP ALU op	Store double	2
Load double	FP ALU op	1
Load double	Store double	0

Loop Unrolling

- Loop unrolling
  - Unroll by a factor of 4 (assume # elements is divisible by 4)
  - Eliminate unnecessary instructions

```
Loop:  L.D     F0,0(R1)
       ADD.D   F4,F0,F2
       S.D     F4,0(R1) ;drop DADDUI & BNE
       L.D     F6,-8(R1)
       ADD.D   F8,F6,F2
       S.D     F8,-8(R1) ;drop DADDUI & BNE
       L.D     F10,-16(R1)
       ADD.D   F12,F10,F2
       S.D     F12,-16(R1) ;drop DADDUI & BNE
       L.D     F14,-24(R1)
       ADD.D   F16,F14,F2
       S.D     F16,-24(R1)
       DADDUI  R1,R1,#-32
       BNE     R1,R2,Loop
```

1 stall

2 stalls

- note: number of live registers vs. original loop

Loop Unrolling/Pipeline Scheduling

- Pipeline schedule the unrolled loop:

```
Loop:  L.D     F0,0(R1)
       L.D     F6,-8(R1)
       L.D     F10,-16(R1)
       L.D     F14,-24(R1)
       ADD.D   F4,F0,F2
       ADD.D   F8,F6,F2
       ADD.D   F12,F10,F2
       ADD.D   F16,F14,F2
       S.D     F4,0(R1)
       S.D     F8,-8(R1)
       DADDUI  R1,R1,#-32
       S.D     F12,16(R1)
       S.D     F16,8(R1)
       BNE     R1,R2,Loop
```

Loop iterations are independent

Strip Mining

- Unknown number of loop iterations?
  - Number of iterations = *n*
  - Goal: make *k* copies of the loop body
  - Generate pair of loops:
    - First executes *n* mod *k* times
    - Second executes *n* / *k* times
    - "Strip mining"

Loop Level Parallelsim

- Loop-Level Parallelism (LLP) analysis focuses on whether data accesses in later iterations of a loop are data dependent on data values produced in earlier iterations and possibly making loop iterations independent.

```
For(i=0;i<100;i++)
    x[i]=x[i]+A;
```

- the computation in each iteration is independent of the previous iterations and the loop is thus parallel. The use of X[i] twice is within a single iteration.
  - Thus loop iterations are parallel (or independent from each other).

Loop Level Parallelsim

- Loop-carried Dependence: A data dependence between different loop iterations (data produced in earlier iteration used in a later one).
- LLP analysis is important in software optimizations such as loop unrolling since it usually requires loop iterations to be independent.
- LLP analysis is normally done at the source code level or close to it since assembly language and target machine code generation introduces loop-carried name dependence in the registers used for addressing and incrementing.
- Instruction level parallelism (ILP) analysis, on the other hand, is usually done when instructions are generated by the compiler

Loop Level Parallism

```
for (i=1; i<=100; i=i+1) {
        A[i+1] = A[i] + C[i];  /* S1 */
        B[i+1] = B[i] + A[i+1];} /* S2 */
}
```



Dependency Graph

- S2 uses the value A[i+1], computed by S1 in the same iteration. This data dependence is within the same iteration (not a loop-carried dependence).
  - ⇒ does not prevent loop iteration parallelism.
- S1 uses a value computed by S1 in an earlier iteration, since iteration i computes A[i+1] read in iteration i+1 (loop-carried dependence, prevents parallelism). The same applies for S2 for B[i] and B[i+1]
  - ⇒ These two dependencies are loop-carried spanning more than one iteration preventing loop parallelism.

Loop Level parallelism

- for(i=0;i<=100;i++)
- A[i] = A[i] + B[i]; /* S1 */
- B[i+1] = C[i] + D[i]; /* S2 */
- S1 uses the value calculated by S2 in the previous iteration (loop carried dependence)
- The dependence is not circular, S2 does not depend on S1 in the previous iteration



Finding Dependence

- Finding dependences in the program is very important for renaming and executing instructions in parallel.
- Arrays and pointers makes finding dependences very difficult.
- Assume array indices are *affine*, which means on the form $ai+b$ where a and b are constant.
- GCD test can be used to detect dependences.

Finding Dependence

- Assume we stored an array with index value of $ai+b$ and loaded an array with an index value of $cj+d$
- Are they pointing to the same location?
- Assume the loop limit is m,n
- Are there

$$j,k \quad m \le j,k \le n \text{ such that } a \times j + b = c \times k + d$$

GCD test

- A simple and sufficient test for absence can be found.
- If a loop dependence exists, then

$$GCD(c,a) \text{ divides } (d-b)$$

GCD Test -- Example

```
for(i=1; i<=100; i=i+1) {
        x[2*i+3] = x[2*i] * 5.0;
    }
```

a = 2 b = 3 c = 2 d = 0

GCD(a, c) = 2

d - b = -3

2 does not divide -3 ⇒ No dependence is not possible.

5,7,9,11,13,15,17,19,21,23,....

4,6,8,10,12,14,16,18,20,22,.....

Dependence Analysis

- Dependence analysis is a very important tool for exploiting LLP, it can not be used in these situations
- Objects are referenced using pointers
- Array indexing using another array *a[b[i]]*
- Dependence may exist for some values of input, but in reality the input never takes these values.
- When we want to know more than the possibility of dependence (which write causes it?)
- Dependence analysis across procedure boundaries

Dependence Analysis

- Sometimes, *points-to* analysis might help.
- We might be able to answer *simpler* questions, or get some hints.
- Do 2 pointers point to the same list?
- Type information
- Information derived when the object was allocated
- Pointer assignments

Software Pipelines

- Software pipelined loop chooses instructions from different loop iterations, thus separating the dependent instructions within one iteration of the original loop



Software Piplines

```
Loop:   L.D      F0,0(R1)
        ADD.D    F4,F0,F2
        S.D      F4,0(R1)
        DADDUI   R1,R1,#-8
        BNE
```

Before: Unrolled 3 times

```
1   L.D      F0,0(R1)
2   ADD.D    F4,F0,F2
3   S.D      F4,0(R1)
4   L.D      F0,-8(R1)
5   ADD.D    F4,F0,F2
6   S.D      F4,-8(R1)
7   L.D      F0,-16(R1)
8   ADD.D    F4,F0,F2
9   S.D      F4,-16(R1)
10  DADDUI   R1,R1,#-24
11  BNE      R1,R2,LOOP
```

After: Software Pipelined Version

```
        L.D      F0,0(R1)
        ADD.D    F4,F0,F2
        L.D      F0,-8(R1)
1       S.D      F4,0(R1)   ;Stores M[i]
2       ADD.D    F4,F0,F2   ;Adds to M[i-1]
3       L.D      F0,-16(R1);Loads M[i-2]
4       DADDUI   R1,R1,#-8
5       BNE      R1,R2,LOOP
        S.D      F4, 0(R1)
        ADDD     F4,F0,F2
        S.D      F4,-8(R1)
```

Software Pipelines



Software pipelines




```
Loop:  L.D     F0,0(R1)
       ADD.D   F4, F0, F2
       S.D     F4,0(R1)
       DADD    R1,R1,#-8
       BNE     R1,R2,Loop
```

```
Loop:  S.D     F4,16(R1)
       ADD.D   F4, F0, F2
       L.D     F0,0(R1)
       DADD    R1,R1,#-8
       BNE     R1,R2,Loop
```


Software Pipelining