## CS 572: Computer Architecture

## (Due: April 14th, 2021)

## Submission Homework 1

Instructor: Prof. Justin Goins

Name: Rashmi Jadhav, Student ID: 934-069-574

1. The algorithm for determining whether two given numbers form an amicable pair was implemented as follows:

```
/* Find square root in O(log N) using binary search space division */
int getSquareRoot(int n) {
    int left = 2, right = n / 2, mid;
    long square;
    if (n < 2) {
        return n;
    while (left <= right) {
        mid = left + (right - left) / 2;
        square = (long) mid * mid;
        if (square > n) {
                                             // Move to left half
            right = mid - 1;
        } else if (square < n) {</pre>
                                             // Move to right half
            left = mid + 1;
        } else {
                                             // Found square root
            return mid;
    }
    return right;
/* Get all proper divisors for the number except itself */
long getDivisorsSum(int number) {
    long sum = 1;
                                             // Consider 1 to be the proper d
    int i = 2;
    while (i <= getSquareRoot(number)) {</pre>
        if ((number % i) == 0) {
                                             // Add divisor i
            sum += i;
            if (number / i != i) {
                sum += number / i;
                                             // Add divisor number / i
        }
        i++;
    return sum;
}
   Returns 1 if the two integers form an amicable pair, 0 otherwise.
   This code needs to function correctly regardless of the ordering.
   For example, check_amicable(220, 284) should return 1, as should
   check_amicable(284, 220).
   This function must work correctly for all integers up to 2 billion.
   Be sure that the function prototype remains intact.
 */
int check_amicable(int a, int b) {
    long sumA, sumB;
    sumA = getDivisorsSum(a);
    sumB = getDivisorsSum(b);
    return ((int)sumA == b && (int)sumB == a) ? 1 : 0;
}
```

2. The code was setup and run on the flip.engr.oregonstate.edu server:

```
[flip3 ~/CS572/hw1 1030$ gcc -std=c11 ./amicable_pairs_v1.c [flip3 ~/CS572/hw1 1031$ a.out; echo $? 1 flip3 ~/CS572/hw1 1032$
```

3. The algorithm was checked for correctness by taking some sample input cases with different **num\_a** and **num\_b**:

```
[flip3 ~/CS572/hw1 1026$ gcc -std=c11 ./amicable_pairs_v1.c
[flip3 ~/CS572/hw1 1027$ a.out; echo $?
num_a: 1
                num_b: 2
                                are amicable?: 0
num_a: 220
                num_b: 284
                                are amicable?: 1
num_a: 5564
                num_b: 5020
                                are amicable?: 1
num_a: 17296
                num_b: 18416
                                are amicable?: 1
                        num_b: 1974754485
                                                are amicable?: 1
num_a: 1987985835
num_a: 1982313333
                        num_b: 1892277387
                                                 are amicable?: 1
num_a: 1892277387
                        num_b: 1982313333
                                                 are amicable?: 1
```

4. num\_a and num\_b were set to 1982313333 and 1892277387 respectively and the non-optimized 64-bit x86 code was generated using the commands:

```
flip3 ~/CS572/hw1 1040$ gcc -std=c11 ./amicable_pairs_v1.c
flip3 ~/CS572/hw1 1041$ gcc -m64 -fno-asynchronous-unwind-tables -std=c11 -00
-S -o ./x86_64bit.asm ./amicable_pairs_v1.c
flip3 ~/CS572/hw1 1042$ gcc -m64 -fno-asynchronous-unwind-tables -std=c11 -00
-o ./x86_64bit.exe ./amicable_pairs_v1.c
[flip3 ~/CS572/hw1 1043$ ls
amicable_pairs_v1.c amicable_pairs_v2.c a.out x86_64bit.asm x86_64bit.exe
flip3 ~/CS572/hw1 1044$
```

5. The check\_amicable function in x86\_64bit.asm has about 24 instructions excluding labels and directives:

```
114 check_amicable:
115
            pushq
                     %rbp
116
             movq
                     %rsp, %rbp
117
             subq
                     $24, %rsp
118
            mov1
                     %edi, -20(%rbp)
                     %esi, -24(%rbp)
119
            mov1
120
            mov1
                     -20(%rbp), %eax
121
            mov1
                     %eax, %edi
122
             call
                     getDivisorsSum
123
            movq
                     %rax, -8(%rbp)
124
             movl
                     -24(\%rbp), %eax
125
             movl
                     %eax, %edi
126
             call
                     getDivisorsSum
127
             movq
                     %rax, -16(%rbp)
128
             movq
                     -8(%rbp), %rax
129
             cmpl
                     -24(%rbp), %eax
130
             jne
                      .L14
131
             movq
                     -16(%rbp), %rax
132
                     -20(%rbp), %eax
             cmp1
133
             jne
                      .114
134
             mov1
                     $1, %eax
135
                     .L15
             jmp
136 .L14:
137
            movl
                     $0, %eax
138 .L15:
139
             leave
140
             ret
                     check_amicable, -check_amicable
141
             .size
142
             .globl
                     main, Ofunction
143
             .type
```

6. The amount of time spent by the CPU in user mode whilst running the generated x86\_64bit.exe was 0.023s:

```
[flip3 ~/CS572/hw1 1048$ time x86_64bit.exe

real 0m0.026s
user 0m0.023s
sys 0m0.001s
```

7. The commands were run to generate assembly code occupying less space:

8. The **check\_amicable** function in **x86\_64bit\_s.asm** now has about **20** instructions excluding labels and directives. We notice that the instructions count reduced from 24 to 20 and hence the optimized code is 1.2x more efficient by 20% in terms of instruction count:

```
80 check_amicable:
 81
             pushq
                     %r12
 82
             pushq
                     %rbp
 83
             movl
                     %edi, %ebp
 84
             pushq
                     %rbx
 85
             mov1
                     %esi, %ebx
 86
             call
                     getDivisorsSum
                     %ebx, %edi
 87
             mov1
 88
             movq
                     %rax, %r12
 89
             call
                     getDivisorsSum
 90
             xorl
                     %edx, %edx
 91
                     %r12d, %ebx
             cmp1
 92
             jne
                      .L18
 93
                     %edx, %edx
             xorl
 94
             cmp1
                     %eax, %ebp
 95
             sete
                     %dl
 96 .L18:
 97
                     %rbx
             popq
98
             popq
                     %rbp
99
                     %edx, %eax
             mov1
100
             popq
                     %r12
101
             ret
102
                     check_amicable, -check_amicable
             .size
103
             .section
                              .text.startup, "ax", @progbits
104
             .globl main
105
                     main, Ofunction
             .type
```

9. The amount of time spent by the CPU in **user mode** whilst running the newly generated **x86\_64bit\_s.exe** was **0.028s**. This is slower than the previously generated code's execution. Surprisingly, as instructions reduced by 20%, time taken was increased by 20%:

10. The commands to generate 32-bit and 64-bit versions that are optimized to minimize execution time were

11. The user mode CPU time of x86\_32bit\_3.exe is 2 minutes and 54.779 seconds = 174.779 seconds which is much slower than x86\_64bit\_3.exe version which takes just 0.010 seconds.

```
[flip3 ~/CS572/hw1 1062$ time x86_32bit_3.exe
real    2m54.989$
user    2m54.779$
sys    0m0.190$
[flip3 ~/CS572/hw1 1063$ time x86_64bit_3.exe
real    0m0.013$
user    0m0.010$
sys    0m0.001$
flip3 ~/CS572/hw1 1064$
```

- 12. All of the commonly used 32-bit registers eax, ebx, ecx, edx, esi, edi, ebp, and esp are used in the generated x86\_32bit\_3.asm.
- 13. The MIPS assembly code **sample\_mips.s** was generated:

```
flip3 ~/CS572/hw1 1066$ mips64-linux-gnu-gcc -mabi=32 -mips32 -static -std=c11 -Os -S -o ./sample_mips.s ./amicable_pairs_v1.c flip3 ~/CS572/hw1 1067$ ls amicable_pairs_v1.c sample_mips.s x86_64bit_3.exe x86_64bit_s.asm amicable_pairs_v2.c x86_32bit_3.asm x86_64bit.asm x86_64bit_s.exe a.out x86_32bit_3.exe x86_64bit.exe
```

- 14. The **x86\_32bit\_3.asm** utilized around **138** instructions for the **check\_amicable** function whereas MIPS assembly utilized only **22** instructions. MIPS has much lesser instructions compared to 32 bit asm.
- 15. Out of the 32 32-bit MIPS registers, \$2 (\$v0), \$3 (\$v1), \$4 (\$a0), \$5 (\$a1), \$6 (\$a2), \$16 (\$s0), \$17 (\$a1), \$18 (\$a2), \$29 (\$sp), \$31 (\$ra) were utilized in the sample\_mips.s.

16. The faster algorithm at the expense of memory for determining whether two given numbers form an amicable pair was implemented as follows:

```
/* Since first array is sorted, apply binary search to spot a or b in first array */
int binarySearch(const int arr[], int size, int number) {
    int left = 0, right = size - 2, mid;
    while (left <= right) {</pre>
        mid = left + (right - left) / 2;
                                                           // To avoid int overflow
        if (arr[mid] == number) {
            return mid;
        if (arr[mid] < number) {</pre>
            left = mid + 1;
        } else {
            right = mid - 1;
    }
    return -1;
}
    Returns 1 if the two integers form an amicable pair, 0 otherwise.
    This code needs to function correctly regardless of the ordering.
    For example, check_amicable(220, 284) should return 1, as should
    check_amicable(284, 220).
    This function must work correctly for all integers up to 2 billion.
    Be sure that the function prototype remains intact.
int check_amicable(int a, int b) {
    int arraySize = sizeof(first) / sizeof(first[0]);
    int aIndex = binarySearch(first, arraySize, a);
                                                                          // Search a in fi
    if (aIndex == -1) {
                                                                         // If a not found
        aIndex = binarySearch(first, arraySize, b);
    if (aIndex != -1 && (first[aIndex] == a && second[aIndex] == b)
                                                                         // Found both a a
        || (first[aIndex] == b && second[aIndex] == a)) {
        return 1;
    }
                                                                          // Any other case
    return 0:
}
```

17. An optimized 64-bit version was compiled out of this faster v2 algorithm and it took as low as **0.001 seconds** of **CPU user mode**. Compared to version 1 (0.01s), version 2 is **10x** faster.

```
[flip1 ~/CS572/hw1 1007$ time v2x86_64bit.exe
```

```
real 0m0.005s
user 0m0.001s
sys 0m0.002s
flip1 ~/CS572/hw1 1008$
```