

For the following formulas:

insn = number of instructions

RAW = number of RAW hazards

RAW_1 = number of RAW hazards causing 1-cycle stalls

RAW_2 = number of RAW hazards causing 2-cycle stalls

1. The CPI for the five stage pipeline due to RAW hazards in question 1 is given by the formula:

$$\text{CPI} = (\text{insn} + 2 \cdot \text{RAW}) / \text{insn}$$

The % drop (slowdown) due to RAW hazards can be derived as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \% \text{ drop} &= (\text{CPI}_{\text{new}} - \text{CPI}_{\text{old}}) / \text{CPI}_{\text{old}} * 100 \\ &= ((\text{insn} + 2 \cdot \text{RAW}) / \text{insn} - \text{insn} / \text{insn}) / (\text{insn} / \text{insn}) \\ &= 2 \cdot \text{RAW} / \text{insn} \end{aligned}$$

2. The CPI for the five stage pipeline with bypassing due to RAW hazards in question 2 is given by the formula:

$$\text{CPI} = (\text{insn} + \text{RAW}_1 + 2 \cdot \text{RAW}_2) / \text{insn}$$

The % drop (slowdown) due to RAW hazards can be derived as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \% \text{ drop} &= (\text{CPI}_{\text{new}} - \text{CPI}_{\text{old}}) / \text{CPI}_{\text{old}} * 100 \\ &= ((\text{insn} + \text{RAW}_1 + 2 \cdot \text{RAW}_2) / \text{insn} - \text{insn} / \text{insn}) / (\text{insn} / \text{insn}) \\ &= (\text{RAW}_1 + 2 \cdot \text{RAW}_2) / \text{insn} \end{aligned}$$

The command used to generate to compile the microbenchmark code is `ssbig-na-sstrix-gcc -O1 mbq1.c -o mbq1`

The benchmark main loop runs 1 million times. This is enough to effectively eliminate the significance of the other instructions outside the loop. The loop contains 7 assembly instructions:

```
(1) addu    $4,$4,1
(2) addu    $5,$4,1
(3) lw      $8,16($sp)
(4) addi    $7,$8,1
(5) sw      $7,16($sp)
(6) addu    $3,$3,1
(7) slt     $2,$6,$3
(8) beq     $2,$0,$L5
```

There are 5 RAW hazards in these 8 instructions in the following places:

1. There is a RAW hazard at instruction (2) because it has a dependency on \$4. This dependency translates to a 2 cycle stall in the pipeline without bypassing and a 1 cycle stall in the pipeline with bypassing since the value needed for \$4 will be ready by the end of the EXEC stage.

2. There is a RAW hazard at instruction (4) because it has a dependency on \$8. This dependency translates to a 2 cycle stall in both the bypassing and non-bypassing pipelines because the value needed for \$8 will be ready at the end of the MEM stage.

3. There is a RAW hazard at instruction (8) because it has a dependency on \$2. This dependency translates to a 2 cycle stall in the non-bypassing pipeline and a 1 cycle stall in the bypassing pipeline because the value needed for \$2 will be ready by the end of the EXEC stage.

4. There is a RAW hazard at instruction (5) only in the non-bypassing pipeline. In the bypassing pipeline, even though (5) has a data dependency on \$7, there is no hazard because the value in \$7 is only needed in the MEM stage by instruction (5) and will be ready by the end of the EXEC stage in instruction (4).

5. There is a RAW hazard at instruction (7) because it has a dependency on \$3 which is a 2 cycle stall in the non-bypassing pipeline and a 1 cycle stall in the bypassing pipeline.

Therefore, the microbenchmark should generate CPI_1 and CPI_2 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CPI}_1 &= (8 + 2 \cdot 5) / 8 \\ &= 18 / 8 \\ &= 2.25 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CPI}_2 &= (8 + 3 + 2 \cdot 1) / 8 \\ &= 13 / 8 \\ &= 1.625 \end{aligned}$$

The actual values measured by running ``sim-safe mbq1`` were:

<code>CPI_from_RAW_hazard_q1</code>	<code>2.2500</code>	<code># CPI from RAW hazard (q1)</code>
<code>CPI_from_RAW_hazard_q2</code>	<code>1.6250</code>	<code># CPI from RAW hazard (q2)</code>

which are exactly as predicted.