

Instruction Level Parallelism

Today's topic

- A thorough treatment of all the ways to exploit parallelism at the instruction level requires a long chapter in a very thick book
- We don't need to design processors, so a simplified mental picture of what's going on will suffice
- I have chosen to highlight
 - Pipelining
 - Out-of-order execution
 - Prefetching & branch prediction
 - Vectorization



Pipelining

- During the clock race, improved switching frequencies made it tricky to complete one complex instruction each clock cycle
- Early RISC architectures broke each operation into 5 stages, to keep up:
 - IF (Instruction Fetch)
 - ID (Instruction Decode)
 - EX (Execute)
 - MEM (Memory)
 - WB (Write Back)



One instruction takes 5 steps

 Alone, an instruction is no faster than it would be with a 5x slower clock:





Two instructions take 6 steps

• With the operations broken into stages, we can start a new instruction when its predecessor goes to stage 2:





Full capacity

• When the pipeline is full (after a 5 step warmup), it produces a finished result for every step:





Stall & flush

• If instruction 3 needs the result from instruction 2, the whole thing has to wait:





Out-of-order execution

- Bernstein's conditions define that statements S₁, S₂ will produce the same result when run in any order if
 - $R(S_1) \cap W(S_2) = \emptyset$
- (S1 doesn't read what S2 writes)
- $W(S_1) \cap R(S_2) = \emptyset$
- $W(S_1) \cap W(S_2) = \emptyset$

- (S1 doesn't write what S2 reads)
- (S1 and S2 don't write in the same place)

(this makes them *independent* statements)

- It's arguably just common sense, but looks better when dressed up as sets and operators
- When we have a window of instructions and their operands, their independence can be checked automatically



Dependences

- When instructions aren't independent, there is some kind of... dependence.
- We have three types:
 - Data dependence
 - Name dependence
 - Control dependence



Data dependence

• This is when the result of one operation is an input to a following operation:

```
// These two expressions are independent
```



Name dependence

• When a name is re-used for a different purpose, its first use must be finished before the second can begin:

```
norm = x[0]*x[0] + y[0]*y[0];
sum += norm;
norm = x[1]*x[1] + y[1]*y[1];
sum += norm;
```

- Programmers don't often re-use their names explicitly (and advanced compilers invisibly rename the variables if they do) but loop iterations can create this effect
- At the instruction level, the CPU has a limited number of registers to use, they have to be recycled every so often



Control dependence

• Branches in the program make it impossible to start operations simultaneously:

```
result = 0.0;
rad = x*x + y*y;
if ( rad < 1.0 )
    result = sqrt(rad);
```

• We can't overwrite result before the comparison between rad and 1.0 is complete



Superscalar processors

- With automatic (in)dependence detection in place, we can
 - replicate the ALU parts of the Neumann machine
 - make the control path dispatch several instructions at once
- This is fondly known as *multiple issue* in computer architecture



Prefetching & branch prediction

- Programs typically spend most of their time in long loops (at least when they spend most of their time using the CPU)
- Many loops create regular access patterns in memory:

This loop will ask for 1000 consecutive addresses that are all 8 bytes apart



Prefetching

- By default, that kind of loop will regularly create cache misses at the end of every cache line
- By (inexpensively) adding a small counter device that tracks how many times we've been fetching stride-8 addresses lately, upcoming misses can be avoided by starting the memory transfer early
- It'll often be correct, and when it isn't, the cache space will just be re-used anyway



Branch prediction

- When pre-loading instructions, if() statements, loop tails, etc. make it hard to decide which branch to pre-load
- A simple variant is just to always guess that branches will be taken

...or, for that matter, that they won't...

 Wrong guesses require the pipeline to be flushed, but without any kind of guess, we couldn't fill it in the first place



Slightly fancier branch prediction

- At a moderate increase in complexity,
 - A unit with 2 states can switch policies based on whether the last branch was actually taken or not
 - A unit with 4 states can switch policies based on the last two branches
 - Etc. etc.
- It is also possible to store branch statistics next to a table of the branch instructions' addresses in the code



Vectorization

Loops like this are not uncommon:

for (int j=0; j<N; j++)
 c[i] = a[i] + b[i];</pre>

This can cause a register to contain a[0], a[1], a[2]... in sequence, another one to contain b[0], b[1], b[2], ... and so on

• Vector registers are extra-wide registers that can store several consecutive values at once:



Combining multiple elements

 With the vector registers loaded, there are instructions that do the same thing to all of their elements in parallel:



Combining multiple elements

 Packing data into wide registers like this, we can do 4 times the work in one of the *read-modify-write* cycles of Neumann

(as long as the data are laid out consecutively in memory)



In practice

- These were all simple illustrations of principles
 - Real pipelines are often much deeper than 5 stages
 - Superscalar processors can "typically" issue 2-8 simultaneous operations
 - Highly sophisticated branch predictors and prefetchers have been invented, but most practical ones aren't super complicated
 - Vectorization is ideally something for the compiler to divine from your source code, but that doesn't always succeed
 (We will look at how to do it by hand, one of these days)

