- 1. List all the dependences in the following code fragment. Indicate whether the true dependences are loop-carried or not. Show why the loop is not parallel.
- For (i=2;i<100;i++) {
 a[i] = b[i] + a[i]; /* S1 */
 c[i-1] = a[i] + d[i]; /* S2 */
 a[i-1] = 2 * b[i]; /* S3 */
 b[i+1] = 2 * b[i]; /* S4 */
 }</pre>
- 2. Here is an unusual loop. First, list the dependences and then rewrite the loop so that it is parallel.

```
For (i=1;i<100;i++) {
    a[i] = b[i] + c[i]; /* S1 */
    b[i] = a[i] + d[i]; /* S2 */
    a[i+1] = a[i] + e[i]; /* S3 */
}</pre>
```

EC332 - Computer Architecture II HW4 – Loop Unrolling

3. Assume the pipeline latencies from below and a one-cycle delayed branch. Unroll the following loop a sufficient number of times to schedule it without any delays. Show the schedule after eliminating any redundant overhead instructions. The loop is a dot product (assuming \$f2 is initially 0) and contains a recurrence. Despite the fact that the loop is not parallel, it can be scheduled with no delays.

Loop:	ld	• •	0(\$s1	,
	ld	\$£4,	0(\$s2	2)
	multd	\$£0,	\$£0,	\$£4
	addd	\$£2,	\$£0,	\$£2
	subi	\$s1,	\$s1,	8
	subi	\$s2,	\$s2,	8
	bneqz	\$s1,	Loop	

Instruction producing result	Instruction using result	latency in clock cycles
FP ALU op	Another FP ALU op	3
FP ALU op	Store Double	2
Load double	FP ALU op	1
Load double	Store double	0