

5.2.1

Index length = 4 bit

Address	Binary	Tag	Index	Hit / Miss
3	00000011	0000	0011	Miss
180	10110100	1011	0100	Miss
43	00101011	0010	1011	Miss
2	00000010	0000	0010	Miss
191	10111111	1011	1111	Miss
88	01011000	0101	1000	Miss
190	10111110	1011	1110	Miss
14	00001110	0000	1110	Miss
181	10110101	1011	0101	Miss
44	00101100	0010	1100	Miss
186	10111010	1011	1010	Miss
253	11111101	1111	1101	Miss

5.2.2

Index length = 3 bit

Offset length = 1 bit

Address	Binary	Tag	Index	Offset	Hit / Miss
3	00000011	0000	001	1	Miss
180	10110100	1011	010	0	Miss
43	00101011	0010	101	1	Miss
2	00000010	0000	001	0	Hit
191	10111111	1011	111	1	Miss
88	01011000	0101	100	0	Miss
190	10111110	1011	111	0	Hit
14	00001110	0000	111	0	Miss
181	10110101	1011	010	1	Hit
44	00101100	0010	110	0	Miss
186	10111010	1011	101	0	Miss
253	11111101	1111	110	1	Miss

5.2.3

8 words of data = 2^3

Miss rate: 3% for current block size

C1 miss rate = $11/12$

C2 miss rate = $9/12$

C3 miss rate = $10/12$

In terms of miss rate, C2 design is the best among three.

C1 stall time: $2 * 12 + 25 * 11 = 299$

C2 stall time: $2 * 12 + 25 * 9 = 261$

C3 stall time: $2 * 12 + 25 * 10 = 310$

C2 is the best design since it has smallest stall time

5.2.4

Total bits = $(2^{\text{index bits}}) * (\text{valid bits} + \text{tag bits} + (\text{data bits} * 2^{\text{offset bits}}))$

First cache:

32 KiB = 2^{15}

Index bit: 15

Offset bit: 1

Address bit: 32

Tag bit: 14

Valid bit: 1

Total bits = $2^{15} * (1 + 14 + (32 * 2^1)) = 2588672$ bits

Second cache (16-word blocks):

Index bit: 13

Offset bit: 4

Address bit: 32

Tag bit: 13

Valid bit: 1

Total bits = $2^{13} * (1 + 13 + (32 * 2^4)) = 4308992$ bits

It might have a slower performance because the number of bits for 16-word cache is more than the first cache

5.2.5

Data size = 32 KB = 2^{15} KB

Size of cache block = 2 words

Number of blocks = 16KB

Number of Cache lines = 14

Number of sets in 2-way set associative memory = 8KB

Increase the block size

There are more data stored in the cache, thus it will have a less miss rate

Advantage:

Less miss rate and mapping will become easier

Disadvantage:

Take a longer time to access, and larger miss penalty

5.2.6

XOR is possible. If we use direct mapping cache, the tag bits will still point to the correct location.

Using mapping function: set – (block address % set), values will be stored in the blocks in a reverse way.

5.7.1

Address	Binary	Tag	Index	offset	Hit / Miss
3	00000011	00000	01	1	Miss
180	10110100	10110	10	0	Miss
43	00101011	00101	01	1	Miss
2	00000010	00000	01	0	Hit
191	10111111	10111	11	1	Miss
88	01011000	01011	00	0	Miss
190	10111110	10111	11	0	Hit
14	00001110	00001	11	0	Miss
181	10110101	10110	10	1	Hit
44	00101100	00101	10	0	Miss
186	10111010	10111	01	0	Miss
253	11111101	11111	10	1	Miss

5.7.2

Address of memory block accessed	Binary address	Hit/ Miss	Contents of cache blocks after reference							
			B0	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7
3	0000 0011	Miss	M[3]							
180	1011 0100	Miss	M[3]	M[180]						
43	0010 1011	Miss	M[3]	M[180]	M[83]					
2	0000 0010	Miss	M[3]	M[180]	M[83]	M[2]				
191	1011 1111	Miss	M[3]	M[180]	M[83]	M[2]	M[191]			
88	0101 1000	Miss	M[3]	M[180]	M[83]	M[2]	M[191]	M[88]		
190	1011 1110	Miss	M[3]	M[180]	M[83]	M[2]	M[191]	M[88]	M[190]	
14	0000 1110	Miss	M[3]	M[180]	M[83]	M[2]	M[191]	M[88]	M[190]	M[14]
181	1011 0101	Miss	M[181]	M[180]	M[83]	M[2]	M[191]	M[88]	M[190]	M[14]
44	0010 1100	Miss	M[181]	M[44]	M[83]	M[2]	M[191]	M[88]	M[190]	M[14]

186	1011 1010	Miss	M[181]	M[44]	M[186]	M[2]	M[191]	M[88]	M[190]	M[14]
253	1111 1101	Miss	M[181]	M[44]	M[186]	M[253]	M[191]	M[88]	M[190]	M[14]

We don't need index for this problem, offset will be 0

Address	Tag	Index	offset	Hit / Miss
3	00000011	000	0	Miss
180	10110100	001	0	Miss
43	00101011	010	0	Miss
2	00000010	011	0	Miss
191	10111111	100	0	Miss
88	01011000	101	0	Miss
190	10111110	110	0	Miss
14	00001110	111	0	Miss
181	10110101	000	0	Miss
44	00101100	001	0	Miss
186	10111010	010	0	Miss
253	11111101	011	0	Miss

5.7.3

LRU:

Page numbers = 12

page hits = 2

miss = 10

miss rate = $10 / 12 = 0.83$

MRU:

Page numbers = 12

page hits = 3

miss = 9

miss rate = $9 / 12 = 0.75$

Best miss rate: 0.75

5.7.4

1)

Miss cycles = $100 / 0.5 = 200$ clock cycles

$$\text{CPI} = 1.5 + 200 * 0.07 = 15.5$$

Access time double:

Miss cycles = $100 * 2 / 0.5 = 400$ clock cycles

$$\text{CPI} = 1.5 + 400 * 0.07 = 29.5$$

Access time half:

Miss cycles = $100 / 1 = 100$ clock cycles

$$\text{CPI} = 1.5 + 100 * 0.07 = 8.5$$

2)

Miss cycles = $100 / 0.5 = 200$ clock cycles

$$\text{CPI} = 1.5 + 200 * 0.035 + 12 * 0.07 = 9.34$$

Access time double:

Miss cycles = $100 * 2 / 0.5 = 400$ clock cycles

$$\text{CPI} = 1.5 + 400 * 0.035 + 12 * 0.07 = 16.34$$

Access time half:

Miss cycles = $100 / 1 = 100$ clock cycles

$$\text{CPI} = 1.5 + 100 * 0.035 + 12 * 0.07 = 5.84$$

3)

Miss cycles = $100 / 0.5 = 200$ clock cycles

$$\text{CPI} = 1.5 + 200 * 0.015 + 28 * 0.07 = 6.46$$

Access time double:

Miss cycles = $100 * 2 / 0.5 = 400$ clock cycles

$CPI = 1.5 + 400 * 0.015 + 28 * 0.07 = 9.46$

Access time half:

Miss cycles = $100 / 1 = 100$ clock cycles

$CPI = 1.5 + 100 * 0.015 + 12 * 0.07 = 4.96$

5.7.5

Second level: $CPI = 1.5 + 200 * 0.035 + 12 * 0.07 = 9.34$

Third level: $CPI = 1.5 + 200 * 0.013 + 12 * 0.07 + 50 * 0.035 = 6.69$

From the value above, third level cache will provide a better performance in this case

Advantage:

Miss penalty is smaller and have a better performance

Disadvantage:

Hard to design and implement third level cache, cycle time will increase

5.7.6

Miss cycle = $100 / 0.5 = 200$ clock cycles

Second level CPI of direct mapping = 9.34

2 levels of 512KB cache

Second level CPI of 8-way associative cache = 6.46

4 levels of 512 KB cache