Compiler Construction

 \sim Loop unrolling \checkmark

Can we do better?

Consider the following code (representing a basic block):

i ₁ :	Loop:	1w	\$t0,	0(\$s1)	# t0=array element
i ₂ :		addu	\$t0,	\$t0, \$s2	# add scalar in s2
i3:		SW	\$t0,	0(\$s1)	# store result
i4:		addi	\$s1,	\$s1,-4	# decrement pointer
i5:		bne	\$s1,	\$0, Loop	# branch s1!=0

Can we do better?

Consider the following code (representing a basic block):

i ₁ :	Loop:	lw	\$t0,	0(\$s1)	# t0=array element
i_2 :		addu	\$t0,	\$t0, \$s2	# add scalar in s2
i3:		SW	\$t0,	0(\$s1)	# store result
i4:		addi	\$s1,	\$s1,-4	# decrement pointer
i5:		bne	\$s1,	\$0, Loop	# branch s1!=0



Can we do better?

Consider the following code (representing a basic block):

i ₁ :	Loop:	lw	\$t0,	0(\$s1)	# t0=array element
i_2 :		addu	\$t0,	\$t0, \$s2	# add scalar in s2
i3:		SW	\$t0,	0(\$s1)	# store result
i4:		addi	\$s1,	\$s1,-4	# decrement pointer
i5:		bne	\$s1,	\$0, Loop	# branch s1!=0



16 cycles for 5 instructions that are all dependent (IPC = 0.31)!

Loop Unrolling

- Replicate loop body to expose more parallelism
- Reduces loop-control overhead

At high level, it can be seen as following:

Without Loop Unrolling	With Loop Unrolling
int i;	int i;
for (i = 0; x < 100; ++i)	for (i = 0; x < 100; i+=5)
tab[i] = tab[i] + 42;	tab[i] = tab[i] +42;
	tab[i+1] = tab[i+1] + 42;
	tab[i+2] = tab[i+2] + 42;
	tab[i+3] = tab[i+3] + 42;
	tab[i+4] = tab[i+4] + 42;

i_1 :	Loop:	lw	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
i_2 :		addu	\$t0,	\$t0, \$s2
i3:		SW	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
i4:		addi	\$s1,	\$s1,-4
i ₅ :		bne	\$s1,	\$0, Loop
i ₆ :	Loop:	lw	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
i7:		addu	\$t0,	\$t0, \$s2
i ₈ :		SW	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
ig:		addi	\$s1,	\$s1,-4
i ₁₀ :		bne	\$s1,	\$0, Loop
i ₁₁ :	Loop:	lw	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
i ₁₂ :		addu	\$t0,	\$t0, \$s2
i ₁₃ :		SW	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
i ₁₄ :		addi	\$s1,	\$s1,-4
i ₁₅ :		bne	\$s1,	\$0, Loop

First duplicate N times the the body of the loop!

i1:	Loop:	1w	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
i_2 :		addu	\$t0,	\$t0, \$s2
i3:		SW	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
i4:		addi	\$s1,	\$s1,-4
i ₆ :		1w	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
i7:		addu	\$t0,	\$t0, \$s2
i ₈ :		SW	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
i9:		addi	\$s1,	\$s1,-4
i ₁₁ :		1w	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
i ₁₂ :		addu	\$t0,	\$t0, \$s2
i ₁₃ :		SW	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
i ₁₄ :		addi	\$s1,	\$s1,-4
i ₁₅ :		bne	\$s1,	\$0, Loop

Remove redundant labels and jump (by supposing that we are able to do it!)

i1:	Loop:	lw	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
i_2 :		addu	\$t0,	\$t0, \$s2
i3:		SW	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
i4:		addi	\$s1,	\$s1,-4
i ₆ :		lw	\$t1,	0(\$s1)
i7:		addu	\$t1,	<mark>\$t1</mark> , \$s2
i8:		SW	\$t1,	0(\$s1)
i9:		addi	\$s1,	\$s1,-4
i ₁₁ :		lw	\$t2,	0(\$s1)
i ₁₂ :		addu	\$t2,	<mark>\$t2</mark> , \$s2
i ₁₃ :		SW	\$t2,	0(\$s1)
i ₁₄ :		addi	\$s1,	\$s1,-4
i ₁₅ :		bne	\$s1,	\$0, Loop

Use other temporaries name when possible!

i4:	Loop:	addi	\$s1,	\$s1,-12
i_1 :		lw	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
i_2 :		addu	\$t0,	\$t0, \$s2
i3:		SW	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
i ₆ :		lw	\$t1,	4 (\$s1)
i7:		addu	\$t1,	\$t1, \$s2
i8:		SW	\$t1,	4 (\$s1)
i ₁₁ :		lw	\$t2,	<mark>8</mark> (\$s1)
i ₁₂ :		addu	\$t2,	\$t2, \$s2
i ₁₃ :		SW	\$t2,	<mark>8</mark> (\$s1)
i ₁₅ :		bne	\$s1,	\$0, Loop

Grab redundant operation and merge them carefully!

i1:	Loop:	addi	\$s1,	\$s1,-12
i ₂ :		lw	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
i3:		lw	\$t1,	4 (\$s1)
i4:		lw	\$t2,	<mark>8</mark> (\$s1)
i5:		addu	\$t0,	\$t0, \$s2
i ₆ :		addu	\$t1,	\$t1, \$s2
i7:		addu	\$t2,	\$t2, \$s2
i8:		SW	\$t0,	0(\$s1)
i9:		SW	\$t1,	4 (\$s1)
i ₁₀ :		SW	\$t2,	<mark>8</mark> (\$s1)
i ₁₁ :		bne	\$s1,	\$0, Loop

Schedule the instructions and renumber them

Pros & Cons

- We avoid a lot of conditional jumps (and many stall hence)
- We require 19 cycles for 11 instructions: IPC=0.57 (a lot better than the previous 0.31)
- This trick allows to have more independent instructions to insert, and thus, less stalls!
- But we have now a prologue and an epilogue: i.e., two more basic blocks
- Require more temporaries: register allocation will be harder!
- Try it by yourself in gcc -funroll-loops

A very last word on Branch Hazards 1/2

- Conditional jumps often introduce delays since we cannot pre-fetch instructions
- Can we avoid them?

We only know inext at cycle 5!



A very last word on Branch Hazards 2/2

- X delayed slot: the X instructions after a branch are systematically executed
- The original SPARC and MIPS processors each used a single branch delay slot to eliminate single-cycle stalls after branches
- We need branch prediction... but nowadays, most of processors do it for us (and use slt...)!
- Some architectures have bypass between stages to avoid stalls

Avoid as possible floating points and jumps!

Summary

"Do you program in mips?" she asked. "nop", he said.

