CPSC 213

Introduction to Computer Systems

Reading

Companion

•2.7.1-2.7.3, 2.7.5-2.7.6

Textbook

• 3.6.1-3.6.5

Unit 1d

Static Control Flow

Control Flow

The flow of control is

- the sequence of instruction executions performed by a program
- every program execution can be described by such a linear sequence
- Controlling flow in languages like Java

LOOPS (S5-loop)

In Java

public class Foo {
 static int s = 0;
 static int i;
 static int a[] = new int[10];
 static void foo () {
 for (i=0; i<10; i++)
 s += a[i];
 }
}</pre>

▶ In C

```
int s=0;
int i;
int a[] = {2,4,6,8,10,12,14,16,18,20};
void foo () {
  for (i=0; i<10; i++)
     s += a[i];
}
```

Implement loops in machine

```
int s=0;
int i;
int a[] = {2,4,6,8,10,12,14,16,18,20};
void foo () {
for (i=0; i<10; i++)
s += a[i];
}
```

Can we implement *this* loop with the existing ISA?

Control-Flow ISA Extensions

- Conditional branches
 - goto <address> if <condition>

Options for evaluating condition

- unconditional
- conditional based on value of a register (==0, >0 etc.)
 - goto <address> if <register> <condition> 0
- conditional check result of last executed ALU instruction
 - goto <address> if last ALU result <condition> 0

Specifying target address

- absolute 32-bit address
 - this requires a 6 byte instruction, which means jumps have high overhead
 - is this a serious problem? how would you decide?
 - are jumps for for/while/if etc. different from jumps for procedure call?

Loop unrolling

Using array syntax

```
int s=0;
int i;
int a[10] = {2,4,6,8,10,12,14,16,18,20};
void foo () {
    i = 0;
    s += a[i];
    i++;
    s += a[i];
    i++;
    ...
    s += a[i];
    i++;
}
```

- Using pointer-arithmetic syntax for access to a?
- Will this technique generalize

• will it work for all loops? why or why not?

PC Relative Addressing

Motivation

- jumps are common and so we want to make them as fast as possible
- small instructions are faster than large ones, so make some jumps be two bytes

Observation

- some jumps such as for/while/if etc. normally jump to a nearby instruction
- so the jump distance can be described by a small number that could fit in a byte

PC Relative Addressing

- specifies jump target as a delta from address of current instruction (actually next)
- in the execute stage *pc register* stores the address of next sequential instruction
- the pc-relative jump delta is applied to the value of the pc register
 jumping with a delta of 0 jumps to the next instruction
- jump instructions that use pc-relative addressing are called branches

Absolute Addressing

- specifies jump target using full 32-bit address
- use when the jump distance too large to fit in a byte

ISA for Static Control Flow (part 1)

ISA requirement (apparently)

- at least one PC-relative jump
 - specify relative distance using real distance / 2 why?
- at least one absolute jumps
- some conditional jumps (at least = and > 0)
 - make these PC-relative why?

New instructions (so far)

Name	Semantics	Assembly	Machine
branch	pc ← (a=pc+oo*2)	br a	8-00
branch if equal	$pc \leftarrow (a=pc+oo*2) \text{ if } r[c]==0$	beq r c , a	9coo
branch if greater	$pc \leftarrow (a=pc+oo*2) \text{ if } r[c]>0$	bgt r c , a	acoo
jump immediate	pc ← a (a specified as label)	j a	b aaaaaaaa

• jump assembly uses label, not direct hex number

PC-relative count starts from next instruction, after fetch increments PC

This example

• pseudo code template

- ISA suggest two transformations
 - only conditional branches we have compared to 0, not 10
 - no need to store i and s in memory in each loop iteration, so use *temp_* to indicate this

Implementing *for* loops (S5-loop)

for (i=0; i<10; i++) s += a[i];

General form

in C and Java

11

for (<init>; <continue-condition>; <step>) <statement-block>

pseudo-code template

<init></init>
loop: if not <continue-condition> goto end_loop <statement-block></statement-block></continue-condition>
<step> goto loop</step>
end_loop:

temp_i=0
temp_s=0
loop: temp_t=temp_i-9
if temp_t>0 goto end_loop
temp_s+=a[temp_i]
temp_i++
goto loop
end_loop: s=temp_s
i=temp_i

• assembly code Assume that all variables are global variables

```
ld $0x0, r0
                         \# r0 = temp_i = 0
                       \# r1 = address of a[0]
      ld $a, r1
      ld $0x0, r2
                         \# r2 = temp_s = 0
      Id 0xffffff7, r4 \# r4 = -9
loop: mov r0, r5
                         # r5 = temp_i
      add r4, r5
                        \# r5 = temp_i-9
      bgt r5, end_loop
                         # if temp_i>9 goto +4
      ld (r1, r0, 4), r3 # r3 = a[temp_i]
      add r3, r2
                        \# temp_s += a[temp_i]
      inc r0
                       # temp_i++
      br loop
                       # goto -7
end_loop: ld $s, r1
                           \# r1 = address of s
      st r2, 0x0(r1)
                         \# s = temp_s
      st r0, 0x4(r1)
                         # i = temp i
```

12

Implementing if-then-else (S6-if)

if (a > b)max = a;else max = b;

General form • in Java and C

- if <condition> <then-statements> else <else-statements>

• pseudo-code template

temp_c = not <condition> goto then if $(temp_c = = 0)$ else: <else-statements> goto end if then: <then-statements> end if:

This example


pseudo-code template

```
temp_a=a
    temp_b=b
    temp_c=temp_a-temp_b
    goto then if (temp_c>0)
else: temp_max=temp_b
    goto end_if
then: temp_max=temp_a
end_if: max=temp_max
```

assembly code

ld \$a, r0	# r0 = &a	
ld <mark>0x0</mark> (r0), r0	# r0 = a	
ld \$b, r1	# r1 = &b	
ld <mark>0x0</mark> (r1), r1	# r1 = b	
mov r1, r2	# r2 = b	
not r2	# temp_c = ! b	
inc r2	# temp_c = – b	
add r0, r2	# temp_c = a-b	
bgt r2, then	# if (a>b) goto +2	
else: mov r1, r3	# temp_max = b	
br end_if	# goto +1	
then: mov r0, r3	# temp_max = a	
end_if: ld \$max, r0	# r0 = &max	
st r3, <mark>0x0</mark> (r0)	# max = temp_max	

Code Examples (S6-static-call)



Java

13

15

- a method is a sub-routine with a name, arguments and local scope
- method invocation causes the sub-routine to run with values bound to arguments and with a possible result bound to the invocation

void ping () {} void foo () { ping ();

C

- a *procedure* is ...
- a procedure *call* is ...

16

Static Procedure Calls

Diagraming a Procedure Call

void foo () { ping ();

Caller

 goto ping -j ping

void ping () {}

Callee

- do whatever ping does
- goto foo just after call to ping()
 - ??????

continue executing

Questions

How is **RETURN** implemented?

It's a jump, but is the address a static property or a dynamic one?

saving the return address

- only the caller knows the address
- so the caller must save it before it makes the call
 - caller will save the return address in r6
 - there is a bit of a problem here if the callee makes a procedure call, more later ...
- we need a new instruction to read the PC
 - we'll call it gpc

jumping back to return address

- we need new instruction to jump to an address stored in a register
 - callee can assume return address is in r6

Implementing Procedure Return

return address is

- the address the procedure jumps to when it completes
- the address of the instruction following the call that caused it to run
- a dynamic property of the program

questions

- how does procedure know the return address?
- how does it jump to a dynamic address?

ISA for Static Control Flow (part 2)

New requirements

19

- read the value of the PC
- jump to a dynamically determined target address

Complete new set of instructions

Name	Semantics	Assembly	Machine
branch	pc ← (a==pc+ pp *2)	br a	<mark>8-pp</mark>
branch if equal	$pc \leftarrow (a = pc + pp^{*2}) \text{ if } r[c] = = 0$	beq a	<mark>9</mark> срр
branch if greater	$pc \leftarrow (a = pc + pp^*2) \text{ if } r[c] > 0$	bgt a	acpp
jump immediate	pc ← a (a specified as label)	j a	b aaaaaaaa
get pc	r[d] ← pc + (o==p*2)	gpc \$o,r <mark>d</mark>	<mark>6fpd</mark>
jump base+offset	$pc \leftarrow r[t] + (o = = pp*2)$	j <mark>o</mark> (rt)	ctpp

20

• jump assembly uses label, not direct hex number

