5.5

- **5.5.1** Each cache block consists of four 8-byte words. The total offset is 5 bits. Three of those 5 bits is the word offset (the offset into an 8-byte word). The remaining two bits are the block offset. Two bits allows us to enumerate $2^2 = 4$ words.
- **5.5.2** There are five index bits. This tells us there are $2^5 = 32$ lines in the cache.
- **5.5.3** The ratio is 1.21. The cache stores a total of 32 lines * 4 words/block * 8 bytes/word = 1024 bytes = 8192 bits.

In addition to the data, each line contains 54 tag bits and 1 valid bit. Thus, the total bits required = 8192 + 54*32 + 1*32 = 9952 bits.

5.5.4

Byte Address	Binary Address	Tag	Index	Offset	Hit/Miss	Bytes Replaced
0x00	0000 0000 0000	0x0	0x00	0x00	М	
0x04	0000 0000 0100	0x0	0x00	0x04	Н	
0x10	0000 0001 0000	0x0	0x00	0x10	Н	
0x84	0000 1000 0100	0x0	0x04	0x04	М	
0xe8	0000 1110 1000	0x0	0x07	0x08	М	
0xa0	0000 1010 0000	0x0	0x05	0x00	М	
0x400	0100 0000 0000	0x1	0x00	0x00	М	0x00-0x1F
0x1e	0000 0001 1110	0x0	0x00	0x1e	М	0x400-0x41F
0x8c	0000 1000 1100	0x0	0x04	0x0c	Н	
Oxc1c	1100 0001 1100	0x3	0x00	0x1c	М	0x00-0x1F
0xb4	0000 1011 0100	0x0	0x05	0x14	Н	
0x884	1000 1000 0100	0x2	0x04	0x04	М	0x80-0x9f

5.5.5 4/12 = 33%.

5.5.6 <index, tag, data>

- <0, 3, Mem[0xC00]-Mem[0xC1F]>
- $\langle 4, 2, Mem[0x880]-Mem[0x89f] \rangle$
- $\langle 5, 0, Mem[0x0A0]-Mem[0x0Bf] \rangle$
- $\langle 7, 0, Mem[0x0e0]-Mem[0x0ff] \rangle$

5.10

5.10.1

P1	1.515 GHz
P2	1.11 GHz

5.10.2

P1	6.31ns	9.56 cycles
P2	5.11ns	5.68 cycles

For P1 all memory accesses require at least one cycle (to access L1). 8% of memory accesses additionally require a 70 ns access to main memory. This is 70/0.66 = 106.06 cycles. However, we can't divide cycles; therefore, we must round up to 107 cycles. Thus, the Average Memory Access time is 1 + 0.08*107 = 9.56 cycles, or 6.31 ps.

For P2, a main memory access takes 70 ns. This is 70/0.66 = 77.78 cycles. Because we can't divide cycles, we must round up to 78 cycles. Thus the Average Memory Access time is 1 + 0.06*78 = 5.68 cycles, or 6.11 ps.

5.10.3

P1	12.64 CPI	8.34 ns per inst
P2	7.36 CPI	6.63 ns per inst

For P1, every instruction requires at least one cycle. In addition, 8% of all instructions miss in the instruction cache and incur a 107-cycle delay. Furthermore, 36% of the instructions are data accesses. 8% of these 36% are cache misses, which adds an additional 107 cycles.

$$1 + .08*107 + .36*.08*107 = 12.64$$

With a clock cycle of 0.66 ps, each instruction requires 8.34 ns.

Using the same logic, we can see that P2 has a CPI of 7.36 and an average of only 6.63 ns/instruction.

5.10.4

An L2 access requires nine cycles (5.62/0.66 rounded up to the next integer).

All memory accesses require at least one cycle. 8% of memory accesses miss in the L1 cache and make an L2 access, which takes nine cycles. 95% of all L2 access are misses and require a 107 cycle memory lookup.

$$1 + .08[9 + 0.95*107] = 9.85$$

5.10.5

13.04

Notice that we can compute the answer to 5.6.3 as follows: AMAT + %memory * (AMAT-1).

Using this formula, we see that the CPI for P1 with an L2 cache is $9.85 \times 0.36 \times 8.85 = 13.04$

5.10.6 Because the clock cycle time and percentage of memory instructions is the same for both versions of P1, it is sufficient to focus on AMAT. We want

AMAT with L2 < AMAT with L1 only

$$1 + 0.08[9 + m*107] < 9.56$$

This happens when m < .916.

5.10.7 We want P1's average time per instruction to be less than 6.63 ns. This means that we want

 $(CPI_P1 * 0.66) < 6.63$. Thus, we need $CPI_P1 < 10.05$

$$CPI_P1 = AMAT_P1 + 0.36(AMAT_P1 - 1)$$

Thus, we want

$$AMAT_P1 + 0.36(AMAT_P1-1) < 10.05$$

This happens when AMAT_P1 < 7.65.

Finally, we solve for

$$1 + 0.08[9 + m*107] < 7.65$$

and find that

m < 0.693

This miss rate can be at most 69.3%.

5.16

5.16.1

				TLB		
Address	Virtual Page	TLB H/M	Valid	Tag	Physical Page	
		-	1	b	12	
4669	1	TLB miss PT hit	1	7	4	
0x123d		PF	1	3	6	
			1 (last access 0)	1	13	
			1 (last access 1)	0	5	
2227	0	TLB miss	1	7	4	
0x08b3	0	PT hit	1	3	6	
			1 (last access 0)	1	13	
			1 (last access 1)	0	5	
13916		TLB miss	1	7	4	
0x365c	3	PT hit	,	6		
			1 (last access 0)	1	13	
			1 (last access 1)	0	5	
34587		TLB miss	1 (last access 3)	8	14	
0x871b	8	PT hit PF	1 (last access 2)	3	6	
		FF	1 (last access 0)	1	13	
			1 (last access 1)	0	5	
48870	_	TLB miss	1 (last access 3)	8	14	
0xbee6	b	PT hit	1 (last access 2)	3	6	
			1 (last access 4)	b	12	
			1 (last access 1)	0	5	
12608	2	TLB miss	1 (last access 3)	8	14	
0x3140	3	PT hit	1 (last access 5)	3	6	
			1 (last access 4)	b	12	
			1 (last access 6)	С	15	
49225		TLB miss	1 (last access 3)	8	14	
0xc040	С	PT hit PF	1 (last access 5)	3	6	
			1 (last access 4)	b	12	

5.16.2

			TLB		
Address	Virtual Page	TLB H/M	Valid	Tag	Physical Page
			1	11	12
4669	1	TLB miss	1	7	4
0x123d		PT hit	1	3	6
			1 (last access 0)	0	5
			1	11	12
2227		TLB hit	1	7	4
0x08b3	0		1	3	6
			1 (last access 1)	0	5
			1	11	12
13916		TLB hit PT hit	1	7	4
0x365c	0		1	3	6
			1 (last access 2)	0	5
		TLB miss PT hit PF	1 (last access 3)	2	13
34587	2		1	7	4
0x871b			1	3	6
		FF	2	0	5
			1 (last access 4)	2	13
48870		TLB hit	1	7	4
0xbee6	2	PT hit	1	3	6
			1 (last access 2)	0	5
			1 (last access 4)	2	13
12608		TLB hit	1	7	4
0x3140	0	PT hit	1	3	6
			5	2 13 7 4 3 6 0 5 2 13 7 4 3 6 0 5	5
			1 (last access 4)	2	13
49225	2	TLB hit	1	7	4
0xc040	3	PT hit	1 (last access 6)	3	6
			1 (last access 5)	0	5

A larger page size reduces the TLB miss rate but can lead to higher fragmentation and lower utilization of the physical memory.

5.16.3 Two-way set associative

					TLB			
Address	Virtual Page	Tag	Index	TLB H/M	Valid	Tag	Physical Page	Index
					1	b	12	0
4669				TLB miss	1	7	4	1
0x123d	1	0	1	PT hit PF	1	з	6	0
				''	1 (last access 0)	0	13	1
					1 (last access 1)	0	5	0
2227	•			TLB miss	1	7	4	1
0x08b3	0	0	0	PT hit	1	3	6	0
					1 (last access 0)	0	13	1
					1 (last access 1)	0	5	0
13916				TLB miss	1 (last access 2)	1	6	1
0x365c	3	1	1	PT hit	1	3	6	0
					1 (last access 0)	1	13	1
					1 (last access 1)	0	5	0
34587	•			TLB miss	1 (last access 2)	1	6	1
0x871b	8	4	0	PT hit PF	1 (last access 3)	4	14	0
				''	1 (last access 0)	1	13	1
					1 (last access 1)	0	5	0
48870		_		TLB miss	1 (last access 2)	1	6	1
0xbee6	b	5	1	PT hit	1 (last access 3)	4	14	0
					1 (last access 4)	5	12	1
					1 (last access 1)	0	5	0
12608	•			TLB hit	1 (last access 5)	1	6	1
0x3140	3	1	1	PT hit	1 (last access 3)	4	14	0
					1 (last access 4)	5	12	1
					1 (last access 6)	6	15	0
49225	_		_	TLB miss	1 (last access 5)	1	6	1
0xc049	С	6	0	PT miss PF	1 (last access 3)	4	14	0
				''	1 (last access 4)	5	12	1

5.16.4 Direct mapped

					TLB			
Address	Virtual Page	Tag	Index	TLB H/M	Valid	Tag	Physical Page	Index
					1	b	12	0
4669		_		TLB miss	1	0	13	1
0x123d	1	0	1	PT hit PF	1	3	6	2
				FI	0	4	9	3
					1	0	5	0
2227				TLB miss	1	0	13	1
0x08b3	0	0	0	PT hit	1	3	6	2
					0	4	9	3
					1	0	5	0
13916	•			TLB miss	1	0	13	1
0x365c	3	0	3	PT hit	1	3	6	2
					1	0	6	3
	8				1	2	14	0
34587			_	TLB miss PT hit	1	0	13	1
0x871b	8	2	0	PF	1	3	6	2
					1	0	6	3
					1	2	14	0
48870	L		2	TLB miss	1	0	13	1
0xbee6	b	2	3	PT hit	1	3	6	2
					1	2	12	3
					1	2	14	0
12608	•			TLB hit	1	0	13	1
0x3140	3	0	3	PT hit	1	3	6	2
					1	0	6	3
					1	3	15	0
49225	_			TLB miss	1	0	13	1
0xc049	С	3	0	PT miss PF	1	3	6	2
				''	1	0	6	3

5.16.5 Without a TLB, almost every memory access would require two accesses to RAM: An access to the page table, followed by an access to the requested data.