

SOLUTIONS:

- Base program (**Direct-mapped** 2KB D\$):

- D\$ Accesses: 1025
- D\$ Misses: 1024
- Cycles: 12837
- Instructions: 8719

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 (**2-way** set-associative 2KB D\$):

- D\$ Accesses: 1025
- D\$ Misses: 257
- Cycles: 9777
- Instructions: 8719

Discussion: In this configuration all conflict misses are avoided, thus reducing the misses to $\frac{1}{4}$ the original number of misses.

- Array Enlargement (**Direct-mapped** 2KB D\$):

- D\$ Accesses: 1025
- D\$ Misses: 259
- Cycles: 9777
- Instructions: 8719

Discussion: The amount of misses gets reduced to $\frac{1}{4}$ the original number of misses. All conflict misses are removed, and only compulsory misses remain. All hits are a consequence of spatial locality exploitation. As for the amount of cycles, it gets significantly reduced with the optimization.

We can easily deduct the average D\$ miss penalty with the next operation: $(12837 - 9777)/(1024 - 259) = 4$ cycles, which, as we determined in Exercise 2, is correct.

- Array Merging (**Direct-mapped** 2KB D\$):

- D\$ Accesses: 1025
- D\$ Misses: 259
- Cycles: 9769
- Instructions: 8718

Discussion: The amount of misses gets reduced to $\frac{1}{4}$ the original number of misses. All conflict misses are removed, and only compulsory misses remain. All hits are a consequence of spatial locality exploitation.