1. Struct iteration and Cache behavior

Consider the following two scenarios. Which has a higher cache miss rate? Why might we choose to do either implementation? Assume that N >> cache_size and we have 64-byte cache lines.

Method 1:

```
struct airplane{
     int id number;
     int num passengers;
     float airport x, airport y;
     float coord x, coord y;
     float dir x, dir y;
     float vel x, vel y;
};
struct airplane airplanes[N];
float avg dist from port = 0;
for(int i = 0; i < N; i++) {</pre>
     float airport x = airplanes[i].airport x;
     float airport y = airplanes[i].airport y;
     avg dist from port += sqrt((airport x) ** 2 + (airport y) **
2);
}
avg dist /= N;
```

Method 2:

```
struct pair{
     float x,y;
}
int id numbers[N];
int num passengers[N];
struct pair airport coords[N];
struct pair coords[N];
struct pair dir[N];
struct pair vel[N];
float avg dist from port = 0;
for(int i = 0; i < N; i++) {</pre>
     float airport x = airport coords[i].x;
     float airport y = airport coords[i].y;
     avg dist from port += sqrt((airport x) ** 2 + (airport y) **
2);
}
avg dist /= N;
```

2. Critical Path

Examine the code below that stores data into an accumulator from operations on elements of the vector v

```
void combine7(vec ptr v, data t *dest) {
     long i;
     long length = vec_length(v);
     long limit = length-1;
     data t *data = get vec start(v);
     data t acc = IDENT:
     // combines 2 elements at a time
     for(i = 0; i < limit; i+=2) {</pre>
           acc = acc OP (data[i] OP data[i+1]);
     }
     // finish any remaining elements
     for(; i < length; i++) {</pre>
           acc = acc OP data[i];
     }
     *dest = acc;
}
```

a) For one iteration of the loop, what would the data-flow graph look like? In addition, highlight the critical path in the data flow.

b) When this function is given a vector size of *n*, what would the data-flow graph look like? Similar to part a, highlight the critical path in the entire data flow.

c) The function incorporates 2x1 loop unrolling, but what other ways can we modify the function to reduce the latency bound by half?

3. 1D and 2D Stencil optimization

In the performance lab, you will be optimizing some code for 3D stencil computation. In this question, let's take a look at 1D and 2D stencil computations. (A side note: in the performance lab and in this question, we simplified the notation of the stencil computation (for handling edge cases), so it may differ slightly from other sources you might find.)

(1) 1D Stencil

Assume OUT LEN is N >> 10000, KERN LEN is 2, and IN LEN is N+2.

(a) Assume cache has 32B/line, what is the miss rate of vanilla 1D stencil?

(b) Given the initialization below, what does the resulting Out array look like after calling vanilla_1D_stencil?

double* In = malloc(IN_LEN * sizeof(double)); for (int i = 0; i < IN_LEN; i++) { In[i] = i + 1;} double* Kern = malloc(KERN_LEN * sizeof(double)); for (int i = 0; i < KERN_LEN; i++) { Kern[i] = 1.0/KERN_LEN;} double* Out = malloc(OUT_LEN * sizeof(double)); for (int i = 0; i < OUT_LEN; i++) {Out[i] = 0;}</pre>

(2) 2D Stencil

Assume OUT_LEN is N >> 10000, KERN_LEN is 4, and IN_LEN is N+4. Assume the cache has 32B/line, and the total cache size is smaller than 8N bytes.

(b) How can we reduce the miss rate?