

P483

S.1.1 4

S.1.2 $I, J, B[I][J][0]$

S.1.3 $A[I][J][I]$

S.1.4 $\frac{8 \times 8 \times 8}{4} \times 2 - \frac{8 \times 8}{4} + \frac{8}{4} = 3136$

S.1.5 $I, J, B(I, 0)$

S.1.6 $A(I, J), B(I, 0), A(J, I)$

S.1.6 $A(I, J), B(I, 0), A(J, I)$

S.2.1 Binary address: 0000011, 10110100, 00101011, 0000010, 10111111, 01011000,
10111110, 00011110, 10110101, 00101100, 10111100, 11111101

Tag: 0000, 1011, 0101, 0100, 1011, 0101, 1011, 0001, 1011, 0101, 1011,
1111

Index: 0011, 0100, 1011, 0010, 1111, 1000, 1110, 1110, 0101, 1100, 1010,
1101

Hit/Miss: M, M, M, M, M, M, M, M, M, M, M, M

S.2.2 Binary address: 0000011, 10110100, 00101011, 0000010, 10111111, 01011000, 10111110,
00011110, 10110101, 00101100, 10110100, 11111101

Tag: 0000, 1011, 0010, 0000, 1011, 0101, 1011, 0001, 1010, 0101, 0101,
1011, 1111

Index: 001, 010, 101, 100, 111, 001, 111, 111, 010, 101, 101, 110

Hit/Miss: M, M, M, M, M, M, H, M, H, M, M, M

s. 2.3

$$C_1: |B_0| = \log_2 |Block\ size| = \log_2 1 = 0$$

$$blocks_in_cache = \frac{cache_size}{block_size} = \frac{8}{1} = 8$$

$$|Index| = \log_2 8 = 3$$

$$C_2: |B_0| = \log_2 |block\ size| = \log_2 2 = 1$$

$$blocks_in_cache = \frac{cache_size}{block_size} = \frac{8}{2} = 4$$

$$|Index| = \log_2 4 = 2$$

$$C_3: |B_0| = \log_2 |block\ size| = \log_2 4 = 2$$

$$blocks_in_cache = \frac{cache_size}{block_size} = \frac{8}{4} = 2$$

$$|Index| = \log_2 2 = 1$$

word address

binary address

C_1

C_2

C_3

3

00000011

M

M

M

180

1011 0100

M

M

M

43

0010 1011

M

M

M

2

00000010

M

M

M

191

1011 1111

M

M

M

88

0101 1000

M

M

M

190

1011 1110

M

H

H

14

0000 1110

M

M

M

181

1011 0101

M

H

M

44

0010 1100

M

M

M

186

1011 1010

M

M

M

253

1111 1101

M

M

M

$$C_1 \text{ Miss-rate} = \frac{\text{Misses}}{\text{accesses}} = 1$$

$$C_2 \text{ Miss-rate} = \frac{\text{Misses}}{\text{accesses}} = \frac{10}{12} = \frac{5}{6}$$

$$C_3 \text{ Miss-rate} = \frac{\text{Misses}}{\text{accesses}} = \frac{11}{12}$$

$\therefore C_2$ is the best

$$C_1' = \frac{20}{25} \quad C_2' = \frac{30}{25} \quad C_3' = \frac{55}{25}$$

At this time, C_1 is the best

S.2.4

$$32 \text{ kB} = 2^{15} \text{ words} \quad \text{Block size} = 2 \text{ words}$$

$$\text{Blocks} = 2^{12}$$

$$2^{12} \times (2 \times 32 + (32 - 10 - 2 - 2) + 1) = 2^{12} \times 83 = 83 \text{ KiB}$$

$$\text{Block size}' = 16 \text{ words} = 2^4 \text{ words}$$

$$\text{blocks} = 2^9$$

$$2^9 \times (16 \times 32 + (32 - 10 - 2 - 2) + 1) = 268.5 \text{ KiB} \approx 66.375 \text{ KiB}$$

Because the second one wastes space and too much time on accessing.

S.2.5

Have a lower or equal miss rate than a smaller 2-way set associative cache. At least double the block size.

Advantage: less misses for non-adj addresses.

Disadvantage: longer access time.

S.2.6

It's possible

The XOR operation leaks the data so that more tag bits are needed to identify the address in the cache.

