

# Part1

The optimized function is

```
for(i=0; i<N; i++)
    for(j=0; j<N; j++){
        c[i][j] = 0;
        for(k=0; k<N; k++){
            c[i][j] += a[i][k] * b[k][j];
        }
    }
```

It will take the longest time for both type Long and Double, the least effective way.

**The function eliminating the unnecessary memory access is**

```
int i, j, k;
for(i=0; i<N; i++)
    for(j=0; j<N; j++){
        data_t acc = 0; //use local variable to accumulate the result
        for(k=0; k<N; k++){
            acc += a[i][k] * b[k][j];
        }
        c[i][j] = acc; // assign the accumulator to c[i][j], which will eliminate the access to the memory
        // address to elements in C for every iterations
    }
```

It is faster than the optimized one, but it is still the second least effective way for both Long and Double.

**The function applying 2X1 loop unrolling is**

```
int i, j, k;
int limit = N-1;
for(i=0; i<N; i++)
    for(j=0; j<N; j++){
        data_t acc = 0; // also use the accumulator
        for(k=0; k<limit; k+=2){ instead of go through the list one by one, it will go through two element
            // for one time, and take two element into operation for one time, which will eliminate half of the
            // iterations(iteration = N/2)
            acc += a[i][k] * b[k][j] + a[i][k+1] * b[k+1][j];
        }
        c[i][j] = acc;
    }
for(; i<N; i++){to check any missing element
    for(; j<N; j++){
        data_t acc = 0;
        for(; k<N; k++){
            acc += a[i][k] * b[k][j];
        }
        c[i][j] = acc;
    }
}
```

It is faster than eliminating memory access for both types and five N

**For the function 2X2 loop unrolling**, it also eliminates the iterations by taking two elements at one time. Instead of using only one accumulator(temp), I created another accumulator(temp1) to accumulate the element of k+1. Thus, it will create 2 critical paths for data flow, and 2 paths can do

the operations simultaneously. It is slightly slower than 2X1 for small size N, but quicker for large size N. **For the function 4X1 loop unrolling**, it just uses one accumulator to do the operation, but it will take 4 elements in the array for operation for one iteration which make iterations from N to N/4. Thus quicker than 2X1 and 2X2 unrolling. **For the 4X4**, it eliminates the iterations just like 4X1 (from N to N/4), but it uses 4 accumulators, which creates 4 critical paths for data flow which operate simultaneously. 4X4 is quicker than 4X1 for both types of variable and 5 different Ns. **8X1** uses one accumulator which takes 8 elements of the array into operation for one iterations, which make the iterations from N to N/8. 8X1 is further quicker than 4X4. **8X8** uses 8 accumulators to take 8 different variables at one time and create 8 different critical paths for data flow that run simultaneously. Thus, faster than 8X1.

## Part 2

**For the case ijk and jik(Case 1)**, we assigned  $c[i][j]$  at the inner loop which would fix i and j, thus the missing rate of c is 0. For the  $a[i][k]$ , it will access the memory with stride-1 which has good spatial locality, and the missing rate for a is 0.25. Somehow, for the  $b[k][j]$ , it will access the memory with stride-N which has bad spatial locality, and misses every time (missing rate = 1). Thus the total number of miss for one iteration is  $1 + 0.25 + 0 = 1.25$ . ijk and jki have similar performance with slight differences. ijk is slightly slower than jik.

**For the case jki and kji(Case 2)**, in the inner loop of i, we fixed j and k, thus fixing the  $b[k][j]$ , which has a missing rate 0. Somehow, for  $a[i][k]$ , we fix k and increment i in the loop, which will access the memory with stride-N which has bad spatial locality, and misses every time (missing rate = 1). Same for the  $c[i][j]$  accessed with stride-N which gives a missing rate = 1. Thus the total number of misses for one iteration is  $1 + 1 + 0 = 2$ , which is higher than the previous case (ijk and jik). For both double and long, kji is slightly quicker than jki.

**For the case kij and ikj(Case 3)**, in the inner loop of j, we fixed k and i. Thus, fixing  $a[i][k]$ , which hits every time and gives a missing rate 0. For both  $b[k][j]$  and  $c[i][j]$ , we access the memory with stride-1 which has good spatial locality. Thus the missing rate for both  $b[k][j]$  and  $c[i][j]$  is 0.25. The total number of misses for one iteration is  $0.25 + 0.25 + 0 = 0.5$ , which is the lowest in these 3 cases. For both double and long, ikj is slightly faster than kij.

Speed: Case 3 > Case 1 > Case 2