# Feedback for EEE6031 Session: 2013-2014

<u>Feedback:</u> Please write simple statements about how well students addressed the exam paper in general and each individual question in particular including common problems/mistakes and areas of concern in the boxes provided below. Increase row height if necessary.

| Gen  | eral  | Com  | mer | ıte: |
|------|-------|------|-----|------|
| OCII | CI AI | CUII |     | ILO. |

| Generally, a reasonably attempted paper. |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Question 1:

Most people 'got this'. A few people made mistakes in part a.ii) counting the number of clock cycles relating to a representative cycle of activity. However, most people in part b) managed to identify how the performance could be improved.

#### Question 2:

If people went wrong in this question it was because they gave answers in part a) for control-flow problems and not data-flow problems – as requested. Additionally, in part b.ii) some people gave an explanation that related to register-forwarding. Again, this is not what was asked for.

### Question 3:

Fewer people did this question. There was, unfortunately, an error in part a) where the target time is clearly not a time because t is in the denominator. Nobody picked up on this but I gave people the benefit of the doubt in this part and a.iii) which followed on from it.

## Question 4:

This question was well answered. However, in part d. some people did not recognize that the extension to Amdahl's law was to be used where the denominator is split up into a number of terms representing each portion of the algorithm and its degree of parallelization rather than the basic parallelized/unparallelised part.