

250P: Computer Systems Architecture

Lecture 8: Dynamic ILP Branch prediction

Anton Burtsev
October, 2019

Static vs Dynamic Scheduling


- Arguments against dynamic scheduling:
 - requires complex structures to identify independent instructions (scoreboards, issue queue)
 - high power consumption
 - low clock speed
 - high design and verification effort
 - the compiler can “easily” compute instruction latencies and dependences – complex software is always preferred to complex hardware (?)

ILP

- Instruction-level parallelism: overlap among instructions: pipelining or multiple instruction execution
- What determines the degree of ILP?
 - dependences: property of the program
 - hazards: property of the pipeline


Branch prediction

Pipeline without Branch Predictor



In the 5-stage pipeline, a branch completes in two cycles →
If the branch went the wrong way, one incorrect instr is fetched →
One stall cycle per incorrect branch

Pipeline with Branch Predictor



In the 5-stage pipeline, a branch completes in two cycles →
If the branch went the wrong way, one incorrect instr is fetched →
One stall cycle per incorrect branch

1-Bit Bimodal Prediction


- For each branch, keep track of what happened last time and use that outcome as the prediction
- What are prediction accuracies for branches 1 and 2 below:

```
while (1) {  
    for (i=0;i<10;i++) {                branch-1  
        ...  
    }  
    for (j=0;j<20;j++) {                branch-2  
        ...  
    }  
}
```

2-Bit Bimodal Prediction

- For each branch, maintain a 2-bit saturating counter:
if the branch is taken: $\text{counter} = \min(3, \text{counter} + 1)$
if the branch is not taken: $\text{counter} = \max(0, \text{counter} - 1)$
- If ($\text{counter} \geq 2$), predict taken, else predict not taken
- Advantage: a few atypical branches will not influence the prediction (a better measure of “the common case”)
- Especially useful when multiple branches share the same counter (some bits of the branch PC are used to index into the branch predictor)
- Can be easily extended to N-bits (in most processors, $N=2$)

Bimodal 1-Bit Predictor




The table keeps track of what the branch did last time

Correlating Predictors

- Basic branch prediction: maintain a 2-bit saturating counter for each entry (or use 10 branch PC bits to index into one of 1024 counters) – captures the recent “common case” for each branch
- Can we take advantage of additional information?
 - If a branch recently went 01111, expect 0; if it recently went 11101, expect 1; can we have a separate counter for each case?
 - If the previous branches went 01, expect 0; if the previous branches went 11, expect 1; can we have a separate counter for each case?


Hence, build **correlating predictors**

Global Predictor




Local Predictor

Also a two-level predictor that only uses local histories at the first level



Local Predictor




The table keeps track of the common-case outcome for the branch/local-history combo

Local/Global Predictors

- Instead of maintaining a counter for each branch to capture the common case,
 - Maintain a counter for each branch and surrounding pattern
 - If the surrounding pattern belongs to the branch being predicted, the predictor is referred to as a local predictor
 - If the surrounding pattern includes neighboring branches, the predictor is referred to as a global predictor

Tournament Predictors

- A local predictor might work well for some branches or programs, while a global predictor might work well for others
- Provide one of each and maintain another predictor to identify which predictor is best for each branch



Alpha 21264:
1K entries in level-1
1K entries in level-2

4K entries
12-bit global history

4K entries

Total capacity: ?

Thank you!