

Microprocessor Evolution: 4004 to Pentium-4

Joel Emer Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory Massachusetts Institute of Technology

> Based on the material prepared by Krste Asanovic and Arvind

First Microprocessor Intel 4004, 1971

Image removed due to copyright restrictions.

To view image, visit http://news.com.com/Images+Moores+L aw+turns+40/2009-1041_3-5649019-<u>5.html</u>

- 4-bit accumulator architecture
- 8µm pMOS
- 2,300 transistors
- 3 x 4 mm²
- 750kHz clock
- 8-16 cycles/inst.



6.823 L15-2

Emer

Microprocessors in the Seventies

Initial target was embedded control

• First micro, 4-bit 4004 from Intel, designed for a desktop printing calculator

Constrained by what could fit on single chip

• Single accumulator architectures

8-bit micros used in hobbyist personal computers

- Micral, Altair, TRS-80, Apple-II
- Little impact on conventional computer market until VISICALC spreadsheet for Apple-II (6502, 1MHz)
- First "killer" business application for personal computers



DRAM in the Seventies

Dramatic progress in MOSFET memory technology

- 1970, Intel introduces first DRAM (1Kbit 1103)
- 1979, Fujitsu introduces 64Kbit DRAM
- => By mid-Seventies, obvious that PCs would soon have > 64KBytes physical memory



Microprocessor Evolution

Rapid progress in size and speed through 70s

- Fueled by advances in MOSFET technology and expanding markets

Intel i432

- Most ambitious seventies' micro; started in 1975 released 1981
- 32-bit capability-based object-oriented architecture
- Instructions variable number of *bits* long
- Severe performance, complexity, and usability problems

Motorola 68000 (1979, 8MHz, 68,000 transistors)

- Heavily microcoded (and nanocoded)
- 32-bit general purpose register architecture (24 address pins)
- 8 address registers, 8 data registers

Intel 8086 (1978, 8MHz, 29,000 transistors)

- "Stopgap" 16-bit processor, architected in 10 weeks
- Extended accumulator architecture, assembly-compatible with 8080
- 20-bit addressing through segmented addressing scheme



Intel 8086

<u>Class</u> Data:	<u>Register</u> AX,BX CX DX	<u>Purpose</u> "general" purpose string and loop ops only mult/div and I/O only
Address:	SP BP SI,DI	stack pointer base pointer (can also use BX) index registers
Segment:	CS SS DS ES	code segment stack segment data segment extra segment
Control:	IP FLAGS	instruction pointer (low 16 bit of PC) C, Z, N, B, P, V and 3 control bits

- Typical format R <= R op M[X], many addressing modes
- Not a GPR organization!



IBM PC, 1981

Hardware

- Team from IBM building PC prototypes in 1979
- Motorola 68000 chosen initially, but 68000 was late
- IBM builds "stopgap" prototypes using 8088 boards from Display Writer word processor
- 8088 is 8-bit bus version of 8086 => allows cheaper system
- Estimated sales of 250,000
- 100,000,000s sold

Software

• Microsoft negotiates to provide OS for IBM. Later buys and modifies QDOS from Seattle Computer Products.

Open System

- Standard processor, Intel 8088
- Standard interfaces
- Standard OS, MS-DOS
- IBM permits cloning and third-party software



The Eighties: Personal Computer Revolution

Personal computer market emerges

- Huge business and consumer market for spreadsheets, word processing and games
- Based on inexpensive 8-bit and 16-bit micros: Zilog Z80, Mostek 6502, Intel 8088/86, ...

Minicomputers replaced by workstations

- Distributed network computing and high-performance graphics for scientific and engineering applications (Sun, Apollo, HP,...)
- Based on powerful 32-bit microprocessors with virtual memory, caches, pipelined execution, hardware floating-point
- Commercial RISC processors developed for workstation market

Massively Parallel Processors (MPPs) appear

 Use many cheap micros to approach supercomputer performance (Sequent, Intel, Parsytec)



6.823 L15-8

Emer

6.823 L15- 9 Emer

The Nineties

Advanced superscalar microprocessors appear

• first superscalar microprocessor is IBM POWER in 1990

MPPs have limited success in supercomputing market

• Highest-end mainframes and vector supercomputers survive "killer micro" onslaught

64-bit addressing becomes essential at high-end

• In 2004, 4GB DRAM costs <\$1,000

Parallel microprocessor-based SMPs take over low-end server and supercomputer market

Workstation and PC markets merge

- By late '90s (except for Apple PowerPC-based systems) RISC vendors have tiny share of desktop market
- CISC x86 ISA thrives!



Intel Pentium 4 (2000)

6.823 L15- 10 Emer

Image removed due to copyright restrictions.

To view image, visit <u>http://www-</u> vlsi.stanford.edu/group/chips_micropro_body.html

This lecture contains figures and data taken from: "The microarchitecture of the Pentium 4 processor", Intel Technology Journal, Q1, 2001



Pentium 4 uOPs

- During L1 instruction cache refill, translates complex x86 instructions into RISC-like micro-operations (uops)
 - e.g., "R ← R op Mem" translates into

load T, Mem	# Load from Mem into temp reg
R 🗲 R op T	# Operate using value in temp

- Execute uops using speculative out-of-order superscalar engine with register renaming
- uop translation introduced in Pentium Pro family architecture (P6 family) in 1995
 - also used on Pentium-II and Pentium-III processors, and new Pentium M (Centrino) processors



Instruction Set Translation: Convert a target ISA into a host machine's ISA

- Pentium Pro (P6 family)
 - translation in hardware after instruction fetch
 - also used in AMD x86 processors
- Pentium-4 family
 - translation in hardware at level 1 instruction cache refill
- Transmeta Crusoe
 - translation in software using "Code Morphing" (see lecture 24)



Pentium 4 Block Diagram





Pentium 4 Front End





6.823 L15- 15 Emer

Trace Cache

Key Idea: Pack multiple non-contiguous basic blocks into one contiguous trace cache line



- Single fetch brings in multiple basic blocks
- Trace cache indexed by start address and next n branch predictions



Pentium 4 Trace Cache

 Holds decoded uops in predicted program flow order, 6 uops per line

Code in memory



Code packed in trace cache (6 uops/line)

cmp	br Tl	sub
br T2	mov	sub
br T3	add	sub
mov	br T4	т4:

Trace cache fetches one 6 uop line every 2 CPU clock cycles (runs at 1/2 main CPU rate)



Trace Cache Advantages

- Removes x86 decode from branch mispredict penalty
 - Parallel x86 decoder took 2.5 cycles in P6, would be 5 cycles in P-4 design
- Allows higher fetch bandwidth fetch for correctly predicted taken branches
 - P6 had one cycle bubble for correctly predicted taken branches
 - P-4 can fetch a branch and its target in same cycle
- Saves energy
 - x86 decoder only powered up on trace cache refill



6.823 L15- 17

Fmer

P-4 Trace Cache Fetch



6.823 L15- 19 Emer

Line Prediction (*Alpha 21[234]64*)



- Line Predictor predicts line to fetch each cycle
 - 21464 was to predict 2 lines per cycle
- Icache fetches block, and predictors predict target
- PC Calc checks accuracy of line prediction(s)



P-III vs. P-4 Renaming







P-4 Execution Ports



Figure by MIT OCW.

- Schedulers compete for access to execution ports
- Loads and stores have dedicated ports
- ALUs can execute two operations per cycle
- Peak bandwidth of 6 uops per cycle
 - load, store, plus four double-pumped ALU operations



6.823 L15- 23 Emer

P-4 Fast ALUs and Bypass Path



- Fast ALUs and bypass network runs at twice global clock speed
- All "non-essential" circuit paths handled out of loop to reduce circuit loading (shifts, mults/divs, branches, flag/ops)
- Other bypassing takes multiple clock cycles



P-4 Staggered ALU Design



- Staggers 32-bit add and flag compare into three 1/2 cycle phases
 - low 16 bits
 - high 16 bits
 - flag checks
- Bypass 16 bits around every ½ cycle
 - back-to-back dependent 32-bit adds at 3GHz in 0.18mm (7.2GHz in 90nm)
- L1 Data Cache access starts with bottom 16 bits as index, top 16 bits used as tag check later



6.823 L15- 25 Emer

P-4 Load Schedule Speculation

TC Next IP 2 3 TC Fetch 4 5 Drive 6 Alloc 7 Rename 8 9 Oueue Schedule 1 Schedule 2 Schedule 3 Dispatch 1 Dispatch 2 Register File 1 Register File 2 Load Execute 1 Load Execute 2 19 Branch Check 20 Drive

November 2, 2005

Long delay from schedulers to load hit/miss

• P-4 guesses that load will hit in L1 and schedules dependent operations to use value

• If load misses, only dependent operations are replayed



6.823 L15- 26 Emer

P-4 Branch Penalty

		TC Novt ID	
	2	TC NEXT IP	
	3	TC Eatch	
	4	TC Felch	
	5	Drive	
	6	Alloc	
	7 8	Rename	
	9	Queue	
	10	Schedule 1	
	11	Schedule 2	
	12	Schedule 3	
	13	Dispatch 1	
	14	Dispatch 2	
	15	Register File 1	
	16	Register File 2	
	17	Execute	
	18	Flags	
	19	Branch Check	
	20	Drive	
ſ	love	ember 2, 2005	

20 cycle branch mispredict penalty

- P-4 uses new "trade secret" branch prediction algorithm
- Intel claims 1/3 fewer mispredicts than P6 algorithm



6.823 L15- 27 Emer

Tournament Branch Predictor (Alpha 21264)



- Choice predictor learns whether best to use local or global branch history in predicting next branch
- Global history is speculatively updated but restored on mispredict
- Claim 90-100% success on range of applications



P-III vs. P-4 Pipelines

				Ba	asic F	Penti	um®	III P	roces	sor Mis	predic	tion F	Pipel	ine				
1		2		3	3	4	4		5	6		7		8		9		10
Fet	ch	Fet	ch	Dec	ode	Dec	code	Dec	code	Renam	e RC	B Rd	Rdy	y/Sch	Dis	patch	n E	xec
				В	asic I	Penti	um®	4 Pro	ocess	or Misp	redict	ion Pi	pelir	ne				
1	2	3	4	B	asic I	Penti	um®	4 Pro	ocess	or Misp	redict	ion Pi	pelir	ne 16	17	18	19	20

Figure by MIT OCW.

- In same process technology, ~1.5x clock frequency
- Performance Equation:





Deep Pipeline Design

Greater potential throughput but:

- Clock uncertainty and latch delays eat into cycle time budget
 - doubling pipeline depth gives less than twice frequency improvement
- Clock load and power increases
 - more latches running at higher frequencies
- More complicated microarchitecture needed to cover long branch mispredict penalties and cache miss penalties
 - from Little's Law, need more instructions in flight to cover longer latencies → larger reorder buffers
- P-4 has three major clock domains
 - Double pumped ALU (3 GHz), small critical area at highest speed
 - Main CPU pipeline (1.5 GHz in 0.18µm)
 - Trace cache (0.75 GHz), save power



Scaling of Wire Delay

- Over time, transistors are getting relatively faster than long wires
 - wire resistance growing dramatically with shrinking width and height
 - capacitance roughly fixed for constant length wire
 - RC delays of fixed length wire rising
- Chips are getting bigger
 - P-4 >2x size of P-III
- Clock frequency rising faster than transistor speed
 - deeper pipelines, fewer logic gates per cycle
 - more advanced circuit designs (each gate goes faster)
- \Rightarrow Takes multiple cycles for signal to cross chip



Visible Wire Delay in P-4 Design^{6.823 L15- 31}





P-4 Microarchitecture





Microarchitecture Comparison



- Speculative fetch but not speculative execution branch resolves before later instructions complete
- Completed values held in bypass network until commit
- Speculative execution, with branches resolved after later instructions complete
- Completed values held in rename registers in ROB or unified physical register file until commit
- Both styles of machine can use same branch predictors in front-end fetch pipeline, and both can execute multiple instructions per cycle
- Common to have 10-30 pipeline stages in either style of design

MIPS R10000 (1995)

- 0.35µm CMOS, 4 metal layers
- Four instructions per cycle
- Out-of-order execution
- Register renaming
- Speculative execution past 4 branches
- On-chip 32KB/32KB split I/D cache, 2-way set-associative
- Off-chip L2 cache
- Non-blocking caches

Compare with simple 5-stage pipeline (R5K series)

- ~1.6x performance SPECint95
- ~5x CPU logic area
- ~10x design effort



I mage removed due to copyright restrictions.

To view the image, visit <u>http://www-</u> vlsi.stanford.edu/group/chips_micropro_ body.html