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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem number</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
<th>Your Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problem 1. Basic Code Optimization Facts. (6 Points)

(a) (3 points) Name two code optimization blockers and briefly explain what they are.
Answer: memory aliasing, procedure side-effects.

Memory aliasing: two different memory references point to the same memory location. The compiler must assume that different pointers may designate a single place in memory.

Procedure side-effects: the function modifies some part of the global program state. Thus, for example, changing the number of times a function gets called may change the program behavior. The compiler has to assume the worst case and cannot optimize code containing function calls.

(b) (3 points) A sorting algorithm takes 1 second to execute. Which profiling tool would you use to find out the bottleneck of this algorithm?
Answer: Pin. Gprof’s sampling period is too coarse grained (10 ms). Since the execution time of this sorting algorithm is 1 second, gprof cannot provide sufficient profiling accuracy in this case (e.g., if this piece of code contains function calls, gprof may skip the entire execution of some of these functions during profiling). Pin provides the ability to insert arbitrary code in arbitrary places in the program, e.g., instruction counts, etc hence its accuracy is higher in this case.
Problem 2. Performance Optimization. (20 Points)

The following problem concerns optimizing codes for maximum performance on an Intel Pentium III. Recall the following performance characteristics of the functional units for this machine:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Latency</th>
<th>Issue Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integer Add</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integer Multiply</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integer Divide</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating Point Add</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating Point Multiply</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating Point Divide</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load or Store (Cache Hit)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part A

Consider the following code segments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loop 1</th>
<th>Loop 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for (i = 0; i &lt; n; i++)</td>
<td>for (i = 0; i &lt; n; i++)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x = y * a[i];</td>
<td>x = x * a[i];</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When compiled with GCC, we obtain the following assembly code for the loop:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loop 1</th>
<th>Loop 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.L21:</td>
<td>.L27:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>movl %ecx,%eax</td>
<td>imull (%esi,%edx,4),%eax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imull (%esi,%edx,4),%eax</td>
<td>incl %edx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incl %edx</td>
<td>cmpl %ebx,%edx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cmpl %ebx,%edx</td>
<td>jl .L27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jl .L21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Running on one of the cluster machines, we find that Loop 1 requires 3.0 clock cycles per iteration, while Loop 2 requires 4.0.
(a) (4 points) Explain how it is that Loop 1 is faster than Loop 2, even though it has one more instruction.
Answer: Loop 1 does not have any loop-carried dependence. It can therefore make better use of pipelining in the functional units.

(b) (4 points) We perform 4-way loop unrolling for the two loops. This speeds up Loop 1. Briefly explain why.
Answer: Loop unrolling reduces the loop overhead (incl, cmpl and jl) for each iteration. In other words, the loop overhead is amortized by combining several loop iterations in one.

(c) (4 points) Even with loop unrolling, we find that the performance of Loop 2 remains the same. Briefly explain why.
Answer: Performance is still limited by the latency of the integer multiply (4 cycles).
You’ve just joined a programming team that is trying to develop the world’s fastest factorial routine. Starting with recursive factorial, they’ve converted the code to use iterations as follows:

```c
int fact(int n) {
    int i;
    int result = 1;
    for (i = n; i > 0; i--) {
        result = result * i;
    }
    return result;
}
```

By doing so, they have reduced the number of cycles per element (CPE) for the function from around 63 to around 4 (really!). Still, they would like to do better.

One of the programmers heard about loop unrolling. He generated the following code:

```c
int fact_u2(int n) {
    int i;
    int result = 1;
    for (i = n; i > 1; i-=2) {
        result = (result * i) * (i-1);
    }
    return result;
}
```

(a) (4 points) However, benchmarking fact_u2 shows no improvement in performance. How would you explain that?

Answer: Performance is limited by the 4 cycle latency of integer multiplication.
(b) (4 points) You modify the line inside the loop to read:

\[
\text{result} = \text{result} \times (i \times (i-1)) ;
\]

To everyone’s astonishment, the measured performance now has a CPE of 2.5. How do you explain this performance improvement?

Answer: The multiplication \( i \times (i-1) \) can overlap with the multiplication of the results from the previous iteration (can draw a picture similar to what we showed in class for \( x = x \times (\text{data}[i] \times \text{data}[i+1]) \)).
Problem 3. Cache Miss Rate. (16 Points)

You are writing a new 3D game that you hope will earn you fame and fortune. You are currently working on a function to blank the screen buffer before drawing the next frame. The screen you are working with is a 640x480 array of pixels. The machine you are working on has a 64 KB direct mapped cache with 4 byte lines. The C structures you are using are:

```c
struct pixel {
    char r;
    char g;
    char b;
    char a;
};
```

```c
struct pixel buffer[480][640];
register int i, j;
register char *cptr;
register int *iptr;
```

Assume:

- `sizeof(char) = 1`
- `sizeof(int) = 4`
- `buffer` begins at memory address 0
- The cache is initially empty.
- The only memory accesses are to the entries of the array `buffer`. Variables `i`, `j`, `cptr`, and `iptr` are stored in registers.
A. (4 points) What percentage of the writes in the following code will miss in the cache?

```c
for (j=0; j < 640; j++) {
    for (i=0; i < 480; i++){
        buffer[i][j].r = 0;
        buffer[i][j].g = 0;
        buffer[i][j].b = 0;
        buffer[i][j].a = 0;
    }
}
```

Miss rate for writes to `buffer`: ________ %
Answer: 25

B. (4 points) What percentage of the writes in the following code will miss in the cache?

```c
char *cptr;
cptr = (char *) buffer;
for (; cptr < (((char *) buffer) + 640 * 480 * 4); cptr++)
    *cptr = 0;
```

Miss rate for writes to `buffer`: ________ %
Answer: 25

C. (4 points) What percentage of the writes in the following code will miss in the cache?

```c
int *iptr;
iptr = (int *) buffer;
for (; iptr < (buffer + 640 * 480); iptr++)
    *iptr = 0;
```

Miss rate for writes to `buffer`: ________ %
Answer: 100

D. (4 points) Which code (A, B, or C) should be the fastest? ________
Answer: C
Problem 4. Dynamic Memory Allocation. (30 Points)

Part A. (12 points)

Consider a memory allocator that uses an implicit free list. The layout of each allocated and free memory block is as follows:

```
| 31 | 2 1 0 |
------------------
| Header | Block Size (bytes) |
|         |                   |
|         |                   |
|         |                   |
|         |                   |
|         |                   |
| Footer | Block Size (bytes) |
|        |                   |
```

Each memory block, either allocated or free, has a size that is a multiple of eight bytes. Thus, only the 29 higher order bits in the header and footer are needed to record block size, which includes the header and footer. The usage of the remaining 3 lower order bits is as follows:

- **bit 0** indicates the use of the current block: 1 for allocated, 0 for free.
- **bit 1** indicates the use of the previous adjacent block: 1 for allocated, 0 for free.
- **bit 2** is unused and is always set to be 0.

Note: The header and footer will always be present regardless of whether the block is allocated or not.
Given the contents of the heap shown on the left in hex values (each hex digit translates into 4 bits e.g., 0x3 means 0011, 0xc means 1100), show the new contents of the heap (in the right table) after a call to `free(0x400b010)` is executed. Your answers should be given as hex values. Note that the address grows from bottom up. Assume that the allocator uses immediate coalescing, that is, adjacent free blocks are merged immediately each time a block is freed. Please also briefly explain your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0x400b028</td>
<td>0x00000012</td>
<td>0x400b28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b24</td>
<td>0x400b611c</td>
<td>0x400b24</td>
<td>0x400b611c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b20</td>
<td>0x400b512c</td>
<td>0x400b20</td>
<td>0x400b512c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b1c</td>
<td>0x00000012</td>
<td>0x400b1c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b18</td>
<td>0x00000013</td>
<td>0x400b18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b14</td>
<td>0x400b511c</td>
<td>0x400b14</td>
<td>0x400b511c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b10</td>
<td>0x400b601c</td>
<td>0x400b10</td>
<td>0x400b601c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b0c</td>
<td>0x00000013</td>
<td>0x400b0c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b08</td>
<td>0x00000013</td>
<td>0x400b08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b04</td>
<td>0x400b601c</td>
<td>0x400b04</td>
<td>0x400b601c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b00</td>
<td>0x400b511c</td>
<td>0x400b00</td>
<td>0x400b511c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400affc</td>
<td>0x00000013</td>
<td>0x400affc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Answer:**

Note that the “free” call is given a pointer to the payload of the block (the same pointer returned by the corresponding “malloc” call which allocated this block). Hence, for free(0x400b010), the first task is to locate the header and footer of the corresponding block. Then, we need to look at the adjacent blocks (previous and next) to check whether they are free, hence if coalescing can occur. Note that the previous adjacent block is below the current block in the figure (because addresses are growing bottom up). After free(0x400b010), the freed block (0x400b00c-0x400b018) is merged (coalesced) with the adjacent free block (0x400b01c-0x400b028), and the new header/footer is 0x00000022. This hex representation shows that the size of this new block is 32 bytes and the fact that its previous adjacent block is used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0x400b028</td>
<td>0x00000012</td>
<td>0x400b028</td>
<td>0x00000022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b024</td>
<td>0x400b611c</td>
<td>0x400b024</td>
<td>0x400b611c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b020</td>
<td>0x400b512c</td>
<td>0x400b020</td>
<td>0x400b512c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b01c</td>
<td>0x00000012</td>
<td>0x400b01c</td>
<td>0x00000012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b018</td>
<td>0x00000013</td>
<td>0x400b018</td>
<td>0x00000013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b014</td>
<td>0x400b511c</td>
<td>0x400b014</td>
<td>0x400b511c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b010</td>
<td>0x400b601c</td>
<td>0x400b010</td>
<td>0x400b601c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b00c</td>
<td>0x00000013</td>
<td>0x400b00c</td>
<td>0x00000022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b008</td>
<td>0x00000013</td>
<td>0x400b008</td>
<td>0x00000013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b004</td>
<td>0x400b601c</td>
<td>0x400b004</td>
<td>0x400b601c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400b000</td>
<td>0x400b511c</td>
<td>0x400b000</td>
<td>0x400b511c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x400affc</td>
<td>0x00000013</td>
<td>0x400affc</td>
<td>0x00000013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part B. (18 points)

Assume that you want to extend the previous implicit allocator to improve its performance. You would like to reduce allocation time by maintaining an explicit doubly-linked free list. In addition, you would like to improve its memory utilization by using the footer only when a block is free. You decide that a first-fit search algorithm is sufficient. You may assume that: \text{sizeof(void *) is 4}.

(a) (4 points) Given that the block size must be a multiple of 8 bytes, what is the minimum block size allowable under this scheme?
Answer: 16 bytes (4 for header, 4 for footer, 4 x 2 for next and prev pointers)

(b) (4 points) Given that the block size must be a multiple of 8 bytes, determine the amount of memory (in bytes), wasted due to internal fragmentation, after the following four allocation requests. Do not include the 4 bytes used for block headers in your count.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \texttt{malloc(1)}
  Answer: 4 for header, 1 for data, 11 for padding
  \item \texttt{malloc(5)}
  Answer: 4 for header, 5 for data, 7 for padding
  \item \texttt{malloc(12)}
  Answer: 4 for header, 12 for data, no padding
  \item \texttt{malloc(13)}
  Answer: 4 for header, 13 for data, 7 padding
\end{itemize}

Internal fragmentation: 25 bytes (11 for \texttt{malloc(1)} + 7 for \texttt{malloc(5)} + 0 for \texttt{malloc(12)} + 7 for \texttt{malloc(13)})
In order to further improve the performance of your allocator, you decide to try to implement an explicit binary tree data structure to enable a fast best-fit search through the free blocks. Each free block within the tree must now maintain a pointer to each of its children, and to its parent.

(c) (4 points) Assuming that the block size must still be a multiple of 8 bytes, what is the minimum block size allowable under this new scheme?
Answer: 24 bytes (4 for header, 4 for footer, 4 x 3 for pointers + 4 for padding)

(d) (6 points) Comment on the effect that this allocator has on memory utilization when compared to the previous explicit linked list first-fit allocator. You should discuss any opposing tensions (trade-offs) that might exist.
Answer: The effect on memory utilization will depend on the allocation requests. This allocator will, on average, reduce the amount of external fragmentation because of the best-fit replacement policy; however, it suffers from higher internal fragmentation for small (less than 20 bytes) memory allocation requests.
Problem 5. Profiling and Speedup. (10 Points)

Part A (5 points)

Explain the following profile data obtained using gprof on the n-body simulation application. Note: You have to explain the meaning of the numbers and the organization of the output. What conclusions can you draw from this profile data? Think of why we used gprof in the first place when drawing conclusions.

Flat profile sample: ....................
% cumulative self self total
time seconds seconds calls s/call s/call name
96.33 1076.18 1076.18 278456 0.00 0.00 World::update()
0.96 1086.85 10.67 212849617 0.00 0.00 ThreadManagerSerial::doSerialWork()
0.63 1093.86 7.01 1 7.01 39.30 OpenGLWindow::runWindowLoop

Callgraph sample:
index % time self children called name

.................
1076.18 0.09 278456/278456 worldUpdate() [5]
0.07 0.01 278240/278241 World::calculateTimeDeltaMilliseconds()[27]
0.00 0.00 149/149 World::updateCallsPerSecond(int) [47]
0.00 0.00 4052/4287 World::radiusForMass(float) [139]
0.00 0.00 642/642 World::swapForegroundElement(World::ForegroundElement*,World::ForegroundElement*)[140]
.................
Answer:
Here is a basic explanation of the profile data. From the flat profile, we see that 96.33% of the application running time is spent in the function World::update. This translates to 1076.18 seconds. This function is being called 278456 times and the time per call is in terms of milliseconds or less. Similarly for the other 2 functions in the flat profile.

The call graph profile is for the function World::update. This function is being called from worldUpdate (the parent) and it calls a number of other functions, such as World::calculateTimeDeltaMilliseconds, World::updateCallsPerSeconds, World::radiusForMass, World::swapForegroundElement (these are the children). As in the previous case, the application spends 96.33% in World::update, meaning 1076.18 s. Next we go over the time spent in each child and explain the called column. From the called column we can see that worldUpdate is the only parent of World::update and there are 278456 calls to this function. The same for the children.

Conclusions: From the flat profile we see that World::update is the bottleneck of the application. From the call graph profile we notice that the bottleneck is actually inside the code for this function itself and not in its children.

Part B (5 Points)

Assume that by profiling the code of our game application with gprof you get that 80% of the time is spent in a loop which is updating the physics of the game world, while 20% of the time is spent in frame rendering. Therefore you focus all your efforts only on improving the update world function through code optimizations such as loop unrolling, use of blocking for the update loop for cache hit improvements and loop parallelization. What is the best speedup you can get for the game application as a whole ?

Answer:
By Amdahl’s Law, if 1/s of the program is sequential, then you can never get a speedup better than s. For this question, 1/s = 0.2, so the best speedup is 5.
Problem 6. Code Parallelization. (18 Points)

Part A (3 points)

Consider the following code, which we want to parallelize.

\[
\text{do } i = 1, n \\
\quad a[2i] = b[i] + c[i] \\
\quad d[i] = a[2i+1] \\
\text{enddo}
\]

Is parallelization possible? Please explain.

Answer:

Yes, the code is parallelizable, because there can be no dependences involving \(a[2i+1]\) and \(a[2i]\). \(a[2i]\) will always be even elements, \(a[2i+1]\) will always be odd elements, for any pair of \(i\)'s.

Part B (15 points)

Consider the following code.

\[
\text{int } j; \\
\text{for}(i = 1; i < n; i++)
\quad j = \ldots; \\
\quad a[i] = j;
\]

(a) (5 points) Please state the dependencies that exist in this code by i) describing the statements and variables involved and ii) stating the dependence type.

There are two possible answers for this problem, depending on whether the “\ldots” expression is loop invariant (i.e., independent of \(i\)) or not. Since the problem does not specify anything about this expression, both assumptions are correct, therefore answers based on either assumption are correct, as long as the assumption is stated clearly and the reasoning can be followed.

(a.1) Assuming that the expression is not a loop invariant. There are several dependences caused by \(j\): True dependence within an iteration. \((a[i]=j)\) has a true dependence on \(j=\ldots\), since \(a[i]=j\) reads a value written by \(j=\ldots\). Anti-dependence across iterations. Output dependence across iterations.

(a.2) Assuming that the expression is a loop invariant (or constant, does not depend on \(i\)). There are no dependencies caused by \(j\).
(b) (5 points) Can you run this code in parallel as given?
Answer: Same as for (a), the answer can be:

(b.2) No, the code cannot be run in parallel as given, because of the cross-iteration dependences caused by j.

(b.1) Yes, but only if j is constant (or loop-invariant). Again, the assumption about j needs to be presented explicitly and clearly as the reason why the code can be parallelized.

(c) (5 points) In what way can you improve the parallelism?
Answer:
Possible correct answers are that the variable j can be privatized if not loop invariant or taken out of the loop if loop invariant.

(c.1) Privatization of j would get rid of the cross-iteration dependences. The code would look like this:

```plaintext
for (i = 1 to n) {
    j[i] = ...;
    a[i] = j[i];
}
```

(c.2) If j is constant, or loop-invariant, then it can be taken out of the loop as in the code below. The answer needs to clearly explain why j can be taken out of the loop.

```plaintext
for (i = 1 to n) {
    a[i] = ....;
}
```

```plaintext
j = ....; (if j is ever used after the loop).
```