

Design of Digital Circuits

Lecture 17b: Branch Prediction

Prof. Onur Mutlu

ETH Zurich

Spring 2019

18 April 2019

Required Readings

■ This week

- ❑ Smith and Sohi, “The Microarchitecture of Superscalar Processors,” Proceedings of the IEEE, 1995
- ❑ H&H Chapters 7.8 and 7.9
- ❑ McFarling, “Combining Branch Predictors,” DEC WRL Technical Report, 1993.

Agenda for Today & Next Few Lectures

- Single-cycle Microarchitectures
- Multi-cycle and Microprogrammed Microarchitectures
- Pipelining
- Issues in Pipelining: Control & Data Dependence Handling, State Maintenance and Recovery, ...
- Out-of-Order Execution
- Other Execution Paradigms

Approaches to (Instruction-Level) Concurrency

- Pipelining
- Out-of-order execution
- Dataflow (at the ISA level)
- Superscalar Execution
- VLIW
- Fine-Grained Multithreading
- SIMD Processing (Vector and array processors, GPUs)
- Decoupled Access Execute
- Systolic Arrays

Control Dependence Handling

Control Dependence

- Question: What should the fetch PC be in the next cycle?
- Answer: The address of the next instruction
 - All instructions are control dependent on previous ones. Why?
- If the fetched instruction is a non-control-flow instruction:
 - Next Fetch PC is the address of the next-sequential instruction
 - Easy to determine if we know the size of the fetched instruction
- If the instruction that is fetched is a control-flow instruction:
 - How do we determine the next Fetch PC?
- In fact, how do we even know whether or not the fetched instruction is a control-flow instruction?

Branch Types


Type	Direction at fetch time	Number of possible next fetch addresses?	When is next fetch address resolved?
Conditional	Unknown	2	Execution (register dependent)
Unconditional	Always taken	1	Decode (PC + offset)
Call	Always taken	1	Decode (PC + offset)
Return	Always taken	Many	Execution (register dependent)
Indirect	Always taken	Many	Execution (register dependent)

Different branch types can be handled differently

How to Handle Control Dependences

- Critical to keep the pipeline full with correct sequence of dynamic instructions.
- Potential solutions if the instruction is a control-flow instruction:
 - **Stall** the pipeline until we know the next fetch address
 - Guess the next fetch address (**branch prediction**)
 - Employ delayed branching (**branch delay slot**)
 - Do something else (**fine-grained multithreading**)
 - Eliminate control-flow instructions (**predicated execution**)
 - Fetch from both possible paths (if you know the addresses of both possible paths) (**multipath execution**)

Stall Fetch Until Next PC is Known: Good Idea?



This is the case with non-control-flow and unconditional br instructions!

The Branch Problem


- Control flow instructions (branches) are frequent
 - 15-25% of all instructions
- Problem: Next fetch address after a control-flow instruction is not determined after N cycles in a pipelined processor
 - N cycles: (minimum) branch resolution latency
- If we are fetching W instructions per cycle (i.e., if the pipeline is W wide)
 - A branch misprediction leads to $N \times W$ wasted instruction slots

Importance of The Branch Problem


- Assume $N = 20$ (20 pipe stages), $W = 5$ (5 wide fetch)
- Assume: 1 out of 5 instructions is a branch
- Assume: Each 5 instruction-block ends with a branch
- How long does it take to fetch 500 instructions?
 - 100% accuracy
 - 100 cycles (all instructions fetched on the correct path)
 - No wasted work; $IPC = 500/100$
 - 99% accuracy
 - 100 (correct path) + $20 * 1$ (wrong path) = 120 cycles
 - 20% extra instructions fetched; $IPC = 500/120$
 - 90% accuracy
 - 100 (correct path) + $20 * 10$ (wrong path) = 300 cycles
 - 200% extra instructions fetched; $IPC = 500/300$
 - 60% accuracy
 - 100 (correct path) + $20 * 40$ (wrong path) = 900 cycles
 - 800% extra instructions fetched; $IPC = 500/900$

Branch Prediction

Branch Prediction: Guess the Next Instruction to Fetch



Misprediction Penalty




Simplest: Always Guess $\text{NextPC} = \text{PC} + 4$

- Always predict the next sequential instruction is the next instruction to be executed
- This is a form of **next fetch address prediction** (and branch prediction)
- How can you make this more effective?
- Idea: **Maximize the chances that the next sequential instruction is the next instruction to be executed**
 - Software: **Lay out the control flow graph such that the “likely next instruction” is on the not-taken path of a branch**
 - Profile guided code positioning → Pettis & Hansen, PLDI 1990.
 - Hardware: **???** (how can you do this in hardware...)
 - Cache traces of executed instructions → Trace cache


Guessing $\text{NextPC} = \text{PC} + 4$

- How else can you make this more effective?
- Idea: Get rid of control flow instructions (or minimize their occurrence)
- How?
 1. Get rid of unnecessary control flow instructions → combine predicates (predicate combining)
 2. Convert control dependences into data dependences → predicated execution

Branch Prediction: Always PC+4



Pipeline Flush on a Misprediction



$Inst_h$ is a branch

Performance Analysis

- correct guess \Rightarrow no penalty ~86% of the time
- incorrect guess \Rightarrow 2 bubbles
- Assume
 - no data dependency related stalls
 - 20% control flow instructions
 - 70% of control flow instructions are taken
 - $\text{CPI} = [1 + (0.20 * 0.7) * 2] =$
 $= [1 + 0.14 * 2] = 1.28$


probability of
a wrong guess

penalty for
a wrong guess

Can we reduce either of the two penalty terms?

Reducing Branch Misprediction Penalty


- Resolve branch condition and target address early




Branch Prediction (A Bit More Enhanced)

- Idea: Predict the next fetch address (to be used in the next cycle)
- Requires three things to be predicted at fetch stage:
 - Whether the fetched instruction is a branch
 - (Conditional) branch direction
 - Branch target address (if taken)
- Observation: Target address remains the same for a conditional direct branch across dynamic instances
 - Idea: Store the target address from previous instance and access it with the PC
 - Called Branch Target Buffer (BTB) or Branch Target Address Cache

Fetch Stage with BTB and Direction Prediction



More Sophisticated Branch Direction Prediction



Three Things to Be Predicted

- Requires three things to be predicted at fetch stage:

1. Whether the fetched instruction is a branch

2. (Conditional) branch direction

3. Branch target address (if taken)

- Third (3.) can be accomplished using a BTB
 - Remember target address computed last time branch was executed
- First (1.) can be accomplished using a BTB
 - If BTB provides a target address for the program counter, then it must be a branch
 - Or, we can store “branch metadata” bits in instruction cache/memory → partially decoded instruction stored in I-cache
- Second (2.): How do we predict the direction?

Simple Branch Direction Prediction Schemes

■ Compile time (static)

- ❑ Always not taken
- ❑ Always taken
- ❑ BTFN (Backward taken, forward not taken)
- ❑ Profile based (likely direction)

■ Run time (dynamic)

- ❑ Last time prediction (single-bit)

More Sophisticated Direction Prediction

■ Compile time (static)

- ❑ Always not taken
- ❑ Always taken
- ❑ BTFN (Backward taken, forward not taken)
- ❑ Profile based (likely direction)
- ❑ Program analysis based (likely direction)

■ Run time (dynamic)

- ❑ Last time prediction (single-bit)
- ❑ Two-bit counter based prediction
- ❑ Two-level prediction (global vs. local)
- ❑ Hybrid
- ❑ Advanced algorithms (e.g., using perceptrons)

Static Branch Prediction (I)

■ Always not-taken

- ❑ Simple to implement: no need for BTB, no direction prediction
- ❑ Low accuracy: ~30-40% (for conditional branches)
- ❑ Remember: Compiler can layout code such that the likely path is the “not-taken” path → more effective prediction

■ Always taken

- ❑ No direction prediction
- ❑ Better accuracy: ~60-70% (for conditional branches)
 - Backward branches (i.e. loop branches) are usually taken
 - Backward branch: target address lower than branch PC

■ Backward taken, forward not taken (BTFN)

- ❑ Predict backward (loop) branches as taken, others not-taken

Static Branch Prediction (II)

■ Profile-based

- Idea: Compiler determines likely direction for each branch using a profile run. Encodes that direction as a hint bit in the branch instruction format.

- + Per branch prediction (more accurate than schemes in previous slide) → accurate if profile is representative!
- Requires hint bits in the branch instruction format
- Accuracy depends on dynamic branch behavior:
 - TTTTTTTTTTTTNNNNNNNNNNNN → 50% accuracy
 - TNTNTNTNTNTNTNTNTNTNTN → 50% accuracy
- Accuracy depends on the representativeness of profile input set

Static Branch Prediction (III)

- Program-based (or, program analysis based)

- Idea: Use heuristics based on program analysis to determine statically-predicted direction
- Example opcode heuristic: Predict BLEZ as NT (negative integers used as error values in many programs)
- Example loop heuristic: Predict a branch guarding a loop execution as taken (i.e., execute the loop)
- Pointer and FP comparisons: Predict not equal

+ Does not require profiling

-- Heuristics might be not representative or good

-- Requires compiler analysis and ISA support (ditto for other static methods)

- Ball and Larus, "Branch prediction for free," PLDI 1993.

- 20% misprediction rate

Static Branch Prediction (IV)

■ Programmer-based

- Idea: Programmer provides the statically-predicted direction
- Via *pragmas* in the programming language that qualify a branch as likely-taken versus likely-not-taken

- + Does not require profiling or program analysis
- + Programmer may know some branches and their program better than other analysis techniques
- Requires programming language, compiler, ISA support
- Burdens the programmer?

Pragmas

- Idea: Keywords that enable a programmer to convey hints to lower levels of the transformation hierarchy
- `if (likely(x)) { ... }`
- `if (unlikely(error)) { ... }`
- Many other hints and optimizations can be enabled with pragmas
 - E.g., whether a loop can be parallelized
 - **#pragma omp parallel**
 - **Description**
 - The `omp parallel` directive explicitly instructs the compiler to parallelize the chosen segment of code.

Static Branch Prediction

- All previous techniques can be combined
 - Profile based
 - Program based
 - Programmer based

- How would you do that?

- What is the common disadvantage of all three techniques?
 - Cannot adapt to dynamic changes in branch behavior
 - This can be mitigated by a dynamic compiler, but not at a fine granularity (and a dynamic compiler has its overheads...)
 - What is a Dynamic Compiler?
 - A compiler that generates code at runtime: Remember Transmeta?
 - Java JIT (just in time) compiler, Microsoft CLR (common lang. runtime)

More Sophisticated Direction Prediction

■ Compile time (static)

- ❑ Always not taken
- ❑ Always taken
- ❑ BTFN (Backward taken, forward not taken)
- ❑ Profile based (likely direction)
- ❑ Program analysis based (likely direction)

■ Run time (dynamic)

- ❑ Last time prediction (single-bit)
- ❑ Two-bit counter based prediction
- ❑ Two-level prediction (global vs. local)
- ❑ Hybrid
- ❑ Advanced algorithms (e.g., using perceptrons)

Dynamic Branch Prediction

- Idea: Predict branches based on dynamic information (collected at run-time)
- Advantages
 - + Prediction based on history of the execution of branches
 - + It can adapt to dynamic changes in branch behavior
 - + No need for static profiling: input set representativeness problem goes away
- Disadvantages
 - More complex (requires additional hardware)

Last Time Predictor

- Last time predictor

- Single bit per branch (stored in BTB)
- Indicates which direction branch went last time it executed
TTTTTTTTTTTTNNNNNNNNNN → 90% accuracy

- Always mispredicts the last iteration and the first iteration of a loop branch


- Accuracy for a loop with N iterations = $(N-2)/N$

+ Loop branches for loops with large N (number of iterations)

-- Loop branches for loops with small N (number of iterations)


TNTNTNTNTNTNTNTNTN → 0% accuracy

Implementing the Last-Time Predictor



The 1-bit BHT (Branch History Table) entry is updated with the correct outcome after each execution of a branch

State Machine for Last-Time Prediction



Improving the Last Time Predictor


- Problem: A last-time predictor changes its prediction from $T \rightarrow NT$ or $NT \rightarrow T$ too quickly
 - even though the branch may be mostly taken or mostly not taken
- Solution Idea: Add hysteresis to the predictor so that prediction does not change on a single different outcome
 - Use two bits to track the history of predictions for a branch instead of a single bit
 - Can have 2 states for T or NT instead of 1 state for each
- Smith, "A Study of Branch Prediction Strategies," ISCA 1981.

Two-Bit Counter Based Prediction


- Each branch associated with a two-bit counter
 - One more bit provides hysteresis
 - A strong prediction does not change with one single different outcome
 - Accuracy for a loop with N iterations = $(N-1)/N$
TNTNTNTNTNTNTNTNTN \rightarrow 50% accuracy
(assuming counter initialized to weakly taken)
- + Better prediction accuracy
- More hardware cost (but counter can be part of a BTB entry)

State Machine for 2-bit Saturating Counter

- Counter using *saturating arithmetic*
 - Arithmetic with maximum and minimum values



Hysteresis Using a 2-bit Counter



Change prediction after 2 consecutive mistakes

Is This Good Enough?

- ~85-90% accuracy for **many** programs with 2-bit counter based prediction (also called **bimodal prediction**)
- Is this good enough?
- How big is the branch problem?

Let's Do the Exercise Again

- Assume $N = 20$ (20 pipe stages), $W = 5$ (5 wide fetch)
- Assume: 1 out of 5 instructions is a branch
- Assume: Each 5 instruction-block ends with a branch
- How long does it take to fetch 500 instructions?
 - 100% accuracy
 - 100 cycles (all instructions fetched on the correct path)
 - No wasted work; $IPC = 500/100$
 - 90% accuracy
 - 100 (correct path) + $20 * 10$ (wrong path) = 300 cycles
 - 200% extra instructions fetched; $IPC = 500/300$
 - 85% accuracy
 - 100 (correct path) + $20 * 15$ (wrong path) = 400 cycles
 - 300% extra instructions fetched; $IPC = 500/400$
 - 80% accuracy
 - 100 (correct path) + $20 * 20$ (wrong path) = 500 cycles
 - 400% extra instructions fetched; $IPC = 500/500$

Can We Do Better: Two-Level Prediction

- Last-time and 2BC predictors exploit “last-time” predictability
- Realization 1: A branch’s outcome can be correlated with other branches’ outcomes
 - Global branch correlation
- Realization 2: A branch’s outcome can be correlated with past outcomes of the same branch (other than the outcome of the branch “last-time” it was executed)
 - Local branch correlation

Global Branch Correlation (I)

- Recently executed branch outcomes in the execution path are correlated with the outcome of the next branch

```
if (cond1)
...
if (cond1 AND cond2)
```

- If first branch not taken, second also not taken

```
branch Y: if (cond1) a = 2;
...
branch X: if (a == 0)
```

- If first branch taken, second definitely not taken

Global Branch Correlation (II)

branch Y: if (cond1)

...

branch Z: if (cond2)

...

branch X: if (cond1 AND cond2)

- If Y and Z both taken, then X also taken
- If Y or Z not taken, then X also not taken

Global Branch Correlation (III)

- Eqntott, SPEC'92: Generates truth table from Boolean expr.

```
if (aa==2)                                ;; B1
    aa=0;
if (bb==2)                                ;; B2
    bb=0;
if (aa!=bb) {                             ;; B3
    ....
}
```


If **B1** is not taken (i.e., $aa==0@B3$) and **B2** is not taken (i.e. $bb=0@B3$) then **B3** is certainly taken

Capturing Global Branch Correlation

- Idea: Associate branch outcomes with “global T/NT history” of all branches
- Make a prediction based on the outcome of the branch the last time the same global branch history was encountered
- Implementation:
 - Keep track of the “global T/NT history” of all branches in a register → Global History Register (GHR)
 - Use GHR to index into a table that recorded the outcome that was seen for each GHR value in the recent past → Pattern History Table (table of 2-bit counters)
- Global history/branch predictor
- Uses two levels of history (GHR + history at that GHR)

Two Level Global Branch Prediction

- First level: **Global branch history register** (N bits)
 - The direction of last N branches
- Second level: **Table of saturating counters** for each history entry
 - The direction the branch took the last time the same history was seen



How Does the Global Predictor Work?

```
for (i=0; i<100; i++)  
    for (j=0; j<3; j++)
```

After the initial startup time, the conditional branches have the following behavior, assuming GR is shifted to the left:

test	value	GR	result
j<3	j=1	1101	taken
j<3	j=2	1011	taken
j<3	j=3	0111	not taken
i<100		1110	usually taken

This branch tests i
Last 4 branches test j
History: TTTN
Predict taken for i
Next history: TTNT
(shift in last outcome)


- McFarling, “Combining Branch Predictors,” DEC WRL TR 1993.

Intel Pentium Pro Branch Predictor

- Two level global branch predictor
- 4-bit global history register
- Multiple pattern history tables (of 2 bit counters)
 - Which pattern history table to use is determined by lower order bits of the branch address


Improving Global Predictor Accuracy

- Idea: Add more context information to the global predictor to take into account which branch is being predicted
 - **Gshare predictor**: GHR hashed with the Branch PC
 - + More context information
 - + Better utilization of PHT
 - Increases access latency




- McFarling, “**Combining Branch Predictors**,” DEC WRL Tech Report, 1993.


Review: One-Level Branch Predictor



Two-Level Global History Branch Predictor



Two-Level Gshare Branch Predictor



Can We Do Better: Two-Level Prediction

- Last-time and 2BC predictors exploit only “last-time” predictability for a given branch
- Realization 1: A branch’s outcome can be correlated with other branches’ outcomes
 - Global branch correlation
- Realization 2: A branch’s outcome can be correlated with past outcomes of the same branch (in addition to the outcome of the branch “last-time” it was executed)
 - Local branch correlation

Local Branch Correlation

```
for (i=1; i<=4; i++) { }
```

If the loop test is done at the end of the body, the corresponding branch will execute the pattern $(1110)^n$, where 1 and 0 represent taken and not taken respectively, and n is the number of times the loop is executed. Clearly, if we knew the direction this branch had gone on the previous three executions, then we could always be able to predict the next branch direction.


- McFarling, “Combining Branch Predictors,” DEC WRL TR 1993.

More Motivation for Local History

- To predict a loop branch “perfectly”, we want to identify the last iteration of the loop
- By having a separate PHT entry for each local history, we can distinguish different iterations of a loop
- Works for “short” loops

Loop closing branch's history

11101110111011101110




Capturing Local Branch Correlation

- Idea: Have a per-branch history register
 - Associate the predicted outcome of a branch with “T/NT history” of the same branch
- Make a prediction based on the outcome of the branch the last time the same local branch history was encountered
- Called the local history/branch predictor
- Uses two levels of history (Per-branch history register + history at that history register value)


Two Level Local Branch Prediction

- First level: A set of local history registers (N bits each)
 - Select the history register based on the PC of the branch
- Second level: Table of saturating counters for each history entry
 - The direction the branch took the last time the same history was seen



Two-Level Local History Branch Predictor

Which directions earlier instances of *this branch* went




Can We Do Even Better?

- Predictability of branches varies
- Some branches are more predictable using local history
- Some using global
- For others, a simple two-bit counter is enough
- Yet for others, a bit is enough
- Observation: There is heterogeneity in predictability behavior of branches
 - No one-size fits all branch prediction algorithm for all branches
- Idea: Exploit that heterogeneity by designing heterogeneous branch predictors

Hybrid Branch Predictors

- Idea: Use more than one type of predictor (i.e., multiple algorithms) and select the “best” prediction
 - E.g., hybrid of 2-bit counters and global predictor
- Advantages:
 - + Better accuracy: different predictors are better for different branches
 - + Reduced **warmup** time (faster-warmup predictor used until the slower-warmup predictor warms up)
- Disadvantages:
 - Need “meta-predictor” or “selector”
 - Longer access latency
- McFarling, “**Combining Branch Predictors**,” DEC WRL Tech Report, 1993.

Alpha 21264 Tournament Predictor



- Minimum branch penalty: 7 cycles
- Typical branch penalty: 11+ cycles
- 48K bits of target addresses stored in I-cache
- Predictor tables are reset on a context switch
- Kessler, "The Alpha 21264 Microprocessor," IEEE Micro 1999.

Are We Done w/ Branch Prediction?

- Hybrid branch predictors work well
 - E.g., 90-97% prediction accuracy on average
- Some “difficult” workloads still suffer, though!
 - E.g., gcc
 - Max IPC with tournament prediction: 9
 - Max IPC with perfect prediction: 35

Some Other Branch Predictor Types

- **Loop branch detector and predictor**
 - ❑ Loop iteration count detector/predictor
 - ❑ Works well for loops with small number of iterations, where iteration count is predictable
 - ❑ Used in Intel Pentium M
- **Perceptron branch predictor**
 - ❑ Learns the *direction correlations* between individual branches
 - ❑ Assigns weights to correlations
 - ❑ Jimenez and Lin, “[Dynamic Branch Prediction with Perceptrons](#),” HPCA 2001.
- **Hybrid history length based predictor**
 - ❑ Uses different tables with different history lengths
 - ❑ Seznec, “[Analysis of the O-Geometric History Length branch predictor](#),” ISCA 2005.

Intel Pentium M Predictors

The advanced branch prediction in the Pentium M processor is based on the Intel Pentium[®] 4 processor's [6] branch predictor. On top of that, two additional predictors to capture special program flows, were added: a Loop Detector and an Indirect Branch Predictor.




Figure 2: The Loop Detector logic




Figure 3: The Indirect Branch Predictor logic

Gochman et al.,


“**The Intel Pentium M Processor: Microarchitecture and Performance,**”
Intel Technology Journal, May 2003.

Perceptrons for Learning Linear Functions

- A perceptron is a simplified model of a biological neuron
- It is also a simple **binary classifier**
- A perceptron maps an input vector X to a 0 or 1
 - Input = Vector X
 - Perceptron learns the linear function (if one exists) of how each element of the vector affects the output (stored in an internal Weight vector)
 - Output = $\text{Weight} \cdot X + \text{Bias} > 0$
- In the branch prediction context
 - Vector X : Branch history register bits
 - Output: Prediction for the current branch

Perceptron Branch Predictor (I)

- Idea: Use a perceptron to learn the correlations between branch history register bits and branch outcome
- A perceptron learns a target Boolean function of N inputs



Each branch associated with a perceptron

A perceptron contains a set of weights w_i
→ Each weight corresponds to a bit in the GHR

→ How much the bit is correlated with the direction of the branch

→ Positive correlation: large + weight

→ Negative correlation: large - weight

Prediction:


→ Express GHR bits as 1 (T) and -1 (NT)

→ Take dot product of GHR and weights

→ If output > 0, predict taken

- Jimenez and Lin, “Dynamic Branch Prediction with Perceptrons,” HPCA 2001.
- Rosenblatt, “Principles of Neurodynamics: Perceptrons and the Theory of Brain Mechanisms,” 1962

Perceptron Branch Predictor (II)



Prediction function:

Dot product of GHR and perceptron weights

$$y = w_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i w_i$$

Output compared to 0

Bias weight (bias of branch, independent of the history)

Training function:

```

if sign( $y_{out}$ )  $\neq t$  or  $|y_{out}| \leq \theta$  then
    for  $i := 0$  to  $n$  do
         $w_i := w_i + tx_i$ 
    end for
end if
    
```

Perceptron Branch Predictor (III)

- Advantages

- + More sophisticated learning mechanism → better accuracy

- Disadvantages

- Hard to implement (adder tree to compute perceptron output)

- Can learn only linearly-separable functions

- e.g., cannot learn XOR type of correlation between 2 history bits and branch outcome

Prediction Using Multiple History Lengths

- Observation: Different branches require different history lengths for better prediction accuracy

- Idea: Have multiple PHTs indexed with GHRs with different history lengths and intelligently allocate PHT entries to different branches





Figure 1: A 5-component TAGE predictor synopsis: a base predictor is backed with several tagged predictor components indexed with increasing history lengths

Seznec and Michaud, “A case for (partially) tagged Geometric History Length Branch Prediction,” JILP 2006.

State of the Art in Branch Prediction

- See the Branch Prediction Championship
 - <https://www.jilp.org/cbp2016/program.html>



Andre Seznec,
"TAGE-SC-L branch predictors,"
CBP 2014.

Andre Seznec,
"TAGE-SC-L branch predictors
again," CBP 2016.

Figure 1. The TAGE-SC-L predictor: a TAGE predictor backed with a Statistical Corrector predictor and a loop predictor

Branch Confidence Estimation

- Idea: Estimate if the prediction is likely to be correct
 - i.e., estimate how “confident” you are in the prediction
- Why?
 - Could be very useful in deciding how to speculate:
 - What predictor/PHT to choose/use
 - Whether to keep fetching on this path
 - Whether to switch to some other way of handling the branch, e.g. dual-path execution (eager execution) or dynamic predication
 - ...
- Jacobsen et al., “Assigning Confidence to Conditional Branch Predictions,” MICRO 1996.

Other Ways of Handling Branches

How to Handle Control Dependences


- Critical to keep the pipeline full with correct sequence of dynamic instructions.
- Potential solutions if the instruction is a control-flow instruction:
 - Stall the pipeline until we know the next fetch address
 - Guess the next fetch address (branch prediction)
 - Employ delayed branching (branch delay slot)
 - Do something else (fine-grained multithreading)
 - Eliminate control-flow instructions (predicated execution)
 - Fetch from both possible paths (if you know the addresses of both possible paths) (multipath execution)

Delayed Branching (I)

- Change the semantics of a branch instruction
 - Branch after N instructions
 - Branch after N cycles
- Idea: Delay the execution of a branch. N instructions (delay slots) that come after the branch are **always** executed regardless of branch direction.
- Problem: How do you find instructions to fill the delay slots?
 - Branch must be independent of delay slot instructions
- Unconditional branch: Easier to find instructions to fill the delay slot
- Conditional branch: Condition computation should not depend on instructions in delay slots → difficult to fill the delay slot

Delayed Branching (II)

Normal code:




Timeline:

if	ex
----	----

A	
B	A
C	B
BC	C
--	BC
G	--

6 cycles

Delayed branch code:



Timeline:

if	ex
----	----


A	
C	A
BC	C
B	BC
G	B

5 cycles


Fancy Delayed Branching (III)

- Delayed branch with squashing
 - In SPARC
 - Semantics: If the branch falls through (i.e., it is **not taken**), the delay slot instruction is **not** executed
 - Why could this help?


Normal code:



Delayed branch code:



Delayed branch w/ squashing:



Delayed Branching (IV)

■ Advantages:

+ Keeps the pipeline full with useful instructions in a simple way assuming

1. Number of delay slots == number of instructions to keep the pipeline full before the branch resolves

2. All delay slots can be filled with useful instructions

■ Disadvantages:

-- Not easy to fill the delay slots (even with a 2-stage pipeline)

1. Number of delay slots increases with pipeline depth, superscalar execution width

2. Number of delay slots should be variable with variable latency operations. Why?

-- Ties ISA semantics to hardware implementation


-- SPARC, MIPS, HP-PA: 1 delay slot

-- What if pipeline implementation changes with the next design?


An Aside: Filling the Delay Slot

reordering data
independent
(RAW, WAW,
WAR)
instructions
does not change
program semantics

a. From before




Becomes




within same
basic block

b. From target




Becomes




For correctness:
add a new instruction
to the not-taken path?

c. From fall through



Becomes



For correctness:
add a new instruction
to the taken path?

Safe?

How to Handle Control Dependences

- Critical to keep the pipeline full with correct sequence of dynamic instructions.
- Potential solutions if the instruction is a control-flow instruction:
 - Stall the pipeline until we know the next fetch address
 - Guess the next fetch address (branch prediction)
 - Employ delayed branching (branch delay slot)
 - Do something else (fine-grained multithreading)
 - Eliminate control-flow instructions (predicated execution)
 - Fetch from both possible paths (if you know the addresses of both possible paths) (multipath execution)

Predicate Combining (*not* Predicated Execution)

- Complex predicates are converted into multiple branches
 - if ((a == b) && (c < d) && (a > 5000)) { ... }
 - 3 conditional branches
- Problem: This increases the number of control dependencies
- Idea: Combine predicate operations to feed a single branch instruction instead of having one branch for each
 - Predicates stored and operated on using condition registers
 - A single branch checks the value of the combined predicate
- + Fewer branches in code → fewer mipredictions/stalls
- Possibly unnecessary work
 - If the first predicate is false, no need to compute other predicates
- Condition registers exist in IBM RS6000 and the POWER architecture

Predication (Predicated Execution)

- Idea: Convert control dependence to data dependence
- Simple example: Suppose we had a Conditional Move instruction...
 - CMOV condition, $R1 \leftarrow R2$
 - $R1 = (\text{condition} == \text{true}) ? R2 : R1$
 - Employed in most modern ISAs (x86, Alpha)
- Code example with branches vs. CMOVs
if (a == 5) {b = 4;} else {b = 3;}

CMPEQ condition, a, 5;

CMOV condition, b \leftarrow 4;



CMOV !condition, b \leftarrow 3;

Predication (Predicated Execution)



- Idea: Compiler converts control dependence into data dependence → branch is eliminated
 - Each instruction has a predicate bit set based on the predicate computation
 - Only instructions with TRUE predicates are committed (others turned into NOPs)

(normal branch code)

```
if (cond) {  
    b = 0;  
}  
else {  
    b = 1;  
}
```



(predicated code)



Predicated Execution References


- Allen et al., “Conversion of control dependence to data dependence,” POPL 1983.
- Kim et al., “Wish Branches: Combining Conditional Branching and Predication for Adaptive Predicated Execution,” MICRO 2005.

Conditional Move Operations

- Very limited form of predicated execution
- CMOV R1 \leftarrow R2
 - R1 = (ConditionCode == true) ? R2 : R1
 - Employed in most modern ISAs (x86, Alpha)


Predicated Execution (II)

- Predicated execution can be high performance and energy-efficient




Predicated Execution

Fetch Decode Rename Schedule RegisterRead Execute



Branch Prediction

Fetch Decode Rename Schedule RegisterRead Execute



Pipeline flush!!

Predicated Execution


- Eliminates branches → enables straight line code (i.e., larger basic blocks in code)
- Advantages
 - Eliminates hard-to-predict branches
 - Always-not-taken prediction works better (no branches)
 - Compiler has more freedom to optimize code (no branches)
 - control flow does not hinder inst. reordering optimizations
 - code optimizations hindered only by data dependencies
- Disadvantages
 - Useless work: some instructions fetched/executed but discarded (especially bad for easy-to-predict branches)
 - Requires additional ISA (and hardware) support
 - Can we eliminate all branches this way?

Predicated Execution vs. Branch Prediction

- + Eliminates mispredictions for hard-to-predict branches
 - + No need for branch prediction for some branches
 - + Good if misprediction cost > useless work due to predication
- Causes useless work for branches that are easy to predict
 - Reduces performance if misprediction cost < useless work
 - **Adaptivity**: Static predication is not adaptive to run-time branch behavior. Branch behavior changes based on input set, program phase, control-flow path.

Predicated Execution in Intel Itanium

- Each instruction can be separately predicated
- 64 one-bit predicate registers
 - each instruction carries a 6-bit predicate field
- An instruction is effectively a NOP if its predicate is false




Conditional Execution in the ARM ISA

- Almost all ARM instructions can include an optional condition code.
 - Prior to ARM v8
- An instruction with a condition code is executed only if the condition code flags in the CPSR meet the specified condition.

Conditional Execution in ARM ISA

31	2827				1615				87				0				<u>Instruction type</u>					
Cond	0	0	I	Opcode				S	Rn	Rd	Operand2								Data processing / PSR Transfer			
Cond	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	A	S	Rd	Rn	Rs	1	0	0	1	Rm	Multiply				
Cond	0	0	0	0	1	U	A	S	RdHi	RdLo	Rs	1	0	0	1	Rm	Long Multiply (v3M / v4 only)					
Cond	0	0	0	1	0	B	0	0	Rn	Rd	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	Rm	Swap		
Cond	0	1	I	P	U	B	W	L	Rn	Rd	Offset								Load/Store Byte/Word			
Cond	1	0	0	P	U	S	W	L	Rn	Register List										Load/Store Multiple		
Cond	0	0	0	P	U	1	W	L	Rn	Rd	Offset1	1	S	H	1	Offset2	Halfword transfer : Immediate offset (v4 only)					
Cond	0	0	0	P	U	0	W	L	Rn	Rd	0	0	0	0	1	S	H	1	Rm	Halfword transfer: Register offset (v4 only)		
Cond	1	0	1	L	Offset														Branch			
Cond	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	Rn	Branch Exchange (v4T only)
Cond	1	1	0	P	U	N	W	L	Rn	CRd	CPNum	Offset						Coprocessor data transfer				
Cond	1	1	1	0	Op1				CRn	CRd	CPNum	Op2	0	CRm			Coprocessor data operation					
Cond	1	1	1	0	Op1				L	CRn	Rd	CPNum	Op2	1	CRm			Coprocessor register transfer				
Cond	1	1	1	1	SWI Number														Software interrupt			


Conditional Execution in ARM ISA



Conditional Execution in ARM ISA

- * **To execute an instruction conditionally, simply postfix it with the appropriate condition:**
 - For example an add instruction takes the form:
 - `ADD r0,r1,r2 ; r0 = r1 + r2 (ADDAL)`
 - To execute this only if the zero flag is set:
 - `ADDEQ r0,r1,r2 ; If zero flag set then...`
`; ... r0 = r1 + r2`
- * **By default, data processing operations do not affect the condition flags (apart from the comparisons where this is the only effect). To cause the condition flags to be updated, the S bit of the instruction needs to be set by postfixing the instruction (and any condition code) with an “S”.**
 - For example to add two numbers and set the condition flags:
 - `ADDS r0,r1,r2 ; r0 = r1 + r2`
`; ... and set flags`

Conditional Execution in ARM ISA



* **Convert the GCD algorithm given in this flowchart into**

- 1) “Normal” assembler, where only branches can be conditional.
- 2) ARM assembler, where all instructions are conditional, thus improving code density.

* **The only instructions you need are CMP, B and SUB.**

Conditional Execution in ARM ISA

“Normal” Assembler

```
gcd    cmp r0, r1      ;reached the end?
        beq stop
        blt less       ;if r0 > r1
        sub r0, r0, r1  ;subtract r1 from r0
        bal gcd
less   sub r1, r1, r0   ;subtract r0 from r1
        bal gcd
stop
```

ARM Conditional Assembler

```
gcd    cmp    r0, r1      ;if r0 > r1
        subgt r0, r0, r1  ;subtract r1 from r0
        sublt r1, r1, r0  ;else subtract r0 from r1
        bne   gcd        ;reached the end?
```




How to Handle Control Dependences

- Critical to keep the pipeline full with correct sequence of dynamic instructions.
- Potential solutions if the instruction is a control-flow instruction:
 - **Stall** the pipeline until we know the next fetch address
 - Guess the next fetch address (**branch prediction**)
 - Employ delayed branching (**branch delay slot**)
 - Do something else (**fine-grained multithreading**)
 - Eliminate control-flow instructions (**predicated execution**)
 - Fetch from both possible paths (if you know the addresses of both possible paths) (**multipath execution**)

Multi-Path Execution

- Idea: Execute both paths after a conditional branch
 - For all branches: Riseman and Foster, “The inhibition of potential parallelism by conditional jumps,” IEEE Transactions on Computers, 1972.
 - For a hard-to-predict branch: Use dynamic confidence estimation
- Advantages:
 - + Improves performance if misprediction cost > useless work
 - + No ISA change needed
- Disadvantages:
 - What happens when the machine encounters another hard-to-predict branch? Execute both paths again?
 - Paths followed quickly become exponential
 - Each followed path requires its own context (registers, PC, GHR)
 - Wasted work (and reduced performance) if paths merge

Dual-Path Execution versus Predication



Handling Other Types of Branches

Remember: Branch Types

Type	Direction at fetch time	Number of possible next fetch addresses?	When is next fetch address resolved?
Conditional	Unknown	2	Execution (register dependent)
Unconditional	Always taken	1	Decode (PC + offset)
Call	Always taken	1	Decode (PC + offset)
Return	Always taken	Many	Execution (register dependent)
Indirect	Always taken	Many	Execution (register dependent)

How can we predict an indirect branch with many target addresses?

Call and Return Prediction

■ Direct calls are easy to predict

- Always taken, single target
- Call marked in BTB, target predicted by BTB

■ Returns are indirect branches

- A function can be called from many points in code
- A return instruction can have many target addresses
 - Next instruction after each call point for the same function
- Observation: Usually a return matches a call
- Idea: Use a stack to predict return addresses (Return Address Stack)
 - A fetched call: pushes the return (next instruction) address on the stack
 - A fetched return: pops the stack and uses the address as its predicted target
 - Accurate most of the time: 8-entry stack → > 95% accuracy

Call X

...

Call X

...

Call X

...


Return

Return


Return

Indirect Branch Prediction (I)

- Register-indirect branches have multiple targets



Conditional (Direct) Branch



Indirect Jump

- Used to implement
 - ❑ Switch-case statements
 - ❑ Virtual function calls
 - ❑ Jump tables (of function pointers)
 - ❑ Interface calls

Indirect Branch Prediction (II)

- No direction prediction needed
- Idea 1: Predict the last resolved target as the next fetch address
 - + Simple: Use the BTB to store the target address
 - Inaccurate: 50% accuracy (empirical). Many indirect branches switch between different targets
- Idea 2: Use history based target prediction
 - E.g., Index the BTB with GHR XORed with Indirect Branch PC
 - Chang et al., “Target Prediction for Indirect Jumps,” ISCA 1997.
 - + More accurate
 - An indirect branch maps to (too) many entries in BTB
 - Conflict misses with other branches (direct or indirect)
 - Inefficient use of space if branch has few target addresses

Intel Pentium M Indirect Branch Predictor

The advanced branch prediction in the Pentium M processor is based on the Intel Pentium® 4 processor's [6] branch predictor. On top of that, two additional predictors to capture special program flows, were added: a Loop Detector and an Indirect Branch Predictor.




Figure 2: The Loop Detector logic




Figure 3: The Indirect Branch Predictor logic

Gochman et al.,


“**The Intel Pentium M Processor: Microarchitecture and Performance,**”
Intel Technology Journal, May 2003.

Issues in Branch Prediction (I)

- Need to identify a branch before it is fetched
- How do we do this?
 - BTB hit → indicates that the fetched instruction is a branch
 - BTB entry contains the “type” of the branch
 - Pre-decoded “branch type” information stored in the instruction cache identifies type of branch
- What if no BTB?
 - Bubble in the pipeline until target address is computed
 - E.g., IBM POWER4

Latency of Branch Prediction

- **Latency:** Prediction is latency critical
 - ❑ Need to generate next fetch address for the next cycle
 - ❑ Bigger, more complex predictors are more accurate but slower



Design of Digital Circuits

Lecture 17b: Branch Prediction

Prof. Onur Mutlu

ETH Zurich

Spring 2019

18 April 2019

Approaches to (Instruction-Level) Concurrency


- Pipelining
- Out-of-order execution
- Dataflow (at the ISA level)
- Superscalar Execution
- VLIW
- Fine-Grained Multithreading
- SIMD Processing (Vector and array processors, GPUs)
- Decoupled Access Execute
- Systolic Arrays

VLIW

VLIW Concept

- Superscalar
 - **Hardware** fetches multiple instructions and checks dependencies between them
- VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word)
 - **Software (compiler) packs independent instructions** in a larger “instruction bundle” to be fetched and executed concurrently
 - Hardware fetches and executes the instructions in the bundle concurrently
- No need for hardware dependency checking between concurrently-fetched instructions in the VLIW model

VLIW Concept



- Fisher, “**Very Long Instruction Word architectures and the ELI-512,**” ISCA 1983.
 - ELI: Enormously longword instructions (512 bits)


VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word)

- A very long instruction word consists of multiple independent instructions packed together by the compiler
 - Packed instructions can be logically unrelated (contrast with SIMD/vector processors, which we will see soon)
- Idea: Compiler finds independent instructions and statically schedules (i.e. packs/bundles) them into a single VLIW instruction
- Traditional Characteristics
 - Multiple functional units
 - All instructions in a bundle are executed in lock step
 - Instructions in a bundle statically aligned to be directly fed into the functional units

VLIW Performance Example (2-wide bundles)

```
lw  $t0, 40($s0)
add $t1, $s1, $s2
sub $t2, $s1, $s3
and $t3, $s3, $s4
or  $t4, $s1, $s5
sw  $s5, 80($s0)
```

Ideal IPC = 2



Actual IPC = 2 (6 instructions issued in 3 cycles)

VLIW Lock-Step Execution

- Lock-step (all or none) execution: If any operation in a VLIW instruction stalls, all instructions stall
- In a truly VLIW machine, the compiler handles all dependency-related stalls, hardware does **not** perform dependency checking
 - What about variable latency operations?

VLIW Philosophy

- Philosophy similar to RISC (simple instructions and hardware)
 - Except multiple instructions in parallel
- RISC (John Cocke, 1970s, IBM 801 minicomputer)
 - Compiler does the hard work to translate high-level language code to simple instructions (John Cocke: control signals)
 - And, to reorder simple instructions for high performance
 - Hardware does little translation/decoding → very simple
- VLIW (Josh Fisher, ISCA 1983)
 - Compiler does the hard work to find instruction level parallelism
 - Hardware stays as simple and streamlined as possible
 - Executes each instruction in a bundle in lock step
 - Simple → higher frequency, easier to design

Commercial VLIW Machines

- Multiflow TRACE, Josh Fisher (7-wide, 28-wide)
- Cydrome Cydra 5, Bob Rau
- Transmeta Crusoe: x86 binary-translated into internal VLIW
- TI C6000, Trimedia, STMicro (DSP & embedded processors)
 - Most successful commercially
- Intel IA-64
 - Not fully VLIW, but based on VLIW principles
 - EPIC (Explicitly Parallel Instruction Computing)
 - Instruction bundles can have dependent instructions
 - A few bits in the instruction format specify explicitly which instructions in the bundle are dependent on which other ones

VLIW Tradeoffs

■ Advantages

- + No need for dynamic scheduling hardware → simple hardware
- + No need for dependency checking within a VLIW instruction → simple hardware for multiple instruction issue + no renaming
- + No need for instruction alignment/distribution after fetch to different functional units → simple hardware

■ Disadvantages

- Compiler needs to find N independent operations per cycle
 - If it cannot, inserts NOPs in a VLIW instruction
 - Parallelism loss AND code size increase
- Recompile required when execution width (N), instruction latencies, functional units change (Unlike superscalar processing)
- Lockstep execution causes independent operations to stall
 - No instruction can progress until the longest-latency instruction completes

VLIW Summary

- VLIW simplifies hardware, but requires complex compiler techniques
 - Solely-compiler approach of VLIW has several downsides that reduce performance
 - Too many NOPs (not enough parallelism discovered)
 - Static schedule intimately tied to microarchitecture
 - Code optimized for one generation performs poorly for next
 - No tolerance for variable or long-latency operations (lock step)
- ++ Most compiler optimizations developed for VLIW employed in optimizing compilers (for superscalar compilation)
- Enable code optimizations
- ++ VLIW successful when parallelism is easier to find by the compiler (traditionally embedded markets, DSPs)

An Example Work: Superblock

The Superblock: An Effective Technique for VLIW and Superscalar Compilation

Wen-mei W. Hwu Scott A. Mahlke William Y. Chen Pohua P. Chang

Nancy J. Warter Roger A. Bringmann Roland G. Ouellette Richard E. Hank

Tokuzo Kiyohara Grant E. Haab John G. Holm Daniel M. Lavery *

Hwu et al., [The superblock: An effective technique for VLIW and superscalar compilation.](#)
The Journal of Supercomputing, 1993.

- Lecture Video on Static Instruction Scheduling
 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=isBEVkIjgGA>

Another Example Work: IMPACT

IMPACT: An Architectural Framework for Multiple-Instruction-Issue Processors

Pohua P. Chang Scott A. Mahlke William Y. Chen Nancy J. Warter Wen-mei W. Hwu

Center for Reliable and High-Performance Computing
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

The performance of multiple-instruction-issue processors can be severely limited by the compiler's ability to generate efficient code for concurrent hardware. In the IMPACT project, we have developed IMPACT-I, a highly optimizing C compiler to exploit instruction level concurrency. The optimization capabilities of the IMPACT-I C compiler are summarized in this paper. Using the IMPACT-I C compiler, we ran experiments to analyze the performance of multiple-instruction-issue processors executing some important non-numerical programs. The multiple-instruction-issue processors achieve solid speedup over high-performance single-instruction-issue processors.

Approaches to (Instruction-Level) Concurrency

- Pipelining
- Out-of-order execution
- Dataflow (at the ISA level)
- Superscalar Execution
- VLIW
- Fine-Grained Multithreading
- SIMD Processing (Vector and array processors, GPUs)
- Decoupled Access Execute
- Systolic Arrays

Recall: How to Handle Data Dependences

- Anti and output dependences are easier to handle
 - write to the destination in one stage and in program order
- Flow dependences are more interesting
- Five fundamental ways of handling flow dependences
 - Detect and wait until value is available in register file
 - Detect and forward/bypass data to dependent instruction
 - Detect and eliminate the dependence at the software level
 - No need for the hardware to detect dependence
 - Predict the needed value(s), execute “speculatively”, and verify
 - Do something else (fine-grained multithreading)
 - No need to detect

How to Handle Control Dependences


- Critical to keep the pipeline full with correct sequence of dynamic instructions.
- **Potential solutions if the instruction is a control-flow instruction:**
 - Stall the pipeline until we know the next fetch address
 - Guess the next fetch address (branch prediction)
 - Employ delayed branching (branch delay slot)
 - Do something else (fine-grained multithreading)
 - Eliminate control-flow instructions (predicated execution)
 - Fetch from both possible paths (if you know the addresses of both possible paths) (multipath execution)

Fine-Grained Multithreading

Fine-Grained Multithreading

- Idea: Hardware has multiple thread contexts (PC+registers). Each cycle, fetch engine fetches from a different thread.
 - By the time the fetched branch/instruction resolves, no instruction is fetched from the same thread
 - Branch/instruction resolution latency overlapped with execution of other threads' instructions

- + No logic needed for handling control and data dependences within a thread
- Single thread performance suffers
- Extra logic for keeping thread contexts
- Does not overlap latency if not enough threads to cover the whole pipeline



Fine-Grained Multithreading (II)

- Idea: Switch to another thread every cycle such that no two instructions from a thread are in the pipeline concurrently
- Tolerates the control and data dependency latencies by overlapping the latency with useful work from other threads
- Improves pipeline utilization by taking advantage of multiple threads
- Thornton, “Parallel Operation in the Control Data 6600,” AFIPS 1964.
- Smith, “A pipelined, shared resource MIMD computer,” ICPP 1978.

Fine-Grained Multithreading: History

- CDC 6600's peripheral processing unit is fine-grained multithreaded
 - Thornton, “[Parallel Operation in the Control Data 6600](#),” AFIPS 1964.
 - Processor executes a different I/O thread every cycle
 - An operation from the same thread is executed every 10 cycles


- Denelcor HEP (Heterogeneous Element Processor)
 - Smith, “[A pipelined, shared resource MIMD computer](#),” ICPP 1978.
 - 120 threads/processor
 - available queue vs. unavailable (waiting) queue for threads
 - each thread can have only 1 instruction in the processor pipeline; each thread independent
 - to each thread, processor looks like a non-pipelined machine
 - system throughput vs. single thread performance tradeoff

Fine-Grained Multithreading in HEP


- Cycle time: 100ns
- 8 stages → 800 ns to complete an instruction
 - ❑ assuming no memory access
- No control and data dependency checking



Burton Smith
(1941-2018)



Multithreaded Pipeline Example



Sun Niagara Multithreaded Pipeline



Kongetira et al., "Niagara: A 32-Way Multithreaded Sparc Processor," IEEE Micro 2005.

Fine-grained Multithreading

■ Advantages


- + No need for dependency checking between instructions
(only one instruction in pipeline from a single thread)
- + No need for branch prediction logic
- + Otherwise-bubble cycles used for executing useful instructions from different threads
- + Improved system throughput, latency tolerance, utilization

■ Disadvantages


- Extra hardware complexity: multiple hardware contexts (PCs, register files, ...), thread selection logic
- Reduced single thread performance (one instruction fetched every N cycles from the same thread)
- Resource contention between threads in caches and memory
- Some dependency checking logic *between* threads remains (load/store)

Modern GPUs are FGMT Machines

NVIDIA GeForce GTX 285 “core”



64 KB of storage
for thread contexts
(registers)



= data-parallel (SIMD) func. unit,
control shared across 8 units

■ = multiply-add
■ = multiply




= instruction stream decode




= execution context storage

NVIDIA GeForce GTX 285 “core”



- Groups of 32 **threads** share instruction stream (each group is a Warp): they execute the same instruction on different data
- **Up to 32 warps are interleaved in an FGMT manner**
- Up to 1024 thread contexts can be stored

NVIDIA GeForce GTX 285



30 cores on the GTX 285: 30,720 threads

End of Fine-Grained Multithreading