



Assignment 3

Parinay Chauhan
200667

November 10, 2023

1 PART A:

| Test Case | Instructions | Loads (%) | Stores (%) | Conditional Branches (%) |
|------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| asm-sim | 158 | 39.24050633 | 34.81012658 | 0 |
| c-sim | 1928 | 17.42738589 | 8.195020747 | 19.29460581 |
| endian | 1965 | 19.13486005 | 11.043257 | 18.01526718 |
| factorial | 2530 | 16.48221344 | 8.616600791 | 18.41897233 |
| fib | 44903 | 13.5915195 | 17.77609514 | 8.344654032 |
| hello | 1744 | 19.0940367 | 8.600917431 | 19.61009174 |
| host | 14894 | 20.10205452 | 9.923459111 | 19.22250571 |
| ifactorial | 2420 | 16.48760331 | 7.851239669 | 19.25619835 |
| ifib | 7581 | 16.98984303 | 10.01187178 | 17.50428703 |
| log2 | 2096 | 17.89122137 | 8.349236641 | 19.60877863 |
| msort | 17219 | 10.58714211 | 5.441663279 | 18.12532667 |
| rfib | 25668 | 14.39925199 | 17.02898551 | 9.513791491 |
| subreg | 3892 | 17.75436793 | 8.170606372 | 19.50154162 |
| towers | 82763 | 20.05727197 | 8.488092505 | 20.54299627 |
| vadd | 7259 | 6.144096983 | 16.35211462 | 10.57996969 |

2 PART B:

2.1 Results:

The designs mentioned below represent the following designs:

- **Design-1:** The complete interlock logic design with no bypass paths and two delay slots for branches.
- **Design-2:** Design-1 but with only one delay slot for branches.
- **Bypass-1:** Design-2 but with EX-EX bypass path enabled
- **Bypass-2:** Bypass-1 with MEM-MEM bypass path enabled
- **Final Design:** This is the final design with only one delay slot for branches and all possible bypass paths (EX-EX, MEM-MEM and MEM-EX) enabled.

The **CPI** of all these designs are indicated below.

| Test Case | Design-1 | Design-2 | Bypass-1 | Bypass-2 | Final Design | Load-delay stalls(%) |
|------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|----------------------|
| asm-sim | 1.57 | 1.47 | 1.22 | 1.22 | 1.22 | 0 |
| c-sim | 1.8 | 1.65 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.01 | 0 |
| endian | 1.73 | 1.58 | 1.11 | 1.1 | 1.01 | 0 |
| factorial | 1.8 | 1.63 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.01 | 0 |
| fib | 1.63 | 1.41 | 1.07 | 1.07 | 1 | 0 |
| hello | 1.77 | 1.62 | 1.12 | 1.12 | 1.01 | 0 |
| host | 1.62 | 1.45 | 1.11 | 1.1 | 1.01 | 0 |
| ifactorial | 1.8 | 1.65 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.01 | 0 |
| ifib | 1.68 | 1.54 | 1.09 | 1.08 | 1 | 0 |
| log2 | 1.75 | 1.59 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.01 | 0 |
| msort | 1.86 | 1.72 | 1.04 | 1.04 | 1 | 0 |
| rfib | 1.63 | 1.43 | 1.07 | 1.07 | 1 | 0 |
| subreg | 1.76 | 1.59 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.01 | 0 |
| towers | 1.59 | 1.41 | 1.1 | 1.09 | 1 | 0 |
| vadd | 1.97 | 1.88 | 1.04 | 1.04 | 1 | 0 |

2.2 Approach and Analysis

To implement the final design the following steps were followed:

- To remove one branch delay slot, the branch target calculation was implemented in a phased manner with the execute checking if the current instruction is a branch instruction (by checking the value of the bd variable. If true the target was calculated in the first half of the execute cycle and the new pc was read by the fetcher in the second half.
- To implement the bypass paths, a buffer states of all logical registers were created. Value was written to these buffer states as soon as it was calculated. Moreover, the instructions with such registers as their source registers always read from the buffer states when executing the instructions.
- If certain instruction had to be stalled due to unavailability of the source register value, it was stalled in the decode phase itself. This was implemented by storing the number of cycles it would take for the value of the destination register, of every instruction that entered the decode phase to become available. This counter was decreased every cycle. Thus for every incoming instruction, the availability of its source registers could be checked in the decode phase itself.

Some highlights of the design and stats:

- The phased writing and reading of registers was implemented at the start itself thus all designs presented above include phased register read and write.
- When a syscall is encountered, the whole pipeline is stalled till it reaches the write-back phase and is executed. The instruction that has already been fetched is also discarded. This leads to 4 stall cycles for each syscall.
- The stall cycles of syscalls are the reason for the some test cases having $CPI > 1$. Below is a table representing the percentage of syscalls for each test case. The table is indicative of the reason behind the CPI being greater than 1.

| Test Case | Number of Instructions | Number of Syscalls | Percentage Syscalls (%) |
|------------|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| asm-sim | 49 | 3 | 6.12244898 |
| c-sim | 1825 | 5 | 0.2739726027 |
| endian | 1864 | 5 | 0.2682403433 |
| factorial | 2407 | 5 | 0.2077274616 |
| fib | 44779 | 5 | 0.01116594832 |
| hello | 1638 | 5 | 0.3052503053 |
| host | 14519 | 24 | 0.1653006405 |
| ifactorial | 2293 | 5 | 0.2180549498 |
| ifib | 7453 | 5 | 0.06708707903 |
| log2 | 1995 | 5 | 0.2506265664 |
| msort | 17103 | 5 | 0.0292346372 |
| rfib | 25540 | 5 | 0.01957713391 |
| subreg | 3738 | 7 | 0.1872659176 |
| towers | 80651 | 67 | 0.08307398544 |
| vadd | 7129 | 5 | 0.07013606396 |