

Instruction Pipelining and Hazards

Daniel Sanchez

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

Princeton challenge


- What problem arises if instructions and data reside in the same memory?

At least the instruction fetch and a Load (or Store) cannot be executed in the same cycle

Structural hazard


Princeton Microarchitecture

Datapath & Control



Two-State Controller:


Princeton Architecture



A flipflop can be used to remember the phase


Hardwired Controller:

Princeton Architecture




Princeton Microarchitecture

Datapath & Control for 2-cycles-per-instruction




Princeton Microarchitecture (redrawn)



Only one of the phases is active in any cycle
 ⇒ a lot of datapath is not in use at any given time

Princeton Microarchitecture

Overlapped execution



Can we overlap instruction fetch and execute?


Yes, unless IR contains a Load or Store

Which action should be prioritized? Execute

What do we do with Fetch? Stall it How?

Stalling the instruction fetch

Princeton Microarchitecture




When stall condition is indicated

- *don't fetch a new instruction and don't change the PC*
- *insert a nop in the IR*
- *set the Memory Address mux to ALU (not shown)*

What if IR contains a jump or branch instruction?

Need to stall on branches


Princeton Microarchitecture



When IR contains a jump or branch-taken

- *no "structural conflict" for the memory*
- *but we do not have the correct PC value in the PC*
- *memory cannot be used – Address Mux setting is irrelevant*
- *insert a nop in the IR*
- *insert the nextPC (branch-target) address in the PC*

Pipelined Princeton Microarchitecture



Pipelined Princeton: Control Table

Opcode	Stall	Ext Sel	B Src	Op Sel	Mem W	Reg W	WB Src	Reg Dst	PC Src1	PC Src2	IR Src	MAddr Src
ALU	no	*	Reg	Func	no	yes	ALU	rd	pc+4	npc	mem	pc
ALUi	no	sE ₁₆	Imm	Op	no	yes	ALU	rt	pc+4	npc	mem	pc
ALUiu	no	uE ₁₆	Imm	Op	no	yes	ALU	rt	pc+4	npc	mem	pc
LW	yes	sE ₁₆	Imm	+	no	yes	Mem	rt	pc+4	pc	nop	ALU
SW	yes	sE ₁₆	Imm	+	yes	no	*	*	pc+4	pc	nop	ALU
BEQZ _{z=1}	yes	sE ₁₆	*	0?	no	no	*	*	br	npc	nop	*
BEQZ _{z=0}	no	sE ₁₆	*	0?	no	no	*	*	pc+4	npc	mem	pc
J	yes	*	*	*	no	no	*	*	jabs	npc	nop	*
JAL	yes	*	*	*	no	yes	PC	R31	jabs	npc	nop	*
JR	yes	*	*	*	no	no	*	*	rind	npc	nop	*
JALR	yes	*	*	*	no	yes	PC	R31	rind	npc	nop	*
NOP	no	*	*	*	no	no	*	*	pc+4	npc	mem	pc

BSrc = Reg / Imm ; WBSrc = ALU / Mem / PC; IRSrc = nop/mem; MAddSrc = pc/ALU
 RegDst = rt / rd / R31; PCSrc1 = pc+4 / br / rind / jabs; PCSrc2 = pc/nPC

stall & IRSrc columns are identical


Pipelined Princeton Architecture

Clock: $t_{\text{C-Princeton}} > t_{\text{RF}} + t_{\text{ALU}} + t_{\text{M}} + t_{\text{WB}}$

CPI: $(1 - f) + 2f$ cycles per instruction
where f is the fraction of
instructions that cause a stall

What is a likely value of f ?

An Ideal Pipeline




- All objects go through the same stages
- No sharing of resources between any two stages
- Propagation delay through all pipeline stages is equal
- The scheduling of an object entering the pipeline is not affected by the objects in other stages

These conditions generally hold for industrial assembly lines.

But what about an instruction pipeline?

Pipelined Datapath



Clock period can be reduced by dividing the execution of an instruction into multiple cycles

$$t_C > \max \{t_{IM}, t_{RF}, t_{ALU}, t_{DM}, t_{RW}\} \quad (= t_{DM} \text{ probably})$$

However, CPI will increase unless instructions are pipelined

How to divide the datapath into stages

Suppose memory is significantly slower than other stages. In particular, suppose

$$t_{IM} = 10 \text{ units}$$

$$t_{DM} = 10 \text{ units}$$


$$t_{ALU} = 5 \text{ units}$$

$$t_{RF} = 1 \text{ unit}$$

$$t_{RW} = 1 \text{ unit}$$

Since the slowest stage determines the clock, it may be possible to combine some stages without any loss of performance

Alternative Pipelining



$$t_C > \max \{t_{IM}, t_{RF}+t_{ALU}, t_{DM}+t_{RW}\} = t_{DM} + t_{RW}$$

⇒ increase the critical path by 10%

Write-back stage takes much less time than other stages.
Suppose we combined it with the memory phase

Maximum Speedup by Pipelining


Assumptions	Unpipelined t_c	Pipelined t_c	Speedup
1. $t_{IM} = t_{DM} = 10,$ $t_{ALU} = 5,$ $t_{RF} = t_{RW} = 1$ 4-stage pipeline	27	10	2.7
2. $t_{IM} = t_{DM} = t_{ALU} = t_{RF} = t_{RW} = 5$ 4-stage pipeline	25	10	2.5
3. $t_{IM} = t_{DM} = t_{ALU} = t_{RF} = t_{RW} = 5$ 5-stage pipeline	25	5	5.0

What seems to be the message here?

One can achieve higher speedup with more pipeline stages.


5-Stage Pipelined Execution

Instruction Flow Diagram




5-Stage Pipelined Execution

Resource Usage Diagram



Pipelined Execution:

ALU Instructions




Not quite correct!

We need an Instruction Reg (IR) for each stage

Pipelined MIPS Datapath

without jumps




What else is needed?

Control Points Need to Be Connected

How instructions can interact with each other in a pipeline

- An instruction in the pipeline may need a resource being used by another instruction in the pipeline → *structural hazard*
- An instruction may depend on something produced by an earlier instruction
 - Dependence may be for a data calculation
→ *data hazard*
 - Dependence may be for calculating the next PC
→ *control hazard (branches, interrupts)*

Data Hazards



...
 $r1 \leftarrow r0 + 10$
 $r4 \leftarrow r1 + 17$
 ...

r1 is stale. Oops!

Resolving Data Hazards

Strategy 1: *Wait for the result to be available by freezing earlier pipeline stages* → *stall*

Strategy 2: *Route data as soon as possible after it is calculated to the earlier pipeline stage* → *bypass*

Strategy 3: *Speculate* on the dependence

Two cases:

Guessed correctly → do nothing


Guessed incorrectly → kill and restart

Resolving Data Hazards (1)

Strategy 1:

*Wait for the result to be available by freezing earlier pipeline stages → **stall***


Feedback to Resolve Hazards





- Later stages provide dependence information to earlier stages which can *stall (or kill) instructions*
- Controlling a pipeline in this manner works provided *the instruction at stage $i+1$ can complete without any interference from instructions in stages 1 to i* (otherwise deadlocks may occur)

Resolving Data Hazards by Stalling

Stall Condition




Stalled Stages and Pipeline Bubbles



nop ⇒ *pipeline bubble*

Stall Control Logic



Compare the *source registers* of the instruction in the decode stage with the *destination register* of the *uncommitted instructions*.