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Problem 1. Evaluating a Dot Product Microbenchmark

In this problem, we will explore a dot product microbenchmark executing on a single-issue scalar processor and a dual-issue superscalar processor integrated with either a direct-mapped or set-associative data cache. Here is the C code for the microbenchmark:

```c
int dot( int* a, int* b, int n )
{
    int result = 0;
    for ( int i = 0; i < n; i++ )
        result += a[i] * b[i];
    return result;
}
```

And here is the corresponding assembly:

```
addi x10, 0, 0

loop:
    lw x5, 0(x11)
    lw x6, 0(x12)
    addi x11, x11, 4
    addi x12, x12, 4
    mul x7, x5, x6
    addi x13, x1, -1
    add x10, x10, x7
    bne x13, x0, loop

jr x1
```

Make sure you understand the connection between the C program and assembly before continuing.

For this problem, you should assume a fully bypassed processor that implements the TinyRV1 instruction set. You should assume there an instruction cache with a single-cycle hit latency and a 100% hit rate. You should assume a 256B data cache with 16B cache lines, parallel-read/pipelined-write, a write-back/write-allocate write policy, and a miss penalty of two cycles. Assume the data cache is initially empty.

Assume that we call the dot function with two arrays each with 64 elements (i.e., n is 64). Assume the base address of array a is 0x1000 and the base address of array b is 0x2000.
Part 1.A Analyzing the Average Memory Access Latency

Assume we are using a direct-mapped cache. Fill in the following table for data memory accesses corresponding to the load instructions. Use h or m to indicate a cache hit or miss. Use the set columns to indicate the state of the tag array at the beginning of each transaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rd/wr</th>
<th>address</th>
<th>tag</th>
<th>idx</th>
<th>h/m</th>
<th>Set 0</th>
<th>Set 1</th>
<th>Set 2</th>
<th>Set 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>0x10000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>0x10000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>0x10041</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>0x10041</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>0x10082</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>0x10082</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>0x100C1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>0x100C1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>0x10102</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>0x10102</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>0x10143</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>0x10143</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now use your table to estimate the average memory access latency for data memory accesses in this microbenchmark.

\[
\text{AMAL} = \text{hit latency} + \text{miss rate} \times \text{miss penalty} = 1 + 1.0 \times 2 = 3 \text{ cycles}
\]
Part 1.B TinyRV1 Single-Issue Scalar Processor

Consider the canonical five-stage fully bypassed TinyRV1 single-issue scalar processor integrated with a direct-mapped cache. **Draw a pipeline diagram that illustrates the execution of this loop. Show as many iterations as you need to find the steady state execution. Only put the instruction name (i.e., lw, addi, etc) not the full assembly instruction in the pipeline diagram. Add arrows to your pipeline diagram to indicate all microarchitectural RAW dependencies and any microarchitectural control dependencies (other than those that simply result in fetching the next instruction).**

How long in cycles will it take to execute the vector-vector add example assuming \( n \) is 64? What is the CPI?

\[
14 \times 64 = 896 \text{ cycles} \quad \text{CPI} = \frac{14}{8} = 1.75
\]
Part 1.C TinyRV1 Dual-Issue Superscalar Processor

Consider the canonical five-stage fully bypassed TinyRV1 *dual-issue superscalar* processor with individual A and B pipes integrated with a direct-mapped cache. Recall that MUL/BNE instructions must use the A pipe, LW/SW instructions must use the B pipe, and ADD/ADDI/JAL/JR instructions can use either pipe. Draw a pipeline diagram that illustrates the execution of this loop. Show as many iterations as you need to find the steady state execution. Only put the instruction name (i.e., lw, addi, etc) not the full assembly instruction in the pipeline diagram. Add arrows to your pipeline diagram to indicate all microarchitectural RAW dependencies and any microarchitectural control dependencies (other than those that simply result in fetching the next instruction).

How long in cycles will it take to execute the vector-vector add example assuming n is 64? What is the CPI? What is the speedup compared to a single-issue processor?

\[
11 \times 64 = 704 \text{ cycles} \quad \text{CPI} = 11/8 = 1.375 \\
\text{Speedup} = 896/704 = 1.27
\]
Part 1.D  Two-Way Set Associative Cache

Start by filling in the following table with your results so far. Then consider replacing the direct-mapped data cache with a two-way set-associative cache. Use your results from the previous parts to quickly estimate the new CPI when using a set-associative cache and fill those results into this table. Justify your answers. Discuss some of the trade-offs between these four different configurations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processor μArch</th>
<th>Cache μArch</th>
<th>CPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Issue</td>
<td>Direct-Mapped</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Issue</td>
<td>Two-Way Set Assoc</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual-Issue</td>
<td>Direct-Mapped</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual-Issue</td>
<td>Two-Way Set Assoc</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Single Issue

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{Mic 0: } 14 \text{ cycles (still compulsory misses)} \\
\text{Mic 1,2,3: } 10 \text{ cycles (no stall due to misses)}
\end{aligned}
\]

\[
14 \times 0.25 + 10 \times 0.75 = 11 \text{ cycles} / \text{Mic}
\]

\[
\text{CPI} = \frac{11}{8} = 1.375
\]

Dual Issue

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{Mic 0: } 11 \text{ cycles (still compulsory misses)} \\
\text{Mic 1,2,3: } 7 \text{ cycles (no stall due to misses)}
\end{aligned}
\]

\[
11 \times 0.25 + 7 \times 0.75 = 8 \text{ cycles} / \text{Mic}
\]

\[
\text{CPI} = \frac{8}{8} = 1.0
\]