## **HW3 Solutions**

1. (P11.1) Using the syntax in Figure 11-2, show how to use the load-linked/store conditional primitives to synthesize a compare-and-swap operation.

2. (P11.8) Real coherence controllers include numerous transient states in addition to the ones shown in Figure to support split-transaction buses. For example, when a processor issues a bus read for an invalid line (I), the line is placed in a IS transient state until the processor has received a valid data response that then causes the line to transition into shared state (S). Given a split-transaction bus that separates each bus command (bus read, bus write, and bus upgrade) into a request and response, augment the state table and state transition diagram of Figure to incorporate all necessary transient states and bus responses. For simplicity, assume that any bus command for a line in a transient state gets a negative acknowledge (NAK) response that forces it to be retried after some delay.

Note: for writebacks, we assume that once the data shows up on the bus as a BD command, the processor issuing the writeback also sees the BD and can then transition to I or S. Similarly, we assume that any subsequent bus read/write will then be satisfied by memory (this is sometimes called the writeback race).

3. (P11.10) Assuming a processor frequency of 1 GHz, a target CPI of 2, a per-instruction level-2 cache miss rate of 1% per instruction, a snoop-based cache coherent system with 32 processors, and 8-byte address messages (including command and snoop addresses), compute the inbound and outbound snoop bandwidth required at each processor node.

Outbound snoop rate = .01 miss/inst x 1 inst/2 cyc x 1 cyc/ns x 8 bytes/miss = <math>.04 b/ns = 40 million bytes per second

Inbound snoop rate =  $31 \times 40 = 1240$  million bytes per second = 1182 MB/sec.

- 4. Cacti problem -- solution not provided
- 5. Niagara problem. (a) solution not provided, but dedicated core per thread should be fastest, followed by 2 threads per core, followed by 4 threads per core (b) most likely cause is destructive interference due to sharing of L1 data cache. (c) open-ended problem.

	Event and Local Coherence Controller Responses and Actions (s' refers to next state)						
Current State s	Local Read (LR)	Local Write (LW)	Local Eviction (EV)	Bus Read (BR)	Bus Write (BW)	Bus Upgrade (BU)	Bus Data (BD)
	Issue bus	Issue bus	s' = I	Do nothing	Do nothing	Do nothing	Error
	read	write					
	if no sharers	s' = IM					
	then s' = IE						
Invalid (I)	else s' = IS						
ItoS (IS)	Stall	Stall	Stall	NAK	NAK	NAK	s' = S
ItoE (IE)	Stall	Stall	Stall	NAK	NAK	NAK	s' = E
ItoM (IM)	Stall	Stall	Stall	NAK	NAK	NAK	s' = M
	Do nothing	Issue bus	s' = I	Respond	s' = I	s' = I	Error
		upgrade		shared			
Shared (S)		s' = M					
	Do nothing	s' = M	s' = I	Respond	s' = I	Error	Error
				shared			
Exclusive (E)				s' = S			
	Do nothing	Do nothing	Write data	Respond	Respond	Error	Error
			back;	dirty;	dirty;		
			s' = I	Write data	Write data		
				back;	back;		
Modified (M)				s' = MS	s' = MI		
Mtol (MI)	Do nothing	Stall	Stall	NAK	NAK	NAK	s' = I
MtoS (MS)	Do nothing	Stall	Stall	NAK	NAK	NAK	s' = S

MESI cache coherence protocol for Problem 8.