- Instruction Scheduling Basics
- List Scheduling
- Modulo Scheduling

### Instruction Scheduling Example

- The purpose of **instruction scheduling** is to improve performance by reducing the number of pipeline stalls suffered during execution.
- The following example illustrates the concept, where the right column is the scheduled code.
- Due to instructions only are scheduled within one basic block, only a limited improvement is achieved — the fsub and stf are not helped at all.

| ldf  | t2,a,t1  | ldf  | t2,a,t1  |
|------|----------|------|----------|
| ldf  | t3,b,t1  | ldf  | t3,b,t1  |
| fadd | t4,t2,t3 | ldf  | t5,c,t1  |
| ldf  | t5,c,t1  | ldf  | t6,d,t1  |
| ldf  | t6,d,t1  | fadd | t4,t2,t3 |
| fmul | t7,t5,t6 | fmul | t7,t5,t6 |
| fsub | t8,t3,t7 | fsub | t8,t3,t7 |
| stf  | t8,e,t1  | stf  | t8,e,t1  |

- The goal of instruction scheduling is to reduce pipeline stall and this is achieved by separating the producer and consumer.
- This separation makes it more difficult to perform register allocation.
- **Question:** Which of instruction scheduling and register allocation should be performed first?

**Answer:** Instruction scheduling because register allocation would create unnecessary constraints for the scheduler, and advanced instruction scheduling would be seriously limited with already assigned registers.

• If register allocation results in spill code, the instruction scheduler is usually run a second time in order to separate the load instructions from the uses of the loaded register.

#### Register Pressure of Different Schedules

The left schedule needs three floating point registers and the right four.

| ldf  | f2,ra,ri | ldf  | f2,ra,ri |
|------|----------|------|----------|
| ldf  | f3,rb,ri | ldf  | f3,rb,ri |
| fadd | f2,f2,f3 | ldf  | f4,rc,ri |
| ldf  | f3,rc,ri | ldf  | f5,rd,ri |
| ldf  | f4,rd,ri | fadd | f2,f2,f3 |
| fmul | f3,f3,f4 | fmul | f4,f4,f5 |
| fsub | f2,f2,f3 | fsub | f2,f2,f4 |
| stf  | f2,re,ri | stf  | f2,re,ri |

#### Rewriting Expressions for Increased Parallelism

- Consider the expression a + b + c + d.
- How it must be evaluated depends on the data type and source language.
- In C (and other languages) addition is left-associative which means the expression should be evaluated as ((a + b) + c) + d.
- Due to the sequential execution it takes at least three clock cycles (and more for floating point).
- If the compiler knows that it can ignore the effects of overflow (either due to the type is unsigned or two's complement representation is used), it can rewrite it as (a + b) + (c + d).
- On a superscalar processor the two additions can be performed concurrently.
- Programmers are **not** ignore overflow other than for unsigned integers (if the computation still makes sense with the overflow, that is).

- Data dependencies constrain how instructions can be scheduled.
- Instruction scheduling is performed after translation from SSA Form and on low level code which is close to the final machine code.
- In addition to the data dependence graph, dependencies due to scalar variables and accesses to memory through unknown addresses are used.

- The most fundamental instruction scheduling technique is called **list** scheduling and schedules one basic block at a time.
- First an instruction level data dependence graph is built.
- Vertices are instructions and directed arcs constrain the scheduling.
- The source vertex must execute before the target vertex.
- List scheduling uses topological sorting.
- Once the graph has been constructed the list scheduler maintains a set of **candidate** instructions.
- Candidate instructions have no predecessor in the graph.

## List Scheduler Goal

- The goal of the list scheduler is to minimize the number of clock cycles required to execute the basic block.
- As this problem is NP-complete, an approximation is found as follows: each vertex is assigned a priority in some way, and the highest priority vertex *i* of the candidates is scheduled next.
- Then any successor vertex *s* of *i* with no predecessor that has not yet been scheduled is moved to the set of candidates.
- This procedure is repeated until the set of candidates is empty.
- The interesting problem is to select the priority function using clever heuristics.
- Changing heuristics can change the execution time by several percent.
- In one version of the IBM C/C++/FORTRAN compiler each block was scheduled three times with different heuristics and the best schedule was used.

• The instruction scheduler builds a graph based on the **definitions** and **uses** of storage resources, e.g. variables, registers, or all of memory.

| Attribute | Description  |  |  |
|-----------|--|--|--|
| def(r)    | The instruction which most recently modified r while         |  |  |
|           | scanning backwards, or null (denoted $\perp$ ).              |  |  |
| uses(r)   | The set of instructions which use the current value of $r$ . |  |  |

**procedure** *define\_resource*(*r*, *s*)

```
if (def(r) \neq \perp) {
    add edge (s, def(r), OUTPUT)
    delete def(r) from candidates
}
```

 $def(r) \leftarrow s$ 

```
for each u \in uses(r) do {
add edge (s, u, TRUE)
delete u from candidates
}
uses(r) \leftarrow \emptyset
end
```

```
procedure use\_resource(r, s)
add s to uses(r)
if (def(r) \neq \bot and def(r) \neq s)
delete def(r) from candidates
add edge (s, def(r), ANTI)
end
```

**procedure** *collect\_candidates*(*v*)

```
/* v is a basic block. */
    for each resource r do {
         uses (r) \leftarrow \emptyset
         def(r) \leftarrow \bot
     }
    candidates \leftarrow \emptyset
    for each instruction s in v in reverse order do {
         for each resource r defined by s do
              define_resource(r, s)
         for each resource r used by s do
              use_resource(r, s)
         add s to candidates
end
```

# List Scheduling

```
procedure list_sched
       for each vertex v in G do
              collect_candidates(v)
              cycle \leftarrow 0
              while (candidates \neq \emptyset) do
                     for each s \in candidates do
                            update_earliest(s)
                             compute_delay(s)
                     max_delay_cand \leftarrow \emptyset
                     earliest\_cand \leftarrow \emptyset
                     for each s \in candidates do
                             if (delay(s) = max_delay)
                                    add S to max_delay_cand
                                    if (earliest(s) < cycle)
                                           add S to earliest_cand
                     if (earliest_cand \neq \emptyset)
                            take s from earliest_cand using heuristics
                     else
                            take s from max_delay_cand using heuristics
                     delete s from candidates
                     schedule s as next statement in v
                     cycle \leftarrow cycle + 1
```

end

 Incrementing the cycle after each scheduled instruction assumes a single-issue pipeline.

## Modulo Scheduling

- Consider the following loop and assume there are true dependencies from A to B and from B to C.
   void h()
   {
   int i;
- Due to list scheduling only works with one basic block, it cannot improve this loop.
- Such loops are of course quite common.

| Jonas 3 | Ske | ppstec | lt |
|---------|-----|--------|----|
|---------|-----|--------|----|

}

### Modulo Scheduling the Loop

- Let us take instructions from three iterations and interleave them.
- First we need to execute instructions from the first two iterations in a prologue.

| cycle | i                     | ii                    | iii                   |
|-------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 0     | $A_0$                 |                       |                       |
| 1     | B <sub>0</sub>        | $A_1$                 |                       |
| 2     | <i>C</i> <sub>0</sub> | <i>B</i> <sub>1</sub> | <i>A</i> <sub>2</sub> |
| 3     | <i>A</i> <sub>3</sub> | <i>C</i> <sub>1</sub> | <i>B</i> <sub>2</sub> |
| 4     | <i>B</i> <sub>3</sub> | A <sub>4</sub>        | <i>C</i> <sub>2</sub> |
| 5     | <i>C</i> <sub>3</sub> | <i>B</i> <sub>4</sub> | $A_5$                 |
| 6     | $A_6$                 | <i>C</i> <sub>4</sub> | $B_5$                 |
| 7     | <i>B</i> <sub>6</sub> | A <sub>7</sub>        | <i>C</i> <sub>5</sub> |
| 8     | C <sub>6</sub>        | B <sub>7</sub>        |                       |
| 9     |                       | C <sub>7</sub>        |                       |

- Assume for illustration only 8 iterations are executed.
- For example  $A_3$  denotes instruction A in iteration 3.
- After a steady-state with  $2 \times 3$  iterations there is an epilogue.
- Consider instruction  $B_3$ . While it waits for  $A_3$ , the CPU can also execute  $C_1$  and  $B_2$ , assuming a pipelined superscalar CPU.

#### List Scheduled Execution



- Each iteration is completed before the next starts.
- The height of an iteration is the number of clock cycles it takes.

#### Parallelism with Modulo Scheduling



- A new iteration is started before the current has completed.
- We wish to start the next iteration as early as possible.
- If we start the next iteration the **same** clock cycle, we need a multicore with one core per loop iteration.

#### The Initiation Interval



• The initiation interval,

abbreviated **II**, is the number of clock cycles between the start of two iterations.

- The II is limited by
  - Data dependencies
  - Available hardware resources
- A maximum II is determined by doing a normal list schedule of the loop body.
- A minimum II is computed from the available resources and required resources in the loop, and the data dependencies.

- The modulo scheduler then tries to find the smallest II which results in a valid schedule, by trying each value of II starting from the minimum II, and incrementing it by one.
- All variables defined before being used in each loop iterations are expanded to different variables for each iteration.
- Then the loop body is duplicated and adapted for the proper iteration.
- A prologue and an epilogue is also generated.

- There are two data dependence analyzes done for modulo scheduling:
   Instruction level as we saw for list scheduling.
   Loop level as we saw in lecture F10.
- There is one modification: in addition to the type (true, anti, or output), dependencies for modulo scheduling are of the form (p, d), where p is the dependence distance (i.e. iteration difference) and d is the delay in clock cycles.
- By delay is meant the time the instructions should be separated to avoid pipeline stalls.

## Scheduling Instructions

- Let  $\sigma(v)$  denote the clock cycle a certain instruction v is scheduled.
- With a dependence (p, d) from instruction u to instruction v, and an initiation interval II, to avoid pipeline stalls we need to satisfy:

$$\sigma(\mathbf{v}) - \sigma(\mathbf{u}) + p \ \mathbf{II} \ge d \tag{1}$$

- Additionally there must be sufficient hardware resources available in each clock cycle.
- Assume for simplicity an instruction only needs one resource each clock cycle (e.g. a certain stage in a pipelined functional unit).
- Then for each clock cycle *i* the instruction executes (counting from zero in e.g. in the instruction decode stage) there must be such a resource available in the clock cycle given by:

$$(\sigma(v) + i) \mod II$$
 (2)

• If no value for  $\sigma(v)$  can be found which satisfies all constraints, the initiation interval must be increased, and the scheduling be repeated.

- We have now seen the essential parts of the modulo scheduling.
- There was in the 1980's a debate regarding which hardware features were needed for efficient software pipelining (e.g. rotating register files).
- The problem was solved completely in software by Monica Lam in her PhD thesis from Carnegie Mellon University.
- Her algorithm is described in her book "A Systolic Array Optimizing Compiler", and is implemented in several compilers, including in SGI's compiler (now called Open64).
- An interesting study was performed that compared an optimal scheduler with the modulo scheduler in the SGI compiler, and concluded that their modulo scheduler almost always produced optimal code.