

CS622
Assignment 1
Group 22

NAME : ANKITA DEY

NAME :SHILPA CHATTERJEE

ROLL No. : 20111013

ROLL No. : 20111057

1 Report on Question 1 of Assignment 1

1.1 Inclusive Cache Organization

Trace File Name	L2 Cache		L3 Cache	
h264ref	Hit Count	1378895	Hit Count	627532
	Miss Count	969678	Miss Count	342146
gromacs	Hit Count	3094660	Hit Count	166320
	Miss Count	336851	Miss Count	170531
hmmer	Hit Count	1766344	Hit Count	1352195
	Miss Count	1743421	Miss Count	391226
bzip	Hit Count	5259461	Hit Count	3951778
	Miss Count	5398166	Miss Count	1446388
sphinx	Hit Count	1933098	Hit Count	8207362
	Miss Count	8820349	Miss Count	612987
gcc	Hit Count	11574350	Hit Count	1663059
	Miss Count	3036461	Miss Count	1373402

1.2 Exclusive Cache Organization

Trace File Name	L2 Cache		L3 Cache	
h264ref	Hit Count	1382949	Hit Count	632041
	Miss Count	965624	Miss Count	333583
gromacs	Hit Count	3094787	Hit Count	170459
	Miss Count	336724	Miss Count	166265
hmmer	Hit Count	1774443	Hit Count	1358978
	Miss Count	1735322	Miss Count	376344
bzip	Hit Count	5260051	Hit Count	3951730
	Miss Count	5397576	Miss Count	1445846
sphinx	Hit Count	1938317	Hit Count	609986
	Miss Count	8815130	Miss Count	8205144
gcc	Hit Count	11581002	Hit Count	1663561
	Miss Count	3029809	Miss Count	1366248

1.3 NINE Cache Organization

Trace File Name	L2 Cache		L3 Cache	
h264ref	Hit Count	1382949	Hit Count	632041
	Miss Count	965624	Miss Count	333583
gromacs	Hit Count	3094787	Hit Count	170459
	Miss Count	336724	Miss Count	166265
hmmer	Hit Count	1774443	Hit Count	1358978
	Miss Count	1735322	Miss Count	376344
bzip	Hit Count	5260051	Hit Count	3951730
	Miss Count	5397576	Miss Count	1445846
sphinx	Hit Count	1938317	Hit Count	609986
	Miss Count	8815130	Miss Count	8205144
gcc	Hit Count	11581002	Hit Count	1663561
	Miss Count	3029809	Miss Count	1366248

1.4 Analysis of the results obtained

1.4.1 Observations on L2 Cache miss count and hit count

- L2 inclusive cache miss count > L2 exclusive cache miss count = L2 nine cache miss count
- L2 inclusive cache hit count < L2 exclusive cache hit count = L2 nine cache hit count

This is because of the following reasons :-

1. The number of misses in L2 cache is the highest in case of inclusive cache organization as whenever a block is evicted from L3 cache it gets invalidated in L2 cache irrespective of it being the either least recently used or being mostly used block.

2. The L2 hit count is the lowest in case of inclusive cache organization as L3 cache is unaware of L2 cache hits and may replace a block which is frequently used in L2 , leading to back invalidation of the block in L2 , thereby lowering its hit rate as compared to nine and exclusive cache organizations.
3. The miss count and hit count of L2 exclusive cache and L2 nine cache are identical as when a block is replaced in L3 cache it has no effect on blocks currently residing in L2 cache.

This can however be proved by the method of induction.

We know that L2 nine and exclusive cache will start with empty blocks and hence the hit and miss count will be same at the beginning. Hence our base case is proved .

Now , say at a time ' t ' let us consider that both L2 nine and exclusive caches have same contents . If we can show that at time ' $t+1$ ' also their contents are same then our proof will be done.

So, let us consider the state of the caches at time ' $t+1$ '. Since same address trace is given to both the caches(exclusive and nine) , so let us consider the following cases:-

Case of hit : If it is a hit in L2 exclusive cache it will also be a hit in L2 nine cache as we have considered the cache contents to be same at time ' t '.

Case of miss : If it is a miss in L2 exclusive cache it surely is going to be a miss in L2 nine cache (again because the cache contents have been assumed to be same at time ' t ') and now the block will be brought from either L3 or memory with no invalidation to the current residing blocks in L2 nine and L2 exclusive caches , thereby making its contents identical even at time ' $t+1$ '. Hence we have proved that as the contents of L2 nine and L2 exclusive caches are identical at any given point of time so their miss and hit counts are also identical.

1.4.2 Observations on L3 cache miss count and hit count

- L3 inclusive cache miss count > L3 nine cache miss count > L3 exclusive cache miss count
- L3 inclusive cache hit count < L3 nine cache hit count < L3 exclusive cache hit count

This is observed due to the following reasons:-

1. The number of misses in L3 inclusive cache is the highest because of the need to maintain the inclusive property i.e. L2 cache contents should be a subset of L3 cache contents , the L3 cache capacity is not utilized to its full potential. Thus , at any point in time the space that is not exploited in L3 inclusive cache is equal to the size of L2 inclusive cache.

Whereas the number of misses in L3 exclusive cache is the least as the L3 cache contents \cap L2 cache contents $= \phi$ and hence L3 can be utilized to its full capacity and there is no duplication of blocks between L2 and L3.

2. The number of hits in L3 exclusive cache is the highest whereas that of L3 inclusive cache is the lowest because , the number of distinct addresses present in L3 and L2 cache follows the pattern exclusive cache > nine > inclusive cache and hence the probability of getting a hit in L2 cache or L3 cache will also follow the same pattern.
3. Now if we compare the hit counts of L3 nine cache and L3 inclusive cache , the hit counts in L3 nine cache is more because of the invalidation policy used in inclusion caches. A block being evicted from L3 cache may later get a hit in L2 cache in case of nine cache organization , which is not possible in cache inclusive caches.

2 Report on Question 2 of Assignment 1

2.1 Inclusive Cache Organization with Belady MIN Replacement Policy in L3 Fully Associate Cache

Trace File Name	Total Miss Count	L3 Cache Cold Miss	L3 Cache Capacity Miss	L3 Cache Conflict Miss
h264ref	342146	63703	47915	230528
Gromacs	170531	107962	35293	27276
Hmmer	391226	75884	77562	237780
Bzip	1446388	119753	417082	912553
Sphinx	8207362	122069	2946509	5138784
Gcc	1373402	773053	166234	434115

2.2 Inclusive Cache Organization with LRU Replacement Policy in L3 Fully Associate Cache

Trace File Name	Total Miss Count	L3 Cache Cold Miss	L3 Cache Capacity Miss	L3 Cache Conflict Miss
h264ref	342146	63703	272177	6266
Gromacs	170531	107962	61406	1163
Hmmer	391226	75884	301140	14202
Bzip	1446388	119753	1241648	84987
Sphinx	8207362	122069	8265179	-64252
Gcc	1373402	773053	596871	3478

2.3 Analysis on the results obtained

Total Miss = Cold Miss + Capacity Miss + Conflict Miss ----- Eq. 1

Now in order to calculate cold, capacity and conflict miss, we made the L3 cache fully associative and in fully associative cache we know that conflict miss is theoretically zero, so our equation of total miss for L3 fully associative cache becomes –

Total Miss of Fully Associative Cache = Cold Miss + Capacity Miss -----Eq. 2

Now, once we have calculated cold and capacity misses, we can now calculate conflict miss by placing the values of cold and capacity misses in Eq. 1.

- **Cold Miss** is the number of unique accesses made to the L3 cache and hence it is same for both the replacement policy (LRU and Belady) applications on L3 fully associative cache.
- **Capacity Miss** is the miss that occurs due to lack of space in a cache for accommodation of an incoming block. It can be observed that the capacity miss count is more when LRU is used than when Belady Min replacement policy is used and this actually should be the case because Belady's Min Replacement policy provides the optimal solution and no other solution can go beyond the solution provided by it.
- **Conflict Miss** is the miss that occurs when several blocks are mapped to the same set or block frame. These misses occur in the set associative or direct mapped block placement strategies. Since the capacity miss is more when LRU replacement policy is used, the

conflict miss becomes less in case of LRU replacement policy implemented L3 cache than that of Belay replacement policy implemented L3 cache.