

SOLUTIONS:

- Base program (direct-mapped 2KB D\$):
 - D\$ Accesses: 8362
 - D\$ Misses: 1033
 - Cycles: 29387
 - Instructions: 19918

Discussion: Given the sizes and memory mapping of the two arrays, each new element brought to the D\$ for an array will replace the latest block brought for the other array, and as a result each read operation will generate a D\$ miss.

- Base program (direct-mapped 4KB D\$):
 - D\$ Accesses: 8358
 - D\$ Misses: 264
 - Cycles: 26267
 - Instructions: 19918

Discussion: All conflict misses are avoided, thus reducing the misses to ¼ the original number of misses. The number of cycles also reduces.

- Loop interchange (direct-mapped 2KB D\$):
 - D\$ Accesses: 8362
 - D\$ Misses: 271
 - Cycles: 26339
 - Instructions: 19918

Discussion: The amount of misses is reduced to around ¼ the original number of misses, which makes sense, as the optimization removes all D\$ conflict misses. All hits are a consequence of spatial locality exploitation.

As for the amount of cycles, we can easily deduct the average miss penalty with the next operation: $(29387-26339)/(1033-271) = 4$ cycles, which, as we will see in a future lab, is correct.