3. Timing: Part 1 (20 Points):

Compile and run the program without any extra optimizations, but with *profiling* for timing: a. How for 65536 strings of length 8 how many cumulative seconds did insertionSort() take? 22.25 seconds

b. How for 65536 strings of length 8 how many cumulative seconds did quickSort_() take? 0.01 seconds

4.Timing: Part 2 (20 Points):

Compile and run the program *with* optimization, but with *profiling* for timing: a. How for 65536 strings of length 8 how many **cumulative seconds** did insertionSort() take? 12.46 seconds

b. How for 65536 strings of length 8 how many cumulative seconds did quickSort_() take? 0.01 seconds

5. Algorithm choice vs. Compiler optimization (Points 10):

Which is faster?

- A bad algorithm and data-structure optimized with -O2
- A good algorithm and data-structure optimized with -O0

6.Parts of an executable (Points 20):

a) objdump -s -j .rodata assign1-0

4010c8 2825642d 2564293a 20002564 006e756d (%d-%d): .%d.num 4010d8 62657220 6f662073 7472696e 6773006c ber of strings.l

b) objdump -d -j .text assign1-0

0000000000400b3e <releaseMem>: 400b3e: 55 push %rbp

```
400b3f:
                                      %rsp,%rbp
             48 89 e5
                                mov
400b42:
             48 83 ec 20
                                      $0x20,%rsp
                                sub
                                callq 400780 <mcount@plt>
400b46:
             e8 35 fc ff ff
400b4b:
                                      %rdi_{,}-0x18(%rbp)
             48 89 7d e8
                                mov
400b4f:
             89 75 e4
                                mov \%esi,-0x1c(\%rbp)
400b52:
             c7 45 fc 00 00 00 00 movl $0x0,-0x4(%rbp)
400b59:
             eb 23
                                imp 400b7e <releaseMem+0x40>
```

```
400b5b:
             8b 45 fc
                                        -0x4(\%rbp),\%eax
                                  mov
400b5e:
             48 98
                                  cltq
400b60:
             48 8d 14 c5 00 00 00 lea
                                       0x0(,\%rax,8),\%rdx
400b67:
             00
400b68:
             48 8b 45 e8
                                        -0x18(\%rbp),\%rax
                                  mov
400b6c:
             48 01 d0
                                  add
                                        %rdx,%rax
400b6f:
             48 8b 00
                                        (%rax),%rax
                                  mov
                                        %rax,%rdi
400b72:
             48 89 c7
                                  mov
                                  callq 4006e0 < free@plt>
400b75:
             e8 66 fb ff ff
400b7a:
             83 45 fc 01
                                  addl $0x1,-0x4(\%rbp)
400b7e:
             8b 45 fc
                                  mov
                                        -0x4(\%rbp),\%eax
             3b 45 e4
400b81:
                                  cmp -0x1c(\%rbp),\%eax
                                      400b5b <releaseMem+0x1d>
400b84:
             7c d5
                                        -0x18(\%rbp),\%rax
400b86:
             48 8b 45 e8
                                  mov
                                        %rax,%rdi
400b8a:
             48 89 c7
                                  mov
400b8d:
             e8 4e fb ff ff
                                  callq 4006e0 < free@plt>
400b92:
             c9
                           leaveq
400b93:
             c3
                           retq
```

c) objdump -t -j .bss assign1-0

00000000000000000 g O .bss 000000000000000 strLen

d) It cannot be found.

7. Compiler optimizations (Points 10):

1) Non-optimized insertionSort has two NULL instructions which do nothing. These useless instructions are eliminated in assign1-2.

400c91: 00 400ca8: 00

2) The use of push/pop in assign1-2 within main() is more efficient