EEE4120F Quiz 2 based on paper:



Hill and Marty "Amdahl's Law in the Multicore Era"
ANSWERS!!!

DATE: 09/3/2023

Please fill in name!

This is just a very short quiz, but it is for marks!

NB: Please select only one answer option for each question

CIRCLE/COLOR-IN ANSWERS FOR MULTIPLE CHIOCE QUESTIONS TOTAL NUMBER OF QUESTIONS · FOUR (4)

	TOTAL NUMBER OF QUESTIONS : FOUR (4)	TIME (mins): 7			
#	Question - EACH QUESTION WORTH 1 MARK	Sec	W	%	Х
Q1	A major aspect, and indeed purpose discussed at the satrt, of this paper is about	60	2	11%	
02	 [1] Pose an alternate perspective on the tensions between applications and software, which differs to the 'Golden Gate Bridge' scenario. [2] Encourage multicore designers to view the entire chip's performance rather than focusing on core efficiencies. [3] Provide a more optimized form of Amdah's law for multicore processors. [4] Incorporate consideration for memory coupling to speedup analysis. [5] Discuss what is meant by a Compiled Binary Executable (or 'cbe'). 	60	3	17%	
QZ	Base Core Equivalent	00	5	17.70	
Q3	The authors use variable r to represent how many resources, in terms of resources a sngle BCE needs, it takes to implement a enhanced multicore. They use the function <i>perf(r)</i> to indicate the sequential performance of the enhanced multicore chip compared to a single BCE. In this question (which is an often-used simplification) you can consider <i>perf(r)</i> to be the speedup of the enhanced multicore compared to one BCE. They say that while <i>perf(r) > r</i> is maintained, dedicating more resources to the multicore suggests benefit, but at a stage when <i>perf(r) < r</i> the addition of resources hurts parallel executation. Briefly try to explain more directly what they mean by this why would there be benefit in dedicating more resources while <i>perf(r) > r</i> continues. And why would it 'hurt parallel execution' if further enhancement causing <i>perf(r) < r</i> ?	90	3	17%	
	while the perf(r)>r, this indicates that the speedup of the muticore enhanced processor design is performing better than that of r BCE cores working perfectly in parallel. This suggests that the design of the multicore is overall more efficient than r BCEs working in paralell perfectly without problems such as synchronization delays. when perf(r) <r efficiently="" enhanced<br="" indicats="" of="" that="" the="" this="">processor no longer acheives an equivelent parallelism performance of that of r BCEs, indeed that having used r BCEs resources to implement r BCEs would have given better performance than implementing the enchanged multicore which still uses equivelent resources but achieves worse performance. They do indicate that the enhanced multicore, when runing sequential code, could still do that faster than one of the r BCEs</r>				

Q4Here are three mutlicore chip models, showing the arrangement of BCEs withing them (note that a mutlcore chip doesn't necessarily just use a collection of BCEs of the same design as the baseline BCE, it just indicates the equivelent resource usage). There are various models that Hill and Marty9052	28%
gave names to. Attempt to name the two multicore equivelents below	
according to the authors naming convention presented.	
Image: Sector of the sector	
	28%
suggesting that it would be nice if processor architects could have their cake	
and eat it. What do they mean by dynamic multicore?? What would be so	
great about such a thing? PS: you could try such an experiment in a YODA topic if you wanted to :-)	
The suggestion is a multicore that could somehow dynamically swap	
between being a higher better-performance multicore and a set of	
equivelent BCEs. For example, when running sequential code it could be a 4-	
BCE, but when running parallel code swaps to a 4x 1-BCE processors.	
TOTAL: 390 18 10	00%