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Moore’s Law

Multi-Core

- **Idea**: Put multiple processors on the same die.

- Technology scaling (Moore’s Law) enables more transistors to be placed on the same die area.

- What else could you do with the die area you dedicate to multiple processors?
  - Have a bigger, more powerful core
  - Have larger caches in the memory hierarchy
  - Simultaneous multithreading
  - Integrate platform components on chip (e.g., network interface, memory controllers)
  - ...

Why Multi-Core?

- Alternative: Bigger, more powerful single core
  - Larger superscalar issue width, larger instruction window, more execution units, large trace caches, large branch predictors, etc

+ Improves single-thread performance transparently to programmer, compiler
- Very difficult to design (Scalable algorithms for improving single-thread performance elusive)
- Power hungry – many out-of-order execution structures consume significant power/area when scaled. Why?
- Diminishing returns on performance
- Does not significantly help memory-bound application performance (Scalable algorithms for this elusive)
Large Superscalar+OoO vs. Multi-Core


Figure 2. Floorplan for the six-issue dynamic superscalar microprocessor.

Figure 3. Floorplan for the four-way single-chip multiprocessor.
Multi-Core vs. Large Superscalar+OoO

- **Multi-core advantages**
  + Simpler cores $\rightarrow$ more power efficient, lower complexity, easier to design and replicate, higher frequency (shorter wires, smaller structures)
  + Higher system throughput on multiprogrammed workloads $\rightarrow$ reduced context switches
  + Higher system performance in parallel applications

- **Multi-core disadvantages**
  - Requires parallel tasks/threads to improve performance (parallel programming)
  - Resource sharing can reduce single-thread performance
  - Shared hardware resources need to be managed
  - Number of pins limits data supply for increased demand
Large Superscalar vs. Multi-Core


- Technology push
  - Instruction issue queue size limits the cycle time of the superscalar, OoO processor $\rightarrow$ diminishing performance
    - Quadratic increase in complexity with issue width
  - Large, multi-ported register files to support large instruction windows and issue widths $\rightarrow$ reduced frequency or longer RF access, diminishing performance

- Application pull
  - Integer applications: little parallelism?
  - FP applications: abundant loop-level parallelism
  - Others (transaction proc., multiprogramming): CMP better fit
## Comparison Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6-way SS</th>
<th>4x2-way MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of CPUs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree superscalar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of architectural registers</td>
<td>32int / 32fp</td>
<td>4 x 32int / 32fp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of physical registers</td>
<td>160int / 160fp</td>
<td>4 x 40int / 40fp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of integer functional units</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of floating pt. functional units</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of load/store ports</td>
<td>8 (one per bank)</td>
<td>4 x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTB size</td>
<td>2048 entries</td>
<td>4 x 512 entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return stack size</td>
<td>32 entries</td>
<td>4 x 8 entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction issue queue size</td>
<td>128 entries</td>
<td>4 x 8 entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I cache</td>
<td>32 KB, 2-way S.A.</td>
<td>4 x 8 KB, 2-way S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D cache</td>
<td>32 KB, 2-way S.A.</td>
<td>4 x 8 KB, 2-way S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 hit time</td>
<td>2 cycles (4 ns)</td>
<td>1 cycle (2 ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 cache interleaving</td>
<td>8 banks</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified L2 cache</td>
<td>256 KB, 2-way S.A.</td>
<td>256 KB, 2-way S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 hit time / L1 penalty</td>
<td>4 cycles (8 ns)</td>
<td>5 cycles (10 ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory latency / L2 penalty</td>
<td>50 cycles (100 ns)</td>
<td>50 cycles (100 ns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1**: Key characteristics of the two microarchitectures
Why Multi-Core?

- **Alternative: Bigger caches**
  
  + Improves single-thread performance transparently to programmer, compiler
  + Simple to design

- Diminishing single-thread performance returns from cache size. Why?
- Multiple levels complicate memory hierarchy
Cache vs. Core

- **Cache**
- **Microprocessor**

![Graph showing the comparison between Cache and Microprocessor over time](chart.png)
Why Multi-Core?

- Alternative: (Simultaneous) Multithreading

  + Exploits thread-level parallelism (just like multi-core)
  + Good single-thread performance with SMT
  + No need to have an entire core for another thread
  + Parallel performance aided by tight sharing of caches

- Scalability is limited: need bigger register files, larger issue width (and associated costs) to have many threads \(\rightarrow\) complex with many threads

- Parallel performance limited by shared fetch bandwidth

- Extensive resource sharing at the pipeline and memory system reduces both single-thread and parallel application performance
Why Multi-Core?

- Alternative: Integrate platform components on chip instead

  + Speeds up many system functions (e.g., network interface cards, Ethernet controller, memory controller, I/O controller)
  
  - Not all applications benefit (e.g., CPU intensive code sections)
Why Multi-Core?

- **Alternative: More scalable superscalar, out-of-order engines**
  - Clustered superscalar processors (with multithreading)

  + Simpler to design than superscalar, more scalable than simultaneous multithreading (less resource sharing)
  + Can improve both single-thread and parallel application performance

- Diminishing performance returns on single thread: Clustering reduces IPC performance compared to monolithic superscalar.
  - Why?
  - Parallel performance limited by shared fetch bandwidth
  - Difficult to design
Clustered Superscalar+OoO Processors

- **Clustering** (e.g., Alpha 21264 integer units)
  - Divide the scheduling window (and register file) into multiple clusters
  - Instructions steered into clusters (e.g. based on dependence)
  - Clusters schedule instructions out-of-order, within cluster scheduling can be in-order
  - Inter-cluster communication happens via register files (no full bypass)

  + Smaller scheduling windows, simpler wakeup algorithms
  + Fewer ports into register files
  + Faster within-cluster bypass

--- Extra delay when instructions require across-cluster communication

Clustering (I)

- Scheduling within each cluster can be out of order

Clustering (II)

Clustering (III)

Each scheduler is a FIFO
  + Simpler
  + Can have N FIFOs
    (OoO w.r.t. each other)
  + Reduces scheduling complexity
  -- More dispatch stalls

Inter-cluster bypass: Results produced by an FU in Cluster 0 is not individually forwarded to each FU in another cluster.

Why Multi-Core?

- **Alternative:** Traditional symmetric multiprocessors

  + Smaller die size (for the same processing core)
  + More memory bandwidth (no pin bottleneck)
  + Fewer shared resources $\rightarrow$ less contention between threads

- Long latencies between cores (need to go off chip) $\rightarrow$ shared data accesses limit performance $\rightarrow$ parallel application scalability is limited

- Worse resource efficiency due to less sharing $\rightarrow$ worse power/energy efficiency
Why Multi-Core?

- Other alternatives?
  - Dataflow?
  - Vector processors (SIMD)?
  - Integrating DRAM on chip?
  - Reconfigurable logic? (general purpose?)
Review: Multi-Core Alternatives

- Bigger, more powerful single core
- Bigger caches
- (Simultaneous) multithreading
- Integrate platform components on chip instead
- More scalable superscalar, out-of-order engines
- Traditional symmetric multiprocessors
- Dataflow?
- Vector processors (SIMD)?
- Integrating DRAM on chip?
- Reconfigurable logic? (general purpose?)
- Other alternatives?
- Your solution?
Today is a very exciting time to study computer architecture.

Industry is in a large paradigm shift (to multi-core and beyond) – many different potential system designs possible.

Many difficult problems motivating and caused by the shift:
- Power/energy constraints → multi-core?, accelerators?
- Complexity of design → multi-core?
- Difficulties in technology scaling → new technologies?
- Memory wall/gap
- Reliability wall/issues
- Programmability wall/problem → single-core?

No clear, definitive answers to these problems.
These problems affect all parts of the computing stack – if we do not change the way we design systems.

No clear, definitive answers to these problems.
You can revolutionize the way computers are built, if you understand both the hardware and the software (and change each according accordingly)

You can invent new paradigms for computation, communication, and storage

Recommended book: Kuhn, “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions” (1962)
- Pre-paradigm science: no clear consensus in the field
- Normal science: dominant theory used to explain things (business as usual); exceptions considered anomalies
- Revolutionary science: underlying assumptions re-examined
... but, first ...

- Let’s understand the fundamentals...

- You can change the world only if you understand it well enough...
  - Especially the past and present dominant paradigms
  - And, their advantages and shortcomings -- tradeoffs
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Related Videos

- Multi-Core Systems and Heterogeneity
  - [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LIDxT0hPl2U&list=PLVngZ7BemHHV6N0ejHhwOfLwTr8Q-UKXj&index=1](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LIDxT0hPl2U&list=PLVngZ7BemHHV6N0ejHhwOfLwTr8Q-UKXj&index=1)
  - [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q0zyLVnzkrM&list=PLVngZ7BemHHV6N0ejHhwOfLwTr8Q-UKXj&index=2](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q0zyLVnzkrM&list=PLVngZ7BemHHV6N0ejHhwOfLwTr8Q-UKXj&index=2)