

UNIT -3

Efficient C Programming

LOCAL VARIABLE TYPES

- ARMv4-based processors can efficiently load and store 8-, 16-, and 32-bit data.
- most ARM data processing operations are 32-bit only.
- For this reason, you should use a 32-bit datatype, int or long for local variables wherever possible.
- Avoid using char and short as local variable types, even if you are manipulating an 8- or 16-bit value.

Example

- A checksum function that sums the values in a data packet.
- Most communication protocols (such as TCP/IP) have a checksum or cyclic redundancy check (CRC) routine to check for errors in a data packet.
- The following code checksums a data packet containing 64 words. It shows why you should avoid using char for local variables.

The following code checksums a data packet containing 64 words. It shows why you should avoid using char for local variables.

```
int checksum_v1(int *data)
{
    char i;
    int sum=0;
    for (i=0; i<64; i++)
    {
        Sum +=data[i];
    }
    Return sum;
}
```

- At first sight it looks as though declaring `i` as a `char` is efficient.
- You may be thinking that a `char` uses less register space or less space on the ARM stack than an `int`.
- On the ARM, both these assumptions are wrong
- All ARM registers are 32-bit and all stack entries are at least 32-bit.
- Furthermore, to implement the `i++` exactly, the compiler must account for the case when `i = 255`.
- Any attempt to increment 255 should produce the answer 0

- Consider the compiler output for this function.
- We've added labels and comments to make the assembly clear.

checksum_v1

```
MOV r2,r0 ; r2=data
MOV r0,#0 ; sum=0
MOV r1,#0 ; i=0
```

checksum_v1_loop

```
LDR r3,[r2,r1,LSL#2] ; r3=data[i]
ADD r1,r1,#1 ; r1=i+1
AND r1,r1,#0xff ; i=(char)r1
CMP r1,#0x40 ; compare i,64
ADD r0,r3,r0 ; sum+=r3
BCC checksum_v1_loop ; if(i<=64)loop
MOV pc,r14 ; return sum
```

- The compiler inserts an extra AND instruction to reduce I to the range 0 to 255 before the comparison with 64

Now compare this to the compiler output where instead we declare `l` as an unsigned int.

```
checksum_v2
    MOV r2,r0    ; r2=data
    MOV r0,#0    ; sum=0
    MOV r1,#0    ; i=0
```

```
checksum_v2_loop
    LDR r3,[r2,r1,LSL#2]    ; r3=data[i]
    ADD r1,r1,#1           ; r1++
    CMP r1,#0x40           ; comparei,64
    ADD r0,r3,r0           ; sum+=r3
    BCC checksum_v2_loop   ; if(l < 64) go to loop
    MOV PC,r14            ; return sum
```


- The AND instruction disappears in the second case

Suppose data packet contains 16bit values and we need 16bit checksum the code typically looks like

```
Short checksum_v3(short *data)
```

```
{  
    unsigned int i;  
    short sum=0;  
    for (i=0; i<64; i++)  
    {  
        Sum = short(sum+data[i]);  
    }  
    Return sum;  
}
```

Consider the compiler output for this function.

checksum_v3

```
MOV r2,r0 ; r2=data
MOV r0,#0 ; sum=0
MOV r1,#0 ; i=0
```

checksum_v3_loop

```
ADD r3,r2,r1,LSL #1 ; r3=&data[i]
LDRH r3,[r3,#0] ; r3=data[i]
ADD r1,r1,#1 ; r1=i+1
CMP r1,#0x40 ; compare i,64
ADD r0,r3,r0 ; sum+=r3
MOV r0,r0,LSL #16
MOV r0,r0,ASR #16 ; sum= (short) r0
BCC checksum_v3_loop ; if(i<=64)loop
MOV pc,r14 ; return sum
```

To fix this problem the C code can be written as

```
Short checksum_v4(short *data)
{
    unsigned int i;
    int sum=0;
    for (i=0; i<64; i++)
    {
        Sum +=*(data++);
    }
    Return short(sum);
}
```

The compiler output for this function.

checksum_v4

```
MOV r2,#0 ; sum=0
MOV r1,#0  ; i=0
```

checksum_v4_loop

```
LDRH r3,[r0],#2      ; r3=*(data++)
ADD r1,r1,#1         ; r1=i+1
CMP r1,#0x40         ; compare i,64
ADD r2,r3,r2         ; sum+=r3
BCC checksum_v4_loop ; if(i<=64)loop
    MOV r0,r0,LSL #16
    MOV r0,r0,ASR #16 ; r0= (short) sum
MOV pc,r14           ; return sum
```