

EECS 583 – Class 12

Superblock Scheduling, Intro to Modulo Scheduling

University of Michigan

October 11, 2021

Announcements & Reading Material

- ❖ Project discussion meetings – next week + Monday (no regular class)
 - » Each group meets 10 mins with Sung/Yunjie and I
 - » Action item
 - Need to identify group members
 - Use piazza to recruit additional group members or express your availability
 - Think about project areas that you want to work on
 - » Signup sheet available starting on Wednes during class
- ❖ Project proposals
 - » Due Wednesday, Oct 27, 11:59pm
 - » 1 paragraph summary of what you plan to work on
 - Topic, what are you going to do, what is the goal, 1-2 references
 - » Email to me & Yunjie & Ze, cc all your group members
- ❖ Today's class
 - » “Iterative Modulo Scheduling: An Algorithm for Software Pipelining Loops”, B. Rau, MICRO-27, 1994, pp. 63-74.
- ❖ Next class
 - » “Code Generation Schema for Modulo Scheduled Loops”, B. Rau, M. Schlansker, and P. Tirumalai, MICRO-25, Dec. 1992.


From Last Time: Generalize Beyond a Basic Block

❖ Superblock

- » Single entry
- » Multiple exits (side exits)
- » No side entries

❖ Schedule just like a BB

- » Priority calculations needs change
- » Dealing with control deps




From Last Time: Lstart in a Superblock

- ❖ Not a single Lstart any more
 - » 1 per exit branch (Lstart is a vector!)
 - » Exit branches have probabilities

op	Estart	Lstart0	Lstart1
1	0	0	0
2	1	2	1
3	2	-	2
4	3	3	4
5	3	-	3
6	5	-	5

- is invalid or infinity



From Last Time: Operation Priority in a Superblock


❖ Priority – Dependence height and speculative yield

- » Height from op to exit * probability of exit
- » Sum up across all exits in the superblock

$$\text{Priority}(\text{op}) = \text{SUM}(\text{Probi} * (\text{MAX_Lstarti} - \text{Lstarti}(\text{op}) + 1))$$

valid late times for op

op	Lstart0	Lstart1	Priority
1	0	0	$.25(3-0+1) + .75(5-0+1) = 5.5$
2	2	1	$.25(3-2+1) + .75(5-1+1) = 4.25$
3	-	2	$0 + .75(5-2+1) = 3$
4	3	4	$.25(3-3+1) + .75(5-4+1) = 1.75$
5	-	3	$0 + .75(5-3+1) = 2.25$
6	-	5	$0 + .75(5-5+1) = .75$




Dependences in a Superblock

Superblock

```
1: r1 = r2 + r3
2: r4 = load(r1)
3: p1 = cmpp(r3 == 0)
4: branch p1 Exit1
5: store (r4, -1)
6: r2 = r2 - 4
7: r5 = load(r2)
8: p2 = cmpp(r5 > 9)
9: branch p2 Exit2
```

Note: Control flow in red bold



* Data dependences shown, all are reg flow except $1 \rightarrow 6$ is reg anti


* Dependences define precedence ordering of operations to ensure correct execution semantics

* What about control dependences?


* Control dependences define precedence of ops with respect to branches

Conservative Approach to Control Dependences

Superblock



Note: Control flow in red bold



* Make branches barriers, nothing moves above or below branches

* Schedule each BB in SB separately

* Sequential schedules


* Whole purpose of a superblock is lost

* Need a better solution!


Upward Code Motion Across Branches

- ❖ Restriction 1a (register op)
 - » The destination of op is not in liveout(br)
 - » Wrongly kill a live value
- ❖ Restriction 1b (memory op)
 - » Op does not modify the memory
 - » Actually live memory is what matters, but that is often too hard to determine
- ❖ Restriction 2
 - » Op must not cause an exception that may terminate the program execution when br is taken
 - » Op is executed more often than it is supposed to (speculated)
 - » Page fault or cache miss are ok
- ❖ Insert control dep when either restriction is violated

...
if (x > 0)
 y = z / x
...



control flow graph




Downward Code Motion Across Branches

- ❖ Restriction 1 (liveness)
 - » If no compensation code
 - Same restriction as before, destination of op is not liveout
 - » Else, no restrictions
 - Duplicate operation along both directions of branch if destination is liveout
- ❖ Restriction 2 (speculation)
 - » Not applicable, downward motion is not speculation
- ❖ Again, insert control dep when the restrictions are violated
- ❖ Part of the philosophy of superblocks is no compensation code insertion hence R1 is enforced!

...
a = b * c
if (x > 0)


else
...




control flow graph

1: a = b * c

2: branch x <= 0




Add Control Dependences to a Superblock



Notes: All branches are control dependent on one another.
If no compensation, all ops dependent on last branch


Class Problem



Draw the dependence graph

Relaxing Code Motion Restrictions

- ❖ Upward code motion is generally more effective
 - » Speculate that an op is useful (just like an out-of-order processor with branch pred)
 - » Start ops early, hide latency, overlap execution, more parallelism
- ❖ Removing restriction 1
 - » For register ops – use register renaming
 - » Could rename memory too, but generally not worth it
- ❖ Removing restriction 2
 - » Need hardware support (aka speculation models)
 - Some ops don't cause exceptions
 - Ignore exceptions
 - Delay exceptions



R1: y is not in liveout(1)
R2: op 2 will never cause
an exception when op1
is taken

Restricted Speculation Model

❖ Most processors have 2 classes of opcodes

» Potentially exception causing

- load, store, integer divide, floating-point

» Never excepting

- Integer add, multiply, etc.
- Overflow is detected, but does not terminate program execution

❖ Restricted model

» R2 only applies to potentially exception causing operations


» Can freely speculate all never exception ops (still limited by R1 however)

```
1: r1 = r2 + r3
2: r4 = load(r1)
3: p1 = cmpp(r2 == 0)
4: branch p1 Exit1
5: store (r4, -1)
6: r2 = r2 - 4
7: r5 = load(r2)
8: p2 = cmpp(r5 > 9)
9: branch p2 Exit2
```

{r5}

{r1}

{r2}




We assumed restricted speculation when this graph was drawn.

This is why there is no cdep between $4 \rightarrow 6$ and $4 \rightarrow 8$


General Speculation Model

- ❖ 2 types of exceptions
 - » Program terminating (traps)
 - Div by 0, illegal address
 - » Fixable (normal and handled at run time)
 - Page fault, TLB miss
- ❖ General speculation
 - » Processor provides non-trapping versions of all operations (div, load, etc)
 - » Return some bogus value (0) when error occurs
 - » R2 is completely ignored, only R1 limits speculation
 - » Speculative ops converted into non-trapping version
 - » Fixable exceptions handled as usual for non-trapping ops




Programming Implications of General Spec

- ❖ Correct program
 - » No problem at all
 - » Exceptions will only result when branch is taken
 - » Results of excepting speculative operation(s) will not be used for anything useful (R1 guarantees this!)
- ❖ Program debugging
 - » Non-trapping ops make this almost impossible
 - » Disable general speculation during program debug phase




Class Problem



1. Starting with the graph assuming restricted speculation, what edges can be removed if general speculation support is provided?
2. With more renaming, what dependences could be removed?

Class Problem - Solution



1. With general speculation, edges from 2→5, 4→5, 4→8, 7→8 can be removed

2. With further renaming, the edge from 2→8 can be removed.

Note, the edge from 2→3 cannot be removed since we conservatively do not allow stores to speculate.

Note2, you do not need general speculation to remove edges from 2→6 and 4→6 since integer subtract never causes exception.


1. Starting with the graph assuming restricted speculation, what edges can be removed if general speculation support is provided?
2. With more renaming, what dependences could be removed?

Change Focus to Scheduling Loops


Most of program execution
time is spent in loops

Problem: How do we achieve
compact schedules for loops

for (j=0; j<100; j++)
 b[j] = a[j] * 26



Basic Approach – List Schedule the Loop Body



Schedule each iteration

resources: 4 issue, 2 alu, 1 mem, 1 br

latencies: add=1, mpy=3, ld = 2, st = 1, br = 1

1: r3 = load(r1)

2: r4 = r3 * 26

3: store (r2, r4)

4: r1 = r1 + 4

5: r2 = r2 + 4

6: p1 = cmpp (r1 < r9)

7: brct p1 Loop

time

ops

0

1, 4

1

6

2

2

3

-

4


-

5

3, 5, 7

Total time = 6 * n

Unroll Then Schedule Larger Body



Schedule each iteration

resources: 4 issue, 2 alu, 1 mem, 1 br

latencies: add=1, cmpp = 1, mpy=3, ld = 2, st = 1, br = 1

1: r3 = load(r1)

2: r4 = r3 * 26

3: store (r2, r4)

4: r1 = r1 + 4

5: r2 = r2 + 4

6: p1 = cmpp (r1 < r9)

7: brct p1 Loop

time

ops

0

1, 4

1

1', 6, 4'

2

2, 6'

3

2'

4

-

5

3, 5, 7

6

3', 5', 7'

Total time = 7 * n/2

Problems With Unrolling

❖ Code bloat

- » Typical unroll is 4-16x
- » Use profile statistics to only unroll “important” loops
- » But still, code grows fast


❖ Barrier after across unrolled bodies

- » I.e., for unroll 2, can only overlap iterations 1 and 2, 3 and 4, ...


❖ Does this mean unrolling is bad?

- » No, in some settings its very useful
 - Low trip count
 - Lots of branches in the loop body
- » But, in other settings, there is room for improvement

Overlap Iterations Using Pipelining



A Software Pipeline



Steady state: 4 iterations executed simultaneously, 1 operation from each iteration. Every cycle, an iteration starts and finishes when the pipe is full.


Creating Software Pipelines

- ❖ Lots of software pipelining techniques out there
- ❖ Modulo scheduling
 - » Most widely adopted
 - » Practical to implement, yields good results
- ❖ Conceptual strategy
 - » Unroll the loop completely
 - » Then, schedule the code completely with 2 constraints
 - All iteration bodies have identical schedules
 - Each iteration is scheduled to start some fixed number of cycles later than the previous iteration
 - » Initiation Interval (II) = fixed delay between the start of successive iterations
 - » Given the 2 constraints, the unrolled schedule is repetitive (kernel) except the portion at the beginning (prologue) and end (epilogue)
 - Kernel can be re-rolled to yield a new loop

Creating Software Pipelines (2)

- ❖ Create a schedule for 1 iteration of the loop such that when the same schedule is repeated at intervals of Π cycles
 - » No intra-iteration dependence is violated
 - » No inter-iteration dependence is violated
 - » No resource conflict arises between operation in same or distinct iterations
- ❖ We will start out assuming Intel Itanium-style hardware support, then remove it later
 - » Rotating registers
 - » Predicates
 - » Software pipeline loop branch

Terminology



Initiation Interval (II) = fixed delay between the start of successive iterations

Each iteration can be divided into stages consisting of II cycles each

Number of stages in 1 iteration is termed the stage count (SC)

Takes $SC-1$ cycles to fill/drain the pipe

Resource Usage Legality

❖ Need to guarantee that


- » No resource is used at 2 points in time that are separated by an interval which is a multiple of Π
- » I.E., within a single iteration, the same resource is never used more than 1x at the same time modulo Π
- » Known as modulo constraint, where the name modulo scheduling comes from
- » Modulo reservation table solves this problem
 - To schedule an op at time T needing resource R
 - ❖ The entry for R at $T \bmod \Pi$ must be free
 - Mark busy at $T \bmod \Pi$ if schedule

$$\Pi = 3$$

	alu1	alu2	mem	bus0	bus1	br
0						
1						
2						

Dependences in a Loop

- ❖ Need worry about 2 kinds
 - » Intra-iteration
 - » Inter-iteration
- ❖ Delay
 - » Minimum time interval between the start of operations
 - » Operation read/write times
- ❖ Distance
 - » Number of iterations separating the 2 operations involved
 - » Distance of 0 means intra-iteration
- ❖ Recurrence manifests itself as a circuit in the dependence graph



Edges annotated with tuple
 $\langle \text{delay}, \text{distance} \rangle$

Dynamic Single Assignment (DSA) Form


Impossible to overlap iterations because each iteration writes to the same register. So, we'll have to remove the anti and output dependences.

Virtual rotating registers

- * Each register is an infinite push down array (Expanded virtual reg or EVR)
- * Write to top element, but can reference any element
- * Remap operation slides everything down $\rightarrow r[n]$ changes to $r[n+1]$

A program is in DSA form if the same virtual register (EVR element) is never assigned to more than 1x on any dynamic execution path

```
1: r3 = load(r1)
2: r4 = r3 * 26
3: store (r2, r4)
4: r1 = r1 + 4
5: r2 = r2 + 4
6: p1 = cmpp (r1 < r9)
7: brct p1 Loop
```



```
1: r3[-1] = load(r1[0])
2: r4[-1] = r3[-1] * 26
3: store (r2[0], r4[-1])
4: r1[-1] = r1[0] + 4
5: r2[-1] = r2[0] + 4
6: p1[-1] = cmpp (r1[-1] < r9)
  remap r1, r2, r3, r4, p1
7: brct p1[-1] Loop
```


Physical Realization of EVRs

- ❖ EVR may contain an unlimited number values
 - » But, only a finite contiguous set of elements of an EVR are ever live at any point in time
 - » These must be given physical registers
- ❖ Conventional register file
 - » Remaps are essentially copies, so each EVR is realized by a set of physical registers and copies are inserted
- ❖ Rotating registers
 - » Direct support for EVRs
 - » No copies needed
 - » File “rotated” after each loop iteration is completed

Loop Dependence Example

```
1: r3[-1] = load(r1[0])
2: r4[-1] = r3[-1] * 26
3: store (r2[0], r4[-1])
4: r1[-1] = r1[0] + 4
5: r2[-1] = r2[0] + 4
6: p1[-1] = cmpp (r1[-1] < r9)
  remap r1, r2, r3, r4, p1
7: brct p1[-1] Loop
```

In DSA form, there are no
inter-iteration anti or output
dependences!



<delay, distance>

Class Problem

Latencies: ld = 2, st = 1, add = 1, cmpp = 1, br = 1

1: r1[-1] = load(r2[0])
2: r3[-1] = r1[1] - r1[2]
3: store (r3[-1], r2[0])
4: r2[-1] = r2[0] + 4
5: p1[-1] = cmpp (r2[-1] < 100)
remap r1, r2, r3
6: brct p1[-1] Loop

Draw the dependence graph
showing both intra and inter
iteration dependences

①

②

③

④

⑤

⑥

Minimum Initiation Interval (MII)

- ❖ Remember, II = number of cycles between the start of successive iterations
- ❖ Modulo scheduling requires a candidate II be selected before scheduling is attempted
 - » Try candidate II , see if it works
 - » If not, increase by 1, try again repeating until successful
- ❖ MII is a lower bound on the II
 - » $MII = \text{Max}(\text{ResMII}, \text{RecMII})$
 - » ResMII = resource constrained MII
 - Resource usage requirements of 1 iteration
 - » RecMII = recurrence constrained MII
 - Latency of the circuits in the dependence graph

ResMII

Concept: If there were no dependences between the operations, what is the the shortest possible schedule?

Simple resource model

A processor has a set of resources R. For each resource r in R there is count(r) specifying the number of identical copies

$$\text{ResMII} = \text{MAX}_{\text{for all } r \text{ in } R} (\text{uses}(r) / \text{count}(r))$$

uses(r) = number of times the resource is used in 1 iteration

In reality its more complex than this because operations can have multiple alternatives (different choices for resources it could be assigned to), but we will ignore this for now

ResMII Example

resources: 4 issue, 2 alu, 1 mem, 1 br

latencies: add=1, mpy=3, ld = 2, st = 1, br = 1

1: r3 = load(r1)
2: r4 = r3 * 26
3: store (r2, r4)
4: r1 = r1 + 4
5: r2 = r2 + 4
6: p1 = cmpp (r1 < r9)
7: brct p1 Loop

ALU: used by 2, 4, 5, 6
→ 4 ops / 2 units = 2

Mem: used by 1, 3
→ 2 ops / 1 unit = 2

Br: used by 7
→ 1 op / 1 unit = 1

ResMII = MAX(2,2,1) = 2



RecMII

Approach: Enumerate all irredundant elementary circuits in the dependence graph

$$\text{RecMII} = \text{MAX}_{\text{for all } c \text{ in } C} (\text{delay}(c) / \text{distance}(c))$$


$\text{delay}(c)$ = total latency in dependence cycle c (sum of delays)

$\text{distance}(c)$ = total iteration distance of cycle c (sum of distances)



cycle

k
k+1
k+2
k+3
k+4
k+5



$$\text{delay}(c) = 1 + 3 = 4$$


$$\text{distance}(c) = 0 + 1 = 1$$

$$\text{RecMII} = 4/1 = 4$$

RecMII Example

```

1: r3 = load(r1)
2: r4 = r3 * 26
3: store (r2, r4)
4: r1 = r1 + 4
5: r2 = r2 + 4
6: p1 = cmpp (r1 < r9)
7: brct p1 Loop
    
```



<delay, distance>

$4 \rightarrow 4: 1 / 1 = 1$
 $5 \rightarrow 5: 1 / 1 = 1$
 $4 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 4: 1 / 1 = 1$
 $5 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 5: 1 / 1 = 1$

$\text{RecMII} = \text{MAX}(1,1,1,1) = 1$

Then,

$\text{MII} = \text{MAX}(\text{ResMII}, \text{RecMII})$


$\text{MII} = \text{MAX}(2,1) = 2$

Homework Problem

Latencies: ld = 2, st = 1, add = 1, cmpp = 1, br = 1

Resources: 1 ALU, 1 MEM, 1 BR

1: r1[-1] = load(r2[0])
2: r3[-1] = r1[1] - r1[2]
3: store (r3[-1], r2[0])
4: r2[-1] = r2[0] + 4
5: p1[-1] = cmpp (r2[-1] < 100)
 remap r1, r2, r3
6: brct p1[-1] Loop



Calculate RecMII, ResMII, and MII