

## Assignment # 1 6532037221

Assembly code for max.c

```
.section __TEXT__text, regular, pure_instructions
.build_version macos14, 0, sdk_version, 14, 5
.globl _max1
.p2align 2
_max1:
.cfi_startproc
; %bb.0:
sub sp, sp, #16
.cfi_def_cfa_offset 16
str w0, [sp, #12]
str w1, [sp, #8]
ldr w8, [sp, #12]
ldr w9, [sp, #8]
subs w8, w8, w9
cset w8, le
tbnz w8, #0, LBB0_2
b LBB0_1
LBB0_1:
ldr w8, [sp, #12]
str w8, [sp, #4]
byte Folded Spill
b LBB0_3
LBB0_2:
ldr w8, [sp, #8]
str w8, [sp, #4]
byte Folded Spill
b LBB0_3
LBB0_3:
ldr w0, [sp, #4]
byte Folded Reload
add sp, sp, #16
ret
.cfi_endproc
; -- End function
.globl _max2
.p2align 2
_max2:
.cfi_startproc
; %bb.0:
sub sp, sp, #16
.cfi_def_cfa_offset 16
str w0, [sp, #12]
str w1, [sp, #8]
ldr w8, [sp, #12]
ldr w9, [sp, #8]
subs w8, w8, w9
cset w8, gt
and w8, w8, #0x1
str w8, [sp, #4]
ldr w8, [sp, #4]
subs w8, w8, #0
cset w8, eq
tbnz w8, #0, LBB1_2
b LBB1_1
LBB1_1:
```

```

    ldr    w8,    [sp, #12]
    str    w8,    [sp]
    b      LBB1_3
LBB1_2:
    ldr    w8,    [sp, #8]
    str    w8,    [sp]
    b      LBB1_3
LBB1_3:
    ldr    w0,    [sp]
    add    sp,    sp, #16
    ret
.cfi_endproc
; -- End function
.subsections_via_symbols

```

1)

```

    str    w1,    [sp, #8]
    ldr    w8,    [sp, #12]

```

- From this part of code, it's considered as **Register-Memory** because it loads and stores exchange between memory (sp = stack pointer) and register (w1 and else for ARM)
- From the offset value of the stack pointer, we can verify that it's **restricted alignment** since every address was offset by multiple of 32-bit integer (4 bytes) if its unrestricted alignment is not.

```

_testMax:                                ; @testMax
.cfi_startproc
; %bb.0:
sub    sp,    sp,    #32
.cfi_def_cfa_offset32
stp    x29,    x30,    [sp, #16]        ; 16-byte
Folded Spill
add    x29,    sp,    #16
.cfi_def_cfa_w29, 16
.cfi_offsetw30, -8
.cfi_offsetw29, -16
stur   w0,    [x29, #-4]
str    w1,    [sp, #8]
ldur   w0,    [x29, #-4]
ldr    w1,    [sp, #8]
bl     _max1
ldp    x29,    x30,    [sp, #16]        ; 16-byte
Folded Reload
add    sp,    sp,    #32
ret
.cfi_endproc
; -- End function

```

```
.subsections_via_symbols
```

- They both have caller-saved and callee-saved.  
the caller (`_testmax`) save the register (x29 and x30) restore them later after the function called. [caller-saved]  
the caller declares the register (w0 and w1) to be stored and it's passed across the function via these register after callee finished their execution these still be the same [callee-saved]
- It uses w0 and w1 register to pass arguments to the max1 function after that the bl that link x30 to keep the return address from `_max1` to the `_testmax`

Testmax code (partial) storing and loading to w0 and w1

```
stur    w0,    [x29,    #-4]
str      w1,    [sp,     #8]
ldur     w0,    [x29,    #-4]
ldr      w1,    [sp,     #8]
bl       _max1
```

max1 (partial) storing from w0, w1 to sp+12 & sp+8.

```
str      w0,    [sp,     #12]
str      w1,    [sp,     #8]
```

- The snippet that making the comparison and conditional branch.

```
subs     w8,     w8,     w9
cset     w8,     le
tbzn     w8,     #0,     LBB0_2
b        LBB0_1
```


the code above the w8 got the result of subtraction between w8 and w9 (from max.c assembly ode at the first page) coming to condition to test whether it should jump to which block next e.g., LBB0\_1 or LBB0\_2.

After creating max.s file with `gcc -O2 -S max.c`, the optimization one (O2) will not keep the value after the comparison by using subtraction but use the `cmp` instruction to get only the flag to branch to the flag condition making then using the `cset` to get the comparison result from its flag.

Compiling with O2

IC = 3, CPI = 1, Tc = 0.3125 ns

Then the CPU time should be 0.9375 ns

```
~/Documents/Chula-CP-Courses/CU_CompSysArch/assignment,  
?   
$ time ./max  
./max 0.00s user 0.00s system 63% cpu 0.004 total  
~/Documents/Chula-CP-Courses/CU_CompSysArch/assignment,
```

Since the hardware is not as fast as ideal, process management of the CPU in the device and other factor may cause it is slower than we expected.

2)

[Apple clang version 15.0.0 (clang-1500.3.9.4)]

From each optimization in fibo program, it can be demonstrated the time in table below.

optimization	user	sys	total
O0	10.90	0.05	11.149
	10.85	0.03	10.959
	10.86	0.04	10.915
O1	6.02	0.01	6.053
	6.03	0.02	6.105
	6.03	0.03	6.082
O2	6.20	0.01	6.222
	6.22	0.02	6.281
	6.22	0.04	6.296
O3	6.00	0.01	6.020
	6.01	0.04	6.068
	6.04	0.03	6.108

Avg of O0 = 11.00 s (total time), 10.87(user)

Avg of O1 = 6.08 s (total time), 6.03(user)

Avg of O2 = 6.27 s (total time), 6.21(user)

Avg of O3 = 6.07 s (total time), 6.02(user)

**O0 > O2 > O1 > O3** as a result, the O3 is the best optimization, but surprisingly it has the execution time near the O1 optimization.

3)

- O0 is no optimization is the default code
- O1 Moderate some optimization but not change compilation time too much
- O2 performing all nearly support optimizations that do not involve space-speed trade-off, it increases compilation time and performance, loop-vectorize
- O3 aggressively optimization more than O2 with more options.