

ECE/CompSci 250 HW #1

1. a)

45 \rightarrow Binary $45 - 32 = 13 - 8 = 5 - 4 = 1 - 1 = 0$ 00000010
~~45~~ \rightarrow Hexadecimal $45_{10} = 00101101_2 = 00000020_{16}$
 $2 \rightarrow 0$ $13 \rightarrow C$

b) -35_{10} $35_{10} = 00100011_2 \cdot -1 = 11011100 + 1 = 11011101_2$
 $00100011_2 \rightarrow K_{16} = 00000023 \cdot 1$ $FFFFFFFF - 00000023 = FFFFFFFC - 1$
 $= FFFFFFFB_{16}$ $-35_{10} = 11011101_2 = FFFB_{16}$

c) $47_{10} \rightarrow 00101111_2$ ~~00101111_2~~ $1.011111 \cdot 2^5$ $00101111_2 = 1.011111 \cdot 2^5$
 $5 + 127 = 132_{10} \rightarrow 011111$
 $011111 / 01000000 / 011111000000000000000000 = 0x223C0000$
 $47_{10} = 001000100011110000000000000000_2 = 0x223C0000_{16}$

d) $.625_{10} = \frac{5}{8} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{8} = \frac{5}{8} = 0.101 = 1.01 \cdot 2^{-1}$ $-.625 = -1.01 \cdot 2^{-1}$
 $IEEE = 1$ For negative, $-1 + 127 = 126_{10} = 01111110$, mantissa = $01 + 210$
 $= 10111110 / 010000000000000000000000 \rightarrow BF200000_{16}$
 $-.625_{10} = 1011111001000000000000000000_2 = 0xBF200000_{16}$

e) Strings for 250! $\ln_{ASCII} = 123 164 162$ I looked up an ASCII table since it seems that the one in the slides are incorrect - NVM
Strings = 123 164 162 151 156 147 163 040₈ = 853 874 872 869 86E 867 873 820
for = 146 157 162 040₈ = 65 6F 72 20
250! $\ln = 062 065 066 041 134 156_8 = 32 35 30 21 5C 68E$
Strings for 250! $\ln = 53 74 72 74 6E 67 73 20 65 6F 72 20 32 35 30 21 5C 6E$

f) $1.01 \cdot 2^{4096}$ because the Exponent is determined by subtracting adding 1023
so since $4096 + 1023$ is larger than what 11 bits can represent.

2. a) a is on the stack; b_ptr is on the heap, *b_ptr is on the stack,
e_ptr is a part of the global data; and *e_ptr is on the stack.

b) $e_ptr \rightarrow \&a \rightarrow 1.2$, $b_ptr \rightarrow \&\text{float malloc} \rightarrow 7.0$, $b_ptr \rightarrow 4.0$

$\text{foo}(e_ptr, b_ptr, b_ptr+1) \rightarrow 1.2 \times 7 + 4$ so return 11

$11 > 0.5$ so return 1

3. Unopt time = .964s Opt time = .832s

Both programs print out C[111]E[392] ~~and~~ ≈ -1801792042 . I assume there is some underlying calculations but the optimized program did it faster by .132 seconds