

2.) Consider the following section of code.

```
for (i=0; i<10; i++)
{
    for (j=0; j<5; j++)
    {
        <code containing no conditional jumps>
    }
}
```

- a.) Once compiled, how many conditional jumps would be contained in the above section of code? (static occurrence)

There should be a conditional jump at the end of each loop to check if the final condition has been exceeded. Therefore, there are **2** static occurrences of the conditional jumps.

- b.) After fully executing the above section of code, how many conditional jumps would the CPU have encountered? (dynamic occurrence)

The outer loop is executed 10 times. Therefore, the conditional jump for the outer loop is encountered 10 times. The inner loop is executed 5 times for every execution of the outer loop, i.e., it is executed $5 \times 10 = 50$ times. Therefore, there are $10 + 50 = 60$ dynamic occurrences of the conditional jumps.

- c.) Using the static branch prediction algorithm "branch always," how many of the conditional jumps calculated in the previous problem would have been predicted incorrectly?

For every completed operation of a loop, there will be one encounter where the conditional jump is **not taken**. This is when the final condition has been exceeded. Since we "fall out" of the outer loop once and we "fall out" of the inner loop 10, then there are $10 + 1 = 11$ times when the branch would not have been taken and therefore predicted incorrectly.

- d.) Using the branch prediction algorithm described in figures 12.16 and 12.17, how many of the conditional jumps calculated in part b would have been predicted correctly assuming an initial state of "predict taken"?

If you look at the state diagram in Figure 12.17, you should see that there must be two incorrect predictions before the system will change its prediction. The only time that the outer loop has a failed prediction is at the very end of the operation of the code segment shown, and therefore, there is no chance for a second incorrect prediction to change the system from "predict taken" to "predict not taken." The inner loop has an incorrect prediction at the end of its five loops. The next time the conditional jump is encountered is when the loop has been started again, and at that point, the branch is taken and the prediction is correct. Therefore, the system will once again always predict that the branch is to be taken and the answer is the same as for problem , i.e., **11** incorrect predictions and **49** correct predictions.

- 3.) Modify the following piece of code in order to support delayed branching and delayed loading. Assume a load from memory will force a subsequent instruction to stall in the pipeline if it uses the same register.

Delayed branching: A NOP needs to be placed at the end of every branch in order to avoid flushing the pipeline. The code below has just one branch, a conditional one immediately after the compare.

Delayed loading: A NOP needs to be placed between any two instructions where data dependency occurs, i.e., where a register is operated on (written to) and then immediately used as an input (read from) for the next instruction. This occurs in two places, right before AL is stored and when As for

```
MOV CL,0           ;Initialize counter CL
L1: MOV AL,[BX:1000] ;Retrieve data from address 1000
                        ;It could be said that a NOP is justified
                        ;here, but it is unlikely that it would be
                        ;needed.
ADD AL,23          ;Add immediate value
NOP                ;NOP to allow AL to settle before storing
MOV [BX:1000],AL   ;Store result back to address 1000
INC CL             ;Increment CL
NOP                ;NOP to allow CL to settle before comparing
CMP CL, 100        ;Check to see if CL equals 100
JNE L1             ;If not, continued looping
NOP                ;NOP to avoid flush after jump
MOV AL,1           ;Storing 1 at address 1001...
NOP                ;NOP to allow AL to settle before storing
MOV [BX:1001],AL   ;...indicates we're done
```