Instruction Scheduling

Motivation

- instruction latency (pipelining) 
  several cycles to complete instruction
- instruction-level parallelism (VLIW, superscalar)
  execute multiple instructions per cycle

Issues

- reorder instructions to reduce execution time
- static schedule → insert NOPs
- dynamic schedule → pipeline stalls
- preserve correctness, improve performance
- interactions with optimizations

Sources of latency (hazards)

- data - operands depend on previous instruction
- structural - limited hardware resources
- control - targets of conditional branches
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Instruction Scheduling

Approach

- schedule after register allocation (postpass)
- model used to estimate execution time

A legal schedule

- assume each \( i \in \text{Instr} \) has \( \text{delay}(i) \)
- a legal schedule \( S \) maps each \( i \in \text{Instr} \) onto a non-negative integer representing its cycle number (i.e., time instruction is executed)
- if \( i_2 \) “depends” on \( i_1 \), \( S(i_1) + \text{delay}(i_1) \leq S(i_2) \)
- the length of schedule \( S \), denoted \( L(S) \), is
  \[
  L(S) = \max_{i \in \text{Instr}} (S(i) + \text{delay}(i))
  \]
- \( S \) is optimal if \( L(S) \leq L(T), \forall \text{legal schedules } T \)

Scope

- basic blocks (list scheduling)
- branches (trace scheduling, percolation)
- loops (unrolling, software pipelining)
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Data Dependences

Dependences ⇒ memory locations instead of values

Statement \( b \) depends on statement \( a \) if there exists:

- true or flow dependence
  \( a \) writes a location that \( b \) later reads  
  (read-after-write or RAW)

- anti-dependence
  \( a \) reads a location \( b \) later writes  
  (write-after-read or WAR)

- output dependence
  \( a \) writes a location that \( b \) later writes  
  (write-after-write or WAW)

Another dependence (doesn’t constrain ordering)

- input dependence
  \( a \) reads a location that \( b \) later reads  
  (read-after-read or RAR)

Example

```plaintext
// true       // anti       // output       // input
a = a         = a           a = a          = a
= a           a =           a =           = a
```

Precedence Graph

Construction

- instructions ⇒ nodes
- dependences ⇒ edges

Example \(<op> <dst, s1, s2>\)

1 load \( r1, X \)
2 load \( r2, Y \)
3 mult \( r3, r2, r1 \)
4 load \( r4, A \)
5 mult \( r2, r4, r1 \)
6 add \( r5, r2, r4 \)
7 mult \( r1, r2, r5 \)
8 load \( r3, B \)
9 add \( r7, r1, r3 \)

Renaming can eliminates anti & output dependences

```plaintext
a = a
= a
a = b
= a
```
**List Scheduling**

Algorithm
1. rename to eliminate anti/output dependences (optional)
2. construct precedence graph
3. assign priorities to instructions
4. iteratively select & schedule instructions
   (a) candidates ← roots of graph
   (b) while candidates remaining
      i. pick highest priority candidate
      ii. schedule instruction
      iii. add exposed instructions to candidates

Two flavors of list scheduling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Forward list scheduling</strong></th>
<th><strong>Backward list scheduling</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• start with available ops</td>
<td>• start with no successors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• work forward</td>
<td>• work backward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ready ⇒ all ops available</td>
<td>• ready ⇒ latency covers uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scheduling heuristics**

Problems

• how to choose between ready instructions?
• NP-hard for straight-line code

Heuristics used to prioritize candidates

1. will not cause pipeline stall
2. longest weighted path to root (critical path)
3. highest latency (more overlap)
4. most immediate successors (create candidates)
5. most descendants (create more candidates)

Approach

• use multiple heuristics (to help break ties)
• try multiple schedules (then take best result)
Scheduling Example

Compute critical path
- build precedence graph
- start from instruction(s) with no successors, work backwards
- weight of node = instruction latency + maximum successor weight

Example machine model
- 2-cycle latency for load
- 1-cycle latency otherwise

Example code
1 load r1, X
2 load r2, Y
3 mult r3, r2, r1
4 load r4, A
5 mult r5, r4, r3
6 add r6, r2, r3
7 load r7, B
8 mult r8, r5, r7
9 jmp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates</td>
<td>1,2,4,7</td>
<td>1,4,7</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>5,6,7</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-issue schedule</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates</td>
<td>1,2,4,7</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,6,8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual-issue schedule</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual-issue schedule (backwards)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trace Scheduling

Overview
- a trace is a path through code
- examine branch probabilities, find trace representing most likely path
- schedule instructions for trace, emit repair code around trace
- repeat as necessary

Example

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{code1} & \text{code1} \\
\text{code2} & \text{code4} \\
\text{code3} & \text{code5} \\
\text{code6} & \text{code6}
\end{array}
\]

Result
- better instruction schedule along trace
- less efficient schedule off trace
- increase in code size (from repair code)

Trace Scheduling Repair Code

Code moved below split
- create basic block B at branch target
- replicate code C moved below split
- insert C in B in original order

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{code1} & \text{if (\ldots)} \\
\text{if (\ldots)} & \text{code1} \\
\text{code2} & \text{code3}
\end{array}
\]

Code moved above split
- only move code which is dead off trace
- may perform unnecessary work

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{code1} & \text{code1} \\
\text{if (\ldots)} & \text{code2} \\
\text{code2} & \text{code3} \quad \text{// code2} \\
\text{if (\ldots)} & \text{// is dead} \\
\end{array}
\]
Loops Unrolling

Approach

- create multiple copies of loop
- more candidates for scheduling

Example

```c
// do i=1,N  // do i=1,N,3
1    load    load
2    load
3    add      add    add    load
4    store    store    add
5                              store    add
6                                                                 store
```

Problems

- choosing degree of unrolling $k$
- pipeline hiccup every $k$ iterations
- increased compilation time
- instruction cache overflow

Software Pipelining

Approach

- overlap iterations of loop
- select schedule for loop body, with constant initiation interval
- initiate iteration after every $k$ cycles, before previous iterations complete

Example

```c
T     i=1    i=2    i=3    i=4
1    load
2    load
3    add      load
4    store    add    load (cjmp L)
5                              store    add
6                              store
7
```

Properties

- prolog, epilog code for pipeline
- steady state within body of loop
- hiccups in pipeline at entry, exit
Branch Prediction

Will a conditional branch be taken?
- affects instruction scheduling
- execution penalty for incorrect guess

Prediction approaches
- hardware history (branch bit)
- history plus branch correlation
- profiling (feedback to compiler)
- compile-time heuristics

Static branch prediction
- no run-time information
- single prediction for all executions
- perfect prediction = 50–100% correct

Simple (target) heuristic
- predict conditional branch taken
- catches loop back edges

Branch Prediction

Loop branch heuristic
- find forward, back, exit edges
- predict back edge, non-exit edge

Op code heuristic
- predict greater than zero
- predict floating point values differ

Loop heuristic
- predict branch leading to loop header

Call heuristic
- predict branch not leading to call

Return heuristic
- predict branch not leading to return

Guard heuristic
- predict branch leading to guarded variable

etc...
Predication

Predicated instructions

- method to deal with conditional branches
- designed for small number of instructions

Mechanism

- instructions are executed *conditionally*
- predicate allowed for each instruction
- instruction only executed if predicate is true
- example \([P1] \text{MOV R1, 0} \Rightarrow \text{if (P1 == true) R1 = 0}\)

Issues

- branch prediction, instruction scheduling still useful
- false predicate \(\rightarrow\) wasted NOP instruction
- can use dedicated predicate registers \(\text{(64 1-bit registers in IA64)}\)
- more complexity for the compiler...

Predication example

Source code

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{if (a == b)} \\
\quad &a = 0; \\
\text{else} \\
\quad &a = b;
\end{align*}
\]

Branching code

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CMP R1, R2} & \quad \text{// check (a == b)} \\
\text{JNE else} & \quad \text{// if no, goto else} \\
\text{MOV R1, 0} & \quad \text{// R1 = 0} \\
\text{JMP end} & \quad \text{// skip past else} \\
\text{else MOV R1, R2} & \quad \text{// R1 = R2} \\
\text{end ...} & \quad \text{// rest of program}
\end{align*}
\]

Predicated code

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CMPEQ R1, R2, P1/P2} & \quad \text{// check (a == b) sets P1, P2} \\
\text{[P1] MOV R1, 0} & \quad \text{// if (P1 == true) R1 = 0} \\
\text{[P2] MOV R1, R2} & \quad \text{// if (P2 == true) R2 = R1}
\end{align*}
\]