Memory Hierarchy and Cache Design (2)

Improving Cache Performance

- Average memory-access time
  \[ = \text{Hit time} + \text{Miss rate} \times \text{Miss penalty} \]

- Improve performance by:
  1. Reduce the miss rate,
  2. Reduce the miss penalty, or
  3. Reduce the time to hit in the cache.

Reducing Miss Rate

- Sources of Cache misses
  - Compulsory misses
    - Misses resulting from first access to a block
    - Also called cold start misses or first reference misses
  - Capacity misses
    - Misses resulting from finite or limited cache size
  - Conflict misses
    - Misses resulting from finite or limited set associativity
    - Also called collision misses or interference misses

Miss rate per type
Miss rate per type

Back to Reducing Miss Rate

1. Larger block size
2. Higher set associativity
3. Victim cache
4. Pseudo-associative cache
5. Hardware prefetching of instruction and data
6. Compiler-controlled prefetching
7. Compiler optimization

First Approach
Large Block Size

- reduces compulsory misses - principle of locality
- reduces number of blocks in cache
  - increasing conflict misses

Larger Block Size
Larger Block Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block size</th>
<th>1K</th>
<th>4K</th>
<th>16K</th>
<th>64K</th>
<th>256K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.05%</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
<td>3.98%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>21.34%</td>
<td>10.66%</td>
<td>2.97%</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>18.84%</td>
<td>7.99%</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>22.81%</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average memory access time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block size</th>
<th>1K</th>
<th>4K</th>
<th>16K</th>
<th>64K</th>
<th>256K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.02%</td>
<td>5.91%</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10.19%</td>
<td>8.39%</td>
<td>4.23%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11.84%</td>
<td>8.84%</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Approach
Higher Associativity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chain size</th>
<th>1-way</th>
<th>2-way</th>
<th>4-way</th>
<th>8-way</th>
<th>16-way</th>
<th>32-way</th>
<th>64-way</th>
<th>128-way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher Set Associativity

Sacrifice: increased hit time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cache size (KB)</th>
<th>One-way</th>
<th>Two-way</th>
<th>Four-way</th>
<th>Eight-way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions: clock cycle time (2-way) = 1.10 x clock cycle time (1-way)
clock cycle time (4-way) = 1.12 x clock cycle time (1-way)
clock cycle time (8-way) = 1.14 x clock cycle time (1-way)

Third Approach
Victim Cache

- Add a small, fully associative cache between a cache and its refill path
- Check victim cache upon a miss
- A four-entry victim cache removed 20% to 95% of the conflict misses in a 4-KB direct mapped cache
**Fourth Approach**

**Pseudo-Associative Caches**

- Pseudo-Associative or Column Associative
  - get miss rate of set associative and the hit speed of direct mapped
- Cache access proceeds just as in the direct mapped cache for a hit
- On a miss, before going to the memory, another cache entry is checked to see if it matches
  - E.g., invert the MSB of the index field to find the other block in the “Pseudo Set”
- Have one fast and one slow hit time

**Fifth Approach**

**Hardware Prefetching**

- Prefetch instructions and/or data before it is requested by the processor
  - Prefetched into the cache or an external buffer
- E.g. AXP 21064 fetches two (instruction) blocks on a miss
  - requested block,
    - Placed in the instruction cache
    - next consecutive block
    - Placed into the instruction stream buffer
    - If requested block is in stream buffer
    - Get it from there and issue next prefetch request
Hardware Prefetching

- Relies on utilizing unused memory bandwidth
- Could interfere with demand misses
  - Memory bus
  - Memory unit

Sixth Approach
Compiler-Controlled Prefetching

- Compiler inserts prefetch instructions
- Several flavors of prefetch
  - Register Prefetch
    - load the value in a register
  - Cache Prefetch
    - load data only into the cache and not the register
  - Either can be faulting or non-faulting (nonblocking)
    - Address does or does not cause virtual address fault and protection violation
- Normal load instruction
  - Faulting register prefetch instruction
- Non faulting instructions turn into no-op if they were to cause a fault

Prefetching

- Prefetch is made semantically invisible to a program
- Lockup-free (nonblocking) Cache
  - Processor can proceed while the prefetched data are being fetched
  - Cache continues to supply instructions and data while waiting for the prefetched data to return
Compiler-controlled Prefetching

/* Before */
for ( i = 0; i < 3; i = i + 1 )
  for ( j = 0; j < 100; j = j + 1 )
    a [ i ][ j ] = b [ j ][ 0 ] * b [ j + 1 ][ 0 ];
/* After */
for ( j = 0; j < 100; j = j + 1 ) {
  prefetch ( b[ j + 7 ][ 0 ]); 
  x[ j ] = b[ j ][ 0 ] * b[ j + 1 ][ 0 ];}

Seventh Approach
Compiler Optimizations

• Instructions
  – Profiling to look at conflicts
  – McFarling [1989] reduced cache misses by 75% on 8KB direct
    mapped cache with 4 byte blocks

• Data
  – Merging Arrays: improve spatial locality by single array of
    compound elements vs. 2 arrays
  – Loop Interchange: change nesting of loops to access data in
    order stored in memory
  – Loop Fusion: Combine 2 independent loops that have same
    looping and some variables overlap
  – Blocking: improve temporal locality by accessing blocks of data
    repeatedly vs. going down whole columns or rows

Merging Arrays

/* Before */
int val[SIZE];
int key[SIZE];
/* After */
struct merge {
  int val;
  int key;
};
struct merge merged_array[SIZE];

  • Reducing conflicts between val & key and improving
    spatial locality

Loop Interchange

/* Before */
for ( j = 0; j < 100; j = j+1)
  for ( i = 0; i < 5000; i = i+1)
    x[i][j] = 2 * x[i][j];
/* After */
for ( i = 0; i < 5000; i = i+1)
  for ( j = 0; j < 100; j = j+1)
    x[i][j] = 2 * x[i][j];
Loop Fusion

/* Before */
for (i = 0; i < N; i = i + 1)
for (j = 0; j < N; j = j + 1)
    a[i][j] = 1/b[i][j]*c[i][j];
for (i = 0; i < N; i = i + 1)
for (j = 0; j < N; j = j + 1)
    d[i][j] = a[i][j] + c[i][j];
/* After */
for (i = 0; i < N; i = i + 1)
for (j = 0; j < N; j = j + 1)
    a[i][j] = 1/b[i][j]*c[i][j];
    d[i][j] = a[i][j] + c[i][j];

Blocking

- Reduce misses via improved temporal locality
- Divide operations to blocks (submatrices)

/* Before */
for (i = 0; i < N; i = i + 1)
for (j = 0; j < N; j = j + 1)
    r = 0;
    for (k = 0; k < N; k = k + 1)
        r = r + y[i][k]*z[k][j];
    x[i][j] = r;
/* After */
for (i = 0; i < N; i = i + 1)
for (j = 0; j < N; j = j + 1)
    r = 0;
    for (k = 0; k < N; k = k + 1)
        r = r + y[i][k]*z[k][j];
    x[i][j] = r;

Two Inner Loops:
- Read all N\times N elements of z
- Read N elements of 1 row of y repeatedly
- Write N elements of 1 row of x

Before blocking

[x] [y] [z]

Blocking

/* After */
for (jj = 0; jj < N; jj = jj + B)
for (kk = 0; kk < N; kk = kk + B)
for (i = 0; i < N; i = i + 1)
for (j = jj; j < min(jj + B - 1, N); j = j + 1)
    r = 0;
    for (k = kk; k < min(kk + B - 1, N); k = k + 1)
        r = r + y[i][k]*z[k][j];
    x[i][j] = r;

Blocking

/* After */
for (jj = 0; jj < N; jj = jj + B)
for (kk = 0; kk < N; kk = kk + B)
for (i = 0; i < N; i = i + 1)
for (j = jj; j < min(jj + B - 1, N); j = j + 1)
    r = 0;
    for (k = kk; k < min(kk + B - 1, N); k = k + 1)
        r = r + y[i][k]*z[k][j];
    x[i][j] = r;
### Summary

- **Reducing Miss Rate**
  1. Larger Block Size
  2. Higher Set Associativity
  3. Victim Cache
  4. Pseudo-Associative Cache
  5. Hardware Prefetching
  6. Compiler-controlled Prefetching
  7. Compiler Optimizations

### Improving Cache Performance

- **Average memory-access time**
  \[
  \text{CPU time} = IC \times \left( \text{Instruction} + \frac{\text{Miss rate} \times \text{Miss penalty} \times \text{Clock cycle time}}{\text{Hit time}} + \text{Miss rate} \times \text{Miss penalty} \right)
  \]

- **Improve performance by**:
  1. Reduce the miss rate,
  2. Reduce the miss penalty, or
  3. Reduce the time to hit in the cache.
Reducing Cache Miss Penalty

1. Giving priority to read misses over writes
2. Sub-block placement for reduced miss penalty
3. Early restart and critical work first
4. Nonblocking caches to reduce stalls on cache misses
5. Second-level caches

First Technique: Giving priority to read misses over writes

- Give priority to reads due to read misses over writes from the write buffer in accessing main memory
- Problem - example

```
SW 512(R0), R3 ; M[512] <- R3 (cache index 0)
LM R1, 1024(R0) ; R1 <- M[1024] (cache index 0)
LM R2, 512(R0) ; R2 <- M[512] (cache index 0)
```

Solution: (1) Wait until the write buffer becomes empty
(2) Check the addresses of the words in the write buffer

Second Technique: Sub-block placement for reduced miss penalty

- Tag is associated with block consisting of a number of sub-blocks, each of which has a valid bit - reduced tag storage & miss penalty

Third Technique: Early restart and critical word first

- Early restart

```
1 2 3 4
```

Requested word: word 3

```
1 -> 2 -> 3 -> 4
```

- Critical word first

```
1 2 3 4
```

```
3 -> 4 -> 1 -> 2
```

- Large sized blocks reap most benefit
Fourth Technique: Nonblocking caches to reduce stalls on cache misses

- Nonblocking cache - does not block on a miss
- Possibility
  - Hit under miss (requires at least out-of-order completion capability)
  - Hit under multiple misses (requires in addition a memory system that can service multiple misses simultaneously)
  → Significantly increases complexity of cache controller

Fifth Technique: Second-level caches

- L1 (first-level) cache: Optimized for fast hit time
- L2 (second-level) cache: Optimized for high hit rate
- Important concern: Inclusion property

Nonblocking caches to reduce stalls on cache misses

- 8-KB direct-mapped
- 32-bytes blocks
- 16-clock-cycle miss penalty

Second-level caches

Average memory access time = Hit time (L1) + Miss rate (L1) x (Hit time (L2) + Miss rate (L2) x Miss penalty (L2))

Local Miss Rate : # of misses in cache divided by total # of accesses to this cache
Global Miss Rate : # of misses divided by the total # of accesses generated by CPU
How to Design Second-level Caches

- Size
- Associativity
- Block size
- Inclusion property

Summary

- Techniques for reducing cache miss penalty
  - Giving priority to read misses over writes
  - Sub-block placement for reduced miss penalty
  - Early restart and critical work first
  - Nonblocking caches to reduce stalls on cache misses
  - Second-level caches

Improving Cache Performance

- Average memory-access time
  \[ = \text{Hit time} + \text{Miss rate} \times \text{Miss penalty} \]

- Improve performance by:
  1. Reduce the miss rate,
  2. Reduce the miss penalty, or
  3. Reduce the time to hit in the cache.

Reducing Hit Time

1. Small and Simple Caches
2. Avoiding Address Translation During Indexing of the Cache
   - Using virtual caches
   - Accessing physical caches without address translation
3. Pipelining Writes for Write Hits
First Technique: Small and Simple Caches

- Smaller is faster $\rightarrow$ smaller caches
- Simple is better $\rightarrow$ direct-mapped
- Alpha AXP 21064 has
  - Direct-mapped 8-KB (256 32-byte blocks) L1 instruction cache and data cache
  - Direct-mapped 128-KB to 8-MB L2 cache
- Becomes increasing important due to the pressure of a fast clock cycle

Second Technique: Avoid Address Translation

- Virtual cache vs Physical cache
- Cache is indexed and/or tagged with the virtual address (what is virtual address?)
- Cache access and MMU translation/validation done in parallel

Using virtual caches

- Problems with virtual caches
  - homonym problem
  - synonym problem

Homonym problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>process 1 translation information</th>
<th>process 2 translation information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

process 1 writes 1000 to virtual page 100
context switched to process 2
process 2 read from virtual page 100
Homonym problem

Solutions to homonym problem

1. Cache purging at each context switch
2. Using PID (process id) as an additional tag

Synonym problem

| process 1 reads from virtual page 100 | 100 | 10 |
| process 1 reads from virtual page 200 | 200 | 10 |
| process 1 writes 10 to virtual page 100 | | |
| process 1 reads from virtual page 200 | | |

Tag data

Solutions to synonym problem

1. Hardware anti-aliasing
2. Alignment of synonyms (require all the synonyms to be identical in the lower bits of their virtual addresses assuming a direct-mapped cache)
Third Technique: Pipelining Writes for Fast Write Hits

Write request $i - 1$  
Write request $i$  
Write request $i + 1$

- Tag comparison
- Time

Summary of Cache Optimizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Miss rate</th>
<th>Miss penalty</th>
<th>Hit time</th>
<th>Hardware complexity</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larger block size</td>
<td>$-$</td>
<td>$-$</td>
<td>$0$</td>
<td>$-1$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher associativity</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$-$</td>
<td>$1$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write cache</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$2$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private associative cache</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$2$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware prefetching of instructions and data</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$2$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion controlled prefetching</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$5$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pipelining Writes for Fast Write Hits

Summary of Cache Optimizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Miss rate</th>
<th>Miss penalty</th>
<th>Hit time</th>
<th>Hardware complexity</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete techniques to reduce cache request</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$-$</td>
<td>$0$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving priority to read misses</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$1$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multithreaded placement</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$1$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early access and critical word first</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$2$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonblocking cache</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second level caches</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small and simple cache</td>
<td>$-$</td>
<td>$-$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding address translation during missing of the cache</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$2$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipelining writes for fast write hits</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td>$1$</td>
<td>$+$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>