CprE 381 Homework 5

[Note: This homework gives you some more practice with MIPS programming and thinking about testing your processor. As a happy coincidence, it will help provide a class-wide test program that I will share with you. Then the homework begins to cover processor design choices.]

1. Processor Implementation Details

P&H(4.2) <§4.1>. The basic single-cycle MIPS implementation in Figure 4.2 can only implement some instructions. New instructions can be added to an existing Instruction Set Architecture (ISA), but the decision whether or not to do that depends, among other things, on the cost and complexity the proposed addition introduces into the processor datapath and control. The first three problems in this exercise refer to the new instruction:

Instruction: **JIC** rt, imm

Interpretation: PC = Reg[rt]+sign_extend(imm)

- a. Which existing blocks (if any) can be used for this instruction? Briefly describe them.
- b. Which new functional blocks (if any) do we need for this instruction? Briefly describe their functioning.
- c. What new signals do we need (if any) from the control unit to support this instruction? Include your control signal names (or widening of existing signals) and their specific assignment (including updated meaning of all values for widened control signals).

2. Processor Cycle Time Determination

Assume the following latencies for the logic blocks in Figure 4.17 from the textbook.

I-Mem	Adder	MUX	ALU	Reg Read	D-Mem	Sign- Extend	Shift- Left-2	Control	ALU Control	AND gate
225ps	85ps	15ps	100ps	110ps	340ps	15ps	10ps	70ps	15ps	10ps

 a. Identify and quantify (i.e., give the path through the blocks and the time for that path) the worst-case path for each of the following: an arithmetic R-format instruction, a lw instruction, and a conditional branch instruction.

[Note that in your project you will actually synthesize your processor and be asked to identifyits critical path—you'll find out the specific delays for the components you've designed when they are mapped to an FPGA. This problem should help you develop an intuitive sense of how to reason about critical paths.]

- b. Rank the following design approaches in terms of which improve the cycle time the most. You **must** justify your ranking.
 - i. Creating word addressable IMEM to eliminate branch / jump address shifting HW
 - ii. Implementing quicker memory to have quicker DMEM access times
 - iii. Designing a lower-latency control unit

3. Performance Analysis

You are in charge of selecting processors for computing simple Natural Language Processing (NLP) tasks. You are considering two processors, A and B (the only ones you and your roommates can afford) that have the following CPIs:

Instruction Type	Cycles per Instruction			
Instruction Type	Processor A	Processor B		
Arithmetic, Logical, Shifts, Stores	3	3		
Jumps	3	2		
Conditional Branch	3	2		
Loads	3	5		

The following applications are the primary ones that you will need to run on your system:

```
# Application 1:
# This is an implementation of a single stop word index identification
# in a string.
# $a0 contains &string (string is an asciiz array of size string size)
# $al contains &stop word (stop word is an asciiz array of size sw size)
# $a2 contains string size variable
# $a3 contains sw size variable
 addiu $t0, $0, 0
 j outer cond
outer loop:
 addiu $t1, $0, 0
 jal inner cond
outer loop cont:
 subu $t2, $t1, $a3
 ori
        $at, $0, 1
 sltu $t2, $t2, $at
 addiu $t0, $t0, 1
 beg $t2, $0, outer cond
       $at, 0x1001
 lui
 ori $a0, $at, 0x19
 addiu $v0, $0, 4
 syscall
 lui
        $at, 0
 ori
        $at, $at, 1
 subu $t0, $t0, $at
 addu $a0, $0, $t0
addiu $v0, $0, 1
 syscall
 j exit
outer_cond:
 subu $t2, $a2, $a3
 slt $10, $8, $10
beq $t2, 1, outer_loop
 beq
 j exit
inner loop:
 addu $t2, $t0, $t1
 addu $t2, $a0, $t2
```

```
$t3, 0($t2)
 1b
 addu $t2, $a1, $t1
 1b
       $t4, 0($t2)
 subu $t2, $t3, $t4
 sltu $t2, $0, $t2
 addiu $t1, $t1, 1
 beq
        $t2, 1, outer loop cont
inner_cond:
 slt
        $t2, $t1, $a3
 beq
        $t2, 1, inner loop
 jr
        $ra
exit:
# Application 2:
# This is an implementation of simple string tokenizer.
# $a1 contains string size variable
# $a2 contains &string (string is an asciiz array of size string size)
# $a3 contains &delimiter (delimiter is a byte array of size 1)
outer cond:
 addiu $t0, $t0, 1
 slt
        $t4, $t0, $a1
        $t4, 1, outer loop
 beq
 j exit
outer loop:
 addu $t4, $t0, $a2
        $t4, 0($t4)
 1b
        $t6, 0($a3)
 1b
 subu $t5, $t4, $t6
 ori
        $at, $0, 1
 sltu $t5, $t5, $at
        $t5, 1, set_ending_index
 beq
 addi
        $at, $0, 0
 subu $t5, $t4, $at
 ori
        $at, $0, 1
 sltu $t5, $t5, $at
        $t5, 1, set_ending_index
 beq
 j outer cond
set ending index:
 addiu $t3, $t0, 1
 addu $t1, $0, $t2
 j inner cond
inner cond:
 slt
        $t4, $t1, $t3
        $t4, 1, inner_loop_print
 bea
 addiu $a0, $0, '\n'
 addiu $v0, $0, 0xB
 syscall
 j set starting_index
set starting index:
 addu $t2, $0, $t3
 j outer_cond
inner_loop_print:
 addu $t4, $t1, $a2
        $t4, 0($t4)
 1b
 addu
        $a0, $0, $t4
 addiu $v0, $0, 0xB
 syscall
 addiu $t1, $t1, 1
 j inner cond
exit:
```

a. Consider the two applications above. Calculate the average CPI for each application on each processor (two applications cross two processors means you should have 4 different CPI values). Assume string_size is always 20 in both applications and sw_size is always 3 (i.e., the stop word is "the") for application 1.

b. Which processor has better performance? [Careful answering this part...it is a tricksy professor question.] Provide the quantitative evidence of "better performance" and include a description of how you evaluated the two applications together. What would the relative frequencies have to be between the two processors in order for their performance to be identical (i.e., calculate the "breakeven frequency")?