Pipeline Hazards

or

Danger!Danger!Danger!

Data Hazards

- Data hazards are caused by data dependences
- Data dependences, and thus data hazards, come in 3 flavors
  - RAW (read-after-write)
  - WAW (write-after-write)
  - WAR (write-after-read)
RAW Hazard

- later instruction tries to read an operand before earlier instruction writes it
- The dependence
  add $R1$, $R2$, $R3$
  sub $R5$, $R1$, $R4$
- The hazard
  add $R1$, $R2$, $R3$
  sub $R5$, $R1$, $R4$
- RAW hazard is extremely common

WAR Hazard

- later instruction tries to write an operand before earlier instruction reads it
- The dependence
  add $R1$, $R2$, $R3$
  sub $R2$, $R5$, $R4$
- The hazard?
  add $R1$, $R2$, $R3$
  sub $R2$, $R5$, $R4$
- WAR hazard is uncommon/impossible in a reasonable (in-order) pipeline

WAW Hazard

- later instruction tries to write an operand before earlier instruction writes it
- The dependence
  add $R1$, $R2$, $R3$
  sub $R1$, $R2$, $R4$
- The hazard
  lw $R1$, $R2$, $R3$
  sub $R1$, $R2$, $R4$
- WAW hazard possible in a reasonable pipeline, but not in the very simple pipeline we’re assuming.

Dealing with Data Hazards through Forwarding
Dealing with Data Hazards through Forwarding

Forwarding Options

- ADD -> ADD
- ADD -> LW
- ADD -> SW (2 operands)
- LW -> ADD
- LW -> LW
- LW -> SW (2 operands)

(I’m letting ADD stand in for all ALU operations)

More Forwarding

More Forwarding
Forwarding and Stalling

```
LW R1, 0(R2)
SUB R4, R1, R5
AND R6, R1, R7
OR R8, R1, R9
```

Example

```
ADD R1, R2, R3
SW R1, 1000(R2)
ADD R5, R7, R1
LW R8, 2004(R2)
SW R7, 2008(R8)
ADD R8, R8, R2
LW R9, 1012(R8)
SW R9, 1016(R8)
```

Avoiding Pipeline Stalls

```
lw R1, 1000(R2)
lw R3, 2000(R2)
add R4, R1, R3
lw R1, 3000(R2)
add R6, R4, R1
sw R6, 1000(R2)
```

- this is a compiler technique called instruction scheduling.

How big a problem are these pipeline stalls?

- 13% of the loads in FP programs
- 25% of the loads in integer programs
Detecting ALU Input Hazards

- ALUop  R?, R?, R?
- ALUop  R?, R?, R?
- ALUop  R?, R?, R?
- lw     R?, disp(R?)
- lw     R?, disp(R?)
- ALUop  R?, R?, R?

Inserting Bubbles

- Set all control values in the EX/MEM register to safe values (equivalent to a nop)
- Keep same values in the ID/EX register and IF/ID register
- Keep PC from incrementing

Adding Datapaths
Control Hazards

- Instructions are not only dependent on instructions that produce their operands, but also on all previous control flow (branch, jump) instructions that lead to that instruction.

add
add
bne
sub
and
beq
branch taken
and
sub

Branch Hazards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>MEM</th>
<th>WB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

correct instruction

Branch Stall Impact

- If CPI = 1, 30% branch, Stall 3 cycles => new CPI = 1.9!
- Two part solution:
  - Determine branch taken or not sooner, AND
  - Compute taken branch address earlier
- MIPS branch tests if register = 0 or ≠ 0
- MIPS Solution:
  - Move Zero test to ID/RF stage
  - Adder to calculate new PC in ID/RF stage
  - 1 clock cycle penalty for branch versus 3

New Datapath
Branch Hazards

What We Know About Branches

- more conditional branches than unconditional
- more forward than backward
- 67% of branches taken
- backward branches taken 80%

Four Branch Hazard Alternatives

#1: Stall until branch direction is clear

#2: Predict Branch Not Taken
- Execute successor instructions in sequence
- “Squash” instructions in pipeline if branch actually taken
- Advantage of late pipeline state update
- 33% MIPS branches not taken on average
- PC+4 already calculated, so use it to get next instruction

#3: Predict Branch Taken
- 67% MIPS branches taken on average
- But haven’t calculated branch target address in MIPS
  - MIPS still incurs 1 cycle branch penalty
  - Other machines: branch target known before outcome

#4: Delayed Branch
- Define branch to take place AFTER a following instruction

  branch instruction
  sequential successor<sub>1</sub>
  sequential successor<sub>2</sub>
  ........
  sequential successor<sub>n</sub>

  branch target if taken

- 1 slot delay allows proper decision and branch target address in 5 stage pipeline
- MIPS uses this
Delayed Branch

- Where to get instructions to fill branch delay slot?
  - Before branch instruction
  - From the target address: only valuable when branch taken
  - From fall through: only valuable when branch not taken
  - Cancelling branches allow more slots to be filled

- Compiler effectiveness for single branch delay slot:
  - Fills about 60% of branch delay slots
  - About 80% of instructions executed in branch delay slots useful in computation
  - About 50% (60% x 80%) of slots usefully filled

Key Points

- Hard to keep the pipeline completely full
- Data Hazards require dependent instructions to wait for the producer instruction
  - Most of the problem handled with forwarding (bypassing)
  - Sometimes stall still required (especially in modern processors)
- Control hazards require control-dependent (post-branch) instructions to wait for the branch to be resolved
  - Branch prediction
  - Flush instructions when prediction is wrong