

# Branch Prediction


*Joel Emer*

Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory  
M.I.T.

# Control Flow Penalty

*Modern processors may have > 10 pipeline stages between next PC calculation and branch resolution!*

*How much work is lost if pipeline doesn't follow correct instruction flow?*



# Average Run-Length between Branches

---

Average dynamic instruction mix of SPEC CPU 2017  
[[Limaye and Adegbiya, ISPASS'18](#)]:

	SPECint	SPECfp
Branches	19 %	11 %
Loads	24 %	26 %
Stores	10 %	7 %
Other	47 %	56 %

SPECint17: *perlbench, gcc, mcf, omnetpp, xalancbmk, x264, deepsjeng, leela, exchange2, xz*

SPECfp17: *bwaves, cactus, lbm, wrf, pop2, imagick, nab, fotonik3d, roms*

*What is the average run length between branches?*

# MIPS Branches and Jumps

---

Each instruction fetch depends on one or two pieces of information from the preceding instruction:

- 1) Is the preceding instruction a taken branch?
- 2) If so, what is the target address?


<i>Instruction</i>	<i>Taken known?</i>	<i>Target known?</i>
J		
JR		
BEQZ/BNEZ		

\*Assuming zero detect on register read

# Example Branch Penalties

---

UltraSPARC-III instruction fetch pipeline stages  
(in-order issue, 4-way superscalar, 750MHz, 2000)



# Reducing Control Flow Penalty

---

- Software solutions
  - *Eliminate branches – loop unrolling*  
Increases run length between branches
  - *Reduce resolution time – instruction scheduling*  
Compute the branch condition as early as possible  
(of limited value)
- Hardware solutions
  - Bypass – usually results are used immediately
  - Change architecture – find something else to do
    - Delay slots* – replace pipeline bubbles with useful work  
(requires software cooperation)
  - *Speculate – branch prediction*  
*Speculative execution* of instructions beyond the branch

# Branch Prediction

---

## *Motivation:*

Branch penalties limit performance of deeply pipelined processors

Modern branch predictors have high accuracy (>95%) and can reduce branch penalties significantly

## *Required hardware support:*

### *Prediction structures:*

- Branch history tables, branch target buffers, etc.


### *Mispredict recovery mechanisms:*

- *Keep result computation separate from commit*
- Kill instructions following branch in pipeline
- Restore state to state following branch

# Static Branch Prediction

---

Overall probability a branch is taken is ~60-70% but:



ISA can attach preferred direction semantics to branches,  
e.g., Motorola MC88110

*bne0 (preferred taken) beq0 (not taken)*


ISA can allow arbitrary choice of statically predicted direction,  
e.g., HP PA-RISC, Intel IA-64

typically reported as ~80% accurate



# Dynamic Prediction

---



- Operations
- Predict
  - Update

Prediction as a feedback control process

# Dynamic Branch Prediction

*Learning based on past behavior*

---

## *Temporal correlation*

The way a branch resolves may be a good predictor of the way it will resolve at the next execution

## *Spatial correlation*

Several branches may resolve in a highly correlated manner (*a preferred path of execution*)

# Predictor Primitive

Emer & Gloy, 1997


---

- Indexed table holding values

- Operations

- Predict
- Update

- Algebraic notation




$$\text{Prediction} = P[\text{Width}, \text{Depth}](\text{Index}; \text{Update})$$

# One-bit Predictor

*aka Branch History Table (BHT)*

---

Simple temporal prediction



$$A_{21064}(PC; T) = P[1, 2K](PC; T)$$

*What happens on loop branches?*

# Two-bit Predictor

*Smith, 1981*

---

- Use two bits per entry instead of one bit
- Manage them as a saturating counter:

On not-taken ↕	↗ On taken	1	1	Strongly taken
		1	0	Weakly taken
		0	1	Weakly not-taken
		0	0	Strongly not-taken


- Direction prediction changes only after two wrong predictions

*How many mispredictions per loop? \_\_\_\_\_*

# Two-bit Predictor

*Smith, 1981*


---



$\text{Counter}[W,D](I; T) = P[W, D](I; \text{if } T \text{ then } P+1 \text{ else } P-1)$

$A21164(PC; T) = \text{MSB}(\text{Counter}[2, 2K](PC; T))$

# Branch History Table



4K-entry BHT, 2 bits/entry, ~80-90% correct predictions

# Exploiting Spatial Correlation

*Yeh and Patt, 1992*

---

```
if (x[i] < 7) then
    y += 1;
if (x[i] < 5) then
    c -= 4;
```

If first condition false, second condition also false


*History register* records the direction of the last N branches executed by the processor



# History Registers

*aka Pattern History Table (PHT)*


---



$$\text{History}(\text{PC}; T) = P(\text{PC}; P \parallel T)$$

# Global-History Predictor

---




$$\text{GHist}(;T) = \text{MSB}(\text{Counter}(\text{History}(0, T); T))$$

*Can we take advantage of a pattern at a particular PC?*

# Local-History Predictor


---



$$\text{LHist}(\text{PC}; T) = \text{MSB}(\text{Counter}(\text{History}(\text{PC}; T); T))$$

*Can we take advantage of the global pattern at a particular PC?*

# Global-History Predictor with Per-PC Counters




$$\text{GHistPA}(\text{PC}; T) = \text{MSB}(\text{Counter}(\text{History}(0; T) || \text{PC}; T))$$

# Two-Level Branch Predictor


(Pentium Pro, 1995)

*Pentium Pro uses the result from the last two branches to select one of the four sets of BHT bits (~95% correct)*



# Choosing Predictors

---



$$\text{Chooser} = \text{MSB}(P(\text{PC}; P + (A==T) - (B==T)))$$


or

$$\text{Chooser} = \text{MSB}(P(\text{GHist}(\text{PC}; T); P + (A==T) - (B==T)))$$

# Tournament Branch Predictor

(Alpha 21264, 1996)


---



- Choice predictor learns whether best to use local or global branch history in predicting next branch
- Global history is speculatively updated but restored on mispredict
- Claim 90-100% success on range of applications

# TAGE predictor

Seznec & Michaud, 2006




$$\text{TAGE\_TREE}[L1, L2, L3](PC; T) = \text{TAGE}[L3](PC, \text{TAGE}[L2](PC, \text{TAGE}[L1](PC, \text{Bimodal}(PC; T); T); T); T)$$



# TAGE component

---



# TAGE predictor component

---

TAGE[L](PC, NEXT; T) =

idx = hash(PC, GHIST[L](;T))  
tag = hash'(PC, GHIST[L](;T))

TAGE.U = SA(idx, tag; ((TAGE == T) && (NEXT != T))?1:SA)  
TAGE.Counter = SA(idx, tag; T?SA+1:SA-1)


use\_me = TAGE.U && isStrong(TAGE.Counter)  
TAGE = use\_me?MSB(TAGE.Counter):NEXT

Notes:

- SA is a set-associative structure
- SA allocation occurs on mispredict (not shown)
- TAGE.U cleared on global counter saturation


# Limitations of branch predictors

Only predicts branch direction. Therefore, cannot redirect fetch stream until after branch target is determined.



*UltraSPARC-III fetch pipeline*

# Branch Target Buffer (untagged)




BP bits are stored with the predicted target address.

IF stage: *If (BP=taken) then  $nPC=target$  else  $nPC=PC+4$*   
later: *check prediction, if wrong then kill the instruction and update BTB & BPb, else update BPb*

# Address Collisions

Assume a  
128-entry  
BTB



What will be fetched after the instruction at 1028?

BTB prediction      =  
Correct target      =

⇒

# BTB is only for Control Instructions

---


BTB contains useful information for branch and jump instructions only

⇒ Do not update it for other instructions

For all other instructions the next PC is  $(PC)+4$  !

*How to achieve this effect without decoding the instruction?*


# Branch Target Buffer (tagged)



- Keep both the branch PC and target PC in the BTB
- PC+4 is fetched if match fails
- Only *taken* branches and jumps held in BTB
- Next PC determined *before* branch fetched and decoded

# Consulting BTB Before Decoding

---




- The match for PC=1028 fails and 1028+4 is fetched  
⇒ *eliminates false predictions after ALU instructions*
- BTB contains entries only for control transfer instructions  
⇒ *more room to store branch targets*



# Combining BTB and BHT

- BTB entries are considerably more expensive than BHT, but can redirect fetches at earlier stage in pipeline and can accelerate indirect branches (JR)
- BHT can hold many more entries and is more accurate



*BTB/BHT only updated after branch resolves in E stage*

# Uses of Jump Register (JR)

---

- Switch statements (jump to address of matching case)
- Dynamic function call (jump to run-time function address)
- Subroutine returns (jump to return address)

*How well does BTB work for each of these cases?*

# Subroutine Return Stack

---

Small structure to accelerate JR for subroutine returns, typically much more accurate than BTBs.


```
fa() { fb(); }
```

```
fb() { fc(); }
```

```
fc() { fd(); }
```

*Push call address when  
function call executed*

*Pop return address  
when subroutine  
return decoded*




*k entries  
(typically k=8-16)*

# Line Prediction

(Alpha 21[234]64)


---

- For superscalar, useful to predict next cache line(s) to fetch



- Line Predictor predicts line to fetch each cycle (tight loop)
  - Untagged BTB structure – Why?
  - 21464 was to predict 2 lines per cycle
- Icache fetches block, and predictors improve target prediction
- PC Calc checks accuracy of line prediction(s)

# Overview of Branch Prediction



Must speculation check always be correct?

*Next Lecture:  
Speculative Execution  
& Value Management*