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## What Makes Code Run Fast?

- Many operations have non-zero latencies
- Modern machines can issue several operations per cycle
- Execution time is order-dependent (and has been since the 60's)

| Operation | Cycles |
| :--- | :---: |
| load | 3 |
| store | 3 |
| loadI | 1 |
| add | 1 |
| mult | 2 |
| fadd | 1 |
| fmult | 2 |
| shift | 1 |
| branch | 0 to 8 |

- Loads \& stores may or may not block on issue
$>$ Non-blocking $\Rightarrow$ fill those issue slots
- Branch costs vary with path taken
- Branches typically have delay slots
> Fill slots with unrelated operations
$>$ Percolates branch upward
- Scheduler should hide the latencies


## Assumed latencies for

 example on next slide.
## Example

$$
a \leftarrow a^{*} 2 * b^{*} c * d
$$

## Simple schedule

| Start |  | Operations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 10adAI | $\mathrm{rarp}, @ a \Rightarrow r_{1}$ |
| 4 | add | $r_{1}, r_{1} \Rightarrow r_{1}$ |
| 5 | loadAI | $r_{\text {arp }}, @ b \Rightarrow r_{2}$ |
| 8 | mult | $r_{1}, r_{2} \Rightarrow r_{1}$ |
| 10 | loadAI | $r_{\text {arp }}, @ c \Rightarrow r_{2}$ |
| 13 | mult | $r_{1}, r_{2} \Rightarrow r_{1}$ |
| 15 | 10adAI | $r_{\text {arp }}, @ d \Rightarrow r_{2}$ |
| 18 | mult | $r_{1}, r_{2} \Rightarrow r_{1}$ |
| 20 | storeAI | $r_{1} \quad \Rightarrow r_{\text {arp }}$, @a |

Schedule loads early

| Start |  | Operations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 oadAI | rarp, @a $\Rightarrow r_{1}$ |
| 2 | loadAI | rarp, @b $\Rightarrow r_{2}$ |
| 3 | loadAI | $r_{\text {arp }}$, @c $\Rightarrow r_{3}$ |
| 4 | add | $r_{1}, r_{1} \Rightarrow r_{1}$ |
| 5 | mult | $r_{1}, r_{2} \Rightarrow r_{1}$ |
| 6 | loadAI | rarp, @d $\Rightarrow r_{2}$ |
| 7 | mult | $r_{1}, r_{3} \Rightarrow r_{1}$ |
| 9 | mult | $r_{1}, r_{2} \Rightarrow r_{1}$ |
| 11 | storeAI | $r_{1} \quad \Rightarrow r_{\text {arp }}$, @a |

Reordering operations for speed is called instruction scheduling

ALU Characteristics


This data is surprisingly hard to measure accurately

- Value-dependent behavior
- Context-dependent behavior
- Compiler behavior
- Have seen gcc underallocate \& inflate operation costs with memory references (spills)
- Have seen commercial compiler generate 3 extra ops per divide raising effective cost by 3
- Difficult to reconcile measured reality with the data in the Manuals (e.g. integer divide on Nehalem)

| Intel E5530 operation latencies |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Instruction | Cost |
| 64 bit integer subtract | 1 |
| 64 bit integer multiply | 3 |
| 64 bit integer divide | 41 |
| Double precision add | 3 |
| Double precision subtract | 3 |
| Double precision multiply | 5 |
| Double precision divide | 22 |
| Single precision add | 3 |
| Single precision subtract | 3 |
| Single precision multiply | 4 |
| Single precision divide | 14 |
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## Instruction Scheduling (Engineer's View)

The Problem
Given a code fragment for some target machine and the latencies for each individual operation, reorder the operations to minimize execution time

The Concept


The Task

- Produce correct code
- Minimize wasted cycles
- Avoid spilling registers
- Operate efficiently


## Instruction Scheduling (The Abstract View)

To capture properties of the code, build a precedence graph $G$

- Nodes $n \in G$ are operations with type( $n$ ) and delay( $n$ )
- An edge $e=\left(n_{1}, n_{2}\right) \in G$ if \& only if $n_{2}$ uses the result of $n_{1}$


The Code


The Precedence Graph

## Instruction Scheduling

A correct schedule $S$ maps each $n \in N$ into a non-negative integer representing its cycle number, and

1. $S(n) \geq 0$, for all $n \in N$, obviously
2. If $\left(n_{1}, n_{2}\right) \in E, S\left(n_{1}\right)+\operatorname{delay}\left(n_{1}\right) \leq S\left(n_{2}\right)$
3. For each type $t$, there are no more operations of type $t$ in any cycle than the target machine can issue

The length of a schedule $S$, denoted $L(S)$, is $L(S)=\max _{n \in N}(S(n)+$ delay $(n))$

The goal is to find the shortest possible correct schedule.
$S$ is time-optimal if $L(S) \leq L\left(S_{1}\right)$, for all other schedules $S_{1}$
A schedule might also be optimal in terms of registers, power, or space....

## Instruction Scheduling (What's so difficult?)

Critical Points

- All operands must be available
- Multiple operations can be ready
- Moving operations can lengthen register lifetimes
- Placing uses near definitions can shorten register lifetimes
- Operands can have multiple predecessors

Together, these issues make scheduling hard (NP-Complete)

Local scheduling is the simple case

- Restricted to straight-line code
- Consistent and predictable latencies


## Instruction Scheduling: The Big Picture

1. Build a precedence graph, $P$
2. Compute a priority function over the nodes in $P$
3. Use list scheduling to construct a schedule, 1 cycle at a time
a. Use a queue of operations that are ready
b. At each cycle
I. Choose the highest priority ready operation \& schedule it
II. Update the ready queue

Local list scheduling

- The dominant algorithm for thirty years
- A greedy, heuristic, local technique


## Local List Scheduling



## Scheduling Example

1. Build the precedence graph


| Scheduling Exa |  | Operation <br> load <br> store | Cycles |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Build the prece <br> 2. Determine prior |  | add | 1 |  |
|  |  | mult | 2 | weighted path |
|  |  | fmult | 2 |  |
|  |  | shift | 1 |  |
|  |  | branch | 0 to 8 |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{a}^{13}$ |
| $b$ : | add $r_{1}, r_{1}$ | $\Rightarrow r_{1}$ |  | 12 |
|  | loadAI rarp.e | b $\Rightarrow r_{2}$ |  | $10^{\text {b }}$ / ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
|  | mult $r_{1}, r_{2}$ | $\Rightarrow r_{1}$ |  | $10^{\text {d }} \mathrm{e}^{10}$ |
|  | loadAl rarp, © | ct $\Rightarrow r_{3}$ |  | $9^{d} /{ }^{\text {d }}$ |
|  | mult $r_{1}, r_{2}$ | $\Rightarrow r_{1}$ |  | $\mathrm{f}^{8}$ |
|  | loadAI rarp, © | فd $\Rightarrow r_{2}$ |  | $7 \mathrm{f}{ }^{5}{ }^{\text {g }}$ |
|  | mult $r_{1}, r_{2}$ | $\Rightarrow r_{1}$ |  |  |
|  | storeAI $r_{1}$ | $\Rightarrow r_{\text {arp }}$.@a |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | The Code |  |  | The Precedence Graph |

## Scheduling Example

1. Build the precedence graph
2. Determine priorities: longest latency-weighted path
3. Perform list scheduling
1) a: loadAl $\quad \mathrm{r} 0, @ \mathrm{ew} \Rightarrow \mathrm{r} 1$
2) c: loadAl $\mathrm{ro}, @ \mathrm{Q} \Rightarrow \mathrm{r} 2$
3) e: loadAl $\mathrm{r0}$, @y $\Rightarrow \mathrm{r} 3$
4) b : add $\quad \mathrm{rl}, \mathrm{r} 1 \quad \Rightarrow \mathrm{r} 1$
5) d: mult $\quad \mathrm{r} 1, \mathrm{r} 2 \quad \Rightarrow \mathrm{r} 1$
6) g : loadAl $\mathrm{r} 0, @ \mathrm{z} \quad \Rightarrow \mathrm{r} 2$
7) f: mult $\quad \mathrm{r} 1, \mathrm{r} 3 \quad \Rightarrow \mathrm{r} 1$
8) h : mult $\quad \mathrm{r} 1, \mathrm{r} 2 \Rightarrow \mathrm{r} 1$
9) i: storeAl $\quad \mathrm{r} 1 \quad \Rightarrow \mathrm{r0}$,@w

The Code
Used a new register name


The Precedence Graph

## More List Scheduling

List scheduling breaks down into two distinct classes
Forward list scheduling

- Start with available operations
- Work forward in time
- Ready $\Rightarrow$ all operands available

Backward list scheduling

- Start with no successors
- Work backward in time
- Ready $\Rightarrow$ latency covers uses

Variations on list scheduling

- Prioritize critical path(s)
- Schedule last use as soon as possible
- Depth first in precedence graph (minimize registers)
- Breadth first in precedence graph (minimize interlocks)
- Prefer operation with most successors



## Local Scheduling

F

|  | Int | Int | Mem |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | loadI $_{1}$ | lshift |  |
| 2 | loadI $_{2}$ | $\mathrm{loadI}_{3}$ |  |
| 3 | $\mathrm{loadI}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{add}_{1}$ |  |
| 4 | $\mathrm{add}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{add}_{3}$ |  |
| 5 | $\mathrm{add}_{4}$ | addI | store ${ }_{1}$ |
| 6 | cmp |  | store $_{2}$ |
| 7 |  |  | store $_{3}$ |
| 8 |  |  | store $_{4}$ |
| 9 |  |  | store $_{5}$ |
| 10 |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |
| 13 | cbr |  |  |


| B | Int |  |  | Int |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a | Mem |  |  |  |
| c | 1 | loadI $_{4}$ |  |  |
| k | 2 | addI | lshift |  |
| w | 3 | add $_{4}$ | loadI $_{3}$ |  |
| a | 4 | $\operatorname{add}_{3}$ | loadI $_{2}$ | store $_{5}$ |
| r | 5 | add $_{2}$ | loadI $_{1}$ | store $_{4}$ |
| d | 6 | add $_{1}$ |  | store $_{3}$ |
| S | 7 |  |  | store $_{2}$ |
| c | 7 |  |  | store $_{1}$ |
| h | 8 |  |  |  |
| e | 9 |  |  |  |
| d | 10 |  |  |  |
| u | 11 | cmp |  |  |
| l | 12 | cbr |  |  |
| e | 12 |  |  |  |
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Using "latency to root" as the priority function

## Scheduling Larger Regions

One step beyond a block is an Extended Basic Block (EBB)

- EBB is a maximal set of blocks s.t.
- Set has a single entry, $B_{i}$
- Each block $B_{j}$ other than $B_{i}$ has ; exactly one predecessor
- Example CFG has three EBBs,



## Scheduling Larger Regions

One step beyond a block is an Extended Basic Block (EBB)

- EBB is a maximal set of blocks such that
- Set has a single entry, $B_{i}$
- Each block $B_{j}$ other than $B_{i}$ has exactly one predecessor
- Example has three EBBs
- Big EBB has two paths
$-\left\{B_{1}, B_{2}, B_{4}\right\} \&\left\{B_{1}, B_{3}\right\}$
- Many optimizations operate on EBBs (including scheduling)



## Scheduling Larger Regions

Superlocal Scheduling

- Schedule entire paths through EBBs
- Example has four EBB paths


[^0]:    Xeon E5530 uses the Nehalem microarchitecture, as does 17

