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## 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
- Not used as extensively in PMP processors - PMP: Parallel Microprogrammed Processor
- Compiler-based static approaches
- Not as successful outside of scientific applications


## Data Dependence

- Loop-Level Parallelism
- Unroll loop statically or dynamically
- Use SIMD (vector processors and GPUs)
- SIMD (Single Instruction Multiple Data)
- 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


## Outline

- Instruction Level Parallelism
- Loop Unrolling
- Instruction Dependencies
- Dynamic Scheduling
- Tomasulo Algorithm
- Speculative Approach
- Dynamic Branch Prediction
- Multiple Instruction Issue


## Instruction-Level Parallelism

- When exploiting Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP), goal is to maximize CPI (Cycles Per Instruction)
- 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

- Dependencies are a property of programs
- 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


## 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 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 register renaming techniques


## Examples

Example 1:
add $\mathrm{x} 1, \mathrm{x} 2, \mathrm{x} 3$
beq $x 4, x 0, L$
sub $\mathrm{x} 1, \mathrm{x} 1, \mathrm{x} 6$
L: .
or $\mathrm{x} 7, \mathrm{x} 1, \mathrm{x} 8$

Example 2:
add $\mathrm{x} 1, \mathrm{x} 2, \mathrm{x} 3$
beq $\mathrm{x} 12, \mathrm{x} 0$,skip
sub $x 4, x 5, x 6$
add $\mathrm{x} 5, \mathrm{x} 4, \mathrm{x} 9$
skip:
or $\quad \mathrm{x} 7, \mathrm{x} 8, \mathrm{x} 9$

- or instruction dependent on add and sub
- Assume x4 isn't used after skip

Possible to move sub before the branch

## Pipeline Stalls




## 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 controlled 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


## Compiler Techniques for Exposing ILP

- Pipeline scheduling
1.4.2020
- Separate dependent instruction from the source instruction by the pipeline latency of the source instruction
- Example
for $(\mathrm{i}=999 ; \mathrm{i}>=0 ; \mathrm{i}=\mathrm{i}-1)$

$$
\mathrm{x}[\mathrm{i}]=\mathrm{x}[\mathrm{i}]+\mathrm{s} ;
$$

| 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

[^0]
## Loop Unrolling/Pipeline Scheduling

- Pipeline schedule the unrolled loop:

| Loop: | fld | f0,0(x1) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | fld | f6,-8(x1) |  |
|  | fld | f8,-16(x1) |  |
|  | fld | f14,-24(x1) |  |
|  | fadd.d | f4,f0,f2 |  |
|  | fadd.d | f8,f6,f2 |  |
|  | fadd.d | f12,f0,f2 |  |
|  | fadd.d | f16,f14,f2 |  |
|  | fsd | f4,0(x1) |  |
|  | fsd | f8,-8(x1) |  |
|  | fsd | f12,-16(x1) |  |
|  | fsd | f16,-24(x1) | - 14 cycles |
|  | addi | $\mathrm{x} 1, \mathrm{x} 1,-32$ | 3.5 cycles per element |
|  | bne | x1,x2,Loop |  |

- First translate into MIPS code:
-To simplify, assume $\mathbf{8}$ is lowest address, $\mathrm{R} 1=$ base address of X and $\mathrm{F} 2=\mathrm{s}$

Loop: L.D F0,0(R1);F0=vector element
ADD.D F4,F0,F2; add scalar from F2
S.D $0(\mathrm{R} 1), \mathrm{F} 4$; store result

DADDUI R1,R1,-8; decrement pointer 8 B (DW)
BNEZ R1,Loop ; branch R1!=zero

## Revised FP Loop Minimizing Stalls

```
1 Loop: L.D F0,0(R1)
    DADDUI R1,R1,-8
    ADD.D F4,F0,F2
    stall
    stall
    S.D 8(R1),F4 ;altered offset when move DADDUI
    BNEZ R1,Loop
```


## Swap DADDUI and S.D by changing address of S.D

| Instruction | Instruction | Latency in <br> clock cycles |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| producing result | using result | 3 |
| FP ALU op | Another FP ALU op | 3 |
| FP ALU op | Store double | 2 |
| Load double | FP ALU op | 1 |

7 clock cycles, but just 3 for execution (L.D, ADD.D,S.D), 4 for loop overhead; How to make faster?

## 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 $n \bmod k$ times
- Second executes $n / k$ times
- "Strip mining"


## FP Loop Showing Stalls

```
1 Loop: L.D F0,O(R1) ;F0=vector element
            stall
    ADD.D F4,F0,F2 ;add scalar in F2
    stall
    stall
    S.D O(R1),F4 ;store result
    DADDUI R1,R1,-8 ;decrement pointer 8B (DW)
    stall ;assumes can't forward to branch
    BNEZ R1,Loop ;branch R1!=zero
Instruction Instruction Latency in
producing result using result clock cycles
FP ALU op Another FP ALU op 3
FP ALU op Store double 2
Load double FP ALU op
- 9 clock cycles: Rewrite code to minimize stalls?
```


## Unroll Loop Four Times (straightforward way)

```
llollol
```

27 clock cycles, or 6.75 per iteration
(Assumes R1 is multiple of 4)

## Unrolled Loop That Minimizes Stalls

```
Loop:L.D F0,0(R1)
    L.D F10,16(R1)
    L.D F14,-24(R1)
    ADD D 14,}24(R1
    ADD.D F4,F0,F2
    ADD.D F8,F6,F2
    ADD.D F12,F10,F2
    ADD.D F16,F14,F2
    S.D O(R1),F4
    S.D -8(R1),F8
    S.D -16(R1),F12
    DSUBUI R1,R1,#32
    S.D 8(R1),F16 ; 8-32 = -24
    BNEZ R1,LOOP
```

14 clock cycles, or 3.5 per iteration

## 5 Loop Unrolling Decisions

- Requires understanding how one instruction depends on another and how the instructions can be changed or reordered given the dependences:

1. Determine loop unrolling useful by finding that loop iterations were independent (except for maintenance code)
2. Use different registers to avoid unnecessary constraints forced by using same registers for different computations
3. Eliminate the extra test and branch instructions and adjust the loop termination and iteration code
4. Determine that loads and stores in unrolled loop can be interchanged by observing that loads and stores from different iterations are independent

- Transformation requires analyzing memory addresses and finding that they do not refer to the same address

5. Schedule the code, preserving any dependences needed to yield the same result as the original code

## Branch Prediction

- Basic 2-bit predictor:
- For each branch:
- Predict taken or not taken
- If the prediction is wrong two consecutive times, change prediction
- Correlating predictor:
- Multiple 2-bit predictors for each branch
- One for each possible combination of outcomes of preceding $n$ branches
- $(m, n)$ predictor: behavior from last $m$ branches to choose from $2^{m} n$-bit predictors
- Tournament predictor:
- Combine correlating predictor with local predictor


## Unrolled Loop Detail

- Do not usually know upper bound of loop
- Suppose it is $n$, and we would like to unroll the loop to make $k$ copies of the body
- Instead of a single unrolled loop, we generate a pair of consecutive loops:
- 1st executes $(n \bmod k)$ times and has a body that is the original loop
$-2 n d$ is the unrolled body surrounded by an outer loop that iterates ( $n / k$ ) times
- For large values of $n$, most of the execution time will be spent in the unrolled loop
- Identify data hazards in the code below:
- MULTD F3, F4, F2
- ADDD F2, F6, F1

$$
-\mathrm{SD} \quad \mathrm{~F} 2,0(\mathrm{~F} 3)
$$

- For each of the following code fragments, identify each type of dependence that a compiler will find (a fragment may have no dependences) and whether a compiler could schedule the two instructions (i.e., change their orders)

| 1. DADDI | R1, R1, \#4 | 2. DADD | R3, R1, R2 |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| LD | R2, 7(R1) | SD | R2, 7(R1) |
|  |  |  |  |
| 3. SD | R2, 7(R1) | 4. BEZ | R1, place |
| SD | F2, 200(R7) | SD | R1, 7(R1) |

Branch Prediction


Branch Prediction Performance


## Tagged Hybrid Predictors

- Need to have predictor for each branch and history
- Problem: this implies huge tables
- Solution:
- Use hash tables, whose hash value is based on branch address and branch history
- Longer histories may lead to increased chance of hash collision, so use multiple tables with increasingly shorter histories


Tagged Hybrid Predictors


## Static Branch Prediction

- Previous lectures showed scheduling code around delayed branch
- To reorder code around branches, need to predict branch statically when compile
- Simplest scheme is to predict a branch as taken
- Average misprediction $=$ untaken branch frequency $=34 \%$ SPEC



## Dynamic Branch Prediction

- Why does prediction work?
- Underlying algorithm has regularities
- Data that is being operated on has regularities
- Instruction sequence has redundancies that are artifacts of way that humans/compilers think about problems
- Is dynamic branch prediction better than static branch prediction?
- Seems to be
- There are a small number of important branches in programs which have dynamic behavior


## Dynamic Branch Prediction

- Solution: 2-bit scheme where change prediction only if get misprediction twice

- Red: stop, not taken
- Green: go, taken
- Adds hysteresis to decision making process


## Correlated Branch Prediction

- Idea: record $m$ most recently executed branches as taken or not taken, and use that pattern to select the proper $n$-bit branch history table
- In general, a $(m, n)$ predictor means recording last $m$ branches to select between $2^{m}$ history tables, each with $n$-bit counters
- Thus, old 2 -bit BHT is a $(0,2)$ predictor
- Global Branch History: m-bit shift register keeping T/NT status of last $m$ branches.
- Each entry in table has $2^{\mathrm{m}} n$-bit predictors.


## Dynamic Branch Prediction

- Performance $=f$ (accuracy, cost of misprediction)
- Branch History Table: Lower bits of PC address index table of 1-bit values
- Says whether or not branch taken last time
- No address check
- Problem: in a loop, 1-bit BHT will cause two mispredictions (avg is 9 iterations before exit):
- End of loop case, when it exits instead of looping as before
- First time through loop on next time through code, when it predicts exit instead of looping


## BHT Accuracy

- Mispredict because either:

Wrong guess for that branch
Got branch history of wrong branch when index the table

- 4096 entry table:



## Correlating Branches



## Accuracy of Different Schemes



## Tournament Predictors

- Multilevel branch predictor
- Use $n$-bit saturating counter to choose between predictors
- Usual choice between global and local predictors


Pentium 4 Misprediction Rate (per 1000 instructions, not per branch)


## Tournament Predictors

Tournament predictor using, say, 4K 2-bit counters indexed by local branch address.

Chooses between:

- Global predictor
-4 K entries index by history of last 12 branches ( $2^{12}=4 \mathrm{~K}$ )
- Each entry is a standard 2-bit predictor
- Local predictor
- Local history table: 1024 10-bit entries recording last 10 branches, index by branch address
- The pattern of the last 10 occurrences of that particular branch used to index table of 1 K entries with 3-bit saturating counters


## Comparing Predictors

- Advantage of tournament predictor is ability to select the right predictor for a particular branch

Particularly crucial for integer benchmarks.

- A typical tournament predictor will select the global predictor almost $40 \%$ of the time for the SPEC integer benchmarks and less than $15 \%$ of the time for the SPEC FP benchmarks



## Branch Target Buffers (BTB)

- Branch target calculation is costly and stalls the instruction fetch.
- BTB stores PCs the same way as caches
- The PC of a branch is sent to the BTB
- When a match is found the corresponding Predicted PC is returned
- If the branch was predicted taken, instruction fetch continues at the returned predicted PC


## Branch Target Buffers



Branch target folding: for unconditional branches store the target instructions themselves in the buffer!

## Dynamic Branch Prediction Summary

- Prediction becoming important part of execution
- Branch History Table: 2 bits for loop accuracy
- Correlation: Recently executed branches correlated with next branch
- Either different branches (GA)
- Or different executions of same branches (PA)
- Tournament predictors take insight to next level, by using multiple predictors
- usually one based on global information and one based on local information, and combining them with a selector
- In 2006, tournament predictors using $\approx 30 \mathrm{~K}$ bits are in processors like the Power5 and Pentium 4
- Branch Target Buffer: include branch address \& prediction;
- Branch target folding.


## Need Address at Same Time as Prediction

- Branch Target Buffer (BTB): Address of branch index to get prediction AND branch address (if taken)



## Dynamic Scheduling

- Rearrange order of instructions to reduce stalls while maintaining data flow
- Advantages:
- Compiler doesn't need to have knowledge of microarchitecture
- Handles cases where dependencies are unknown at compile time
- Disadvantage:
- Substantial increase in hardware complexity
- Complicates exceptions


## Dynamic Scheduling

- Dynamic scheduling implies:
- Out-of-order execution
- Out-of-order completion
- Example 1:

| fdiv.d | $\mathrm{f0}, \mathrm{f} 2, \mathrm{f} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| fadd.d | $\mathrm{f} 10, \mathrm{f0}, \mathrm{f8}$ |
| fsub.d | $\mathrm{f} 12, \mathrm{f} 8, \mathrm{f} 14$ |

## Dynamic Scheduling

- Example 2:
fdiv.d f0,f2,f4
fmul.d f6,f0,f8
fadd.d f0,f10,f14
- fadd.d is not dependent, but the antidependence makes it impossible to issue earlier without register renaming
- fsub.d is not dependent, issue before fadd.d


## Register Renaming

- Example 3:

| fdiv.d | f0,f2,f4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| fadd.d | f6,f0,f8 | Antiependence $\mathrm{f}^{8}$ |
| fsd | f6,0( x ¢ ${ }^{\text {( }}$ |  |
| fsub.d | f8,f10,f14 | Output dependence f6 |
| fmul.d | f6,f10,f8 |  |

name dependence with f0,f6,f8

## Register Renaming

- Example 3:

| fdiv.d | f0,f2,f4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| fadd.d | S,f0,f8 |
| fsd | S,0(x1) |
| fsub.d | T,f10,f14 |
| fmul.d | f6,f10,T |

- Now only RAW hazards remain, which can be strictly ordered


## Register Renaming

- Tomasulo's Approach
- Tracks when operands are available
- Introduces register renaming in hardware
- Minimizes WAW and WAR hazards
- Register renaming is provided by Reservation Stations (RS)
- Contains:
- The instruction
- Buffered operand values (when available)
- Reservation station number of instruction providing the operand values


## Register Renaming

- RS fetches and buffers an operand as soon as it becomes available (not necessarily involving register file)
- Pending instructions designate the RS to which they will send their output
- Result values broadcast on a result bus, called the Common Data Bus (CDB)
- Only the last output updates the register file
- As instructions are issued, the register specifiers are renamed with the reservation station
- May be more reservation stations than registers
- Load and store buffers
- Contain data and addresses, act like reservation stations

Tomasulo's Algorithm


## Tomasulo's Algorithm

- Three Steps:
- Issue
- Get next instruction from FIFO queue
- If available RS, issue the instruction to the RS with operand values if available
- If operand values not available, stall the instruction
- Execute
- When operand becomes available, store it in any reservation stations
waiting for it
- When all operands are ready, issue the instruction
- Loads and store maintained in program order through effective address
- No instruction allowed to initiate execution until all branches that proceed it in program order have completed
- Write result
- Write result on CDB into reservation stations and store buffers - (Stores must wait until address and value are received)


## Example



Tomasulo's Algorithm


## Tomasulo Algorithm

- Control \& buffers distributed with Function Units (FU) FU buffers called Reservation Stations (RS); have pending operands
- Registers in instructions replaced by values or pointers to RS;
- form of register renaming
- avoids WAR and WAW hazards
- More reservation stations than registers, so can do optimizations compilers can't
- Results to FU from RS, not through registers, over Common Data Bus that broadcasts results to all FUs
- Load and Stores treated as FUs with RSs as well
- Integer instructions can go past branches, allowing FP ops beyond basic block in FP queue


## Tomasulo's Algorithm

- Example loop:
fmul.d f4,f0,f2
fsd $\quad \mathrm{f} 4,0(\mathrm{x} 1)$
addi $\mathrm{x} 1, \mathrm{x} 1,8$
bne x1,x2,Loop // branches if x16 != x2


## Dynamic Scheduling

- Simple pipeline had 1 stage to check both structural and data hazards: Instruction Decode (ID), also called Instruction Issue
- Split the ID pipe stage of simple 5-stage pipeline into 2 stages:
- Issue-Decode instructions, check for structural hazards
- Read operands-Wait until no data hazards, then read operands

Tomasulo Organization


## Reservation Station Components

Op: Operation to perform in the unit (e.g., + or - )
Vj, Vk: Value of Source operands

- Store buffers has V field, result to be stored

Qj, Qk: Reservation stations producing source registers (value to be written)

- Note: $\mathrm{Qj}, \mathrm{Qk}=0$ => ready
- Store buffers only have Qi for RS producing result

Busy: Indicates reservation station or FU is busy

Register result status-Indicates which functional unit will write each register, if one exists. Blank when no pending instructions that will write that register.

Tomasulo Example
Instruction stream


## Tomasulo Example Cycle 2



Register result status: Clock


## Three Stages of Tomasulo Algorithm

1. Issue-get instruction from FP Op Queue

If reservation station free (no structural hazard),
control issues instr \& sends operands (renames registers).
2. Execute - operate on operands (EX)

When both operands ready then execute;
When both operands ready then execute;
if not ready, watch Common Data Bus for result
3. Write result-finish execution (WB)

Write on Common Data Bus to all awaiting units;
mark reservation station available

- Normal data bus: data + destination ("go to" bus)
- Common data bus: data + source ("come from" bus)
- 64 bits of data +4 bits of Functional Unit source address
- Write if matches expected Functional Unit (produces result) - Does the broadcast
- Example speed:

3 clocks for Fl .pt. +,-; 10 for * ; 40 clks for /

Tomasulo Example Cycle 1


Register result status:
Clock


Tomasulo Example Cycle 8


Note: Can have multiple loads outstanding

Tomasulo Example Cycle 3


Register result status:
Clock


- Note: registers names are removed ("renamed") in Reservation Stations; MULT issued
- Load1 completing; what is waiting for Load1?


## Tomasulo Example Cycle 5



Register result status:

$$
\begin{array}{lllllllll}
F 0 & F 2 & F 4 & F 6 & F 8 & F 10 & F 12 & \ldots & F 30 \\
\hline \text { Mult1 } & \text { M(A2) } & \text { F(A1) } & \text { Add1 } & \text { Mult2 }
\end{array}
$$

- Timer starts down for Add1, Mult1

Tomasulo Example Cycle 4

| Instruction stat | tus: |  |  | Exec | Write |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Instruction | $j$ | $k$ | Issue | Comp | Result |  |  | Busy | Address |
| LD F6 | 34+ | R2 | 1 | 3 | 4 |  | Load 1 | No |  |
| LD F2 | $45+$ | R3 | 2 | 4 |  |  | Load2 | Yes | 45+R3 |
| MULTD Fo | F2 | F4 | 3 |  |  |  | Load3 | No |  |
| SUBD F8 | F6 | F2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DIVD F10 | F0 | F6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADDD F6 | F8 | F2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reservation Sta | ations |  |  | S1 | S2 | RS | RS |  |  |
| Time | Name | Busv | On | Vi | Vk | Oi | Ok |  |  |
|  | Add1 | Yes | SUBD | M(A1) |  |  | Load2 |  |  |
|  | Add2 | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Add3 | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mult 1 | Yes | MULTD |  | R(F4) | Load2 |  |  |  |
|  | Mult2 | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

```
Register result status
Clock
``` \(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
- Load2 completing; what is waiting for Load2?

\section*{Tomasulo Example Cycle 6}


\section*{Register result status:}

- Issue ADDD here despite name dependency on F6?

\section*{Tomasulo Example Cycle 9}


\footnotetext{
Register result status:
Clock \(\qquad\)
}
- Add1 (SUBD) completing; what is waiting for it?

\section*{Tomasulo Example Cycle 10}


Register result status
Clock \(\qquad\)
- Add2 (ADDD) completing; what is waiting for it?

\section*{Tomasulo Example Cycle 12}


Register result status: Clock \(\qquad\)

Tomasulo Example Cycle 14


Register result status: Clock


Tomasulo Example Cycle 11

```

egister result status:

Clock | $F O$ | $F 2$ | $F 4$ | $F 6$ | $F 8$ | $F 10$ | $F 12$ | ... | F3O |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mult1 | M(A) |  | $(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{M}$ | $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{M})$ | Mult2 |  |  |  |

```
- Write result of ADDD here?
- All quick instructions complete in this cycle!

Tomasulo Example Cycle 13


\section*{Register result status:}

Clock


Tomasulo Example Cycle 15


Register result status:
Clock
15
- Mult1 (MULTD) completing; what is waiting for it?

Tomasulo Example Cycle 16


Tomasulo Example Cycle 55


Register result status: Clock \(\qquad\)

Tomasulo Example Cycle 57


Register result status: Clock
56
- Once again: In-order issue, out-of-order execution and out-of-order completion.
\(\qquad\)

\section*{Faster than light computation (skip a couple of cycles)}

Tomasulo Example Cycle 56


Register result status:
Clock
- Mult2 (DIVD) is completing; what is waiting for it?

\section*{Tomasulo Loop Example}

Loop: LD

\section*{MULTD \\ SD}
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
SUBI R1 R1 & R1 \\
R1
\end{tabular}

BNEZ
- This time assume Multiply takes 4 clocks
- Assume 1st load takes 8 clocks
(L1 cache miss), 2nd load takes 1 clock (hit)
- To be clear, will show clocks for SUBI, BNEZ Reality: integer instructions ahead of Fl. Pt. Instructions
- Show 2 iterations

Loop Example


\section*{Loop Example Cycle 2}


\section*{Loop Example Cycle 4}

- Dispatching SUBI Instruction (not in FP queue)

Loop Example Cycle 1


\section*{Loop Example Cycle 3}

- Implicit renaming sets up data flow graph

\section*{Loop Example Cycle 5}

- And, BNEZ instruction (not in FP queue)

\section*{Loop Example Cycle 6}

- Notice that F0 never sees Load from location 80

\section*{Loop Example Cycle 8}


\section*{Loop Example Cycle 10}

- Load2 completing: who is waiting?

Note: Dispatching BNEZ

\section*{Loop Example Cycle 7}


First and Second iteration completely overlapped

\section*{Loop Example Cycle 9}

- Note: Dispatching SUB

\section*{Loop Example Cycle 11}

- Next load in sequence

\section*{Loop Example Cycle 12}

- Why not issue third multiply?

\section*{Loop Example Cycle 14}

- Mult 1 completing. Who is waiting?

\section*{Loop Example Cycle 13}

- Why not issue third store?

\section*{Loop Example Cycle 15}

- Mult2 completing. Who is waiting?

\section*{Loop Example Cycle 17}


\section*{Loop Example Cycle 18}


\section*{Loop Example Cycle 20}


Once again: In-order issue, out-of-order execution and out-of-order completion.

Loop Example Cycle 19


Why can Tomasulo overlap iterations of loops?
- Register renaming

Multiple iterations use different physical destinations for registers (dynamic loop unrolling).
- Reservation stations
- Permit instruction issue to advance past integer control flow operations - Also buffer old values of registers - totally avoiding the WAR stall that we saw in the scoreboard.
- Other perspective: Tomasulo building data flow dependency graph on the fly.

\section*{What about Precise Interrupts?}
- State of machine looks as if no instruction beyond faulting instructions has issued
- Tomasulo had:

In-order issue, out-of-order execution, and out-of-order completion
- Need to "fix" the out-of-order completion aspect so that we can find precise breakpoint in instruction stream.

\section*{Relationship between Precise Interrupts and Speculation:}
- Speculation: guess and check
- Important for branch prediction:
- Need to "take our best shot" at predicting branch direction.
- If we speculate and are wrong, need to back up and restart execution to point at which we predicted incorrectly:

This is exactly same as precise exceptions!
- Technique for both precise interrupts/exceptions and speculation: in-order completion or commit

\section*{Reorder Buffer}
- Reorder buffer - holds the result of instruction between completion and commit
- Four fields:
- Instruction type: branch/store/register
- Destination field: register number
- Value field: output value
- Ready field: completed execution?
- Modify reservation stations:
- Operand source is now reorder buffer instead of functional unit

\section*{Reorder Buffer}
- Register values and memory values are not written until an instruction commits
- On misprediction:
- Speculated entries in ROB are cleared
- Exceptions:
- Not recognized until it is ready to commit

\section*{Hardware-Based Speculation}
- Execute instructions along predicted execution paths but only commit the results if prediction was correct
- Instruction commit: allowing an instruction to update the register file when instruction is no longer speculative
- Need an additional piece of hardware to prevent any irrevocable action until an instruction commits

\footnotetext{
- I.e. updating state or taking an execution
}
- Issue:
- Allocate RS (Reservation Stations) and ReOrder Buffer (ROB), read available operands
- Execute:
- Begin execution when operand values are available
- Write result:
- Write result and ROB tag on CDB (Common Data Bus)
- Commit:
- When ROB reaches head of ROB, update register
- When a mispredicted branch reaches head of ROB, discard all entries

\section*{Reorder Buffer}


\section*{Speculation to greater ILP}
- Greater ILP: Overcome control dependence by hardware speculating on outcome of branches and executing program as if guesses were correct
- Speculation \(\Rightarrow\) fetch, issue, and execute instructions as if branch predictions were always correct
- Dynamic scheduling \(\Rightarrow\) only fetches and issues instructions
- Essentially a data flow execution model: Operations execute as soon as their operands are available

\section*{Speculation to greater ILP}
- 3 components of HW-based speculation:
1. Dynamic branch prediction to choose which instructions to execute
2. Speculation to allow execution of instructions before control dependences are resolved
+ ability to undo effects of incorrectly speculated sequence
3. Dynamic scheduling to deal with scheduling of different combinations of basic blocks

\section*{Reorder Buffer (ROB)}
- In non-speculative Tomasulo's algorithm, once an instruction writes its result, any subsequently issued instructions will find result in the register file
- With speculation, the register file is not updated until the instruction commits
- (we know definitively that the instruction should execute)
- Thus, the ROB supplies operands in interval between completion of instruction execution and instruction commit
- ROB is a source of operands for instructions, just as
reservation stations (RS) provide operands in Tomasulo's algorithm
- ROB extends architectured registers like RS

\section*{Adding Speculation to Tomasulo}
- Must separate execution from allowing instruction to finish or "commit"
- This additional step called instruction commit
- When an instruction is no longer speculative, allow it to update the register file or memory
- Requires additional set of buffers to hold results of instructions that have finished execution but have not committed
- This reorder buffer (ROB) is also used to pass results among instructions that may be speculated

\section*{Reorder Buffer Entry Fields}
- Each entry in the ROB contains four fields:
1. Instruction type
- a branch (has no destination result), a store (has a memory address destination), or a register operation (ALU operation or load, which has register destinations)
2. Destination
- Register number (for loads and ALU operations) or memory address (for stores) where the instruction result should be written
3. Value
- Value of instruction result until the instruction commits
4. Ready
- Indicates that instruction has completed execution, and the value is ready

\section*{Reorder Buffer Operation}
- Holds instructions in FIFO order, exactly as issued
- When instructions complete, results placed into ROB

Supplies operands to other instruction between execution
complete \& commit \(\Rightarrow\) more registers like RS
Tag results with ROB buffer number instead of reservation station
- Instructions commit \(\Rightarrow\) values at head of ROB placed in registers (or memory locations)
- As a result, easy to undo speculated instructions on mispredicted branches or on exceptions


Tomasulo With Reorder buffer:


Tomasulo With Reorder buffer:


Recall: 4 Steps of Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm
1. Issue-get instruction from FP Op Queue

If reservation station and reorder buffer slot free, issue instr \& send
operands \& reorder buffer no. for destination (this stage sometimes called "dispatch")
2. Execution-operate on operands (EX)

When both operands ready then execute; if not ready, watch CDB for result; when both in reservation station, execute; checks RAW (sometimes called "issue")
3. Write result-finish execution (WB)

Write on Common Data Bus to all awaiting FUs
\& reorder buffer; mark reservation station available.
4. Commit-update register with reorder result

When instr. at head of reorder buffer \& result present, update register with result (or store to memory) and remove instr from reorder buffer. Mispredicted branch flushes reorder buffer (sometimes called "graduation")

Tomasulo With Reorder buffer:


Tomasulo With Reorder buffer:



\section*{Avoiding Memory Hazards}
- WAW and WAR hazards through memory are eliminated with speculation because actual updating of memory occurs in order, when a store is at head of the ROB, and hence, no earlier loads or stores can still be pending
- RAW dependence through memory are maintained by two restrictions:
1. not allowing a load to initiate the second step of its execution if any active ROB entry occupied by a store has a Destination field that matches the value of the A field of the load, and
2. maintaining the program order for the computation of an effective address of a load with respect to all earlier stores.
- these restrictions ensure that any load that accesses a memory location written to by an earlier store cannot perform the memory access until the store has written the data


\section*{Exceptions and Interrupts}
- IBM 360/91 invented "imprecise interrupts"
- Computer stopped at this PC; its likely close to this address
- Not so popular with programmers
- Also, what about Virtual Memory? (Not in IBM 360)
- Technique for both precise interrupts/exceptions and speculation: in-order completion and in-order commit
- If we speculate and are wrong, need to back up and restart execution to point at which we predicted incorrectly
- This is exactly same as need to do with precise exceptions
- Exceptions are handled by not recognizing the exception until instruction that caused it is ready to commit in ROB
- If a speculated instruction raises an exception, the exception
is recorded in the ROB
- This is why reorder buffers in all new processors

\section*{Multiple Issue and Static Scheduling}
- To achieve \(\mathrm{CPI}<1\), need to complete multiple instructions per clock
- Solutions:
- Statically scheduled superscalar processors
- VLIW (very long instruction word) processors
- Dynamically scheduled superscalar processors
- Vector Processing: Explicit coding of independent loops as operations on large vectors of numbers - Multimedia instructions being added to many processors
- Superscalar: varying no. instructions/cycle (1 to 8 ), scheduled by compiler or by HW (Tomasulo) - IBM PowerPC, Sun UltraSparc, Pentium 4
- (Very) Long Instruction Words (V)LIW: fixed number of instructions (4-16) scheduled by the compiler; put ops into wide templates Intel Architecture-64 (IA-64) 64-hit address
- Renamed: "Explicitly Parallel Instruction Computer (EPIC)"
- Anticipated success of multiple instructions lead to Instructions Per Clock_cycle (IPC) vs. CPI

> Vector Processor


Multiple Issue
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Common name & Issue structure & Hazard detection & Scheduling & Distinguishing characteristic & Examples \\
\hline Superscalar (static) & Dynamic & Hardware & Sutic & In-order execution & Mostly in the embedded space: MIPS and ARM. incluting the Cortex-A53 \\
\hline Superscalar (dynamic) & Dynamic & Hardware & Dynamic & Same out-of-ader execution, but no speculation & None at the present \\
\hline Superscalar (speculative) & Dynamic & Hardware & Dynamic with speculation & Out-of-order execution with speculation & Intel Core i3, is, i7; AMD Phenom; IBM Power 7 \\
\hline vLiwhiw & Static & Primarily software & Satic & All hazards determined and indicated by compiler (often implicity) & Most examples are in signal processing, such as the TI C6x \\
\hline EPIC & \begin{tabular}{l}
Primarily \\
static
\end{tabular} & Primarily software & Mostly static & All hazards determined and indicated explicitly by the compiler & tanium \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Vector Processor




VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word)

Instruction Format
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline FP Add & FP Mult & Int ALU & Branch & Load/Store \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Superscalar Pipeline
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline IF & ID & EX & MEM & WB & & & & \\
\hline IF & ID & EX & MEM & WB & & & & \\
\hline & IF & ID & EX & MEM & WB & & & \\
\hline  & IF & ID & EX & MEM & WB & & & \\
\hline \(\rightarrow\) & & IF & ID & EX & MEM & WB & & \\
\hline & & IF & ID & EX & MEM & WB & & \\
\hline & & & IF & ID & EX & MEM & WB & \\
\hline & & & IF & ID & EX & MEM & WB & \\
\hline & & & & IF & ID & EX & MEM & WB \\
\hline & & & & IF & ID & EX & MEM & WB \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Vector Processor}

\section*{VLIW Pipeline}


Superscalar


\section*{VLIW Processors}
- Package multiple operations into one instruction
- Example VLIW processor:
- One integer instruction (or branch)
- Two independent floating-point operations
- Two independent memory references
- Must be enough parallelism in code to fill the available slots

\section*{VLIW: Very Large Instruction Word}
- Each "instruction" has explicit coding for multiple operations
- In IA-64, grouping called a "packet"
- In Transmeta, grouping called a "molecule" (with "atoms" as ops)
- Tradeoff instruction space for simple decoding
- The long instruction word has room for many operations
- By definition, all the operations the compiler puts in the long instruction word are independent \(=>\) execute in parallel
- E.g., 2 integer operations, 2 FP ops, 2 Memory refs, 1 branch - 16 to 24 bits per field \(\Rightarrow>7 * 16\) or 112 bits to \(7 * 24\) or 168 bits wide
- Need compiling technique that schedules across several branches

\section*{Loop Unrolling in VLIW}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Memory reference 1 & Memory reference 2 & FP operation 1 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& F P \\
& \text { op. } 2
\end{aligned}
\] & Int. op/ branch & Clock \\
\hline L.D F0,0(R1) & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{L.D F6,-8(R1)} & & & 1 \\
\hline L.D F10,-16(R1) & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{L.D F14,-24(R1)} & & & 2 \\
\hline L.D F18,-32(R1) & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{L.D \(\mathrm{F} 22,40\) (R1)} & ADD.D F4,F0,F2 & ADD.D & 8,F6,F2 & 3 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{L.D F26,-48(R1)} & & ADD.DF12,F10,F2 & ADD. \({ }^{\text {d }}\) & 16,F14,F2 & 4 \\
\hline & & ADU.DF20,F18,F2 & ADD.D & 24,F22,F2 & 5 \\
\hline S.D 0(R1),F4 & SD P(R1),F8 & ADD.D F28,F26,F2 & & & 6 \\
\hline S.D-16(R1),F12 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.D -24(R1),F16} & & & 7 \\
\hline S.D -32(R1),F20 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{S.D -40(R1),F24} & & & DSUBUI R1,R1,\#48 & 48 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.D -0(R1),F28} & & & BNEZ R 1,LOOP & 9 \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{Unrolled 7 times to avoid delays} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{7 results in 9 clocks, or 1.3 clocks per iteration (1.8X)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{Average: 2.5 ops per clock, \(50 \%\) efficiency} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{Note: Need more registers in VLIW (15 vs. 6 in SS)} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{VLIW Processors}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Memory reference 1 & Memory reference 2 & FP operation 1 & FP operation 2 & Integer operation/branch \\
\hline f1d f0,0(x) & fld \(\mathrm{f} 6,-\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{x} 1)\) & & & \\
\hline fldfl0. \(16(x 1)\) & fldf14. \(24(\mathrm{x} 1)\) & & & \\
\hline fld f18, \(32(x 1)\) & fld f22. \(40(x 1)\) & fadd.d f4,f0,f2 & fadd.d f8, f6.f2 & \\
\hline fld f26, \(48(x 1)\) & & fadd.d fl2,f0,f2 & fadd.d f16,f14,f2 & \\
\hline & & fadd.d f20,f18, f2 & fadd.d f24.f22.f2 & \\
\hline fsd f4.0(x) & fsd f8, -8(x1) & fadd.d f28, f26.f24 & & \\
\hline fsd f12.-16(x1) & fsd \(116 . \sim 24(\mathrm{x} 1)\) & & & addi \(\times 1 . \times 1 .-56\) \\
\hline fsd f20.24(x) & fsd f24.16(x1) & & & \\
\hline fsd \(\mathrm{f} 28, \mathrm{~B}(\mathrm{x} 1)\) & & & & bne \(\times 1, \times 2\), Loop \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
- Disadvantages:
- Statically finding parallelism
- Code size
- No hazard detection hardware
- Binary code compatibility
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 1 Loop: & L.D & F0, 0 (R1) & & L.D to ADD.D: 1 Cycle \\
\hline 2 & L. D & F6,-8(R1) & & ADD.D to S.D: 2 Cycles \\
\hline 3 & L. D & F10,-16(R1) & & \\
\hline 4 & L. D & F14,-24 (R1) & & \\
\hline 5 & ADD. D & F4,F0, F2 & & \\
\hline 6 & ADD. D & F8,F6,F2 & & \\
\hline 7 & ADD. D & F12,F10,F2 & & \\
\hline 8 & ADD. D & F16,F14,F2 & & \\
\hline 9 & S.D & 0 (R1), F4 & & \\
\hline 10 & S.D & -8(R1) , F8 & & \\
\hline 11 & S.D & -16(R1) , F12 & & \\
\hline 12 & DSUBUI & R1,R1,\#32 & & \\
\hline 13 & BNEZ & R1, LOOP & & \\
\hline 14 & S.D & \(8(\mathrm{R} 1), \mathrm{F} 16\) & ; 8-32 & \(=-24\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Problems with 1st Generation VLIW}
- Increase in code size
- generating enough operations in a straight-line code fragment requires ambitiously unrolling loops
- whenever VLIW instructions are not full, unused functional units translate to wasted bits in instruction encoding
- Operated in lock-step; no hazard detection HW
- a stall in any functional unit pipeline caused entire processor to stall, since all functional units must be kept synchronized
- Compiler might predict function units, but caches hard to predict
- Binary code compatibility
- Pure VLIW => different numbers of functional units and unit latencies require different versions of the code
- Modern microarchitectures:
- Dynamic scheduling + multiple issue + speculation
- Two approaches:
- Assign reservation stations and update pipeline control table in half clock cycles
- Only supports 2 instructions/clock
- Design logic to handle any possible dependencies between the instructions
- Issue logic is the bottleneck in dynamically scheduled superscalars

\section*{Multiple Issue}
- Examine all the dependencies among the instructions in the bundle
- If dependencies exist in bundle, encode them in reservation stations
- Also need multiple completion/commit
- To simplify RS allocation:
- Limit the number of instructions of a given class that can be issued in a "bundle", i.e. on FP, one integer, one load, one store

\section*{Example (No Speculation)}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Iteration number & Instruc & ctions & Issues at clock cycle number & Executes at clock cycle number & Memory access at clock cycle number & Write CDB at clock cycle number & Comment \\
\hline 1 & 1 d & x2.0(x1) & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & Finst issue \\
\hline 1 & addi & \(\times 2, \times 2,1\) & 1 & 5 & & 6 & Wait for 1d \\
\hline 1 & sd & x2,0(x1) & 2 & 3 & 7 & & Wait for addi \\
\hline 1 & addi & \(\times 1 . \times 1.8\) & 2 & 3 & & 4 & Execute directly \\
\hline 1 & bne & x2, x3,Loop & 3 & 7 & & & Wait for addi \\
\hline 2 & 1 d & x2,0(x1) & 4 & 8 & 9 & 10 & Wait for bne \\
\hline 2 & addi & x2, x2, & 4 & 11 & & 12 & Wait for 1d \\
\hline 2 & sd & \(\times 2,0(x 1)\) & 5 & 9 & 13 & & Wait for addi \\
\hline 2 & addi & \(\times 1, \times 1,8\) & 5 & 8 & & 9 & Wait for bne \\
\hline 2 & bne & x2, x3,Loop & 6 & 13 & & & Wait for addi \\
\hline 3 & 1 d & \(\times 2.0(\times 1)\) & 7 & 14 & 15 & 16 & Wait for bne \\
\hline 3 & addi & \(\times 2 . \times 2,1\) & 7 & 17 & & 18 & Wait for 1 d \\
\hline 3 & sd & x2,0(x1) & 8 & 15 & 19 & & Wait for addi \\
\hline 3 & addi & \(\times 1 . \times 1.8\) & 8 & 14 & & 15 & Wait for bne \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Overview of Design


\section*{Example}
\begin{tabular}{rlr} 
Loop: & ld \(\mathrm{x} 2,0(\mathrm{x} 1)\) & \(/ / \mathrm{x} 2=\) array element \\
& addi \(\mathrm{x} 2, \mathrm{x} 2,1\) & //increment x 2 \\
& sd \(\mathrm{x} 2,0(\mathrm{x} 1)\) & //store result \\
& addi \(\mathrm{x} 1, \mathrm{x} 1,8\) & //increment pointer \\
& bne \(\mathrm{x} 2, \mathrm{x} 3\), Loop & //branch if not last
\end{tabular}

Example (Multiple Issue with Speculation)


\section*{Branch-Target Buffer}
- Need high instruction bandwidth
- Branch-Target buffers
- Next PC prediction buffer, indexed by current PC


\section*{Return Address Predictor}
- Most unconditional branches come from function returns
- The same procedure can be called from multiple sites
- Causes the buffer to potentially forget about the return address from previous calls
- Create return address buffer organized as a stack

\section*{Integrated Instruction Fetch Unit}
- Design monolithic unit that performs:
- Branch prediction
- Instruction prefetch
- Fetch ahead
- Instruction memory access and buffering
- Deal with crossing cache lines

\section*{Branch Folding}
- Optimization:
- Larger branch-target buffer
- Add target instruction into buffer to deal with longer decoding time required by larger buffer
- "Branch folding"

Return Address Predictor


\section*{Register Renaming}
- Register renaming vs. reorder buffers

Instead of virtual registers from reservation stations and reorder buffer, create a single register pool
- Contains visible registers and virtual registers
- Use hardware-based map to rename registers during issue
- WAW and WAR hazards are avoided

Speculation recovery occurs by copying during commit
- Still need a ROB-like queue to update table in order
- Simplifies commit:
- Record that mapping between architectural register and physical register is no longer speculative
- Free up physical register used to hold older value
- In other words: SWAP physical registers on commit

Physical register de-allocation is more difficult
- Simple approach: deallocate virtual register when next instruction writes to its mapped architecturally-visibly register

\section*{Integrated Issue and Renaming}
- Combining instruction issue with register renaming:
- Issue logic pre-reserves enough physical registers for the bundle
- Issue logic finds dependencies within bundle, maps registers as necessary
Issue logic finds dependencies between current bundle and already in-flight bundles, maps registers as necessary
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Instr. 4 & Instruction & Physical register assigned or destination & Instruction with physical register numbers & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Rename map } \\
& \text { changes }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1 & add \(\times 1 . \times 2 . \times 3\) & p32 & add p32.p2.p3 & x1-> p32 \\
\hline 2 & sub \(\times 1, \times 1, \times 2\) & p33 & sub p33.p32.p2 & x1->p33 \\
\hline 3 & add \(\times 2, \times 1, \times 2\) & p34 & add p34,p33,x2 & \(x 2 \cdot \mathrm{p} 44\) \\
\hline 4 & sub \(\times 1 . \times 3, \times 2\) & p35 & sub p35.p3.p34 & x1->p35 \\
\hline 5 & add \(\times 1 . \times 1, \times 2\) & p36 & add p36.p35.p34 & \(x 1->p^{36}\) \\
\hline 6 & sub \(\times 1 \times \times 3 \times 1\) & p37 & sub p37.p3.p36 & x1->p37 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

How Much Speculation?


\section*{Fallacies and Pitfalls}
- It is easy to predict the performance/energy efficiency of two different versions of the same ISA if we hold the technology constant


\section*{How Much Speculation?}
- How much to speculate
- Mis-speculation degrades performance and power relative to no speculation
- May cause additional misses (cache, TLB)
- Prevent speculative code from causing higher costing misses (e.g. L2)
- Speculating through multiple branches
- Complicates speculation recovery
- Speculation and energy efficiency
- Note: speculation is only energy efficient when it significantly improves performance

\section*{Energy Efficiency}
- Value prediction
- Uses:
- Loads that load from a constant pool
- Instruction that produces a value from a small set of values
- Not incorporated into modern processors
- Similar idea--address aliasing prediction--is used on some processors to determine if two stores or a load and a store reference the same address to allow for reordering

\section*{Fallacies and Pitfalls}
- Processors with lower CPIs / faster clock rates will also be faster


\footnotetext{
- Pentium 4 had higher clock, lower CPI
- Itanium had same CPI, lower clock
}

\section*{Fallacies and Pitfalls}
- Sometimes bigger and dumber is better
- Pentium 4 and Itanium were advanced designs, but could not achieve their peak instruction throughput because of relatively small caches as compared to i7
- And sometimes smarter is better than bigger and dumber
- TAGE branch predictor outperforms gshare with less stored predictions

Fallacies and Pitfalls
```


[^0]:    - Loop unrolling

    Unroll by a factor of 4 (assume \# of elements is divisible by 4)
    Eliminate unnecessary instructions
    Loop: fld f0,0(x)
    fadd.d $\quad \mathrm{f} 4, \mathrm{f0} 0 \mathrm{f} 2$
    fsd $\quad 4,0(\mathrm{x} 1) / /$ drop addi $\&$ bne
    fld $\quad \mathrm{f} 6,-8(\mathrm{x} 1)$
    fsd $\quad \mathrm{f8},-8(\mathrm{x} 1) / /$ drop addi $\&$ bne
    fld $\quad \mathrm{f0},-16(\mathrm{xl})$
    fadd.d fl2,f0,f2
    fsd $\quad \mathrm{fl2},-16(\mathrm{x} 1) / /$ drop addi \& bne
    fld fl4,-24(x1)
    fadd.d f16,f14,f2 note: number of
    $\begin{array}{ll}\text { fsd } \\ \text { addi } & \mathrm{fl} 6,-24(\mathrm{x} 1) \\ \mathrm{x} 1, \mathrm{x} 1,-32\end{array} \quad$ live registers vs
    $\begin{array}{lll}\text { addi } & \mathrm{xl}, \mathrm{x} 1,-32 & \text { original loop } \\ \text { bne } & \mathrm{x} 1, \mathrm{x} 2, \text { Loop }\end{array}$

