





# Why Separate Instruction Memory and Data Memory? Continued

- Think about what has to happen on a lw. (Is this possible with a single memory?)
- (This is one of the textbook's "check yourself" questions.)



Slide 5

Slide 6

### Multi-Cycle Implementations

- So, we have a sketch for an implementation that executes one instruction per cycle. But clearly this isn't how all real systems work (if nothing else, many don't separate instruction memory from data memory).
- Why not? means cycle time is limited by length of longest path through the whole path, while many instructions can be done faster.
- What to do? break up work into multiple pieces ...



# Simple Multi-Cycle Implementation

- One approach is to stick to the idea of executing one instruction at a time, but break things up so instructions potentially take multiple cycles. (How's that going to help? Well ...)
- Control logic is now going to be more complex must do everything we were doing before, plus keep track of which phase we're in. (Recall discussion of finite state machines from Appendix B.)
- However, one potential payoff is skipping unused phases e.g.., the R-format (arithmetic/logic) instructions don't need to access data memory, and indeed we don't need separate instruction/data memories. A previous edition of the textbook lays out a design for this (review figures briefly).



- Another approach is to use "pipelining": Modeled after assembly line; many real-world analogies possible. Textbook describes a laundry "assembly line", with stages corresponding to washing, drying, folding, and putting away.
- Could base a pipelined implementation of MIPS on the same phases used for a multi-cycle implementation, with one pipeline stage per phase.
- How does this help? well, it doesn't make individual instructions faster, but it means you can get more of them done in a given time.
- Like the simple multi-cycle implementation, it means added hardware complexity ...

#### Pipelining — Implementation Overview

- First might observe that the five phases into which we've divided instruction processing seem to map onto the picture of our datapath what we're doing is breaking up the flow of information through it into steps(!).
- So the idea will be to somehow partition the datapath so we can have each piece working on a different instruction. But for that to work, we have to add groups of registers between pieces, so we save the results of one step for the next step.
- Ignoring complications ("hazards" next slides), this gives what's sketched in Figures 4.33 and 4.35.

Slide 9



Pipelining Complications — "Structural Hazards"

- Idea is that two things we want to do at the same time conflict e.g., read instruction from memory and read data from memory.
- Only solution is to avoid. For MIPS, we could go back to separate instruction and data memories.



## Pipelining Complications — "Data Hazards"

 Idea is that we need data computed by one instruction before it would normally be available — e.g., two successive R-type instructions, or a load followed by an R-type instruction.

Several possible solutions:

- Stall just wait until data is available. (Probably not a good solution.)
- Add hardware for "forwarding" special hardware to route results to next instruction in addition to regular destination. May or may not be possible.
- Use delayed loads don't allow instruction after a "load" to use the result. (This is what original MIPS did.)



