In For single cycle processing, the cycle time is given as the time of the longest instruction. This because each instruction must be computed within a single cycle and cycle time can't change (It actually can, but it's extremely inefficient). Therefore, the single cycle clock cycle time is 450 ps For pipelined datapath, the cycle time is the length of the longest stage among all instructions. In this case, it is the lw MEM2 stage with 150ps. So, the pipelined cycle time is 150ps Multicycle datapath has the same cycle time as pipelined for the same reason an should also be 150 ps. First calculate how long the pipelined instruction is. Every pipelined instruction runs every stage at the same speed as the clock cycle. Then the timing is as IF ID EX, EX, WB, MEM, MEM, WB, 150 150 150 150 150 150 150 While this is long, it only takes an additional 150 ps to run the next instruction Next, calculate the time for single cycle. Cycle time is already given as 450 ps. So every instruction runs in 450 ps. While this may seem short, it takes an extra 450 ps. It only takes 4 instructions for single cycle to surpass pipelined in time for execution. To answer the question, subtract pipelined by single cycle to get 750 ps faster. Lastly, we need to calculate multicycle time to completion. Multicycle and pipelined have the same clock cycle time, but multicycle only runs one instruction at a time. The benefit of multicycle is that it can skip unused stages, so for lw, the execution is as follows: TFID EX, EX, WB, MEM, MEM, WB, So multicycle is 300ps faster than pipelined for one instruction

| | a)- |
|-----------------------|--|
| 1c | Draw the pipeline for this question |
| P N | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 |
| idditv1, \$0, #0x1000 | IF IO EX, EX, WB, M, M, WB2 |
| dd \$v0, \$0, \$0 | IF ID EX, EX, WB, M, M2 WB2 |
| ddi\$50, \$00, #16 | IF ID EX, EX, WB, M, M, WB, |
| di \$10, \$50, #16 | IF ID EX. (EX. WE, M, M2 WB, |
| w \$H, -16(\$50) | IF IB EX, EX, WB, M, M2 WB, 2 hazards with this (w |
| ddi \$50, \$50, #4 | IF ID EX, EX, WB, M. M2 WB2 How many NOPS do we need? |
| dd \$10, \$10, \$11 | TETITION M M INC |
| ub \$v1,\$v1,\$f1 | hazard since IFIDEXIEX MR M. M. WB therefore at least 4 NOPS |
| one \$50, \$10, Loop | data needs to move backwards IF IDEX, EX, WB, M, M2 WB, between Iw and using the |
| add \$v0, \$v0, \$v1 | in time IFID EX, EX, WB, M, M2 WB, loaded register. |
| 1 | data forwarding |
| | from add into \$vo |
| | and sub into \$v1 No hazard |
| | No branch delay hazard because the add \$40, \$10, \$11 instruction is |
| | killed by the branch if the branch is taken before writeback happens. |
| | Only 2 hazards, both read after write with register \$ 11 in the /w |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| 14 | Ustart with initialization |
|---------------|--|
| | addi \$v1, \$0, #0x1000 |
| | add \$v0, \$0, \$0 |
| e test con en | addi \$50, \$a0, #16 |
| | addi \$10, \$50, #16 |
| | Inow loop unroll. It is 4 copies because \$ to is 16 away from \$50 |
| | Mand \$50 increments by 4 |
| 241 11. | Metal without the land of the second of the |
| | Il start with loads, each load acts as a delay slot for previous loads |
| ctal - | $(w \pm t1, -16(\pm 50))$ |
| | |
| adding new | [W +23, -8(\$50) |
| registers | |
| | addi \$50, \$50, 16 //increment \$50 for more delay |
| | add \$v0, \$v0, \$t1 // at this point only \$t1 is ready, so just add it into \$vo |
| | sub \$v1, \$v1, \$t1 // now \$t2 is ready, but it's better to combine with \$t3 |
| | add \$t5, \$t2, \$t3 // combine \$t2, \$t3 |
| | add \$15, \$15, \$14 // combine with \$14 |
| 351 | add \$v0, \$v0, \$t5 // put them into \$v0 and \$v1 |
| | sub \$v1, \$v1, \$t5 |
| | Il now execute the line after the loop ends |
| | add \$v0, \$v0, \$v1 |
| | |
| | So, this code removes the hazards while loop unrolling. However, during the midterm, |
| | follow the homework answers for loop unrolling. This is a more advanced question. |
| | |
| | To compute CPI, you simply need the number of cycles and the number of |
| | instructions. The first instruction, as discussed before, finishes in 8 cycles. |
| | Every instruction after is only one additional cycle, so the total number of |
| | cycles = $8 + (\#ins - 1) = 23$ cycles |
| | # ins = (6 ins |
| | Then CPI = 23 |
| | 16 16 |
| | |
| | |

Using dual issue on the previous code with this format

| | ALU Branch | ANY | Start at the beginning |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | addi \$v1,\$0,#0x1000 | 1 | Swap two and \$50, so we can load |
| 1 | add \$ vo, \$0, \$0 | lw \$t1,-16(\$so) | The life the Class day |
| | addi \$ to, \$50, #16 | lw \$t2,-12(\$so | Language and the second |
| | (w \$14,-4(\$50) | (w\$t3,-8(\$s0) | of an Small and Add Add |
| | addi \$50, \$50, 16 | NoP | \$tl isn't ready yet, but \$50 is |
| | addi \$50, \$50, #16 | NOP | \$11 still not ready |
| | add \$10,\$10,\$11 | sub \$v1,\$v1,\$t1 | \$11 ready now |
| | NOP | NOP | \$t2 ready now, going solely based |
| | add \$t5, \$t2, \$13 | NOP | on the previous code, nothing can run |
| | add \$15, \$15, \$14 | Nop | all loads available here |
| | add \$vo, \$vo, \$t5 | sub \$v1, \$v1, \$t5 | CALLES TO BE |
| | · add \$ vo, \$vo, \$v1 | Nop | |

The new CPI will have the same number of instructions as before. So 16 instructions. The number of cycles is now only dependent on the number of instructions run in each issue. Both sides have 12 instructions so the total number of cycle = 19. Then EPI = 19

Spatial locality defines that memory close to recently used memory will likely be used. It allows for multiple values close to each other to be brought up from memory to cache.

Temporal locality defines that memory recently used will likely be used again Therefore, a recently used value will be brought up to cache since it will likely be used again

So, for this question spatial locality would result in more hits

Ig It will not affect hit rate because the program accesses different locations in memory. This means they will all miss initially irregardless of cache structure.



| 20 | L.d \$f5, 8(\$f1) Since processor format is not given, assume |
|------------|--|
| | L.d \$f2,0(\$f1) execution time of instructions approach co. |
| | add.d \$f3, \$f2, \$f2 |
| | daddui \$f4, \$0, #4.8 Then data dependencies are any registers that |
| | mul. d \$f3, \$f2, \$f3 match going in this direction: |
| | add of \$f2, \$f5, \$f3 Anti dependencies go the opposite way and are |
| | not real hazards. They only have the potential |
| - Language | Data dependencies: to be hazards with out of order processing. They |
| | \$ f5 L1 L6 are in this direction: K |
| | \$ f2 L2 L3 Output dependencies are write after write hazards |
| | \$ f2 L2 L5 Not and go in this direction: V |
| | \$f3 L3 L5 fixable |
| | \$f3 L5 L6 |
| | fixable |
| | Anti dependencies Output dependencies |
| | \$ f2 L3 L6 \$ f2 L2 L6 |
| | \$f2 L5 L6 \$f3 L3 L5 |
| | The state of the s |
| 26 | Fixing output dependencies |
| | L. 2 = f5, 8(\$f1) |
| | L.d \$ f2, O (\$11) This ended up fixing the anti-dependencies as |
| | add.d +13, \$12, \$12 well. |
| | daddui \$f4, \$0, #4.8 |
| | mul.d. \$f9, \$f2, \$f3 |
| | add & \$10, \$15, \$19 - This must change to \$19 because it must match |
| | the previous reference of \$13. Data dependencies |
| | can't be fixed |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | 1 F | Leg | Bu | sy Do |
|----|------------------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----|-----|---------------------------------------|--------|------------|-----|----------|-------|-------|-------|----------|
| 20 | Cycle #1 | | ADD | /SUB | 2 21 | | 1 | | MUL | 1/011 | / | 139 | = | \$f1 | N | 100 |
| | | Ret | Tag | Ref | Tag | V | | Ref | Tag | Ref | Tag | V | | f2 | y | MCIO |
| | 1 | | 1 1 | | 1 | | 4 | | | | | | | f3 | N | 26 |
| | 2 | | | | 100 | | 5 | | | | | 5 | 1 | f4 | | 12.2 |
| | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | \$ | f5 | Y | MULO |
| | The first It will tak | ee unt | il the | end | of C | | - | for | the v | alues | | ad | | N | 100 | <i>H</i> |
| | Cycle #2 | | ADI | | | - | 1- | | -/DI | 1 | | \$f | | Y | 100 | |
| | , , , | Ref | Tag | | Tag 1 | V4 | Ke | Tag | Ket | Tag | V | \$ \$ f3 | | y | M(10 | |
| | Ex left: 2 | 10 | | | 0. | 1 2 | | | | | | 14F4 | - | - | 52 | |
| | EXTETT - Z | | 0 2 | 7.0 | 0 | | _ | | | | | 1717 | 1 | /2 | | |
| ` | T | | | | | 1 | | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | | | | \$45 | | | M (10 | |
| | The 2 add | | | 1. | | | | | | - 1 | | | | | | |
| | second on | | not | deper | ndent | | | sta | rt exe | ecution | | vail t | for 1 | the c | load | , the |
| | | 2 1'S | not | deper | ndent | and | car | sta Mu | rt exe | v V | | vail t | Or 1 | the N | load | , the |
| | second on | 2 1'S | not | deper /SUB Ret | Tag | and | car | Mu ef Ta | rt exe | V f Tag | | vail t | (1) | the N | load | , the 04 |
| | second on | Ref. | not ADD Tag | deper /SUB Ref. | Tag 1(1004) | and | car | Mu ef Ta | rt exe | V f Tag | | vail t | (1) | the N | load | , the |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 10) |
|-------------|-----|---------|------|---------|---|-----|---------|-----|-----|---|-------|-----|---------|-----|
| Cycle #4 | 1 | · A | 00/5 | UB | | | MUL | DIV | | - | \$41 | N | 1004 | 1 4 |
| - Cycle - | Ret | | T. | 1 - | V | Ref | Tag | Ref | Tag | V | \$f2 | 14 | 53 . // | |
| | 26 | 0 | - | M(1004) | | - | M(1004) | | 1 | | 14f3 | y | SU | |
| Ex left : 0 | 10 | 10 | 4.8 | 0 | | | | | | | \$ 44 | 4 | 52 | |
| | _ | M(100C) | _ | И | | | | | | | \$45 | 1 | M(cooc) | |
| | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | · · | | |

In cycle #5, we need to update values in both reservation stations and the register file for the contents of M(1004), M(100c), and \$14.

| Cycle #5 | 1 | AD | D/su | Ŗ | | | MUL | 1 DIV | | | \$61 | N | 1004 | 1 |
|------------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|----|-------|----|------|---|
| | Ref | Tag | Ref | Tas | V | Ref | Tag | Ref | Tag | IV | 1 4f2 | 14 | 53 | |
| Ex left: 2 | 26 | 0 | 2.6 | 0 | 11 | 2.6 | 0 | - | 1 | | 4f3 | y | 54 | |
| | - | - | - | _ | 4.8 | | | | | | 464 | N | 4.8 | |
| | 0.6 | 0 | - | 4 | | | | | | | \$15 | N | 0.6 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | |

Cycles 6 and 7 will be identical to Cycle #5 since both instructions are waiting on operation 1 to finish first

| Cycle 6,7 | | AD | 15/50 | UB | | | MUL | 10 IV | | | \$11 | N | 1004 |
|-----------|-----|-----|-------|-----|---|-----|---------|-------|------|-------|---------|---|------|
| | Ref | Tag | Ret | Tag | V | Ref | Tag | Ret | Itag | / V / | 1 \$ F2 | y | 53 |
| | 26 | 0 | 2.6 | 0 | | 2.6 | 10 | - | 1 | | \$f3 | y | 34 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | \$F4 | N | 14.8 |
| | 0.6 | 0 | - | 4 | | | i deser | | | | 415 | N | 0.6 |

In cycle 8, update values for the results of SI

| | ADD | /SUB | | | | | MI | UL/DI | V | | 1 \$ f l | N | 1004 |
|------|-------------|-------------------|-----|------|-----------|-----|-----|-------|-----|---|----------|----|------|
| Ref | Tag | Ref | Tag | V | | Ret | Tag | Ref | Tag | V | 1 \$ f 2 | Y | 53 |
| - | - | - | - | 28.6 | Exleft: 6 | 2.6 | 0 | 28.6 | 0 | | 413 | 1 | 54 |
| 10 6 | <i>(</i> 2) | T AND THE RESERVE | | | | | | | | | \$f4 | N | 4.8 |
| 0.6 | 0 | | 4 | | | | | | | | 415 | 1) | 0.6 |

| | I'm not going to show the rest of Tomasulo's because it's too much writing. After Cycle #8, cycles 9,10,11,12,13, and 14 will be used to execute the |
|---|---|
| | multiply instruction. Then on cycle 15, it will write the result (74.36) into both 58 and \$f3. Cycles 15, 16, and 17 will be used to execute the |
| | last add instruction. Cycle 18 will be the last cycle where the result (74.96 is written into \$f2. |
| 3 | Cache size = 1 kB Main memory = 16 kB Block size = 4 bytes |
| | direct mapped byte addressing |
| | # address bits = log_ (main - memory - size) |
| | log_ (16 kB) -> same thing as 16 x2 . |
| | #index bits = log_ (#blocks associativity) -> Since it is direct mapped, the number of blocks = cache size / block size #index bits = log_2 (148) and associativity = 1 |
| | 10-2 |
| | 8 bits |
| | # offset bits = log_ (block size) log_ (4) 2 bits |
| | |
| | unused to hits |
| | index bits |
| | |
| | |

| | | -0) |
|---------------|---|------|
| 4 | INS % Cycles Ins miss = 5% penalty 5 | U7 |
| | LW/SW 25% 6 . LI cache miss = 50% penalty w | |
| | ALU 70% 2 12 cache miss = 25% penalty 40 | |
| | Branch 5% 3 | |
| tokon hiji la | The same that I have been a former of the same of the | |
| | CPI = 6(0.25) + 2(0.7) + 3(0.05) | |
| | CPI = 1.5 + 1.4 + 0.15 | |
| | (CPI = 3.05) | |
| | | |
| | Use an arbitrary number of instructions to help calculate the second p. I like to use 1,000 | art. |
| | Of coop instructions, 250 LW/SW, 700 ALU, and 50 branch. | |
| | Of 1000 instructions, 50 will miss with penalty 5 = +250 cycles | |
| | | (10 |
| | of 250 LW/SW, 125 will miss = + 1250 | |
| | Of 125 that missed, 31.25 will miss again = + 1250 | |
| | Total time = 250(6) + 700(2) + 50(3) + 250 + 1250 + 1250 | |
| | = 1500 + 1400 + 150 + 250 + 2500' | |
| | = 2900 + 400 + 2500 | |
| | = 5800 | |
| | | |
| | 5800 5.8 new [PI = 5.8] | |
| | 1000 | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |