

2004 CPU




Image: approx 2004 AMD press image of Opteron die;
approx register location via chip-architect.org (Hans de Vries)

2004 CPU

▲ Registers




Image: approx 2004 AMD press image of Opteron die;
approx register location via chip-architect.org (Hans de Vries)

2004 CPU




Image: approx 2004 AMD press image of Opteron die;
approx register location via chip-architect.org (Hans de Vries)

2004 CPU





Image: approx 2004 AMD press image of Opteron die;
approx register location via chip-architect.org (Hans de Vries)

2004 CPU





Image: approx 2004 AMD press image of Opteron die;
approx register location via chip-architect.org (Hans de Vries)

2004 CPU





Image: approx 2004 AMD press image of Opteron die;
approx register location via chip-architect.org (Hans de Vries)

2004 CPU





Image: approx 2004 AMD press image of Opteron die;
approx register location via chip-architect.org (Hans de Vries)

the place of cache



memory hierarchy goals

performance of the fastest (smallest) memory

hide 100x latency difference? 99+% hit (= value found in cache) rate

capacity of the largest (slowest) memory

memory hierarchy assumptions

temporal locality

“if a value is accessed now, it will be accessed again soon”

caches should keep **recently accessed values**

spatial locality

“if a value is accessed now, adjacent values will be accessed soon”

caches should **store adjacent values at the same time**

natural properties of programs — think about loops

locality examples

```
double computeMean(int length, double *values) {  
    double total = 0.0;  
    for (int i = 0; i < length; ++i) {  
        total += values[i];  
    }  
    return total / length;  
}
```

temporal locality: machine code of the loop

spatial locality: machine code of most consecutive instructions

temporal locality: `total`, `i`, `length` accessed repeatedly

spatial locality: `values[i+1]` accessed after `values[i]`

building a (direct-mapped) cache

Cache

value
00 00
00 00
00 00
00 00

cache block: 2 bytes

Memory

addresses	bytes
00000-00001	00 11
00010-00011	22 33
00100-00101	55 55
00110-00111	66 77
01000-01001	88 99
01010-01011	AA BB
01100-01101	CC DD
01110-01111	EE FF
10000-10001	F0 F1
...	...

building a (direct-mapped) cache

read byte at 01011?

Cache

value
00 00
00 00
00 00
00 00

cache block: 2 bytes


Memory

addresses	bytes
00000-00001	00 11
00010-00011	22 33
00100-00101	55 55
00110-00111	66 77
01000-01001	88 99
01010-01011	AA BB
01100-01101	CC DD
01110-01111	EE FF
10000-10001	F0 F1
...	...

building a (direct-mapped) cache

read byte at 01011?


exactly **one place** for each address
spread out what can go in a block



building a (direct-mapped) cache

read byte at 01011?


exactly **one place** for each address
spread out what can go in a block



building a (direct-mapped) cache

read byte at 01011?

exactly **one place** for each address
spread out what can go in a block



building a (direct-mapped) cache

read byte at 01011?

Cache			Memory	
index	valid	value	addresses	bytes
00	0	00 00		1
01	0	00 00	00010-00011	22 33
10	0		0-00101	55 55
11	0	00 00	00110-00111	66 77
			01000-01001	88 99
			01010-01011	AA BB
			01100-01101	CC DD
			01110-01111	EE FF
			10000-10001	F0 F1
		

cache block: 2 bytes

direct-mapped

is this even a value?

need extra bit to know

building a (direct-mapped) cache

read byte at 01011?

invalid, fetch

Cache

index	valid	value
00	0	00 00
01	1	AA BB
10	0	00 00
11	0	00 00

cache block: 2 bytes

direct-mapped

Memory

addresses	bytes
00000-00001	00 11
00010-00011	22 33
00100-00101	55 55
00110-00111	66 77
01000-01001	88 99
01010-01011	AA BB
01100-01101	CC DD
01110-01111	EE FF
10000-10001	F0 F1
...	...

building a (direct-mapped) cache

read byte at 01011?

invalid, fetch

Cache				Memory	
index	valid	tag	value	addresses	bytes
00	0	00	00 00	00000-00001	00 11
01	1	01	AA BB	00010-00011	22 33
10	0	00	00 00	00100-00101	55 55
11	0			00110-00111	66 77
				01000-01001	88 99
				01010-01011	AA BB
				01100-01101	CC DD
				01110-01111	EE FF
				10000-10001	F0 F1
			

value from 01010 or 00010?

need tag to know

cache block: 2 bytes
direct-mapped

building a (direct-mapped) cache

read byte at 01011?

invalid, fetch

Cache

index	valid	tag	value
00	0	00	00 00
01	1	01	AA BB
10	0	00	00 00
11	0	00	00 00

cache block: 2 bytes

direct-mapped

Memory

addresses	bytes
00000-00001	00 11
00010-00011	22 33
00100-00101	55 55
00110-00111	66 77
01000-01001	88 99
01010-01011	AA BB
01100-01101	CC DD
01110-01111	EE FF
10000-10001	F0 F1
...	...

terminology

row = set

preview: change how much is in a row

Tag-Index-Offset (TIO)

address 001111 (stores value 0xFF)

cache tag index offset

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

2 byte blocks, 8 sets

4 byte blocks, 2 sets

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

index	valid	tag	value
00	1	000	00 11
01	1	001	AA BB
10	0	--	-- --
11	1	001	EE FF

4 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value
0	1	000	00 11 22 33
1	1	001	CC DD EE FF

2 byte blocks, 8 sets

index	valid	tag	value
000	1	00	00 11
001	1	01	F1 F2
010	0	--	-- --
011	0	--	-- --
100	0	--	-- --
101	1	00	AA BB
110	0	--	-- --
111	1	00	EE FF

Tag-Index-Offset (TIO)

address 00111**1** (stores value 0xFF)

cache tag index offset

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

1

2 byte blocks, 8 sets

1

4 byte blocks, 2 sets

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

index	valid	tag	value
00	1	000	00 11
01	1	001	AA BB
10	0	--	-- --
11	1	001	EE FF

4 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value
0	1	000	00 11 22 33
1	1	001	CC DD EE FF

2 byte blocks, 8 sets

index	valid	tag	value
000	0	--	-- --
001	0	--	-- --
010	1	00	AA BB
011	0	--	-- --
100	0	--	-- --
101	1	00	AA BB
110	0	--	-- --
111	1	00	EE FF

$2 = 2^1$ bytes in block
1 bit to say which byte

Tag-Index-Offset (TIO)

address 0011**11** (stores value 0xFF)

cache	tag	index	offset
2 byte blocks, 4 sets			1
2 byte blocks, 8 sets			1
4 byte blocks , 2 sets			11

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

index	valid	tag	value
00	1	000	00 11
01	1	001	AA BB
10	0		
11	1		

4 byte

index	valid	tag	value
0	1	000	00 11 22 33
1	1	001	CC DD EE FF

4 = 2² bytes in block
2 bits to say which byte

2 byte blocks, 8 sets

index	valid	tag	value
000	1	00	00 11
001	1	01	F1 F2
	0	--	-- --
	0	--	-- --
	0	--	-- --
	1	00	AA BB
	0	--	-- --
	1	00	EE FF

Tag-Index-Offset (TIO)

address 001111 (stores value 0xFF)

cache	tag	index	offset
2 byte blocks, 4 sets		11	1
2 byte blocks, 8 sets			1
4 byte blocks, 2 sets	1		11

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

index	valid	tag	value
00	1	000	00 11
01	1	001	AA BB
10	0	--	-- --
11	1	001	EE FF

4 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value
0	1	000	00 11 22 33
1	1	001	CC DD EE FF

2 byte blocks, 8 sets

index	valid	tag	value
000	1	00	00 11
			F1 F2
			-- --
			-- --
100	0	--	-- --
101	1	00	AA BB
110	0	--	-- --
111	1	00	EE FF

$2^2 = 4$ sets

2 bits to index set

Tag-Index-Offset (TIO)

address 001111 (stores value 0xFF)

cache	tag	index	offset
2 byte blocks, 4 sets	11	1	
2 byte blocks, 8 sets	111	1	
4 byte blocks, 2 sets	1	11	

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

index	valid	tag	value
00	1	000	00 11
01	1	001	AA BB
10	0	--	-- --
11	1		

$2^3 = 8$ sets
3 bits to index set

index	valid	tag	value
0	1	000	00 11 22 33
1	1	001	CC DD EE FF

2 byte blocks, 8 sets

index	valid	tag	value
000	1	00	00 11
001	1	01	F1 F2
010	0	--	-- --
011	0	--	-- --
100	0	--	-- --
101	1	00	AA BB
110	0	--	-- --
111	1	00	EE FF

Tag-Index-Offset (TIO)

address 001111 (stores value 0xFF)

cache	tag	index	offset
2 byte blocks, 4 sets	11	1	
2 byte blocks, 8 sets	111	1	
4 byte blocks, 2 sets	1	11	

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

index	valid	tag	value
00	1	000	00 11
01	1	001	AA BB
10	0	--	-- --
11	1	001	EE FF

4 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value
0	1	000	00 11 22 33
1	1	001	CC DD EE FF

2 byte blocks, 8 sets

index	valid	tag	value
000	1	00	00 11
001	1	01	F1 F2
010	0	--	-- --
011	0	--	-- --
100	0	--	-- --
101	0	--	-- --
110	0	--	-- --
111	1	00	EE FF

$2^1 = 2$ sets
1 bit to index set

Tag-Index-Offset (TIO)

address 001111 (stores value 0xFF)

cache	tag	index	offset
2 byte blocks, 4 sets	001	11	1
2 byte blocks, 8 sets	00	111	1
4 byte blocks, 2 sets	001	1	11

tag — whatever is left over

00	1	000	00 11
01	1	001	AA BB
10	0	--	-- --
11	1	001	EE FF

4 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value
0	1	000	00 11 22 33
1	1	001	CC DD EE FF

2 byte blocks, 8 sets

index	valid	tag	value
000	1	00	00 11
001	1	01	F1 F2
010	0	--	-- --
011	0	--	-- --
100	0	--	-- --
101	1	00	AA BB
110	0	--	-- --
111	1	00	EE FF

Tag-Index-Offset formulas (direct-mapped)

(formulas derivable from prior slides)

$S = 2^s$ number of sets

s (set) index bits

$B = 2^b$ block size

b (block) offset bits

m memory addresses bits

$t = m - (s + b)$ tag bits

$C = B \times S$ cache size (if direct-mapped)

Tag-Index-Offset formulas (direct-mapped)

(formulas derivable from prior slides)

$S = 2^s$ number of sets

s (set) index bits

$B = 2^b$ block size

b (block) offset bits

m memory addresses bits

$t = m - (s + b)$ tag bits

$C = B \times S$ **cache size** (if direct-mapped)

TIO: exercise

64-byte blocks, 128 set cache

stores $64 \times 128 = 8192$ bytes (of data)

if addresses 32-bits, then how many tag/index/offset bits?

which bytes are stored in the same block as byte from 0x1037?

- A. byte from 0x1011
- B. byte from 0x1021
- C. byte from 0x1035
- D. byte from 0x1041

example access pattern (1)

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	
00000001 (01)	
01100011 (63)	
01100001 (61)	
01100010 (62)	
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

index	valid	tag	value
00	0		
01	0		
10	0		
11	0		

example access pattern (1)

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	
00000001 (01)	
01100011 (63)	
01100001 (61)	
01100010 (62)	
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

index	valid	tag	value
00	0		
01	0		
10	0		
11	0		

$B = 2 = 2^b$ byte block size

$b = 1$ (block) offset bits

$S = 4 = 2^s$ sets

$s = 2$ (set) index bits

$m = 8$ bit addresses

$t = m - (s + b) = 5$ tag bits

example access pattern (1)

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	
00000001 (01)	
01100011 (63)	
01100001 (61)	
01100010 (62)	
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

tag index offset

$B = 2 = 2^b$ byte block size

$b = 1$ (block) offset bits

$S = 4 = 2^s$ sets

$s = 2$ (set) index bits

index	valid	tag	value
00	0		
01	0		
10	0		
11	0		

$m = 8$ bit addresses

$t = m - (s + b) = 5$ tag bits

example access pattern (1)

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	
01100011 (63)	
01100001 (61)	
01100010 (62)	
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

tag index offset

$B = 2 = 2^b$ byte block size

$b = 1$ (block) offset bits

$S = 4 = 2^s$ sets

$s = 2$ (set) index bits

index	valid	tag	value
00	1	00000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]
01	0		
10	0		
11	0		

$m = 8$ bit addresses

$t = m - (s + b) = 5$ tag bits

example access pattern (1)

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	hit
01100011 (63)	
01100001 (61)	
01100010 (62)	
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

tag index offset

$B = 2 = 2^b$ byte block size

$b = 1$ (block) offset bits

$S = 4 = 2^s$ sets

$s = 2$ (set) index bits

index	valid	tag	value
00	1	00000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]
01	0		
10	0		
11	0		

$m = 8$ bit addresses

$t = m - (s + b) = 5$ tag bits

example access pattern (1)

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	hit
01100011 (63)	miss
01100001 (61)	
01100010 (62)	
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

tag index offset

$B = 2 = 2^b$ byte block size

$b = 1$ (block) offset bits

$S = 4 = 2^s$ sets

$s = 2$ (set) index bits

index	valid	tag	value
00	1	00000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]
01	1	01100	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]
10	0		
11	0		

$m = 8$ bit addresses

$t = m - (s + b) = 5$ tag bits

example access pattern (1)

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	hit
01100011 (63)	miss
01100001 (61)	miss
01100010 (62)	
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

tag index offset

$B = 2 = 2^b$ byte block size

$b = 1$ (block) offset bits

$S = 4 = 2^s$ sets

$s = 2$ (set) index bits

index	valid	tag	value
00	1	01100	mem[0x60] mem[0x61]
01	1	01100	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]
10	0		
11	0		

$m = 8$ bit addresses

$t = m - (s + b) = 5$ tag bits

example access pattern (1)

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	hit
01100011 (63)	miss
01100001 (61)	miss
01100010 (62)	hit
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

tag index offset

$B = 2 = 2^b$ byte block size

$b = 1$ (block) offset bits

$S = 4 = 2^s$ sets

$s = 2$ (set) index bits

index	valid	tag	value
00	1	01100	mem[0x60] mem[0x61]
01	1	01100	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]
10	0		
11	0		

$m = 8$ bit addresses

$t = m - (s + b) = 5$ tag bits

example access pattern (1)

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	hit
01100011 (63)	miss
01100001 (61)	miss
01100010 (62)	hit
00000000 (00)	miss
01100100 (64)	

tag index offset

$B = 2 = 2^b$ byte block size

$b = 1$ (block) offset bits

$S = 4 = 2^s$ sets

$s = 2$ (set) index bits

index	valid	tag	value
00	1	00000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]
01	1	01100	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]
10	0		
11	0		

$m = 8$ bit addresses

$t = m - (s + b) = 5$ tag bits

example access pattern (1)

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	hit
01100011 (63)	miss
01100001 (61)	miss
01100010 (62)	hit
00000000 (00)	miss
01100100 (64)	miss

tag index offset

$B = 2 = 2^b$ byte block size

$b = 1$ (block) offset bits

$S = 4 = 2^s$ sets

$s = 2$ (set) index bits

index	valid	tag	value
00	1	00000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]
01	1	01100	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]
10	1	01100	mem[0x64] mem[0x65]
11	0		

$m = 8$ bit addresses

$t = m - (s + b) = 5$ tag bits

example access pattern (1)

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	hit
01100011 (63)	miss
01100001 (61)	miss
01100010 (62)	hit
00000000 (00)	miss
01100100 (64)	miss

tag index offset

$B = 2 = 2^b$ byte block size

$b = 1$ (block) offset bits

$S = 4 = 2^s$ sets

$s = 2$ (set) index bits

index	valid	tag	value
00	1	00000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]
01	1	01100	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]
10	1	01100	mem[0x64] mem[0x65]
11	0		

$m = 8$ bit addresses

$t = m - (s + b) = 5$ tag bits

example access pattern (1)

2 byte blocks, 4 sets

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	hit
01100011 (63)	miss
01100001 (61)	miss
01100010 (62)	hit
00000000 (00)	miss
01100100 (64)	miss

tag index offset

$B = 2 = 2^b$ byte block size

$b = 1$ (block) offset bits

$S = 4 = 2^s$ sets

$s = 2$ (set) index bits

index	valid	tag	value
00	1	00000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]
01	1	01100	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]
10	1	01100	mem[0x64] mem[0x65]
11	0		

miss caused by conflict

$m = 8$ bit addresses

$t = m - (s + b) = 5$ tag bits

exercise

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	
00000001 (01)	
01100011 (63)	
01100001 (61)	
01100010 (62)	
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

4 byte blocks, 4 sets

index	valid	tag	value
00			
01			
10			
11			

exercise

4 byte blocks, 4 sets

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	
00000001 (01)	
01100011 (63)	
01100001 (61)	
01100010 (62)	
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

index	valid	tag	value
00			
01			
10			
11			

how is the 8-bit address 61 (01100001) split up into tag/index/offset?

b block offset bits;

$B = 2^b$ byte block size;

s set index bits; $S = 2^s$ sets ;

$t = m - (s + b)$ tag bits (leftover)

exercise

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	
00000001 (01)	
01100011 (63)	
01100001 (61)	
01100010 (62)	
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

4 byte blocks, 4 sets

index	valid	tag	value
00			
01			
10			
11			

exercise

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	
00000001 (01)	
01100011 (63)	
01100001 (61)	
01100010 (62)	
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

4 byte blocks, 4 sets

index	valid	tag	value
00			
01			
10			
11			

exercise


4 byte blocks, 4 sets

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	
00000001 (01)	
01100011 (63)	
01100001 (61)	
01100010 (62)	
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

index	valid	tag	value
00			
01			
10			
11			

exercise: which accesses are hits?

split caches; multiple cores



hierarchy and instruction/data caches

typically separate data and instruction caches for L1

(almost) never going to read instructions as data or vice-versa

avoids instructions evicting data and vice-versa

can optimize instruction cache for different access pattern

easier to build fast caches: that handles less accesses at a time

cache accesses and C code (1)

```
int scaleFactor;  
  
int scaleByFactor(int value) {  
    return value * scaleFactor;  
}
```

```
scaleByFactor:  
    movl scaleFactor, %eax  
    imull %edi, %eax  
    ret
```

exercise: what data cache accesses does this function do?

cache accesses and C code (1)

```
int scaleFactor;  
  
int scaleByFactor(int value) {  
    return value * scaleFactor;  
}
```

```
scaleByFactor:  
    movl scaleFactor, %eax  
    imull %edi, %eax  
    ret
```

exercise: what data cache accesses does this function do?

- 4-byte read of scaleFactor
- 8-byte read of return address

possible scaleFactor use

```
for (int i = 0; i < size; ++i) {  
    array[i] = scaleByFactor(array[i]);  
}
```

misses and code (2)

scaleByFactor:

```
movl scaleFactor, %eax
imull %edi, %eax
ret
```

suppose each time this is called in the loop:

return address located at address 0x7fffffffe43b8

scaleFactor located at address 0x6bc3a0

with direct-mapped 32KB cache w/64 B blocks, what is their:

	return address	scaleFactor
tag		
index		
offset		

misses and code (2)

scaleByFactor:

```
movl scaleFactor, %eax
imull %edi, %eax
ret
```

suppose each time this is called in the loop:

return address located at address 0x7fffffffe43b8

scaleFactor located at address 0x6bc3a0

with direct-mapped 32KB cache w/64 B blocks, what is their:

	return address	scaleFactor
tag	0xffffffffc	0xd7
index	0x10e	0x10e
offset	0x38	0x20

misses and code (2)

scaleByFactor:

```
movl scaleFactor, %eax
imull %edi, %eax
ret
```

suppose each time this is called in the loop:

return address located at address 0x7fffffffe43b8

scaleFactor located at address 0x6bc3a0

with direct-mapped 32KB cache w/64 B blocks, what is their:

	return address	scaleFactor
tag	0xffffffffc	0xd7
index	0x10e	0x10e
offset	0x38	0x20

conflict miss coincidences?

obviously I set that up to have the same index

have to use exactly the right amount of stack space...

but one of the reasons we'll want something better than
direct-mapped cache


C and cache misses (warmup 1)

```
int array[4];  
...  
int even_sum = 0, odd_sum = 0;  
even_sum += array[0];  
odd_sum += array[1];  
even_sum += array[2];  
odd_sum += array[3];
```

Assume everything but array is kept in registers (and the compiler does not do anything funny).

How many data cache misses on a 1-set direct-mapped cache with 8B blocks?

some possibilities



Q1: how do cache blocks correspond to array elements?
not enough information provided!

aside: alignment

compilers and malloc/new implementations usually try **align** values

align = make address be multiple of something

most important reason: don't cross cache block boundaries

C and cache misses (warmup 2)

```
int array[4];  
int even_sum = 0, odd_sum = 0;  
even_sum += array[0];  
even_sum += array[2];  
odd_sum += array[1];  
odd_sum += array[3];
```

Assume everything but array is kept in registers (and the compiler does not do anything funny).

Assume array[0] at beginning of cache block.

How many data cache misses on a 1-set direct-mapped cache with 8B blocks?

C and cache misses (warmup 3)

```
int array[8];  
...  
int even_sum = 0, odd_sum = 0;  
even_sum += array[0];  
odd_sum += array[1];  
even_sum += array[2];  
odd_sum += array[3];  
even_sum += array[4];  
odd_sum += array[5];  
even_sum += array[6];  
odd_sum += array[7];
```

Assume everything but array is kept in registers (and the compiler does not do anything funny), and array[0] at beginning of cache block.

How many data cache misses on a **2**-set direct-mapped cache with 8B blocks?

C and cache misses (warmup 4)

```
int array[8];  
...  
int even_sum = 0, odd_sum = 0;  
even_sum += array[0];  
even_sum += array[2];  
even_sum += array[4];  
even_sum += array[6];  
odd_sum += array[1];  
odd_sum += array[3];  
odd_sum += array[5];  
odd_sum += array[7];
```

Assume everything but array is kept in registers (and the compiler does not do anything funny).

How many data cache misses on a **2**-set direct-mapped cache with 8B blocks?

cache size

cache size = amount of *data* in cache

not included metadata (tags, valid bits, etc.)

arrays and cache misses (1)

```
int array[1024]; // 4KB array
int even_sum = 0, odd_sum = 0;
for (int i = 0; i < 1024; i += 2) {
    even_sum += array[i + 0];
    odd_sum += array[i + 1];
}
```

Assume everything but array is kept in registers (and the compiler does not do anything funny).

How many *data cache misses* on initially empty 2KB direct-mapped cache with 16B cache blocks?

arrays and cache misses (2)

```
int array[1024]; // 4KB array
int even_sum = 0, odd_sum = 0;
for (int i = 0; i < 1024; i += 2)
    even_sum += array[i + 0];
for (int i = 0; i < 1024; i += 2)
    odd_sum += array[i + 1];
```

Assume everything but array is kept in registers (and the compiler does not do anything funny).

How many *data cache misses* on initially empty 2KB direct-mapped cache with 16B cache blocks?

arrays and cache misses (2b)

```
int array[1024]; // 4KB array
int even_sum = 0, odd_sum = 0;
for (int i = 0; i < 1024; i += 2)
    even_sum += array[i + 0];
for (int i = 0; i < 1024; i += 2)
    odd_sum += array[i + 1];
```

Assume everything but array is kept in registers (and the compiler does not do anything funny).

How many *data cache misses* on initially empty 4KB direct-mapped cache with 16B cache blocks?


arrays and cache misses (3)

```
int sum; int array[1024]; // 4KB array
for (int i = 8; i < 1016; i += 1) {
    int local_sum = 0;
    for (int j = i - 8; j < i + 8; j += 1) {
        local_sum += array[i] * (j - i);
    }
    sum += (local_sum - array[i]);
}
```

Assume everything but array is kept in registers (and the compiler does not do anything funny).


How many *data cache misses* on initially empty 2KB direct-mapped cache with 16B cache blocks?

simulated misses: BST lookups



(simulated 16KB direct-mapped data cache; excluding BST setup)


actual misses: BST lookups



(actual 32KB more complex data cache)


(only one set of measurements + other things on machine + excluding initial load)

simulated misses: matrix multiplies



(simulated 16KB direct-mapped data cache; excluding initial load)

actual misses: matrix multiplies



(actual 32KB more complex data cache; excluding matrix initial load)
(only one set of measurements + other things on machine)

misses with skipping

```
int array1[512]; int array2[512];  
...  
for (int i = 0; i < 512; i += 1)  
    sum += array1[i] * array2[i];  
}
```

Assume everything but array1, array2 is kept in registers (and the compiler does not do anything funny).

About how many *data cache misses* on a 2KB direct-mapped cache with 16B cache blocks?

Hint: depends on relative placement of array1, array2

best/worst case

array1[i] and array2[i] always different sets:

= distance from array1 to array2 not multiple of $\# \text{ sets} \times \text{bytes/set}$

2 misses every 4 i

blocks of 4 array1[X] values loaded, then used 4 times before loading next block

(and same for array2[X])

array1[i] and array2[i] same sets:

= distance from array1 to array2 is multiple of $\# \text{ sets} \times \text{bytes/set}$

2 misses every i

block of 4 array1[X] values loaded, one value used from it,

then, block of 4 array2[X] values replaces it, one value used from it, ...

worst case in practice?

two rows of matrix?

often `sizeof(row)` bytes apart

if the row size is multiple of number of sets \times bytes per block,
oops!

adding associativity

2-way set associative, 2 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value	valid	tag	value
0	0			0		
1	0			0		

multiple places to put values with same index
avoid misses from two active values using same set
("conflict misses"))

adding associativity

2-way set associative, 2 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value	valid	tag	value
0	0		set 0	0		
1	0		set 1	0		

adding associativity

2-way set associative, 2 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value	valid	tag	value
0	0			0		
1	0			0		

way 0

way 1

adding associativity

2-way set associative, 2 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value	valid	tag	value
0	0			0		
1	0			0		

$m = 8$ bit addresses

$S = 2 = 2^s$ sets

$s = 1$ (set) index bits

$B = 2 = 2^b$ byte block size

$b = 1$ (block) offset bits

$t = m - (s + b) = 6$ tag bits

adding associativity

2-way set associative, 2 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value	valid	tag	value
0	1	000000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]	0		
1	0			0		

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	
01100011 (63)	
01100001 (61)	
01100010 (62)	
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

tag indexoffset

adding associativity

2-way set associative, 2 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value	valid	tag	value
0	1	000000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]	0		
1	0			0		

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	hit
01100011 (63)	
01100001 (61)	
01100010 (62)	
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

tag index offset

adding associativity

2-way set associative, 2 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value	valid	tag	value
0	1	000000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]	0		
1	1	011000	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]	0		

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	hit
01100011 (63)	miss
01100001 (61)	
01100010 (62)	
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

tag indexoffset

adding associativity

2-way set associative, 2 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value	valid	tag	value
0	1	000000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]	1	011000	mem[0x60] mem[0x61]
1	1	011000	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]	0		

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	hit
01100011 (63)	miss
01100001 (61)	miss
01100010 (62)	
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

tag indexoffset

adding associativity

2-way set associative, 2 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value	valid	tag	value
0	1	000000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]	1	011000	mem[0x60] mem[0x61]
1	1	011000	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]	0		

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	hit
01100011 (63)	miss
01100001 (61)	miss
01100010 (62)	hit
00000000 (00)	
01100100 (64)	

tag index offset

adding associativity

2-way set associative, 2 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value	valid	tag	value
0	1	000000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]	1	011000	mem[0x60] mem[0x61]
1	1	011000	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]	0		

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	hit
01100011 (63)	miss
01100001 (61)	miss
01100010 (62)	hit
00000000 (00)	hit
01100100 (64)	

tag index offset

adding associativity

2-way set associative, 2 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value	valid	tag	value
0	1	000000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]	1	011000	mem[0x60] mem[0x61]
1	1	011000	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]	0		

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	hit
01100011 (63)	miss
01100001 (61)	miss
01100010 (62)	hit
00000000 (00)	hit
01100100 (64)	miss

needs to replace block in set 0!

tag indexoffsetset

adding associativity


2-way set associative, 2 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value	valid	tag	value
0	1	000000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]	1	011000	mem[0x60] mem[0x61]
1	1	011000	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]	0		


address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	hit
01100011 (63)	miss
01100001 (61)	miss
01100010 (62)	hit
00000000 (00)	hit
01100100 (64)	miss

tag index offset


cache operation (associative)



cache operation (associative)



cache operation (associative)



associative lookup possibilities

none of the blocks for the index are valid

none of the valid blocks for the index match the tag
something else is stored there

one of the blocks for the index is valid and matches the tag

replacement policies

2-way set associative, 2 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value	valid	tag	value
0	1	000000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]	1	011000	mem[0x60] mem[0x61]
1	1	011000	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]	0		

address (hex)	result
000	
00000001 (01)	hit
01100011 (63)	miss
01100001 (61)	miss
01100010 (62)	hit
00000000 (00)	hit
01100100 (64)	miss

how to decide where to insert 0x64?

replacement policies

2-way set associative, 2 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value	valid	tag	value	LRU
0	1	000000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]	1	011000	mem[0x60] mem[0x61]	1
1	1	011000	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]	0			1

address (hex)	result
00000000 (00)	miss
00000001 (01)	hit
01100011 (63)	miss
01100001 (61)	miss
01100010 (62)	hit
00000000 (00)	hit
01100100 (64)	miss

track which block was read least recently
updated on **every access**

example replacement policies

least recently used

take advantage of **temporal locality**

at least $\lceil \log_2(E!) \rceil$ bits per set for E -way cache

(need to store order of all blocks)

approximations of least recently used

implementing least recently used is expensive

really just need “avoid recently used” — much faster/simpler

good approximations: E to $2E$ bits

first-in, first-out

counter per set — where to replace next

(pseudo-)random

no extra information!

actually works pretty well in practice

associativity terminology

direct-mapped — one block per set

E -way set associative — E blocks per set
 E ways in the cache

fully associative — one set total (everything in one set)

Tag-Index-Offset formulas

m	memory addresses bits
E	number of blocks per set (“ways”)
$S = 2^s$	number of sets
s	(set) index bits
$B = 2^b$	block size
b	(block) offset bits
$t = m - (s + b)$	tag bits
$C = B \times S \times E$	cache size (excluding metadata)

Tag-Index-Offset exercise

m	memory addresses bits (Y86-64: 64)
E	number of blocks per set (“ways”)
$S = 2^s$	number of sets
s	(set) index bits
$B = 2^b$	block size
b	(block) offset bits
$t = m - (s + b)$	tag bits
$C = B \times S \times E$	cache size (excluding metadata)

My desktop:

L1 Data Cache: 32 KB, 8 blocks/set, 64 byte blocks

L2 Cache: 256 KB, 4 blocks/set, 64 byte blocks

L3 Cache: 8 MB, 16 blocks/set, 64 byte blocks

Divide the address 0x34567 into **tag**, **index**, **offset** for each cache.

T-I-O exercise: L1

T-I-O results

T-I-O: splitting

misses with skipping

```
int array1[512]; int array2[512];  
...  
for (int i = 0; i < 512; i += 1)  
    sum += array1[i] * array2[i];  
}
```

Assume everything but array1, array2 is kept in registers (and the compiler does not do anything funny).

About how many *data cache misses* on a 2KB direct-mapped cache with 16B cache blocks?

Hint: depends on relative placement of array1, array2

How about on a two-way set associative cache?


arrays and cache misses (2)

```
int array[1024]; // 4KB array  
int even_sum = 0, odd_sum = 0;  
for (int i = 0; i < 1024; i += 2)  
    even_sum += array[i + 0];  
for (int i = 0; i < 1024; i += 2)  
    odd_sum += array[i + 1];
```


Assume everything but array is kept in registers (and the compiler does not do anything funny).

How many *data cache misses* on initially empty 2KB direct-mapped cache with 16B cache blocks? Would a set-associative cache be better?

simulated misses: BST lookups



simulated misses: matrix multiplies



handling writes

what about writing to the cache?

two decision points:

if the value is not in cache, do we add it?

- if yes: need to load rest of block

- if no: missing out on locality?

if value is in cache, when do we update next level?

- if immediately: extra writing

- if later: need to remember to do so

allocate on write?

processor writes **less than whole** cache block

block not yet in cache

two options:

write-allocate


fetch rest of cache block, replace written part
(then follow write-through or write-back policy)

write-no-allocate

don't use cache at all (send write to memory *instead*)
guess: not read soon?


write-through v. write-back

option 1: write-through




write-through v. write-back

option 1: write-through




write-through v. write-back

option 2: write-back




write-through v. write-back

option 2: write-back



write-through v. write-back



writeback policy

changed value!

2-way set associative, 4 byte blocks, 2 sets

index	valid	tag	value	dirty	valid	tag	value	dirty	LRU
0	1	000000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]	0	1	011000	mem[0x60]* mem[0x61]*	1	1
1	1	011000	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]	0	0				0

1 = dirty (different than memory)
needs to be written if evicted

write-allocate + write-back

2-way set associative, LRU, writeback

index	valid	tag	value	dirty	valid	tag	value	dirty	LRU
0	1	000000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]	0	1	011000	mem[0x60]* mem[0x61]*	1	1
1	1	011000	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]	0	0				0

writing 0xFF into address 0x04?

index 0, tag 000001

write-allocate + write-back

2-way set associative, LRU, writeback

index	valid	tag	value	dirty	valid	tag	value	dirty	LRU
0	1	000000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]	0	1	011000	mem[0x60]* mem[0x61]*	1	1
1	1	011000	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]	0	0				0

writing 0xFF into address 0x04?

index 0, tag 000001

step 1: find **least recently used** block

write-allocate + write-back

2-way set associative, LRU, writeback

index	valid	tag	value	dirty	valid	tag	value	dirty	LRU
0	1	000000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]	0	1	011000	mem[0x60]* mem[0x61]*	1	1
1	1	011000	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]	0	0				0

writing 0xFF into address 0x04?

index 0, tag 000001

step 1: find **least recently used** block

step 2: possibly writeback old block

write-allocate + write-back

2-way set associative, LRU, writeback

index	valid	tag	value	dirty	valid	tag	value	dirty	LRU
0	1	000000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]	0	1	000001	0xFF mem[0x05]	1	0
1	1	011000	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]	0	0				0

writing 0xFF into address 0x04?

index 0, tag 000001

step 1: find **least recently used** block

step 2: possibly writeback old block

step 3a: read in new block – to get mem[0x05]

step 3b: update LRU information

write-no-allocate + write-back

2-way set associative, LRU, writeback

index	valid	tag	value	dirty	valid	tag	value	dirty	LRU
0	1	000000	mem[0x00] mem[0x01]	0	1	011000	mem[0x60]* mem[0x61]*	1	1
1	1	011000	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]	0	0				0

writing 0xFF into address 0x04?

step 1: is it in cache yet?

step 2: no, just send it to memory

exercise (1)

2-way set associative, LRU, write-allocate, writeback

index	valid	tag	value	dirty	valid	tag	value	dirty	LRU
0	1	001100	mem[0x30] mem[0x31]	0	1	010000	mem[0x40]* mem[0x41]*	1	0
1	1	011000	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]	0	1	001100	mem[0x32]* mem[0x33]*	1	1

for each of the following accesses, performed alone, would it require (a) reading a value from memory (or next level of cache) and (b) writing a value to the memory (or next level of cache)?

writing 1 byte to 0x33

reading 1 byte from 0x52

reading 1 byte from 0x50

exercise (2)

2-way set associative, LRU, write-no-allocate, write-through

index	valid	tag	value	valid	tag	value	LRU
0	1	001100	mem[0x30] mem[0x31]	1	010000	mem[0x40] mem[0x41]	0
1	1	011000	mem[0x62] mem[0x63]	1	001100	mem[0x32] mem[0x33]	1


for each of the following accesses, performed alone, would it require (a) reading a value from memory and (b) writing a value to the memory?

writing 1 byte to 0x33

reading 1 byte from 0x52

reading 1 byte from 0x50

fast writes



write appears to complete immediately when placed in buffer
memory can be much slower

cache miss types

common to categorize misses:

roughly “cause” of miss assuming cache block size fixed

compulsory (or *cold*) — **first time** accessing something
adding more sets or blocks/set wouldn't change

conflict — sets aren't big/flexible enough
a fully-associative (1-set) cache of the same size would have done better

capacity — cache was not big enough

coherence — from sync'ing cache with other caches
only issue with multiple cores

making any cache look bad

1. access enough blocks, to fill the cache
2. access an additional block, replacing something
3. access last block replaced
4. access last block replaced
5. access last block replaced
- ...

but — typical real programs have **locality**

cache optimizations

(assuming typical locality + keeping cache size constant if possible...)

	miss rate	hit time	miss penalty
increase cache size	better	worse	—
increase associativity	better	worse	worse?
increase block size	depends	worse	worse
add secondary cache	—	—	better
write-allocate	better	—	?
writeback	—	—	?
LRU replacement	better	?	worse?
prefetching	better	—	—

prefetching = guess what program will use, access in advance


$$\text{average time} = \text{hit time} + \text{miss rate} \times \text{miss penalty}$$

cache optimizations by miss type


(assuming other listed parameters remain constant)

	capacity	conflict	compulsory
increase cache size	fewer misses	fewer misses	—
increase associativity	—	fewer misses	—
increase block size	more misses?	more misses?	fewer misses
LRU replacement	—	fewer misses	—
prefetching	—	—	fewer misses

another view



two-level page table lookup



cache accesses and multi-level PTs


four-level page tables — five cache accesses per program memory access

L1 cache hits — typically a couple cycles each?

so add 8 cycles to each program memory access?

not acceptable

program memory active sets



0xFFFF FFFF FFFF FFFF

0xFFFF 8000 0000 0000

0x7F...

small areas of memory active at a time
one or two pages in each area?

0x0000 0000 0040 0000

page table entries and locality

page table entries have **excellent temporal locality**

typically one or two pages of the stack active

typically one or two pages of code active

typically one or two pages of heap/globals active

each page contains **whole functions**, arrays, stack frames, etc.

page table entries and locality

page table entries have **excellent temporal locality**

typically one or two pages of the stack active

typically one or two pages of code active

typically one or two pages of heap/globals active

each page contains **whole functions**, arrays, stack frames, etc.

needed page table entries are **very small**

page table entry cache

called a **TLB** (translation lookaside buffer)

very small cache of page table entries

L1 cache	TLB
physical addresses	virtual page numbers
bytes from memory	page table entries
tens of bytes per block	one page table entry per block
usually thousands of blocks	usually tens of entries

page table entry cache

called a **TLB** (translation lookaside buffer)

very small cache of page table entries

L1 cache	TLB
physical addresses	virtual page numbers
bytes from memory	page table entries
tens of bytes per block	one page table entry per block
usually thousands of blocks	usually tens of entries
only caches the page table lookup itself (generally) just entries from the last-level page tables	

page table entry cache

called a **TLB** (translation lookaside buffer)

very small cache of page table entries

L1 cache	TLB
physical addresses	virtual page numbers
bytes from memory	page table entries
tens of bytes per block	one page table entry per block
usually thousands of blocks	usually tens of entries

not much spatial locality between page table entries
(they're used for kilobytes of data already)
(and if spatial locality, maybe use larger page size?)

page table entry cache

called a **TLB** (translation lookaside buffer)

very small cache of page table entries

L1 cache	TLB
physical addresses	virtual page numbers
bytes from memory	page table entries
tens of bytes per block	one page table entry per block
usually thousands of blocks	usually tens of entries

few active page table entries at a time
enables highly associative cache designs


TLB and multi-level page tables

TLB caches **valid last-level page table entries**


doesn't matter which last-level page table

means TLB output can be used directly to form address


TLB and two-level lookup




TLB and two-level lookup




TLB organization (2-way set associative)




TLB organization (2-way set associative)



TLB organization (2-way set associative)



TLB organization (2-way set associative)



address splitting for TLBs (1)

my desktop:

4KB (2^{12} byte) pages; 48-bit virtual address

64-entry, 4-way L1 data TLB

TLB index bits?

TLB tag bits?

address splitting for TLBs (2)

my desktop:

4KB (2^{12} byte) pages; 48-bit virtual address

1536-entry ($3 \cdot 2^9$), 12-way L2 TLB

TLB index bits?

TLB tag bits?

exercise: TLB access pattern (setup)

4-entry, 2-way TLB, LRU replacement policy, initially empty

4096 byte pages

how many index bits?

TLB index of virtual address 0x12345?

exercise: TLB access pattern

4-entry, 2-way TLB, LRU replacement policy, initially empty

4096 byte pages

type	virtual	physical
read	0x440030	0x554030
write	0x440034	0x554034
read	0x7FFFE008	0x556008
read	0x7FFFE000	0x556000
read	0x7FFFDFF8	0x5F8FF8
read	0x664080	0x5F9080
read	0x440038	0x554038
write	0x7FFFDFF0	0x5F8FF0

which are TLB hits? which are TLB misses? final contents of TLB?

changing page tables

what happens to TLB when page table base pointer is changed?

e.g. context switch

most entries in TLB refer to things from **wrong process**

oops — read from the wrong process's stack?

changing page tables

what happens to TLB when page table base pointer is changed?

e.g. context switch

most entries in TLB refer to things from **wrong process**

oops — read from the wrong process's stack?

option 1: **invalidate** all TLB entries

side effect on “change page table base register” instruction

changing page tables

what happens to TLB when page table base pointer is changed?

e.g. context switch

most entries in TLB refer to things from **wrong process**

oops — read from the wrong process's stack?

option 1: **invalidate** all TLB entries

side effect on “change page table base register” instruction

option 2: TLB entries contain process ID

set by OS (special register)

checked by TLB in addition to TLB tag, valid bit

editing page tables

what happens to TLB when OS changes a page table entry?

most common choice: has to be handled **in software**

editing page tables

what happens to TLB when OS changes a page table entry?

most common choice: has to be handled **in software**

invalid to valid — nothing needed

- TLB doesn't contain invalid entries

- MMU will check memory again

valid to invalid — **OS needs to tell processor** to invalidate it


- special instruction (x86: `invlpg`)

valid to other valid — **OS needs to tell processor** to invalidate it

inclusive versus exclusive


L2 inclusive of L1

everything in L1 cache duplicated in L2
adding to L1 also adds to L2



L2 exclusive of L1


L2 contains different data than L1
adding to L1 must remove from L2
probably evicting from L1 adds to L2



inclusive versus exclusive

L2 inclusive of L1

everything in L1 cache duplicated in L2
adding to L1 also adds to L2




L2 exclusive of L1

L2 contains different data than L1
adding to L1 must remove from L2
probably evicting from L1 adds to L2

inclusive policy:
no extra work on eviction
but duplicated data

easier to explain when
 L_k shared by multiple $L(k-1)$ caches?



inclusive versus exclusive



L2 inclusive of L1

everything in L1 cache duplicated in L2
adding to L1 also adds to L2

L2 cache

exclusive policy:
avoid duplicated data
sometimes called *victim cache*
(contains cache eviction victims)

makes less sense with multicore





L2 exclusive of L1

L2 contains different data than L1
adding to L1 must remove from L2
probably evicting from L1 adds to L2

L2 cache

L1 cache



Tag-Index-Offset formulas (direct-mapped)

(formulas derivable from prior slides)

$S = 2^s$ number of sets

s (set) index bits

$B = 2^b$ block size

b (block) offset bits

m memory addresses bits

$t = m - (s + b)$ tag bits

$C = B \times S$ cache size (if direct-mapped)

Tag-Index-Offset formulas (direct-mapped)

(formulas derivable from prior slides)

$S = 2^s$ number of sets

s (set) index bits

$B = 2^b$ block size

b (block) offset bits

m memory addresses bits

$t = m - (s + b)$ tag bits

$C = B \times S$ **cache size** (if direct-mapped)

backup slides — cache performance

average memory access time

$AMAT = \text{hit time} + \text{miss penalty} \times \text{miss rate}$

or $AMAT = \text{hit time} \times \text{hit rate} + \text{miss time} \times \text{miss rate}$

effective speed of memory

AMAT exercise (1)

90% cache hit rate

hit time is 2 cycles

30 cycle miss penalty

what is the average memory access time?

suppose we could increase hit rate by increasing its size, but it would increase the hit time to 3 cycles

how much do we have to increase the hit rate for this to not increase AMAT?

AMAT exercise (1)

90% cache hit rate

hit time is 2 cycles

30 cycle miss penalty

what is the average memory access time?

suppose we could increase hit rate by increasing its size, but it would increase the hit time to 3 cycles

how much do we have to increase the hit rate for this to not increase AMAT?

AMAT exercise (1)

90% cache hit rate

hit time is 2 cycles

30 cycle miss penalty

what is the average memory access time?

suppose we could increase hit rate by increasing its size, but it would increase the hit time to 3 cycles

how much do we have to increase the hit rate for this to not increase AMAT?

exercise: AMAT and multi-level caches

suppose we have L1 cache with

- 3 cycle hit time

- 90% hit rate

and an L2 cache with

- 10 cycle hit time

- 80% hit rate (for accesses that make this far)

- (assume all accesses come via this L1)

and main memory has a 100 cycle access time

assume when there's an cache miss, the next level access starts after the hit time

- e.g. an access that misses in L1 and hits in L2 will take $10+3$ cycles

what is the average memory access time for the L1 cache?

exercise: AMAT and multi-level caches

suppose we have L1 cache with

- 3 cycle hit time

- 90% hit rate

and an L2 cache with

- 10 cycle hit time

- 80% hit rate (for accesses that make this far)

- (assume all accesses come via this L1)

and main memory has a 100 cycle access time

assume when there's an cache miss, the next level access starts after the hit time

- e.g. an access that misses in L1 and hits in L2 will take $10+3$ cycles

what is the average memory access time for the L1 cache?

exercise: AMAT and multi-level caches

suppose we have L1 cache with

- 3 cycle hit time

- 90% hit rate

and an L2 cache with

- 10 cycle hit time

- 80% hit rate (for accesses that make this far)

- (assume all accesses come via this L1)

and main memory has a 100 cycle access time

assume when there's an cache miss, the next level access starts after the hit time

- e.g. an access that misses in L1 and hits in L2 will take $10+3$ cycles

what is the average memory access time for the L1 cache?

approximate miss analysis

very tedious to precisely count cache misses

even more tedious when we take advanced cache optimizations into account

instead, approximations:

good or bad temporal/spatial locality

good temporal locality: value stays in cache

good spatial locality: use all parts of cache block

with nested loops: what does inner loop use?

intuition: values used in inner loop loaded into cache once
(that is, once each time the inner loop is run)

...if they can all fit in the cache

approximate miss analysis

very tedious to precisely count cache misses

even more tedious when we take advanced cache optimizations into account

instead, approximations:

good or bad temporal/spatial locality

good temporal locality: value stays in cache

good spatial locality: use all parts of cache block

with nested loops: what does inner loop use?

intuition: values used in inner loop loaded into cache once
(that is, once each time the inner loop is run)

...if they can all fit in the cache

locality exercise (1)

```
/* version 1 */  
for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)  
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)  
        A[i] += B[j] * C[i * N + j]
```

```
/* version 2 */  
for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)  
    for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)  
        A[i] += B[j] * C[i * N + j];
```

exercise: which has better temporal locality in A? in B? in C?
how about spatial locality?

exercise: miss estimating (1)

```
for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)
        A[i] += B[j] * C[i * N + j]
```

Assume: 4 array elements per block, N very large, nothing in cache at beginning.

Example: $N/4$ estimated misses for A accesses:

$A[i]$ should always be hit on all but first iteration of inner-most loop.
first iter: $A[i]$ should be hit about $3/4$ s of the time (same block as $A[i-1]$ that often)

Exercise: estimate # of misses for B , C

a note on matrix storage

A — $N \times N$ matrix

represent as **array**

makes dynamic sizes easier:

```
float A_2d_array[N][N];  
float *A_flat = malloc(N * N);
```

```
A_flat[i * N + j] == A_2d_array[i][j]
```

conversion re: rows/columns

going to call the first index rows

$A_{i,j}$ is A row i, column j

rows are stored together

this is an arbitrary choice

5x5 array and 4-element cache blocks

array[0*5 + 0]	array[0*5 + 1]	array[0*5 + 2]	array[0*5 + 3]	array[0*5 + 4]
array[1*5 + 0]	array[1*5 + 1]	array[1*5 + 2]	array[1*5 + 3]	array[1*5 + 4]
array[2*5 + 0]	array[2*5 + 1]	array[2*5 + 2]	array[2*5 + 3]	array[2*5 + 4]
array[3*5 + 0]	array[3*5 + 1]	array[3*5 + 2]	array[3*5 + 3]	array[3*5 + 4]
array[4*5 + 0]	array[4*5 + 1]	array[4*5 + 2]	array[4*5 + 3]	array[4*5 + 4]

5x5 array and 4-element cache blocks

array[0*5 + 0]	array[0*5 + 1]	array[0*5 + 2]	array[0*5 + 3]	array[0*5 + 4]
array[1*5 + 0]	array[1*5 + 1]	array[1*5 + 2]	array[1*5 + 3]	array[1*5 + 4]
array[2*5 + 0]	array[2*5 + 1]	array[2*5 + 2]	array[2*5 + 3]	array[2*5 + 4]
array[3*5 + 0]	array[3*5 + 1]	array[3*5 + 2]	array[3*5 + 3]	array[3*5 + 4]
array[4*5 + 0]	array[4*5 + 1]	array[4*5 + 2]	array[4*5 + 3]	array[4*5 + 4]

if array starts on cache block
first cache block = first elements
all together in one row!

5x5 array and 4-element cache blocks

array[0*5 + 0]	array[0*5 + 1]	array[0*5 + 2]	array[0*5 + 3]	array[0*5 + 4]
array[1*5 + 0]	array[1*5 + 1]	array[1*5 + 2]	array[1*5 + 3]	array[1*5 + 4]
array[2*5 + 0]	array[2*5 + 1]	array[2*5 + 2]	array[2*5 + 3]	array[2*5 + 4]
array[3*5 + 0]	array[3*5 + 1]	array[3*5 + 2]	array[3*5 + 3]	array[3*5 + 4]
array[4*5 + 0]	array[4*5 + 1]	array[4*5 + 2]	array[4*5 + 3]	array[4*5 + 4]

second cache block:

1 from row 0

3 from row 1

5x5 array and 4-element cache blocks

array[0*5 + 0]	array[0*5 + 1]	array[0*5 + 2]	array[0*5 + 3]	array[0*5 + 4]
array[1*5 + 0]	array[1*5 + 1]	array[1*5 + 2]	array[1*5 + 3]	array[1*5 + 4]
array[2*5 + 0]	array[2*5 + 1]	array[2*5 + 2]	array[2*5 + 3]	array[2*5 + 4]
array[3*5 + 0]	array[3*5 + 1]	array[3*5 + 2]	array[3*5 + 3]	array[3*5 + 4]
array[4*5 + 0]	array[4*5 + 1]	array[4*5 + 2]	array[4*5 + 3]	array[4*5 + 4]

5x5 array and 4-element cache blocks

array[0*5 + 0]	array[0*5 + 1]	array[0*5 + 2]	array[0*5 + 3]	array[0*5 + 4]
array[1*5 + 0]	array[1*5 + 1]	array[1*5 + 2]	array[1*5 + 3]	array[1*5 + 4]
array[2*5 + 0]	array[2*5 + 1]	array[2*5 + 2]	array[2*5 + 3]	array[2*5 + 4]
array[3*5 + 0]	array[3*5 + 1]	array[3*5 + 2]	array[3*5 + 3]	array[3*5 + 4]
array[4*5 + 0]	array[4*5 + 1]	array[4*5 + 2]	array[4*5 + 3]	array[4*5 + 4]

generally: cache blocks contain data from 1 or 2 rows
→ better performance from reusing rows

matrix multiply

$$C_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^n A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$$

```
/* version 1: inner loop is k, middle is j */  
for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)  
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)  
        for (int k = 0; k < N; ++k)  
            C[i * N + j] += A[i * N + k] * B[k * N + j];
```

matrix multiply

$$C_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^n A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$$

```
/* version 1: inner loop is k, middle is j */  
for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)  
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)  
        for (int k = 0; k < N; ++k)  
            C[i*N+j] += A[i * N + k] * B[k * N + j];
```

```
/* version 2: outer loop is k, middle is i */  
for (int k = 0; k < N; ++k)  
    for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)  
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)  
            C[i*N+j] += A[i * N + k] * B[k * N + j];
```

loop orders and locality

loop body: $C_{ij} += A_{ik}B_{kj}$

kij order: C_{ij} , B_{kj} have **spatial locality**

kij order: A_{ik} has **temporal locality**

... better than ...

ijk order: A_{ik} has spatial locality

ijk order: C_{ij} has temporal locality

loop orders and locality

loop body: $C_{ij} += A_{ik}B_{kj}$

kij order: C_{ij} , B_{kj} have spatial locality

kij order: A_{ik} has temporal locality

... better than ...

ijk order: A_{ik} has spatial locality

ijk order: C_{ij} has temporal locality

matrix multiply

$$C_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^n A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$$

```
/* version 1: inner loop is k, middle is j */  
for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)  
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)  
        for (int k = 0; k < N; ++k)  
            C[i*N+j] += A[i * N + k] * B[k * N + j];
```

```
/* version 2: outer loop is k, middle is i */  
for (int k = 0; k < N; ++k)  
    for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)  
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)  
            C[i*N+j] += A[i * N + k] * B[k * N + j];
```


matrix multiply

$$C_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^n A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$$

```
/* version 1: inner loop is k, middle is j */
for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)
        for (int k = 0; k < N; ++k)
            C[i*N+j] += A[i * N + k] * B[k * N + j];
```

```
/* version 2: outer loop is k, middle is i */
for (int k = 0; k < N; ++k)
    for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)
            C[i*N+j] += A[i * N + k] * B[k * N + j];
```

matrix multiply

$$C_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^n A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$$

```
/* version 1: inner loop is k, middle is j */  
for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)  
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)  
        for (int k = 0; k < N; ++k)  
            C[i*N+j] += A[i * N + k] * B[k * N + j];
```

```
/* version 2: outer loop is k, middle is i */  
for (int k = 0; k < N; ++k)  
    for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)  
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)  
            C[i*N+j] += A[i * N + k] * B[k * N + j];
```

which is better?


$$C_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^n A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$$

```
/* version 1: inner loop is k, middle is j */  
for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)  
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)  
        for (int k = 0; k < N; ++k)  
            C[i*N+j] += A[i * N + k] * B[k * N + j];
```

```
/* version 2: outer loop is k, middle is i */  
for (int k = 0; k < N; ++k)  
    for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)  
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)  
            C[i*N+j] += A[i * N + k] * B[k * N + j];
```

exercise: Which version has better spatial/temporal locality for...
...accesses to C? ...accesses to A? ...accesses to B?

array usage: ijk order



for all i :

for all j :

for all k :

$$C_{ij} += A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$$

if N large:




using C_{ij} many times per load into cache

using A_{ik} once per load-into-cache

(but using $A_{i,k+1}$ right after)

using B_{kj} once per load into cache


array usage: ijk order



```
for all  $i$ :  
  for all  $j$ :  
    for all  $k$ :  
       $C_{ij} += A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$ 
```

looking only at innermost loop:
good spatial locality in A
(rows stored together = reuse cache blocks)
bad spatial locality in B
(use each cache block once)
no useful spatial locality in C

array usage: ijk order



for all i :


for all j :

for all k :

$$C_{ij} += A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$$

looking only at innermost loop:
temporal locality in C
bad temporal locality in everything else
(everything accessed exactly once)

array usage: *ijk* order



A_{x0} A_{xN}

for all i :




for all j :

for all k :

$$C_{ij} += A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$$

looking only at innermost loop:
row of A (elements used once)
column of B (elements used once)
single element of C (used many times)

array usage: *ijk* order



for all i :


 for all j :

 for all k :

$$C_{ij+} = A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$$

looking only at two innermost loops together:
some temporal locality in A (column reused)
some temporal locality in B (row reused)
some temporal locality in C (row reused)

array usage: kij order



for all k :

for all i :

for all j :

$$C_{ij} += A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$$


if N large:

using C_{ij} once per load into cache
(but using $C_{i,j+1}$ right after)

using A_{ik} many times per load-into-cache

using B_{kj} once per load into cache
(but using $B_{k,j+1}$ right after)


array usage: *kij* order



A_{x0} A_{xN}
for all k :
 for all i :
 for all j :
 $C_{ij} += A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$

looking only at innermost loop:
spatial locality in B, C
(use most of loaded B, C cache blocks)
no useful spatial locality in A
(rest of A's cache block wasted)

array usage: *kij* order



for all k :




for all i :

for all j :

$$C_{ij} += A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$$

looking only at innermost loop:
temporal locality in A
no temporal locality in B, C
(B, C values used exactly once)

array usage: *kij* order



for all k :




for all i :

for all j :

$$C_{ij} += A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$$

looking only at innermost loop:
processing one element of A (use many times)
row of B (each element used once)
column of C (each element used once)

array usage: kij order



for all k :

for all i :

for all j :

$$C_{ij} += A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$$

looking only at two innermost loops together:
good temporal locality in A (column reused)
good temporal locality in B (row reused)
bad temporal locality in C (nothing reused)



matrix multiply

$$C_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^n A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$$


```
/* version 1: inner loop is k, middle is j */
for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)
        for (int k = 0; k < N; ++k)
            C[i*N+j] += A[i * N + k] * B[k * N + j];
```

```
/* version 2: outer loop is k, middle is i */
for (int k = 0; k < N; ++k)
    for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)
            C[i*N+j] += A[i * N + k] * B[k * N + j];
```


performance (with $A=B$)



alternate view 1: cycles/instruction



alternate view 2: cycles/operation



counting misses: version 1

```
for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)
  for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)
    for (int k = 0; k < N; ++k)
      C[i * N + j] += A[i * N + k] * B[k * N + j];
```

if N really large

assumption: can't get close to storing N values in cache at once

for A: about $N \div \text{block size}$ misses per k-loop

total misses: $N^3 \div \text{block size}$

for B: about N misses per k-loop

total misses: N^3

for C: about $1 \div \text{block size}$ miss per k-loop

total misses: $N^2 \div \text{block size}$

counting misses: version 2

```
for (int k = 0; k < N; ++k)
  for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)
      C[i * N + j] += A[i * N + k] * B[k * N + j];
```

for A: about 1 misses per j-loop

total misses: N^2

for B: about $N \div \text{block size}$ miss per j-loop

total misses: $N^3 \div \text{block size}$

for C: about $N \div \text{block size}$ miss per j-loop

total misses: $N^3 \div \text{block size}$

exercise: miss estimating (2)

```
for (int k = 0; k < 1000; k += 1)
    for (int i = 0; i < 1000; i += 1)
        for (int j = 0; j < 1000; j += 1)
            A[k*N+j] += B[i*N+j];
```

assuming: 4 elements per block


assuming: cache not close to big enough to hold 1K elements

estimate: *approximately* how many misses for A , B ?


L1 misses (with $A=B$)



L1 miss detail (1)



L1 miss detail (2)



addresses

$B[k*114+j]$ is at 10 0000 0000 0100

$B[k*114+j+1]$ is at 10 0000 0000 1000

$B[(k+1)*114+j]$ is at 10 0011 1001 0100

$B[(k+2)*114+j]$ is at 10 0101 0101 1100

...

$B[(k+9)*114+j]$ is at 11 0000 0000 1100

addresses

$B[k*114+j]$ is at 10 0000 0000 0100

$B[k*114+j+1]$ is at 10 0000 0000 1000

$B[(k+1)*114+j]$ is at 10 0011 1001 0100

$B[(k+2)*114+j]$ is at 10 0101 0101 1100

...

$B[(k+9)*114+j]$ is at 11 0000 0000 1100

test system L1 cache: 6 index bits, 6 block offset bits

conflict misses

powers of two — lower order bits unchanged

$B[k*93+j]$ and $B[(k+11)*93+j]$:

1023 elements apart (4092 bytes; 63.9 cache blocks)

64 sets in L1 cache: usually maps to same set

$B[k*93+(j+1)]$ will not be cached (next i loop)

even if in same block as $B[k*93+j]$

how to fix? improve spatial locality
(maybe even if it requires copying)

locality exercise (2)

```
/* version 2 */  
for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)  
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)  
        A[i] += B[j] * C[i * N + j]
```

```
/* version 3 */  
for (int ii = 0; ii < N; ii += 32)  
    for (int jj = 0; jj < N; jj += 32)  
        for (int i = ii; i < ii + 32; ++i)  
            for (int j = jj; j < jj + 32; ++j)  
                A[i] += B[j] * C[i * N + j];
```

exercise: which has better temporal locality in A? in B? in C?
how about spatial locality?

a transformation

```
for (int k = 0; k < N; k += 1)
    for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)
            C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+k] * B[k*N+j];
```

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 2)
    for (int k = kk; k < kk + 2; ++k)
        for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)
            for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)
                C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+k] * B[k*N+j];
```

split the loop over k — should be exactly the same
(assuming even N)

a transformation

```
for (int k = 0; k < N; k += 1)
    for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)
            C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+k] * B[k*N+j];
```

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 2)
    for (int k = kk; k < kk + 2; ++k)
        for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)
            for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)
                C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+k] * B[k*N+j];
```

split the loop over k — should be exactly the same
(assuming even N)

simple blocking

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 2)
    /* was here: for (int k = kk; k < kk + 2; ++k) */
    for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)
            /* load Aik, Aik+1 into cache and process: */
            for (int k = kk; k < kk + 2; ++k)
                C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+k] * B[k*N+j];
```

now **reorder** split loop — same calculations

simple blocking

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 2)
    /* was here: for (int k = kk; k < kk + 2; ++k) */
    for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)
            /* load Aik, Aik+1 into cache and process: */
            for (int k = kk; k < kk + 2; ++k)
                C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+k] * B[k*N+j];
```

now **reorder** split loop — same calculations

now handle B_{ij} for $k+1$ right after B_{ij} for k

(previously: $B_{i,j+1}$ for k right after B_{ij} for k)

simple blocking

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 2)
    /* was here: for (int k = kk; k < kk + 2; ++k) */
    for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i)
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)
            /* load Aik, Aik+1 into cache and process: */
            for (int k = kk; k < kk + 2; ++k)
                C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+k] * B[k*N+j];
```

now **reorder** split loop — same calculations

now handle B_{ij} for $k+1$ right after B_{ij} for k

(previously: $B_{i,j+1}$ for k right after B_{ij} for k)

simple blocking – expanded

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 2) {  
    for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i) {  
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {  
            /* process a "block" of 2 k values: */  
            C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+0] * B[(kk+0)*N+j];  
            C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+1] * B[(kk+1)*N+j];  
        }  
    }  
}
```

simple blocking – expanded

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 2) {  
    for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i) {  
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {  
            /* process a "block" of 2 k values: */  
            C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+0] * B[(kk+0)*N+j];  
            C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+1] * B[(kk+1)*N+j];  
        }  
    }  
}
```

Temporal locality in C_{ij} s

simple blocking – expanded

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 2) {  
    for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i) {  
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {  
            /* process a "block" of 2 k values: */  
            C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+0] * B[(kk+0)*N+j];  
            C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+1] * B[(kk+1)*N+j];  
        }  
    }  
}
```

More spatial locality in A_{ik}

simple blocking – expanded

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 2) {  
    for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i) {  
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {  
            /* process a "block" of 2 k values: */  
            C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+0] * B[(kk+0)*N+j];  
            C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+1] * B[(kk+1)*N+j];  
        }  
    }  
}
```

Still have good spatial locality in B_{kj} , C_{ij}

counting misses for A (1)

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 2)
  for (int i = 0; i < N; i += 1)
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+0] * B[(kk+0)*N+j];
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+1] * B[(kk+1)*N+j];
    }
```

access pattern for A:

$A[0*N+0]$, $A[0*N+1]$, $A[0*N+0]$, $A[0*N+1]$...(repeats N times)

$A[1*N+0]$, $A[1*N+1]$, $A[1*N+0]$, $A[1*N+1]$...(repeats N times)

...

...

counting misses for A (1)

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 2)
  for (int i = 0; i < N; i += 1)
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+0] * B[(kk+0)*N+j];
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+1] * B[(kk+1)*N+j];
    }
```

access pattern for A:

$A[0*N+0]$, $A[0*N+1]$, $A[0*N+0]$, $A[0*N+1]$... (repeats N times)

$A[1*N+0]$, $A[1*N+1]$, $A[1*N+0]$, $A[1*N+1]$... (repeats N times)

...

$A[(N-1)*N+0]$, $A[(N-1)*N+1]$, $A[(N-1)*N+0]$, $A[(N-1)*N+1]$...

$A[0*N+2]$, $A[0*N+3]$, $A[0*N+2]$, $A[0*N+3]$...

...

counting misses for A (1)

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 2)
  for (int i = 0; i < N; i += 1)
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+0] * B[(kk+0)*N+j];
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+1] * B[(kk+1)*N+j];
    }
```

access pattern for A:

$A[0*N+0]$, $A[0*N+1]$, $A[0*N+0]$, $A[0*N+1]$...(repeats N times)

$A[1*N+0]$, $A[1*N+1]$, $A[1*N+0]$, $A[1*N+1]$...(repeats N times)

...

$A[(N-1)*N+0]$, $A[(N-1)*N+1]$, $A[(N-1)*N+0]$, $A[(N-1)*N+1]$...

$A[0*N+2]$, $A[0*N+3]$, $A[0*N+2]$, $A[0*N+3]$...

...

counting misses for A (2)

$A[0*N+0]$, $A[0*N+1]$, $A[0*N+0]$, $A[0*N+1]$... (repeats N times)

$A[1*N+0]$, $A[1*N+1]$, $A[1*N+0]$, $A[1*N+1]$... (repeats N times)

...

...

counting misses for A (2)

$A[0*N+0]$, $A[0*N+1]$, $A[0*N+0]$, $A[0*N+1]$... (repeats N times)

$A[1*N+0]$, $A[1*N+1]$, $A[1*N+0]$, $A[1*N+1]$... (repeats N times)

...

$A[(N-1)*N+0]$, $A[(N-1)*N+1]$, $A[(N-1)*N+0]$, $A[(N-1)*N+1]$...

$A[0*N+2]$, $A[0*N+3]$, $A[0*N+2]$, $A[0*N+3]$...

...

likely cache misses: only first iterations of j loop

how many cache misses per iteration? usually one

$A[0*N+0]$ and $A[0*N+1]$ usually in same cache block

counting misses for A (2)

$A[0*N+0]$, $A[0*N+1]$, $A[0*N+0]$, $A[0*N+1]$... (repeats N times)

$A[1*N+0]$, $A[1*N+1]$, $A[1*N+0]$, $A[1*N+1]$... (repeats N times)

...

$A[(N-1)*N+0]$, $A[(N-1)*N+1]$, $A[(N-1)*N+0]$, $A[(N-1)*N+1]$...

$A[0*N+2]$, $A[0*N+3]$, $A[0*N+2]$, $A[0*N+3]$...

...

likely cache misses: only first iterations of j loop

how many cache misses per iteration? usually one

$A[0*N+0]$ and $A[0*N+1]$ usually in same cache block

about $\frac{N}{2} \cdot N$ misses total

counting misses for B (1)

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 2)
  for (int i = 0; i < N; i += 1)
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+0] * B[(kk+0)*N+j];
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+1] * B[(kk+1)*N+j];
    }
```

access pattern for B:

$B[0*N+0]$, $B[1*N+0]$, ... $B[0*N+(N-1)]$, $B[1*N+(N-1)]$

$B[2*N+0]$, $B[3*N+0]$, ... $B[2*N+(N-1)]$, $B[3*N+(N-1)]$

$B[4*N+0]$, $B[5*N+0]$, ... $B[4*N+(N-1)]$, $B[5*N+(N-1)]$

...

$B[0*N+0]$, $B[1*N+0]$, ... $B[0*N+(N-1)]$, $B[1*N+(N-1)]$

...

counting misses for B (2)

access pattern for B:

$B[0*N+0]$, $B[1*N+0]$, ... $B[0*N+(N-1)]$, $B[1*N+(N-1)]$

$B[2*N+0]$, $B[3*N+0]$, ... $B[2*N+(N-1)]$, $B[3*N+(N-1)]$

$B[4*N+0]$, $B[5*N+0]$, ... $B[4*N+(N-1)]$, $B[5*N+(N-1)]$

...

$B[0*N+0]$, $B[1*N+0]$, ... $B[0*N+(N-1)]$, $B[1*N+(N-1)]$

...

counting misses for B (2)

access pattern for B:

$B[0*N+0]$, $B[1*N+0]$, ... $B[0*N+(N-1)]$, $B[1*N+(N-1)]$

$B[2*N+0]$, $B[3*N+0]$, ... $B[2*N+(N-1)]$, $B[3*N+(N-1)]$

$B[4*N+0]$, $B[5*N+0]$, ... $B[4*N+(N-1)]$, $B[5*N+(N-1)]$

...

$B[0*N+0]$, $B[1*N+0]$, ... $B[0*N+(N-1)]$, $B[1*N+(N-1)]$

...

likely cache misses: any access, each time

counting misses for B (2)

access pattern for B:

$B[0*N+0]$, $B[1*N+0]$, ... $B[0*N+(N-1)]$, $B[1*N+(N-1)]$

$B[2*N+0]$, $B[3*N+0]$, ... $B[2*N+(N-1)]$, $B[3*N+(N-1)]$

$B[4*N+0]$, $B[5*N+0]$, ... $B[4*N+(N-1)]$, $B[5*N+(N-1)]$

...

$B[0*N+0]$, $B[1*N+0]$, ... $B[0*N+(N-1)]$, $B[1*N+(N-1)]$

...

likely cache misses: any access, each time

how many cache misses per iteration? equal to $\#$ cache blocks in 2 rows

counting misses for B (2)

access pattern for B:

$B[0*N+0], B[1*N+0], \dots B[0*N+(N-1)], B[1*N+(N-1)]$

$B[2*N+0], B[3*N+0], \dots B[2*N+(N-1)], B[3*N+(N-1)]$

$B[4*N+0], B[5*N+0], \dots B[4*N+(N-1)], B[5*N+(N-1)]$

...

$B[0*N+0], B[1*N+0], \dots B[0*N+(N-1)], B[1*N+(N-1)]$

...

likely cache misses: any access, each time

how many cache misses per iteration? equal to $\#$ cache blocks in 2 rows

about $\frac{N}{2} \cdot N \cdot \frac{2N}{\text{block size}} = N^3 \div \text{block size}$ misses

simple blocking – counting misses

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 2)
  for (int i = 0; i < N; i += 1)
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+0] * B[(kk+0)*N+j];
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+1] * B[(kk+1)*N+j];
    }
```

$\frac{N}{2} \cdot N$ j-loop executions and (assuming N large):

about 1 misses from A per j-loop

$N^2/2$ total misses (before blocking: N^2)

about $2N \div \text{block size}$ misses from B per j-loop

$N^3 \div \text{block size}$ total misses (same as before blocking)

about $N \div \text{block size}$ misses from C per j-loop

$N^3 \div (2 \cdot \text{block size})$ total misses (before: $N^3 \div \text{block size}$)

simple blocking – counting misses

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 2)
  for (int i = 0; i < N; i += 1)
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+0] * B[(kk+0)*N+j];
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+1] * B[(kk+1)*N+j];
    }
```

$\frac{N}{2} \cdot N$ j-loop executions and (assuming N large):

about 1 misses from A per j-loop

$N^2/2$ total misses (before blocking: N^2)


about $2N \div \text{block size}$ misses from B per j-loop

$N^3 \div \text{block size}$ total misses (same as before blocking)

about $N \div \text{block size}$ misses from C per j-loop

$N^3 \div (2 \cdot \text{block size})$ total misses (before: $N^3 \div \text{block size}$)

improvement in read misses



simple blocking (2)

same thing for i in addition to k ?

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 2) {  
    for (int ii = 0; ii < N; ii += 2) {  
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {  
            /* process a "block": */  
            for (int k = kk; k < kk + 2; ++k)  
                for (int i = 0; i < ii + 2; ++i)  
                    C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+k] * B[k*N+j];  
        }  
    }  
}
```

simple blocking — locality

```
for (int k = 0; k < N; k += 2) {  
  for (int i = 0; i < N; i += 2) {  
    /* load a block around Aik */  
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {  
      /* process a "block": */  
       $C_{i+0,j} += A_{i+0,k+0} * B_{k+0,j}$   
       $C_{i+0,j} += A_{i+0,k+1} * B_{k+1,j}$   
       $C_{i+1,j} += A_{i+1,k+0} * B_{k+0,j}$   
       $C_{i+1,j} += A_{i+1,k+1} * B_{k+1,j}$   
    }  
  }  
}
```

simple blocking — locality

```
for (int k = 0; k < N; k += 2) {  
    for (int i = 0; i < N; i += 2) {  
        /* load a block around Aik */  
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {  
            /* process a "block": */  
             $C_{i+0,j} += A_{i+0,k+0} * B_{k+0,j}$   
             $C_{i+0,j} += A_{i+0,k+1} * B_{k+1,j}$   
             $C_{i+1,j} += A_{i+1,k+0} * B_{k+0,j}$   
             $C_{i+1,j} += A_{i+1,k+1} * B_{k+1,j}$   
        }  
    }  
}
```

now: more temporal locality in B

previously: access B_{kj} , then don't use it again for a long time

simple blocking — counting misses for A

```
for (int k = 0; k < N; k += 2)
  for (int i = 0; i < N; i += 2)
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {
       $C_{i+0,j} += A_{i+0,k+0} * B_{k+0,j}$ 
       $C_{i+0,j} += A_{i+0,k+1} * B_{k+1,j}$ 
       $C_{i+1,j} += A_{i+1,k+0} * B_{k+0,j}$ 
       $C_{i+1,j} += A_{i+1,k+1} * B_{k+1,j}$ 
    }
```

$\frac{N}{2} \cdot \frac{N}{2}$ iterations of j loop

likely 2 misses per loop with A (2 cache blocks)

total misses: $\frac{N^2}{2}$ (same as only blocking in K)

simple blocking — counting misses for B

```
for (int k = 0; k < N; k += 2)
  for (int i = 0; i < N; i += 2)
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {
       $C_{i+0,j} += A_{i+0,k+0} * B_{k+0,j}$ 
       $C_{i+0,j} += A_{i+0,k+1} * B_{k+1,j}$ 
       $C_{i+1,j} += A_{i+1,k+0} * B_{k+0,j}$ 
       $C_{i+1,j} += A_{i+1,k+1} * B_{k+1,j}$ 
    }
```

$\frac{N}{2} \cdot \frac{N}{2}$ iterations of j loop

likely $2 \div$ block size misses per iteration with B

total misses: $\frac{N^3}{2 \cdot \text{block size}}$ (before: $\frac{N^3}{\text{block size}}$)

simple blocking — counting misses for C

```
for (int k = 0; k < N; k += 2)
  for (int i = 0; i < N; i += 2)
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {
       $C_{i+0,j} += A_{i+0,k+0} * B_{k+0,j}$ 
       $C_{i+0,j} += A_{i+0,k+1} * B_{k+1,j}$ 
       $C_{i+1,j} += A_{i+1,k+0} * B_{k+0,j}$ 
       $C_{i+1,j} += A_{i+1,k+1} * B_{k+1,j}$ 
    }
```

$\frac{N}{2} \cdot \frac{N}{2}$ iterations of j loop

likely $\frac{2}{\text{block size}}$ misses per iteration with C

total misses: $\frac{N^3}{2 \cdot \text{block size}}$ (same as blocking only in K)

simple blocking — counting misses (total)

```
for (int k = 0; k < N; k += 2)
  for (int i = 0; i < N; i += 2)
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {
       $C_{i+0,j} += A_{i+0,k+0} * B_{k+0,j}$ 
       $C_{i+0,j} += A_{i+0,k+1} * B_{k+1,j}$ 
       $C_{i+1,j} += A_{i+1,k+0} * B_{k+0,j}$ 
       $C_{i+1,j} += A_{i+1,k+1} * B_{k+1,j}$ 
    }
```

before:

$$A: \frac{N^2}{2}; B: \frac{N^3}{1 \cdot \text{block size}}; C: \frac{N^3}{1 \cdot \text{block size}}$$

after:


$$A: \frac{N^2}{2}; B: \frac{N^3}{2 \cdot \text{block size}}; C: \frac{N^3}{2 \cdot \text{block size}}$$

generalizing: divide and conquer

```
partial_matrixmultiply(float *A, float *B, float *C
                        int startI, int endI, ...) {
    for (int i = startI; i < endI; ++i) {
        for (int j = startJ; j < endJ; ++j) {
            for (int k = startK; k < endK; ++k) {
                ...
            }
        }
    }
}


matrix_multiply(float *A, float *B, float *C, int N) {
    for (int ii = 0; ii < N; ii += BLOCK_I)
        for (int jj = 0; jj < N; jj += BLOCK_J)
            for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += BLOCK_K)
                ...
                /* do everything for segment of A, B, C
                that fits in cache! */
                partial_matmul(A, B, C,
                               ii, ii + BLOCK_I, jj, jj + BLOCK_J,
                               kk, kk + BLOCK_K)
```

array usage: matrix block $C_{ij} += A_{ik} \cdot B_{kj}$




inner loops work on “matrix block” of A, B, C
rather than rows of some, little blocks of others
blocks fit into cache (b/c we choose I, K, J)
where previous rows might not

array usage: matrix block $C_{ij} += A_{ik} \cdot B_{kj}$




now (versus loop ordering example)
some spatial locality in A, B, and C
some temporal locality in A, B, and C

array usage: matrix block $C_{ij} += A_{ik} \cdot B_{kj}$




C_{ij} calculation uses strips from A , B
 K calculations for one cache miss
good temporal locality!

array usage: matrix block $C_{ij} += A_{ik} \cdot B_{kj}$



A_{ik} used with entire strip of B J calculations for one cache miss
good temporal locality!

array usage: matrix block $C_{ij} += A_{ik} \cdot B_{kj}$



(approx.) KIJ fully cached calculations
 for $KI + IJ + KJ$ values need to be loaded per “matrix block”
 (assuming everything stays in cache)

cache blocking efficiency

for each of N^3/IJK matrix blocks:

load $I \times K$ elements of A_{ik} :

$\approx IK \div \text{block size}$ misses per matrix block

$\approx N^3/(J \cdot \text{blocksize})$ misses total

load $K \times J$ elements of B_{kj} :

$\approx N^3/(I \cdot \text{blocksize})$ misses total

load $I \times J$ elements of C_{ij} :

$\approx N^3/(K \cdot \text{blocksize})$ misses total

bigger blocks — more work per load!

catch: $IK + KJ + IJ$ elements must fit in cache
otherwise estimates above don't work

cache blocking rule of thumb

fill the **most of the cache with useful data**

and do as much work as possible from that

example: my desktop 32KB L1 cache

$I = J = K = 48$ uses $48^2 \times 3$ elements, or 27KB.

assumption: conflict misses aren't important

systematic approach

```
for (int k = 0; k < N; ++k) {  
    for (int i = 0; i < N; ++i) {  
         $A_{ik}$  loaded once in this loop:  
        for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j)  
             $C_{ij}, B_{kj}$  loaded each iteration (if  $N$  big):  
             $B[i*N+j] += A[i*N+k] * A[k*N+j];$ 
```

values from A_{ik} used N times per load

values from B_{kj} used 1 times per load

but good spatial locality, so cache block of B_{kj} together

values from C_{ij} used 1 times per load

but good spatial locality, so cache block of C_{ij} together

exercise: miss estimating (3)

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < 1000; kk += 10)
    for (int jj = 0; jj < 1000; jj += 10)
        for (int i = 0; i < 1000; i += 1)
            for (int j = jj; j < jj+10; j += 1)
                for (int k = kk; k < kk + 10; k += 1)
                    A[k*N+j] += B[i*N+j];
```

assuming: 4 elements per block

assuming: cache not close to big enough to hold 1K elements, but big enough to hold 500 or so

estimate: *approximately* how many misses for A, B?

hint 1: part of A, B loaded in two inner-most loops only needs to be loaded once

loop ordering compromises

loop ordering forces compromises:

```
for k: for i: for j: c[i,j] += a[i,k] * b[j,k]
```

perfect temporal locality in $a[i,k]$

bad temporal locality for $c[i,j]$, $b[j,k]$

perfect spatial locality in $c[i,j]$

bad spatial locality in $b[j,k]$, $a[i,k]$

loop ordering compromises

loop ordering forces compromises:

```
for k: for i: for j: c[i,j] += a[i,k] * b[j,k]
```

perfect temporal locality in $a[i,k]$

bad temporal locality for $c[i,j]$, $b[j,k]$

perfect spatial locality in $c[i,j]$

bad spatial locality in $b[j,k]$, $a[i,k]$

cache blocking: work on blocks rather than rows/columns
have some temporal, spatial locality in everything

cache blocking pattern

no perfect loop order? work on rectangular matrix blocks

size amount used in inner loops based on cache size

in practice:

- test performance to determine 'size' of blocks

backup slides

cache organization and miss rate

depends on program; one example:

SPEC CPU2000 benchmarks, 64B block size

LRU replacement policies

data cache miss rates:

Cache size	direct-mapped	2-way	8-way	fully assoc.
1KB	8.63%	6.97%	5.63%	5.34%
2KB	5.71%	4.23%	3.30%	3.05%
4KB	3.70%	2.60%	2.03%	1.90%
16KB	1.59%	0.86%	0.56%	0.50%
64KB	0.66%	0.37%	0.10%	0.001%
128KB	0.27%	0.001%	0.0006%	0.0006%

cache organization and miss rate

depends on program; one example:

SPEC CPU2000 benchmarks, 64B block size

LRU replacement policies

data cache miss rates:

Cache size	direct-mapped	2-way	8-way	fully assoc.
1KB	8.63%	6.97%	5.63%	5.34%
2KB	5.71%	4.23%	3.30%	3.05%
4KB	3.70%	2.60%	2.03%	1.90%
16KB	1.59%	0.86%	0.56%	0.50%
64KB	0.66%	0.37%	0.10%	0.001%
128KB	0.27%	0.001%	0.0006%	0.0006%

exercise (1)

initial cache: 64-byte blocks, 64 sets, 8 ways/set

If we leave the other parameters listed above unchanged, which will probably reduce the number of **capacity misses** in a typical program? (Multiple may be correct.)

- A. quadrupling the block size (256-byte blocks, 64 sets, 8 ways/set)
- B. quadrupling the number of sets
- C. quadrupling the number of ways/set

exercise (2)

initial cache: 64-byte blocks, 8 ways/set, 64KB cache

If we leave the other parameters listed above unchanged, which will probably reduce the number of **capacity misses** in a typical program? (Multiple may be correct.)

- A. quadrupling the block size (256-byte block, 8 ways/set, 64KB cache)
- B. quadrupling the number of ways/set
- C. quadrupling the cache size

exercise (3)

initial cache: 64-byte blocks, 8 ways/set, 64KB cache

If we leave the other parameters listed above unchanged, which will probably reduce the number of **conflict misses** in a typical program? (Multiple may be correct.)

- A. quadrupling the block size (256-byte block, 8 ways/set, 64KB cache)
- B. quadrupling the number of ways/set
- C. quadrupling the cache size

prefetching

seems like we can't really improve cold misses...

have to have a miss to bring value into the cache?

prefetching

seems like we can't really improve cold misses...

have to have a miss to bring value into the cache?

solution: don't require miss: 'prefetch' the value before it's accessed

remaining problem: how do we know what to fetch?

common access patterns

suppose recently accessed 16B cache blocks are at:

0x48010, 0x48020, 0x48030, 0x48040

guess what's accessed next

common access patterns

suppose recently accessed 16B cache blocks are at:

0x48010, 0x48020, 0x48030, 0x48040

guess what's accessed next

common pattern with **instruction fetches** and **array accesses**

prefetching idea

look for sequential accesses


bring in guess at next-to-be-accessed value

if right: no cache miss (even if never accessed before)


if wrong: possibly evicted something else — could cause more misses

fortunately, sequential access guesses almost always right


mapping of sets to memory (direct-mapped)




mapping of sets to memory (direct-mapped)




mapping of sets to memory (direct-mapped)



mapping of sets to memory (direct-mapped)




mapping of sets to memory (3-way)



memory




mapping of sets to memory (3-way)



memory




mapping of sets to memory (3-way)



memory




mapping of sets to memory (3-way)



$$\text{where } X = \frac{\text{way size}}{\text{array element size}}$$

accesses (way size) bytes apart in array?
beware conflict misses!

memory



C and cache misses (4)

```
typedef struct {  
    int a_value, b_value;  
    int other_values[6];  
} item;  
item items[5];  
int a_sum = 0, b_sum = 0;  
for (int i = 0; i < 5; ++i)  
    a_sum += items[i].a_value;  
for (int i = 0; i < 5; ++i)  
    b_sum += items[i].b_value;
```

Assume everything but `items` is kept in registers (and the compiler does not do anything funny).

C and cache misses (4, rewrite)

```
int array[40]
int a_sum = 0, b_sum = 0;
for (int i = 0; i < 40; i += 8)
    a_sum += array[i];
for (int i = 1; i < 40; i += 8)
    b_sum += array[i];
```

Assume everything but array is kept in registers (and the compiler does not do anything funny) and array starts at beginning of cache block.

How many *data cache misses* on a 2-way set associative 128B cache with 16B cache blocks and LRU replacement?

C and cache misses (4, solution pt 1)

ints 4 byte \rightarrow array[0 to 3] and array[16 to 19] in same cache set

64B = 16 ints stored per way

4 sets total

accessing 0, 8, 16, 24, 32, 1, 9, 17, 25, 33

C and cache misses (4, solution pt 1)

ints 4 byte \rightarrow array[0 to 3] and array[16 to 19] in same cache set

64B = 16 ints stored per way

4 sets total

accessing 0, 8, 16, 24, 32, 1, 9, 17, 25, 33

0 (set 0), 8 (set 2), 16 (set 0), 24 (set 2), 32 (set 0)

1 (set 0), 9 (set 2), 17 (set 0), 25 (set 2), 33 (set 0)

C and cache misses (4, solution pt 2)

access	set 0 after (LRU first)	result
—	—, —	
array[0]	—, array[0 to 3]	miss
array[16]	array[0 to 3], array[16 to 19]	miss
array[32]	array[16 to 19], array[32 to 35]	miss
array[1]	array[32 to 35], array[0 to 3]	miss
array[17]	array[0 to 3], array[16 to 19]	miss
array[32]	array[16 to 19], array[32 to 35]	miss

6 misses for set 0

C and cache misses (4, solution pt 3)

access	set 2 after (LRU first)	result	
—	—, —		
array[8]	—, array[8 to 11]	miss	2 misses for set 1
array[24]	array[8 to 11], array[24 to 27]	miss	
array[9]	array[8 to 11], array[24 to 27]	hit	
array[25]	array[16 to 19], array[32 to 35]	hit	

C and cache misses (3)

```
typedef struct {  
    int a_value, b_value;  
    int other_values[10];  
} item;  
item items[5];  
int a_sum = 0, b_sum = 0;  
for (int i = 0; i < 5; ++i)  
    a_sum += items[i].a_value;  
for (int i = 0; i < 5; ++i)  
    b_sum += items[i].b_value;
```

observation: 12 ints in struct: only first two used

equivalent to accessing array[0], array[12], array[24], etc.

...then accessing array[1], array[13], array[25], etc.

C and cache misses (3, rewritten?)

```
int array[60];
int a_sum = 0, b_sum = 0;
for (int i = 0; i < 60; i += 12)
    a_sum += array[i];
for (int i = 1; i < 60; i += 12)
    b_sum += array[i];
```

Assume everything but array is kept in registers (and the compiler does not do anything funny) and array at beginning of cache block.

How many *data cache misses* on a 128B two-way set associative cache with 16B cache blocks and LRU replacement?

observation 1: first loop has 5 misses — first accesses to blocks

observation 2: array[0] and array[1], array[12] and array[13], etc. in same cache block

C and cache misses (3, solution)

ints 4 byte \rightarrow array[0 to 3] and array[16 to 19] in same cache set

64B = 16 ints stored per way

4 sets total

accessing array indices 0, 12, 24, 36, 48, 1, 13, 25, 37, 49

so access to 1, 21, 41, 61, 81 all hits:

set 0 contains block with array[0 to 3]

set 5 contains block with array[20 to 23]

etc.

C and cache misses (3, solution)

ints 4 byte \rightarrow array[0 to 3] and array[16 to 19] in same cache set

64B = 16 ints stored per way

4 sets total

accessing array indices 0, 12, 24, 36, 48, 1, 13, 25, 37, 49

so access to 1, 21, 41, 61, 81 all hits:

set 0 contains block with array[0 to 3]

set 5 contains block with array[20 to 23]

etc.

C and cache misses (3, solution)

ints 4 byte \rightarrow array[0 to 3] and array[16 to 19] in same cache set

64B = 16 ints stored per way

4 sets total

accessing array indices 0, 12, 24, 36, 48, 1, 13, 25, 37, 49

0 (set 0, array[0 to 3]), 12 (set 3), 24 (set 2), 36 (set 1), 48 (set 0)

each set used at most twice

no replacement needed

so access to 1, 21, 41, 61, 81 all hits:

set 0 contains block with array[0 to 3]

set 5 contains block with array[20 to 23]

etc.

C and cache misses (3)

```
typedef struct {  
    int a_value, b_value;  
    int boring_values[126];  
} item;  
item items[8]; // 4 KB array  
int a_sum = 0, b_sum = 0;  
for (int i = 0; i < 8; ++i)  
    a_sum += items[i].a_value;  
for (int i = 0; i < 8; ++i)  
    b_sum += items[i].b_value;
```

Assume everything but `items` is kept in registers (and the compiler does not do anything funny).

How many *data cache misses* on a 2KB direct-mapped cache with 16B cache blocks?

C and cache misses (3, rewritten?)

```
item array[1024]; // 4 KB array  
int a_sum = 0, b_sum = 0;  
for (int i = 0; i < 1024; i += 128)  
    a_sum += array[i];  
for (int i = 1; i < 1024; i += 128)  
    b_sum += array[i];
```

C and cache misses (4)

```
typedef struct {  
    int a_value, b_value;  
    int boring_values[126];  
} item;  
item items[8]; // 4 KB array  
int a_sum = 0, b_sum = 0;  
for (int i = 0; i < 8; ++i)  
    a_sum += items[i].a_value;  
for (int i = 0; i < 8; ++i)  
    b_sum += items[i].b_value;
```

Assume everything but `items` is kept in registers (and the compiler does not do anything funny).

How many *data cache misses* on a 4-way set associative 2KB direct-mapped cache with 16B cache blocks?

thinking about cache storage (1)

2KB direct-mapped cache with 16B blocks —

set 0: address 0 to 15, $(0 \text{ to } 15) + 2\text{KB}$, $(0 \text{ to } 15) + 4\text{KB}$, ...

set 1: address 16 to 31, $(16 \text{ to } 31) + 2\text{KB}$, $(16 \text{ to } 31) + 4\text{KB}$, ...

...

set 127: address 2032 to 2047, $(2032 \text{ to } 2047) + 2\text{KB}$, ...

thinking about cache storage (1)

2KB direct-mapped cache with 16B blocks —

set 0: address 0 to 15, $(0 \text{ to } 15) + 2\text{KB}$, $(0 \text{ to } 15) + 4\text{KB}$, ...

set 1: address 16 to 31, $(16 \text{ to } 31) + 2\text{KB}$, $(16 \text{ to } 31) + 4\text{KB}$, ...

...

set 127: address 2032 to 2047, $(2032 \text{ to } 2047) + 2\text{KB}$, ...

thinking about cache storage (1)

2KB direct-mapped cache with 16B blocks —

set 0: address 0 to 15, $(0 \text{ to } 15) + 2\text{KB}$, $(0 \text{ to } 15) + 4\text{KB}$, ...
block at 0: array[0] through array[3]

set 1: address 16 to 31, $(16 \text{ to } 31) + 2\text{KB}$, $(16 \text{ to } 31) + 4\text{KB}$, ...
block at 16: array[4] through array[7]

...

set 127: address 2032 to 2047, $(2032 \text{ to } 2047) + 2\text{KB}$, ...
block at 2032: array[508] through array[511]

thinking about cache storage (1)

2KB direct-mapped cache with 16B blocks —

set 0: address 0 to 15, $(0 \text{ to } 15) + 2\text{KB}$, $(0 \text{ to } 15) + 4\text{KB}$, ...

block at 0: array[0] through array[3]

block at 0+2KB: array[512] through array[515]

set 1: address 16 to 31, $(16 \text{ to } 31) + 2\text{KB}$, $(16 \text{ to } 31) + 4\text{KB}$, ...

block at 16: array[4] through array[7]

block at 16+2KB: array[516] through array[519]

...

set 127: address 2032 to 2047, $(2032 \text{ to } 2047) + 2\text{KB}$, ...

block at 2032: array[508] through array[511]

block at 2032+2KB: array[1020] through array[1023]

thinking about cache storage (2)

2KB 2-way set associative cache with 16B blocks: block addresses

—

set 0: address 0, $0 + 2\text{KB}$, $0 + 4\text{KB}$, ...

set 1: address 16, $16 + 2\text{KB}$, $16 + 4\text{KB}$, ...

...

set 63: address 1008, $2032 + 2\text{KB}$, $2032 + 4\text{KB}$...

thinking about cache storage (2)

2KB 2-way set associative cache with 16B blocks: block addresses

set 0: address 0, $0 + 2\text{KB}$, $0 + 4\text{KB}$, ...
block at 0: array[0] through array[3]

set 1: address 16, $16 + 2\text{KB}$, $16 + 4\text{KB}$, ...
address 16: array[4] through array[7]

...

set 63: address 1008, $2032 + 2\text{KB}$, $2032 + 4\text{KB}$...
address 1008: array[252] through array[255]

thinking about cache storage (2)

2KB 2-way set associative cache with 16B blocks: block addresses

set 0: address 0, $0 + 2\text{KB}$, $0 + 4\text{KB}$, ...

block at 0: array[0] through array[3]

block at $0+1\text{KB}$: array[256] through array[259]

block at $0+2\text{KB}$: array[512] through array[515]

...

set 1: address 16, $16 + 2\text{KB}$, $16 + 4\text{KB}$, ...

address 16: array[4] through array[7]

...

set 63: address 1008, $2032 + 2\text{KB}$, $2032 + 4\text{KB}$...

address 1008: array[252] through array[255]

thinking about cache storage (2)

2KB 2-way set associative cache with 16B blocks: block addresses

set 0: address 0, $0 + 2\text{KB}$, $0 + 4\text{KB}$, ...

block at 0: array[0] through array[3]

block at 0+1KB: array[256] through array[259]

block at 0+2KB: array[512] through array[515]

...

set 1: address 16, $16 + 2\text{KB}$, $16 + 4\text{KB}$, ...




address 16: array[4] through array[7]

...

set 63: address 1008, $2032 + 2\text{KB}$, $2032 + 4\text{KB}$...

address 1008: array[252] through array[255]

array usage: *ijk* order



for all i :




for all j :

for all k :

$$C_{ij+} = A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$$

looking only at two innermost loops together:
good spatial locality in A
poor spatial locality in B
good spatial locality in C

array usage: kij order



for all k :

for all i :

for all j :

$$C_{ij} += A_{ik} \times B_{kj}$$

looking only at two innermost loops together:
poor spatial locality in A
good spatial locality in B
good spatial locality in C

simple blocking – with 3?

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 3)
  for (int i = 0; i < N; i += 1)
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+0] * B[(kk+0)*N+j];
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+1] * B[(kk+1)*N+j];
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+2] * B[(kk+2)*N+j];
    }
```

$\frac{N}{3} \cdot N$ j-loop iterations, and (assuming N large):

about 1 misses from A per j-loop iteration

$N^2/3$ total misses (before blocking: N^2)

about $3N \div$ block size misses from B per j-loop iteration

$N^3 \div$ block size total misses (same as before)

about $3N \div$ block size misses from C per j-loop iteration

$N^3 \div$ block size total misses (same as before)

simple blocking – with 3?

```
for (int kk = 0; kk < N; kk += 3)
  for (int i = 0; i < N; i += 1)
    for (int j = 0; j < N; ++j) {
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+0] * B[(kk+0)*N+j];
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+1] * B[(kk+1)*N+j];
      C[i*N+j] += A[i*N+kk+2] * B[(kk+2)*N+j];
    }
```

$\frac{N}{3} \cdot N$ j-loop iterations, and (assuming N large):

about 1 misses from A per j-loop iteration

$N^2/3$ total misses (before blocking: N^2)

about $3N \div$ block size misses from B per j-loop iteration

$N^3 \div$ block size total misses (same as before)

about $3N \div$ block size misses from C per j-loop iteration

$N^3 \div$ block size total misses (same as before)

more than 3?

can we just keep doing this increase from 3 to some large X ? ...




assumption: X values from A would stay in cache

X too large — cache not big enough

assumption: X blocks from B would help with spatial locality

X too large — evicted from cache before next iteration

array usage (2 k at a time)



for each kk :




for each i :

for each j :

for $k=kk, kk+1$:

$$C_{ij} += A_{ik} \cdot B_{kj}$$




array usage (2 k at a time)



```
for each kk:  
  for each i:  
    for each j:  
      for k=kk, kk+1:  
         $C_{ij} += A_{ik} \cdot B_{kj}$ 
```

within innermost loop
good spatial locality in A
bad locality in B
good temporal locality in C

array usage (2 k at a time)



for each kk :

for each i :




for each j :

for $k=kk, kk+1$:

$$C_{ij} += A_{ik} \cdot B_{kj}$$

loop over j : better spatial locality
over A than before;
still good temporal locality for A

array usage (2 k at a time)



for each kk :

for each i :




for each j :

for $k=kk, kk+1$:

$C_{ij} += A_{ik} \cdot B_{kj}$

loop over j : spatial locality over B is worse
but probably not more misses
cache needs to keep two cache blocks
for next iter instead of one
(probably has the space left over!)

array usage (2 k at a time)



for each kk :

for each i :

for each j :

for $k=kk, kk+1$:

$C_{ij} += A_{ik} \cdot$

right now: only really care about
keeping 4 cache blocks in j loop

have more than 4 cache blocks?

increasing kk increment would use more of them

keeping values in cache

can't *explicitly* ensure values are kept in cache

...but reusing values *effectively* does this


cache will try to keep recently used values

cache optimization ideas: choose what's in the cache


for thinking about it: load values explicitly

for implementing it: access only values we want loaded


TLB and the MMU (1)




TLB and the MMU (2)



TLB and the MMU (2)




TLB and the MMU (2)




TLB and the MMU (2)


TLB miss: page table access happens



TLB and the MMU (2)



TLB and the MMU (2)



backup slides