

Computer Organization & Assembly Language Programming (CSE 2312)

Lecture 22: More on Caches, Virtual Memory, Dependable
Memory


Taylor Johnson

Announcements and Outline


- Programming assignment 2 assigned, due 11/13 by midnight

- Review
 - Memory hierarchy
 - Cache basics
- More Caches
- Dependable and Virtual Memory


Memory Hierarchy




Cache Memory




Cache Hit: find necessary data in cache



Cache Miss: have to get necessary data from main memory



Memory Hierarchy Levels



- Block (aka line): unit of copying
 - May be multiple words
- If accessed data is present in upper level
 - Hit: access satisfied by upper level
 - Hit ratio: hits/accesses
- If accessed data is absent
 - Miss: block copied from lower level
 - Time taken: miss penalty
 - Miss ratio: misses/accesses = $1 - \text{hit ratio}$
 - Then accessed data supplied from upper level

Cache Terms

- Cache line: block of cells inside a cache
 - Usually store several words in a line (e.g., store 32 bytes on 32-bit word CPU)
- Cache hit: memory access finds value in cache
 - Antonym: cache miss: have to get it from main memory
- Spatial locality: likely we need data from addresses around one we're requesting (example: array operations)
- Mean access time: $C + (1 - H) * M$
 - C: cache access time
 - M: main memory access time (usually $M \gg C$, e.g., $M > 100 * C$)
 - H: hit ratio: probability to find a value in the cache
 - miss ratio: $1 - H$
- Time cost of cache miss: $C + M$ memory access time

Quantifying Memory Access Speed

- Let:

- mean_access_time be the average time it takes for the CPU to access a memory word.
- C be the average time it takes for the CPU to access a memory word **if that word is currently in the cache**.
- M be the average time it takes for the CPU to access a word in main memory (i.e., **not in the cache**).
- H be the **hit ratio**: the fraction of times that the memory word the CPU needs is in the cache.

- $\text{mean_access_time} = C + (1 - H) M$

- If H is close to 1:

- If H is close to 0:

Quantifying Memory Access Speed

- Let:

- mean_access_time be the average time it takes for the CPU to access a memory word.
- C be the average time it takes for the CPU to access a memory word **if that word is currently in the cache.**
- M be the average time it takes for the CPU to access a word in main memory (i.e., **not in the cache**).
- H be the **hit ratio**: the fraction of times that the memory word the CPU needs is in the cache.

- $\text{mean_access_time} = C + (1 - H) M$

- If H is close to 1: $\text{mean_access_time} \cong C$.

- If H is close to 0: $\text{mean_access_time} \cong C + M$.

Quantifying Memory Access Speed


- $\text{mean_access_time} = C + (1 - H) M$
- If H is close to 1: $\text{mean_access_time} \cong C$.
 - If the hit ratio is close to 1, then almost all memory accesses are handled by the cache, so the time it takes to access main memory does not affect the average much.
- If H is close to 0: $\text{mean_access_time} \cong C + M$.
 - If the hit ratio is close to 0, then almost all memory accesses are handled by the main memory. In that case, the CPU:
 - First tries to access the word in the cache, which takes time C .
 - The word is not found in the cache, so the CPU then accesses the word from memory, which takes time M .

Principle of Locality

- Programs access a small proportion of their address space at any time
- Temporal locality
 - Items accessed recently are likely to be accessed again soon
 - e.g., instructions in a loop, induction variables
- Spatial locality
 - Items near those accessed recently are likely to be accessed soon
 - E.g., sequential instruction access, array data

Direct-Mapped Cache

- Location determined by address
- Direct mapped: only one choice
 - (Block address) modulo (#Blocks in cache)




- #Blocks is a power of 2
- Use low-order address bits

Direct-Mapped Caches

MEMORY		CACHE (4-element)			
		Index	Tag	Data	Valid
MEM[0x0000]	0x1FFF				
MEM[0x0001]	0x0000	00	0x00	x1FFF	1
MEM[0x0002]	0xABCD	01	0x00	x0000	1
MEM[0x0003]	0x1234	10	0x00	xABCD	1
MEM[0x0004]	0x0005	11	0x00	x1234	1
MEM[0x0005]	0x0006				
MEM[0x0006]	0x0007				
...					

Direct-Mapped Caches

MEMORY		CACHE (4-element)			
		Index	Tag	Data	Valid
MEM[0x0000]	0x1FFF	00	0x00	x1FFF	1
MEM[0x0001]	0x0000	01	0x01	x0006	1
MEM[0x0002]	0xABCD	10	0x01	x0007	1
MEM[0x0003]	0x1234	11	0x00	x1234	1
MEM[0x0004]	0x0005				
MEM[0x0005]	0x0006				
MEM[0x0006]	0x0007				
...					



Direct-Mapped Caches

MEMORY		CACHE (4-element)			
		Index	Tag	Data	Valid
MEM[0x0000]	0x1FFF	00	0x00	<u>x0000</u>	<u>0</u>
MEM[0x0001]	0x0000	01	0x01	x0006	1
MEM[0x0002]	0xABCD	10	0x01	x0007	1
MEM[0x0003]	0x1234	11	0x00	x1234	1
MEM[0x0004]	0x0005				
MEM[0x0005]	0x0006				
MEM[0x0006]	0x0007				
...					

Tags and Valid Bits

- How do we know which particular block is stored in a cache location?
 - **Index** = bottom bits of address
 - Store block address as well as the data
 - Actually, only need the high-order bits
 - Called the **tag**
 - **Memory Address = concatenating tag and index**
- What if there is no data in a location?
 - Valid bit: 1 = present, 0 = not present
 - Initially 0

Direct-Mapped Cache Example

- 8-blocks, 1 word/block, direct mapped
- Initial state

Index	V	Tag	Data
000	N		
001	N		
010	N		
011	N		
100	N		
101	N		
110	N		
111	N		

Direct-Mapped Cache Example

Word addr	Binary addr	Hit/miss	Cache block
22	10110	Miss	110

Index	V	Tag	Data
000	N		
001	N		
010	N		
011	N		
100	N		
101	N		
110	Y	10	Mem[10110]
111	N		

Direct-Mapped Cache Example

Word addr	Binary addr	Hit/miss	Cache block
26	11 010	Miss	010

Index	V	Tag	Data
000	N		
001	N		
010	Y	11	Mem[11010]
011	N		
100	N		
101	N		
110	Y	10	Mem[10110]
111	N		

Direct-Mapped Cache Example

Word addr	Binary addr	Hit/miss	Cache block
22	10 110	Hit	110
26	11 010	Hit	010

Index	V	Tag	Data
000	N		
001	N		
010	Y	11	Mem[11010]
011	N		
100	N		
101	N		
110	Y	10	Mem[10110]
111	N		

Direct-Mapped Cache Example

Word addr	Binary addr	Hit/miss	Cache block
16	10 000	Miss	000
3	00 011	Miss	011
16	10 000	Hit	000


Index	V	Tag	Data
000	Y	10	Mem[10000]
001	N		
010	Y	11	Mem[11010]
011	Y	00	Mem[00011]
100	N		
101	N		
110	Y	10	Mem[10110]
111	N		

Direct-Mapped Cache Example

Word addr	Binary addr	Hit/miss	Cache block
18	10 010	Miss	010


Index	V	Tag	Data
000	Y	10	Mem[10000]
001	N		
010	Y	10	Mem[10010]
011	Y	00	Mem[00011]
100	N		
101	N		
110	Y	10	Mem[10110]
111	N		

Address Subdivision



Example: Larger Block Size

- 64 blocks, 16 bytes/block
 - To what block number does address 1200 map?
- Block address = $\lfloor 1200/16 \rfloor = 75$
- Block number = 75 modulo 64 = 11



Block Size Considerations

- Larger blocks should reduce miss rate
 - Due to spatial locality
- But in a fixed-sized cache
 - Larger blocks \Rightarrow fewer of them
 - More competition \Rightarrow increased miss rate
 - Larger blocks \Rightarrow pollution
- Larger miss penalty
 - Can override benefit of reduced miss rate
 - Early restart and critical-word-first can help

Cache Misses

- On cache hit, CPU proceeds normally
- On cache miss
 - Stall the CPU pipeline
 - Fetch block from next level of hierarchy
 - Instruction cache miss
 - Restart instruction fetch
 - Data cache miss
 - Complete data access

Write-Through

- On data-write hit, could just update the block in cache
 - But then cache and memory would be inconsistent
- Write through: also update memory
- But makes writes take longer
 - e.g., if base CPI = 1, 10% of instructions are stores, write to memory takes 100 cycles
 - Effective CPI = $1 + 0.1 \times 100 = 11$
- Solution: write buffer
 - Holds data waiting to be written to memory
 - CPU continues immediately
 - Only stalls on write if write buffer is already full

Write-Back

- Alternative: On data-write hit, just update the block in cache
 - Keep track of whether each block is dirty
- When a dirty block is replaced
 - Write it back to memory
 - Can use a write buffer to allow replacing block to be read first


Write Allocation

- What should happen on a write miss?
- Alternatives for write-through
 - Allocate on miss: fetch the block
 - Write around: don't fetch the block
 - Since programs often write a whole block before reading it (e.g., initialization)
- For write-back
 - Usually fetch the block

Example: Intrinsity FastMATH

- Embedded MIPS processor
 - 12-stage pipeline
 - Instruction and data access on each cycle
- Split cache: separate I-cache and D-cache
 - Each 16KB: 256 blocks \times 16 words/block
 - D-cache: write-through or write-back
- SPEC2000 miss rates
 - I-cache: 0.4%
 - D-cache: 11.4%
 - Weighted average: 3.2%

Example: Intrinsic FastMATH



Main Memory Supporting Caches

- Use DRAMs for main memory
 - Fixed width (e.g., 1 word)
 - Connected by fixed-width clocked bus
 - Bus clock is typically slower than CPU clock
- Example cache block read
 - 1 bus cycle for address transfer
 - 15 bus cycles per DRAM access
 - 1 bus cycle per data transfer
- For 4-word block, 1-word-wide DRAM
 - Miss penalty = $1 + 4 \times 15 + 4 \times 1 = 65$ bus cycles
 - Bandwidth = $16 \text{ bytes} / 65 \text{ cycles} = 0.25 \text{ B/cycle}$

Measuring Cache Performance

- Components of CPU time
 - Program execution cycles
 - Includes cache hit time
 - Memory stall cycles
 - Mainly from cache misses
- With simplifying assumptions:

Memory stall cycles

$$= \frac{\text{Memory accesses}}{\text{Program}} \times \text{Miss rate} \times \text{Miss penalty}$$

$$= \frac{\text{Instructions}}{\text{Program}} \times \frac{\text{Misses}}{\text{Instruction}} \times \text{Miss penalty}$$

Cache Performance Example

- Given
 - I-cache miss rate = 2%
 - D-cache miss rate = 4%
 - Miss penalty = 100 cycles
 - Base CPI (ideal cache) = 2
 - Load & stores are 36% of instructions
- Miss cycles per instruction
 - I-cache: $0.02 \times 100 = 2$
 - D-cache: $0.36 \times 0.04 \times 100 = 1.44$
- Actual CPI = $2 + 2 + 1.44 = 5.44$
 - Ideal CPU is $5.44/2 = 2.72$ times faster

Average Access Time

- Hit time is also important for performance
- Average memory access time (AMAT)
 - $AMAT = \text{Hit time} + \text{Miss rate} \times \text{Miss penalty}$
- Example
 - CPU with 1ns clock, hit time = 1 cycle, miss penalty = 20 cycles, l-cache miss rate = 5%
 - $AMAT = 1 + 0.05 \times 20 = 2ns$
 - 2 cycles per instruction

Performance Summary


- When CPU performance increased
 - Miss penalty becomes more significant
- Decreasing base CPI
 - Greater proportion of time spent on memory stalls
- Increasing clock rate
 - Memory stalls account for more CPU cycles
- Can't neglect cache behavior when evaluating system performance

Associative Caches


- Fully associative
 - Allow a given block to go in any cache entry
 - Requires all entries to be searched at once
 - Comparator per entry (expensive)
- n -way set associative
 - Each set contains n entries
 - Block number determines which set
 - (Block number) modulo (#Sets in cache)
 - Search all entries in a given set at once
 - n comparators (less expensive)

Associative Cache Example


Direct mapped



Set associative



Fully associative



Spectrum of Associativity

- For a cache with 8 entries

**One-way set associative
(direct mapped)**

Block	Tag	Data
0		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		

Two-way set associative

Set	Tag	Data	Tag	Data
0				
1				
2				
3				

Four-way set associative

Set	Tag	Data	Tag	Data	Tag	Data	Tag	Data
0								
1								

Eight-way set associative (fully associative)

Tag	Data	Tag	Data	Tag	Data	Tag	Data	Tag	Data	Tag	Data	Tag	Data	Tag	Data

Associativity Example

- Compare 4-block caches
 - Direct mapped, 2-way set associative, fully associative
 - Block access sequence: 0, 8, 0, 6, 8
- Direct mapped

Block address	Cache index	Hit/miss	Cache content after access			
			0	1	2	3
0	0	miss	Mem[0]			
8	0	miss	Mem[8]			
0	0	miss	Mem[0]			
6	2	miss	Mem[0]		Mem[6]	
8	0	miss	Mem[8]		Mem[6]	

Associativity Example

- 2-way set associative

Block address	Cache index	Hit/miss	Cache content after access			
			Set 0		Set 1	
0	0	miss	Mem[0]			
8	0	miss	Mem[0]	Mem[8]		
0	0	hit	Mem[0]	Mem[8]		
6	0	miss	Mem[0]	Mem[6]		
8	0	miss	Mem[8]	Mem[6]		


■ Fully associative

Block address		Hit/miss	Cache content after access			
0		miss	Mem[0]			
8		miss	Mem[0]	Mem[8]		
0		hit	Mem[0]	Mem[8]		
6		miss	Mem[0]	Mem[8]	Mem[6]	
8		hit	Mem[0]	Mem[8]	Mem[6]	

How Much Associativity

- Increased associativity decreases miss rate
 - But with diminishing returns
- Simulation of a system with 64KB D-cache, 16-word blocks, SPEC2000
 - 1-way: 10.3%
 - 2-way: 8.6%
 - 4-way: 8.3%
 - 8-way: 8.1%

Set Associative Cache Organization



Replacement Policy

- Direct mapped: no choice
- Set associative
 - Prefer non-valid entry, if there is one
 - Otherwise, choose among entries in the set
- Least-recently used (LRU)
 - Choose the one unused for the longest time
 - Simple for 2-way, manageable for 4-way, too hard beyond that
- Random
 - Gives approximately the same performance as LRU for high associativity

Multilevel Caches

- Primary cache attached to CPU
 - Small, but fast
- Level-2 cache services misses from primary cache
 - Larger, slower, but still faster than main memory
- Main memory services L-2 cache misses
- Some high-end systems include L-3 cache

Multilevel Cache Example

- Given
 - CPU base CPI = 1, clock rate = 4GHz
 - Miss rate/instruction = 2%
 - Main memory access time = 100ns
- With just primary cache
 - Miss penalty = $100\text{ns}/0.25\text{ns} = 400$ cycles
 - Effective CPI = $1 + 0.02 \times 400 = 9$

Example (cont.)

- Now add L-2 cache
 - Access time = 5ns
 - Global miss rate to main memory = 0.5%
- Primary miss with L-2 hit
 - Penalty = $5\text{ns}/0.25\text{ns} = 20$ cycles
- Primary miss with L-2 miss
 - Extra penalty = 500 cycles
- $\text{CPI} = 1 + 0.02 \times 20 + 0.005 \times 400 = 3.4$
- Performance ratio = $9/3.4 = 2.6$

Multilevel Cache Considerations


- Primary cache
 - Focus on minimal hit time
- L-2 cache
 - Focus on low miss rate to avoid main memory access
 - Hit time has less overall impact
- Results
 - L-1 cache usually smaller than a single cache
 - L-1 block size smaller than L-2 block size

Interactions with Advanced CPUs


- Out-of-order CPUs can execute instructions during cache miss
 - Pending store stays in load/store unit
 - Dependent instructions wait in reservation stations
 - Independent instructions continue
- Effect of miss depends on program data flow
 - Much harder to analyse
 - Use system simulation

Interactions with Software


- Misses depend on memory access patterns
 - Algorithm behavior
 - Compiler optimization for memory access



a.



b.



c.



Virtual Memory

Virtual Memory

- Use main memory as a “cache” for secondary (disk) storage
 - Managed jointly by CPU hardware and the operating system (OS)
- Programs share main memory
 - Each gets a private virtual address space holding its frequently used code and data
 - Protected from other programs
- CPU and OS translate virtual addresses to physical addresses
 - VM “block” is called a page
 - VM translation “miss” is called a page fault

Address Translation

- Fixed-size pages (e.g., 4K)




Page Fault Penalty

- On page fault, the page must be fetched from disk
 - Takes millions of clock cycles
 - Handled by OS code
- Try to minimize page fault rate
 - Fully associative placement
 - Smart replacement algorithms


Page Tables

- PTE: Page Table Entry
- Stores placement information
 - Array of page table entries, indexed by virtual page number
 - Page table register in CPU points to page table in physical memory
- If page is present in memory
 - PTE stores the physical page number
 - Plus other status bits (referenced, dirty, ...)
- If page is not present
 - PTE can refer to location in swap space on disk

Translation Using a Page Table



Mapping Pages to Storage




Replacement and Writes

- To reduce page fault rate, prefer least-recently used (LRU) replacement
 - Reference bit (aka use bit) in PTE set to 1 on access to page
 - Periodically cleared to 0 by OS
 - A page with reference bit = 0 has not been used recently
- Disk writes take millions of cycles
 - Block at once, not individual locations
 - Write through is impractical
 - Use write-back
 - Dirty bit in PTE set when page is written

Fast Translation Using a TLB

- Address translation would appear to require extra memory references
 - One to access the PTE
 - Then the actual memory access
- But access to page tables has good locality
 - So use a fast cache of PTEs within the CPU
 - Called a **Translation Look-aside Buffer (TLB)**
 - Typical: 16–512 PTEs, 0.5–1 cycle for hit, 10–100 cycles for miss, 0.01%–1% miss rate
 - Misses could be handled by hardware or software

Fast Translation Using a TLB



TLB Misses

- If page is in memory
 - Load the PTE from memory and retry
 - Could be handled in hardware
 - Can get complex for more complicated page table structures
 - Or in software
 - Raise a special exception, with optimized handler
- If page is not in memory (page fault)
 - OS handles fetching the page and updating the page table
 - Then restart the faulting instruction


TLB Miss Handler

- TLB miss indicates
 - Page present, but PTE not in TLB
 - Page not present
- Must recognize TLB miss before destination register overwritten
 - Raise exception
- Handler copies PTE from memory to TLB
 - Then restarts instruction
 - If page not present, page fault will occur

Page Fault Handler

- Use faulting virtual address to find PTE
- Locate page on disk
- Choose page to replace
 - If dirty, write to disk first
- Read page into memory and update page table
- Make process runnable again
 - Restart from faulting instruction

TLB and Cache Interaction



- If cache tag uses physical address
 - Need to translate before cache lookup
- Alternative: use virtual address tag
 - Complications due to aliasing
 - Different virtual addresses for shared physical address

Memory Protection

- Different tasks can share parts of their virtual address spaces
 - But need to protect against errant access
 - Requires OS assistance
- Hardware support for OS protection
 - Privileged supervisor mode (aka kernel mode)
 - Privileged instructions
 - Page tables and other state information only accessible in supervisor mode
 - System call exception (e.g., syscall in MIPS)

Commonalities Between Memory Hierarchies

Cache = faster way to access larger main memory

Virtual memory = cache for storage (e.g., faster way to access larger secondary memory / storage)

Memory Hierarchy Big Picture

- Common principles apply at all levels of the memory hierarchy
 - Based on notions of caching
- At each level in the hierarchy
 - Block placement
 - Finding a block
 - Replacement on a miss
 - Write policy

Block Placement

- Determined by associativity
 - Direct mapped (1-way associative)
 - One choice for placement
 - n-way set associative
 - n choices within a set
 - Fully associative
 - Any location
- Higher associativity reduces miss rate
 - Increases complexity, cost, and access time

Finding a Block

Associativity	Location method	Tag comparisons
Direct mapped	Index	1
n-way set associative	Set index, then search entries within the set	n
Fully associative	Search all entries	#entries
	Full lookup table	0

- Hardware caches
 - Reduce comparisons to reduce cost
- Virtual memory
 - Full table lookup makes full associativity feasible
 - Benefit in reduced miss rate

Replacement

- Choice of entry to replace on a miss
 - Least recently used (LRU)
 - Complex and costly hardware for high associativity
 - Random
 - Close to LRU, easier to implement
- Virtual memory
 - LRU approximation with hardware support

Write Policy

- Write-through
 - Update both upper and lower levels
 - Simplifies replacement, but may require write buffer
- Write-back
 - Update upper level only
 - Update lower level when block is replaced
 - Need to keep more state
- Virtual memory
 - Only write-back is feasible, given disk write latency

Sources of Misses

- Compulsory misses (aka cold start misses)
 - First access to a block
- Capacity misses
 - Due to finite cache size
 - A replaced block is later accessed again
- Conflict misses (aka collision misses)
 - In a non-fully associative cache
 - Due to competition for entries in a set
 - Would not occur in a fully associative cache of the same total size


Cache Design Trade-offs

Design change	Effect on miss rate	Negative performance effect
Increase cache size	Decrease capacity misses	May increase access time
Increase associativity	Decrease conflict misses	May increase access time
Increase block size	Decrease compulsory misses	Increases miss penalty. For very large block size, may increase miss rate due to pollution.

Dependable Memory

Dependability Measures, Error Correcting Codes, RAID, ...

Dependability



- Fault: failure of a component
 - May or may not lead to system failure

Dependability Measures

- Reliability: mean time to failure (MTTF)
- Service interruption: mean time to repair (MTTR)
- Mean time between failures
 - $MTBF = MTTF + MTTR$
- Availability = $MTTF / (MTTF + MTTR)$
- Improving Availability
 - Increase MTTF: fault avoidance, fault tolerance, fault forecasting
 - Reduce MTTR: improved tools and processes for diagnosis and repair

The Hamming SEC Code

- Hamming distance
 - Number of bits that are different between two bit patterns
- Minimum distance = 2 provides single bit error detection
 - E.g. parity code
- Minimum distance = 3 provides single error correction, 2 bit error detection

Encoding SEC

- To calculate Hamming code:
 - Number bits from 1 on the left
 - All bit positions that are a power 2 are parity bits
 - Each parity bit checks certain data bits:

Bit position		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Encoded data bits		p1	p2	d1	p4	d2	d3	d4	p8	d5	d6	d7	d8
Parity bit coverage	p1	X		X		X		X		X		X	
	p2		X	X			X	X			X	X	
	p4				X	X	X	X					X
	p8								X	X	X	X	X

Decoding SEC

- Value of parity bits indicates which bits are in error
 - Use numbering from encoding procedure
 - E.g.
 - Parity bits = 0000 indicates no error
 - Parity bits = 1010 indicates bit 10 was flipped

SEC/DEC Code

- Add an additional parity bit for the whole word (p_n)
- Make Hamming distance = 4
- Decoding:
 - Let H = SEC parity bits
 - H even, p_n even, no error
 - H odd, p_n odd, correctable single bit error
 - H even, p_n odd, error in p_n bit
 - H odd, p_n even, double error occurred
- Note: ECC DRAM uses SEC/DEC with 8 bits protecting each 64 bits

Error Detection – Error Correction

- Memory data can get corrupted, due to things like:
 - Voltage spikes.
 - Cosmic rays.
- The goal in **error detection** is to come up with ways to tell if some data has been corrupted or not.
- The goal in **error correction** is to not only detect errors, but also be able to correct them.
- Both error detection and error correction work by attaching additional bits to each memory word.
- Fewer extra bits are needed for error detection, more for error correction.

Encoding, Decoding, Codewords

- Error detection and error correction work as follows:
- Encoding stage:
 - Break up original data into m -bit words.
 - Each m -bit original word is converted to an n -bit **codeword**.
- Decoding stage:
 - Break up encoded data into n -bit codewords.
 - By examining each n -bit codeword:
 - Deduce if an error has occurred.
 - Correct the error if possible.
 - Produce the original m -bit word.

Parity Bit

- Suppose that we have an m -bit word.
- Suppose we want a way to tell if a single error has occurred (i.e., a single bit has been corrupted).
 - No error detection/correction can catch an unlimited number of errors.
- Solution: represent each m -bit word using an $(m+1)$ -bit codeword.
 - The extra bit is called **parity bit**.
- Every time the word changes, the parity bit is set so as to make sure that the number of 1 bits is even.
 - This is just a convention, enforcing an odd number of 1 bits would also work, and is also used.

Parity Bits - Examples

- Size of original word: $m = 8$.

Original Word (8 bits)	Number of 1s in Original Word	Codeword (9 bits): Original Word + Parity Bit
01101101		
00110000		
11100001		
01011110		

Parity Bits - Examples

- Size of original word: $m = 8$.

Original Word (8 bits)	Number of 1s in Original Word	Codeword (9 bits): Original Word + Parity Bit
01101101	5	011011011
00110000	2	001100000
11100001	4	111000010
01011110	5	010111101

Parity Bit: Detecting A 1-Bit Error

- Suppose now that indeed the memory work has been corrupted in a single bit.
- How can we use the parity bit to detect that?

Parity Bit: Detecting A 1-Bit Error

- Suppose now that indeed the memory work has been corrupted in a single bit.
- How can we use the parity bit to detect that?
- How can a single bit be corrupted?

Parity Bit: Detecting A 1-Bit Error

- Suppose now that indeed the memory work has been corrupted in a single bit.
- How can we use the parity bit to detect that?
- How can a single bit be corrupted?
 - Either it was a 1 that turned to a 0.
 - Or it was a 0 that turned to a 1.
- Either way, the number of 1-bits either increases by 1 or decreases by 1, and **becomes odd**.
- The error detection code just has to check if the number of 1-bits is even.

Error Detection Example

- Size of original word: $m = 8$.
- Suppose that the error detection algorithm gets as input one of the bit patterns on the left column. What will be the output?

Input: Codeword (9 bits): Original Word + Parity Bit	Number of 1s	Error?
011001011		
001100000		
100001010		
010111110		

Error Detection Example

- Size of original word: $m = 8$.
- Suppose that the error detection algorithm gets as input one of the bit patterns on the left column. What will be the output?

Input: Original Word + Parity Bit (9 bits)	Number of 1s	Error?
011001011	5	yes
001100000	2	no
100001010	3	yes
010111110	6	no

Parity Bit and Multi-Bit Errors

- What if two bits get corrupted?
- The number of 1-bits can:
 - remain the same, or
 - increase by 2, or
 - decrease by 2.
- In all cases, the number of 1-bits remains even.
- The error detection algorithm will not catch this error.
- That is to be expected, a single parity bit is only good for detecting a single-bit error.

More General Methods

- Up to the previous slide, we discussed a very simple error detection method, namely **using a single parity bit**.
- We now move on to more general methods, that possibly detect and/or correct multiple errors.
 - For that, we need multiple extra bits.
- Key parameters:
 - m : the number of bits in the original memory word.
 - r : the number of extra (also called *redundant*) bits.
 - n : the total number of bits per codeword: $n = m + r$.
 - d : the number of errors we want to be able to detect or correct.

Legal and Illegal Codewords

- Each m -bit original word corresponds to **only one** n -bit codeword.
- A codeword is called **legal** if an original m -bit word corresponds to that codeword.
- A codeword is called **illegal** if **no** original m -bit word corresponds to that codeword.
- How many possible original words are there?
- How many possible codewords are there?
- How many **legal** codewords are there? In other words, how many codewords are possible to observe if there are no errors?

Legal and Illegal Codewords

- Each m -bit original word corresponds to **only one** n -bit codeword.
- A codeword is called **legal** if an original m -bit word corresponds to that codeword.
- A codeword is called **illegal** if **no** original m -bit word corresponds to that codeword.
- How many possible original words are there? 2^m .
- How many possible codewords are there? 2^n .
- How many **legal** codewords are there? In other words, how many codewords are possible to observe if there are no errors? 2^m .

Legal and Illegal Codewords

- How many possible original words are there? 2^m .
- How many possible codewords are there? 2^n .
- How many **legal** codewords are there? In other words, how many codewords are possible to observe if there are no errors? 2^m .
- Therefore, most $(2^n - 2^m)$ codewords are illegal, and only show up in the case of errors.
- The set of legal codewords is called a **code**.

The Hamming Distance

- Suppose we have two codewords A and B .
- Each codeword is an n -bit binary pattern.
- We define the distance between A and B to be the number of bit positions where A and B differ.
- This is called the **Hamming distance**.
- One way to compute the Hamming distance:
 - Let $C = \text{EXCLUSIVE OR}(A, B)$.
 - $\text{Hamming Distance}(A, B) = \text{number of 1-bits in } C$.
- Given a code (i.e., the set of legal codewords), we can find the pair of codewords with the smallest distance.
- We call this minimum distance the **distance of the code**.

Hamming Distance: Example

- What is the Hamming distance between these two patterns?

1 0 1 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0
0 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0

- How can we measure this distance?

Hamming Distance: Example

- What is the Hamming distance between these two patterns?

1 0 1 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0
0 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 1 0 1 0

- How can we measure this distance?
 - Find all positions where the two bit patterns differ.
 - Count all those positions.
- Answer: the Hamming distance in the example above is 3.

Example: 2-Bit Error Detection

- Size of original word: $m = 3$.
- Number of redundant bits: $r = 3$.
- Size of codeword: $n = 6$.
- Construction:
 - 1 parity bit for bits 1, 2.
 - 1 parity bit for bits 1, 3.
 - 1 parity bit for bits 2, 3.
- You can manually verify that you cannot find any two codewords with Hamming distance 2 (just need to manually check 28 pairs).
- This is a code with distance 3.
- Any 2-bit error can be detected.

Original Word	Codeword
000	000000
001	001011
010	010101
011	011110
100	100110
101	101101
110	110011
111	111000

Example: 2-Bit Error Detection

Original Word	Codeword
000	000000
001	001011
010	010101
011	011110
100	100110
101	101101
110	110011
111	111000

Input Codeword	Error?
001100	
101011	
110011	
011110	
111110	
101101	
010011	
011000	

- Suppose that the error detection algorithm takes as input bit patterns as shown on the right table.
- What will be the output? How is it determined?

Example: 2-Bit Error Detection

Original Word	Codeword
000	000000
001	001011
010	010101
011	011110
100	100110
101	101101
110	110011
111	111000

Input Codeword	Error?
001100	Yes
101011	Yes
110011	No
011110	No
111110	Yes
101101	No
010011	Yes
011000	Yes

- Suppose that the error detection algorithm takes as input bit patterns as shown on the right table.
- The output simply depends on whether the input codeword is a legal codeword, as listed on the left table.

Example: 1-Bit Error Correction

- Size of original word: $m = 3$.
- Number of redundant bits: $r = 3$.
- Size of codeword: $n = 6$.
- Construction:
 - 1 parity bit for bits 1, 2.
 - 1 parity bit for bits 1, 3.
 - 1 parity bit for bits 2, 3.
- You can manually verify that you cannot find any two codewords with Hamming distance 2 (just need to manually check 28 pairs).
- This is a code with distance 3.
- Any 1-bit error can be corrected.

Original Word	Codeword
000	000000
001	001011
010	010101
011	011110
100	100110
101	101101
110	110011
111	111000

Example: 1-Bit Error Correction

Original Word	Codeword
000	000000
001	001011
010	010101
011	011110
100	100110
101	101101
110	110011
111	111000

Input Codeword	Error?	Most Similar Codeword	Output (original word)
110101			
101000			
110011			
011110			
000010			
101101			
001111			
000110			

- Suppose that the error detection algorithm takes as input bit patterns as shown on the right table.
- What will be the output? How is it determined?

Example: 1-Bit Error Correction

Original Word	Codeword
000	000000
001	001011
010	010101
011	011110
100	100110
101	101101
110	110011
111	111000

Input Codeword	Error?	Most Similar Codeword	Output (original word)
110101	Yes	010101	010
101000	Yes	111000	111
110011	No	110011	110
011110	No	011110	011
000010	Yes	000000	000
101101	No	101101	101
001111	Yes	001011	001
000110	Yes	100110	100

- The error detection algorithm:
 - Finds the legal codeword that is most similar to the input.
 - If that legal codeword is not equal to the input, there was an error!
 - Outputs the original word that corresponds to that legal codeword.

Example: 1-Bit Error Correction

Original Word	Codeword
000	000000
001	001011
010	010101
011	011110
100	100110
101	101101
110	110011
111	111000

Input Codeword	Error?	Most Similar Codewords	Output (original word)
001100			

- What happens in this case?

Example: 1-Bit Error Correction

Original Word	Codeword
000	000000
001	001011
010	010101
011	011110
100	100110
101	101101
110	110011
111	111000

Input Codeword	Error?	Most Similar Codewords	Output (original word)
001100	Yes	000000 011110 101101	More than 1 bit corrupted, cannot correct!

- No legal codeword is within distance 1 of the input codeword.
- 3 legal codewords are within distance 2 of the input codeword.
- More than 1 bit have been corrupted, the error has been detected, but cannot be corrected.

Significance of Code Distances

- To detect up to d single-bit errors, we need a code with Hamming distance at least $d+1$. Why?
- When does an error fail to get detected?

Significance of Code Distances

- To detect up to d single-bit errors, we need a code with Hamming distance at least $d+1$. Why?
- When does an error fail to get detected?
 - When, due to bad luck, the error changes a legal codeword to another legal codeword.
- With a code of distance $d+1$, what is the smallest number of single-bit errors that can change a legal codeword to another legal codeword?

Significance of Code Distances

- To detect up to d single-bit errors, we need a code with Hamming distance at least $d+1$. Why?
- When does an error fail to get detected?
 - When, due to bad luck, the error changes a legal codeword to another legal codeword.
- With a code of distance $d+1$, what is the smallest number of single-bit errors that can change a legal codeword to another legal codeword?
 - $d+1$.
- Thus, d or fewer single-bit errors are guaranteed to produce an illegal codeword, and thus will be detected.

Correcting d Single-Bit Errors

- To correct d or fewer single-bit errors, we need a code of distance at least $2d + 1$. Why?

Correcting d Single-Bit Errors

- To correct d or fewer single-bit errors, we need a code of distance at least $2d + 1$. Why?
- What would be a good algorithm to use for error correction, if we have a code of distance $2d + 1$?
- Input: n -bit codeword (may be corrupted or not).
- Output: n -bit corrected codeword.
 - If no error has occurred, output = input.
- Steps:

Correcting d Single-Bit Errors

- To correct d or fewer single-bit errors, we need a code of distance at least $2d + 1$. Why?
- What would be a good algorithm to use for error correction, if we have a code of distance $2d + 1$?
- Input: n -bit codeword (may be corrupted or not).
- Output: n -bit corrected codeword.
 - Comment: If no error has occurred, output = input.
- Steps:
 - Find, among the 2^m legal codewords, the most similar to the input.
 - Return that most similar codeword as output.

Correcting d Single-Bit Errors

- Input: n -bit codeword (may be corrupted or not).
- Output: n -bit corrected codeword.
- Error correction algorithm:
 - Find, among the 2^m legal codewords, the most similar to the input.
 - Return that most similar codeword as output.
- If the distance of the code is $2d+1$, why would this algorithm correct up to d single-bit errors?

Correcting d Single-Bit Errors

- Input: n -bit codeword (may be corrupted or not).
- Output: n -bit corrected codeword.
- Error correction algorithm:
 - Find, among the 2^m legal codewords, the most similar to the input.
 - Return that most similar codeword as output.
- If the distance of the code is $2d+1$, why would this algorithm correct up to d single-bit errors?
- Suppose we have a legal codeword A , that gets d or fewer single-bit errors, and becomes codeword B .
- What is the most similar legal codeword to B ?

Correcting d Single-Bit Errors

- Input: n -bit codeword (may be corrupted or not).
- Output: n -bit corrected codeword.
- Error correction algorithm:
 - Find, among the 2^m legal codewords, the most similar to the input.
 - Return that most similar codeword as output.
- If the distance of the code is $2d+1$, why would this algorithm correct up to d single-bit errors?
- Suppose we have a legal codeword A , that gets d or fewer single-bit errors, and becomes codeword B .
- What is the most similar legal codeword to B ?
- It has to be A .
 - The distance from B to A is at most ???.
 - The distance from B to any other legal codeword is at least ???.

Correcting d Single-Bit Errors

- Input: n -bit codeword (may be corrupted or not).
- Output: n -bit corrected codeword.
- Error correction algorithm:
 - Find, among the 2^m legal codewords, the most similar to the input.
 - Return that most similar codeword as output.
- If the distance of the code is $2d+1$, why would this algorithm correct up to d single-bit errors?
- Suppose we have a legal codeword A , that gets d or fewer single-bit errors, and becomes codeword B .
- What is the most similar legal codeword to B ?
- It has to be A .
 - The distance from B to A is at most d .
 - The distance from B to any other legal codeword is at least $d+1$.

Correcting a Single-Bit Error

- The previous approaches are not **constructive**.
- We didn't say anywhere:

Correcting a Single-Bit Error

- The previous approaches are not **constructive**.
- We didn't say anywhere:
 - How many extra bits we need to obtain a $d+1$ distance code or a $2d+1$ distance code.
 - How to actually define the codewords for such a code.
- Now we will explicitly define a method for correcting a single-bit error.

Correcting a Single-Bit Error

- Suppose that A is a legal n -bit codeword.
- Suppose that now A gets a single-bit-error, and becomes B .
- Given A , how many possible values are there for B ?
 - n , one for every possible location of the bit that changed.
- Thus, to be able to correct single-bit errors, there must be at least $n+1$ codewords (legal or illegal) that the error correction algorithm will map to codeword A :
 - A itself, and the n codewords that differ from A by a single bit.
- We have 2^m legal codewords, and we need at least $n+1$ codewords for each legal codeword, thus we need at least $(n+1)2^m$ codewords.

Correcting a Single-Bit Error

- Thus, we have two equations, that we can solve:
 - $(n+1) 2^m \leq 2^n$.
 - $n = m + r$.
- From the above equations, given m (the number of bits in the original memory word), we obtain:
 - a lower bound for r (the number of extra bits we need to add to each word).
 - a lower bound for n (the number of bits in each codeword).

Table of Bits Needed

Word size	Check bits	Total size	Percent overhead
8	4	12	50
16	5	21	31
32	6	38	19
64	7	71	11
128	8	136	6
256	9	265	4
512	10	522	2

Number of check bits for a code that can correct a single error.

Hamming's Algorithm

- Hamming's Algorithm can correct a single-bit error.
- Suppose we have a 16-bit word.
 - Based on the previous equations (and table), we need 5 extra bits, for a total of 21 bits.
- Let's number these 21 bits as bit 1, bit 2, ..., bit 21.
 - We break from our usual convention, where numbering starts at 0.
- The five parity bits are placed at positions 1, 2, 4, 8, 16.
 - Positions corresponding to powers of 2.
- Each parity bit will check some (but not all) of the 21 bits.

Hamming's Algorithm

- The five parity bits are placed at positions *1, 2, 4, 8, 16*.
- Each parity bit will check some (but not all) of the 21 bits.
- Some bits may be checked by multiple parity bits.
- To determine which parity bits will check the bit at position *p*, we:
 - write *p* in binary. We need 5 digits. We get $d_5 d_4 d_3 d_2 d_1$.
 - For each d_i , if $d_i = 1$ then position *p* is checked by the parity bit at position 2^{i-1} .
- Example: position *18* is written in binary as *10010*.
- Since $d_5 = 1$, bit *18* is checked by parity bit *16* ($16 = 2^4$).
- Since $d_2 = 1$, bit *18* is checked by parity bit *2* ($2 = 2^1$).

Assigning Bits to Parity Bits

- By following the previous process for every single bit, we arrive at the following:
 - Parity bit 1 checks bits 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21.
 - Parity bit 2 checks bits 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 19.
 - Parity bit 4 checks bits 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21.
 - Parity bit 8 checks bits 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.
 - Parity bit 16 checks bits 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21.
- Thus, each parity bit is set to 0 or 1, so as to ensure that the total number of 1-bits (among the bits that this parity bit checks) is even.


Correcting an Error

- Suppose now that a single-bit error has occurred.
- Will that be detected?
- Yes. One or more of the parity bits will be wrong.
 - What does this mean that a parity bit is wrong? It means that, among the bits that this parity bit checks, the total number of 1-bits is odd.
- How do we figure out the position of the error?
- We just need to add the positions of the parity bits that are wrong.

Proof That This Works?

- It is a bit complicated to get an elegant proof that Hamming's algorithm works.
- We can prove it by case-by-case examination.
- Pick any subset of the parity bits to be wrong. You can check manually that:
 - An error in the bit computed by Hamming's algorithm will lead to exactly that subset of parity bits to be wrong.
 - An error in any other bit will lead to a different subset of parity bits being wrong.

An Example Codeword



Construction of the Hamming code for the memory word 1111000010101110 by adding 5 check bits to the 16 data bits.

From Word to Codeword: Example 1

Position:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Value			1		1	1	1		1	0	0	0	1	0	1		0	1	1	1	0
Bit 1 checks	*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*
Bit 2 checks		*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*		
Bit 4 checks				*	*	*	*					*	*	*	*					*	*
Bit 8 checks								*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*						
Bit 16 checks																*	*	*	*	*	*

- Bit 1: number of 1s in original word = ?? Bit 1 value = ??
- Bit 2: number of 1s in original word = ?? Bit 1 value = ??
- Bit 4: number of 1s in original word = ?? Bit 1 value = ??
- Bit 8: number of 1s in original word = ?? Bit 1 value = ??
- Bit 16: number of 1s in original word = ?? Bit 1 value = ??

From Word to Codeword: Example 1

Position:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Value	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0
Bit 1 checks	*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*
Bit 2 checks		*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*		
Bit 4 checks				*	*	*	*					*	*	*	*					*	*
Bit 8 checks								*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*						
Bit 16 checks																*	*	*	*	*	*

- Bit 1: number of 1s in original word = 7. Bit 1 value = 1.
- Bit 2: number of 1s in original word = 6. Bit 2 value = 0.
- Bit 4: number of 1s in original word = 6. Bit 4 value = 0.
- Bit 8: number of 1s in original word = 3. Bit 8 value = 1.
- Bit 16: number of 1s in original word = 3. Bit 16 value = 1.

From Word to Codeword: Example 2

Position:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Value			0		1	0	1		0	1	1	1	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	1
Bit 1 checks	*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*
Bit 2 checks		*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*		
Bit 4 checks				*	*	*	*					*	*	*	*					*	*
Bit 8 checks								*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*						
Bit 16 checks																*	*	*	*	*	*

- Bit 1: number of 1s in original word = ?? Bit 1 value = ??
- Bit 2: number of 1s in original word = ?? Bit 1 value = ??
- Bit 4: number of 1s in original word = ?? Bit 1 value = ??
- Bit 8: number of 1s in original word = ?? Bit 1 value = ??
- Bit 16: number of 1s in original word = ?? Bit 1 value = ??

From Word to Codeword: Example 2

Position:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Value	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Bit 1 checks	*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*
Bit 2 checks		*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*		
Bit 4 checks				*	*	*	*					*	*	*	*					*	*
Bit 8 checks								*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*						
Bit 16 checks																*	*	*	*	*	*

- Bit 1: number of 1s in original word = 5. Bit 1 value = 1.
- Bit 2: number of 1s in original word = 3. Bit 2 value = 1.
- Bit 4: number of 1s in original word = 4. Bit 4 value = 0.
- Bit 8: number of 1s in original word = 3. Bit 8 value = 1.
- Bit 16: number of 1s in original word = 2. Bit 16 value = 0.

Error Correction: Example 1

Position:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Value	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1
Bit 1 checks	*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*
Bit 2 checks		*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*		
Bit 4 checks				*	*	*	*					*	*	*	*					*	*
Bit 8 checks								*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*						
Bit 16 checks																*	*	*	*	*	*

- Bit 1: number of 1s in codeword = ??
- Bit 2: number of 1s in codeword = ??
- Bit 4: number of 1s in codeword = ??
- Bit 8: number of 1s in codeword = ??
- Bit 16: number of 1s in codeword = ??

Error Correction: Example 1

Position:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Value	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1
Bit 1 checks	*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*
Bit 2 checks		*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*		
Bit 4 checks				*	*	*	*					*	*	*	*					*	*
Bit 8 checks								*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*						
Bit 16 checks																*	*	*	*	*	*

- Bit 1: number of 1s in codeword = 6. OK
- Bit 2: number of 1s in codeword = 5. ERROR
- Bit 4: number of 1s in codeword = 4. OK
- Bit 8: number of 1s in codeword = 2. OK
- Bit 16: number of 1s in codeword = 5. ERROR

Position of error:

Error Correction: Example 1

Position:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Value	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1
Bit 1 checks	*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*
Bit 2 checks		*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*		
Bit 4 checks				*	*	*	*					*	*	*	*					*	*
Bit 8 checks								*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*						
Bit 16 checks																*	*	*	*	*	*

- Bit 1: number of 1s in codeword = 6. OK
- Bit 2: number of 1s in codeword = 5. ERROR
- Bit 4: number of 1s in codeword = 4. OK
- Bit 8: number of 1s in codeword = 2. OK
- Bit 16: number of 1s in codeword = 5. ERROR

Position of error:
 $16+2 = 18$

Error Correction: Example 2

Position:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Value	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Bit 1 checks	*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*
Bit 2 checks		*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*		
Bit 4 checks				*	*	*	*					*	*	*	*					*	*
Bit 8 checks								*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*						
Bit 16 checks																*	*	*	*	*	*

- Bit 1: number of 1s in codeword = ??
- Bit 2: number of 1s in codeword = ??
- Bit 4: number of 1s in codeword = ??
- Bit 8: number of 1s in codeword = ??
- Bit 16: number of 1s in codeword = ??

Error Correction: Example 2

Position:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Value	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Bit 1 checks	*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*
Bit 2 checks		*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*		
Bit 4 checks				*	*	*	*					*	*	*	*					*	*
Bit 8 checks								*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*						
Bit 16 checks																*	*	*	*	*	*

- Bit 1: number of 1s in codeword = 6. OK
- Bit 2: number of 1s in codeword = 2. OK
- Bit 4: number of 1s in codeword = 7. ERROR
- Bit 8: number of 1s in codeword = 4. OK
- Bit 16: number of 1s in codeword = 2. OK

Position of error:

Error Correction: Example 2

Position:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Value	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Bit 1 checks	*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*		*
Bit 2 checks		*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*			*	*		
Bit 4 checks				*	*	*	*					*	*	*	*					*	*
Bit 8 checks								*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*						
Bit 16 checks																*	*	*	*	*	*

- Bit 1: number of 1s in codeword = 6. OK
- Bit 2: number of 1s in codeword = 2. OK
- Bit 4: number of 1s in codeword = 7. ERROR
- Bit 8: number of 1s in codeword = 4. OK
- Bit 16: number of 1s in codeword = 2. OK

Position of error:

Bit 4

Summary

- Memory hierarchy
 - Caches
 - Main memory
 - Disk / storage
 - Virtual memory
 - Dependable memory: error-correcting codes


Software Optimization via Blocking

- Goal: maximize accesses to data before it is replaced
- Consider inner loops of DGEMM:

```
for (int j = 0; j < n; ++j)
{
    double cij = C[i+j*n];
    for( int k = 0; k < n; k++ )
        cij += A[i+k*n] * B[k+j*n];
    C[i+j*n] = cij;
}
```

DGEMM Access Pattern


- C, A, and B arrays




Cache Blocked DGEMM

```
1 #define BLOCKSIZE 32
2 void do_block (int n, int si, int sj, int sk, double *A, double
3 *B, double *C)
4 {
5   for (int i = si; i < si+BLOCKSIZE; ++i)
6     for (int j = sj; j < sj+BLOCKSIZE; ++j)
7       {
8         double cij = C[i+j*n];/* cij = C[i][j] */
9         for( int k = sk; k < sk+BLOCKSIZE; k++ )
10          cij += A[i+k*n] * B[k+j*n];/* cij+=A[i][k]*B[k][j] */
11        C[i+j*n] = cij;/* C[i][j] = cij */
12      }
13 }
14 void dgemm (int n, double* A, double* B, double* C)
15 {
16   for ( int sj = 0; sj < n; sj += BLOCKSIZE )
17     for ( int si = 0; si < n; si += BLOCKSIZE )
18       for ( int sk = 0; sk < n; sk += BLOCKSIZE )
19         do_block(n, si, sj, sk, A, B, C);
20 }
```


Blocked DGEMM Access Pattern




■ 32x32 ■ 160x160 ■ 480x480 ■ 960x960



CDs



CDs




- **Mode 1**

- 16 bytes preamble, 2048 bytes data, 288 bytes error-correcting code
- Single Speed CD-ROM: 75 sectors/sec, so data rate: $75 \times 2048 = 153,600$ bytes/sec
- 74 minutes audio CD: Capacity: $74 \times 60 \times 153,600 = 681,984,000$ bytes
 ~ 650 MB

- **Mode 2**


- 2336 bytes data for a sector, $75 \times 2336 = 175,200$ bytes/sec

CD-R




DVDs

- Single-sided, single-layer (4.7 GB)
- Single-sided, dual-layer (8.5 GB)
- Double-sided, single-layer (9.4 GB)
- Double-sided, dual-layer (17 GB)



Storing Images



- Disks in this family include:
 - CDs, DVDs, Blu-ray disks.
- The basic technology is similar, but improvements have led to higher capacities and speeds.
- Optical disks are much slower than magnetic drives.
- These disks are a cheap option for write-once purposes.
 - Great for mass distribution of data (software, music, movies).
- CD capacity: 650-700MB.
 - Minimum data rate: 150KB/sec.
- DVD capacity: 4.7GB to 17GB.
 - Minimum data rate: 1.4MB/sec.
- Blu-ray capacity: 25GB-50GB.
 - Minimum data rate: 4.5MB/sec.

Optical Disk Capacities

- CD capacity: 650-700MB.
 - Minimum data rate: 150KB/sec.
- DVD capacity: 4.7GB to 17GB.
 - Minimum data rate: 1.4MB/sec.
 - Single-sided, single-layer: 4.7GB.
 - Single-sided, dual-layer: 8.5GB.
 - Double-sided, single-layer: 9.4GB.
 - Double-sided, dual-layer: 17GB.
- Blu-ray capacity: 25GB-50GB.
 - Minimum data rate: 4.5MB/sec.
 - Single-sided: 25GB.
 - Double-sided: 50GB.

Magnetic Disks

- Consists of one or more platters with magnetizable coating
- Disk head containing induction coil floats just over the surface
- When a positive or negative current passes through head, it magnetizes the surface just beneath the head, aligning the magnetic particles face right or left, depending on the polarity of the drive current
- When head passes over a magnetized area, a positive or negative current is induced in the head, making it possible to read back the previously stored bits
- Track
 - Circular sequence of bits written as disk makes complete rotation
 - Sector: Each track is divided into some sector with fixed length

Classical Hard Drives: Magnetic Disks


- A magnetic disk is a disk, that spins very fast.
 - Typical rotation speed: 5400, 7200, 10800 RPMs.
 - RPMs: rotations per minute.
 - These translate to 90, 120, 180 rotations per second.
- The disk is divided into rings, that are called **tracks**.
- Data is read by the **disk head**.
 - The head is placed at a specific radius from the disk center.
 - That radius corresponds to a specific track.
 - As the disk spins, the head reads data from that track.



- A solid-state drive (SSD) is NOT a spinning disk. It is just cheap memory.
- Compared to hard drives, SSDs have two to three times faster speeds, and ~100nsec access time.
- Because SSDs have no mechanical parts, they are well-suited for mobile computers, where motion can interfere with the disk head accessing data.
- Disadvantage #1: price.
 - Magnetic disks: pennies/gigabyte.
 - SSDs: one to three dollars/gigabyte.
- Disadvantage #2: failure rate.
 - A bit can be written about 100,000 times, then it fails.

Flash Storage

- Nonvolatile semiconductor storage
 - 100× – 1000× faster than disk
 - Smaller, lower power, more robust
 - But more \$/GB (between disk and DRAM)




Flash Types

- NOR flash: bit cell like a NOR gate
 - Random read/write access
 - Used for instruction memory in embedded systems
- NAND flash: bit cell like a NAND gate
 - Denser (bits/area), but block-at-a-time access
 - Cheaper per GB
 - Used for USB keys, media storage, ...
- Flash bits wears out after 1000's of accesses
 - Not suitable for direct RAM or disk replacement
 - Wear leveling: remap data to less used blocks

Disk Storage


- Nonvolatile, rotating magnetic storage



Disk Tracks and Sectors

- A track can be $0.2\mu\text{m}$ wide.
 - We can have 50,000 tracks per cm of radius.
 - About 125,000 tracks per inch of radius.
- Each track is divided into fixed-length **sectors**.
 - Typical sector size: 512 bytes.
- Each sector is preceded by a **preamble**. This allows the head to be synchronized before reading or writing.
- In the sector, following the data, there is an error-correcting code.
- Between two sectors there is a small **intersector gap**.

Visualizing a Disk Track



A portion of a disk track. Two sectors are illustrated.

Disk Sectors and Access

- Each sector records
 - Sector ID
 - Data (512 bytes, 4096 bytes proposed)
 - Error correcting code (ECC)
 - Used to hide defects and recording errors
 - Synchronization fields and gaps
- Access to a sector involves
 - Queuing delay if other accesses are pending
 - Seek: move the heads
 - Rotational latency
 - Data transfer
 - Controller overhead


Disk Access Example

- Given
 - 512B sector, 15,000rpm, 4ms average seek time, 100MB/s transfer rate, 0.2ms controller overhead, idle disk
- Average read time
 - 4ms seek time
 - + $\frac{1}{2} / (15,000/60) = 2\text{ms}$ rotational latency
 - + $512 / 100\text{MB/s} = 0.005\text{ms}$ transfer time
 - + 0.2ms controller delay
 - = 6.2ms
- If actual average seek time is 1ms
 - Average read time = 3.2ms

Disk Performance Issues

- Manufacturers quote average seek time
 - Based on all possible seeks
 - Locality and OS scheduling lead to smaller actual average seek times
- Smart disk controller allocate physical sectors on disk
 - Present logical sector interface to host
 - SCSI, ATA, SATA
- Disk drives include caches
 - Prefetch sectors in anticipation of access
 - Avoid seek and rotational delay

Magnetic Disk Sectors




Measuring Disk Capacity

- Disk capacity is often advertized in unformatted state.
- However, **formatting** takes away some of this capacity.
 - Formatting creates preambles, error-correcting codes, and gaps.
- The formatted capacity is typically about 15% lower than unformatted capacity.

Multiple Platters

- A typical hard drive unit contains multiple platters, i.e., multiple actual disks.
- These platters are stacked vertically (see figure).
- Each platter stores information on both surfaces.
- There is a separate arm and head for each surface.

Magnetic Disk Platters



Cylinders

- The set of tracks corresponding to a specific radial position is called a **cylinder**.
- Each track in a cylinder is read by a different head.



- Suppose we want to get some data from the disk.
- First, the head must be placed on the right track (i.e., at the right radial distance).
 - This is called **seek**.
 - Average seek times are in the 5-10 msec range.
- Then, the head waits for the disk to rotate, so that it gets to the right sector.
 - Given that disks rotate at 5400-10800 RPMs, this incurs an average wait of 3-6 msec. This is called **rotational latency**.
- Then, the data is read. A typical rate for this stage is 150MB/sec.
 - So, a 512-byte sector can be read in $\sim 3.5 \mu\text{sec}$.

Measures of Disk Speed

- **Maximum Burst Rate**: the rate (number of bytes per sec) at which the head reads a sector, **once the head has started seeing the first data bit**.
 - This excludes seeks, rotational latencies, going through preambles, error-correcting codes, intersector gaps.
- **Sustained Rate**: the actual average rate of reading data over several seconds, that includes all the above factors (seeks, rotational latencies, etc.).

Worst Case Speed

- Rarely advertised, but VERY IMPORTANT to be aware of if your software accesses the hard drive: **the worst case speed.**
- What scenario gives us the worst case?

Worst Case Speed

- Rarely advertised, but VERY IMPORTANT to be aware of if your software accesses the hard drive: **the worst case speed.**
- What scenario gives us the worst case?
 - Read random positions, one byte at a time.
 - To read each byte, we must perform a seek, wait for the rotational latency, go through the sector preamble, etc.
- If this whole process takes about 10 msec (which may be a bit optimistic), we can only read ???/sec?

Worst Case Speed

- Rarely advertised, but VERY IMPORTANT to be aware of if your software accesses the hard drive: **the worst case speed.**
- What scenario gives us the worst case?
 - Read random positions, one byte at a time.
 - To read each byte, we must perform a seek, wait for the rotational latency, go through the sector preamble, etc.
- If this whole process takes about 10 msec (which may be a bit optimistic), we can only read 100 bytes/sec.
 - More than a million times slower than the maximum burst rate.

Worst Case Speed

- Reading a lot of non-contiguous small chunks of data kills magnetic disk performance.
- When your programs access disks a lot, it is important to understand how disk data are read, to avoid this type of pitfall.

Disk Controller

- The disk controller is a chip that controls the drive.
 - Some controllers contain a full CPU.
- Controller tasks:
 - Execute commands coming from the software, such as:
 - READ
 - WRITE
 - FORMAT (writing all the preambles)
 - Control the arm motion.
 - Detect and correct errors.
 - Buffer multiple sectors.
 - Cache sectors read for potential future use.
 - Remap bad sectors.

IDE and SCSI Drives

- IDE and SCSI drives are the two most common types of hard drives on the market.
- Just be aware that:
 - IDE drives are cheaper and slower.
 - Newer IDE drives are also called serial ATA or SATA.
 - SCSI drives are more expensive and faster.
- Most inexpensive computers use IDE drives.

- RAID stands for *Redundant Array of Inexpensive Disks*.
- RAID arrays are simply sets of disks, that are visible as a single unit by the computer.
 - Instead of a single drive accessible via a drive controller, the whole RAID is accessible via a RAID controller.
 - Since a RAID can look as a single drive, software accessing disks does not need to be modified to access a RAID.
- Depending on their type (we will see several types), RAIDs accomplish one (or both) of the following:
 - Speed up performance.
 - Tolerate failures of entire drive units.

RAID for Faster Speed

- Disk performance has not improved as dramatically as CPU performance.
- In the 1970s, average seek times on minicomputer disks were 50-100 msec.
- Now they have improved to 5-10 msec.
- The slow gains in performance have motivated people to look into ways to gain speed via parallel processing.

RAID-0

- RAID level 0: Improves speed via **striping**.
 - When a write request comes in, data is broken into strips.
 - Each strip is written to a different drive, in round-robin fashion.
 - Thus, multiple strips are written in parallel, effectively leading to faster speed, compared to using a single drive.
- Effect: most files are stored in a distributed manner: with different pieces of them stored on each drive of the RAID.
- When reading a file, the different pieces (strips) are read again in parallel, from all drives.

RAID-0 Example

- Suppose we have a RAID-0 system with 8 disks.
- What is the best case scenario, in which performance will be the best, compared to a single disk?
- Compared to a single disk, in the **best** case:
 - The write performance of RAID-0 is: ???
 - The read performance of RAID-0 is: ???
- What is the best case scenario, in which performance will be the best, compared to a single disk?
- Compared to a single disk, in the **worst** case:
 - The write performance of RAID-0 is: ???
 - The read performance of RAID-0 is: ???

RAID-0 Example

- Suppose we have a RAID-0 system with 8 disks.
- What is the best case scenario, in which performance will be the best, compared to a single disk?
 - Reading/writing large chunks of data, so striping can be exploited.
- Compared to a single disk, in the **best** case:
 - The write performance of RAID-0 is: 8 times faster than a single disk.
 - The read performance of RAID-0 is: 8 times faster than a single disk.
- What is the best case scenario, in which performance will be the best, compared to a single disk?
 - Reading/writing many small, unrelated chunks of data (e.g., a single byte at a time). Then, striping cannot be used.
- Compared to a single disk, in the **worst** case:
 - The write performance of RAID-0 is: the same as that of a single disk.
 - The read performance of RAID-0 is: the same as that of a single disk.

RAID-0: Pros and Cons

- RAID-0 works the best for large read/write requests.
- RAID-0 speed deteriorates into that of a single drive if the software asks for data in chunks of one strip (or less) at a time.
- How about reliability? A RAID-0 is **less** reliable, and more prone to failure than that of a single drive.
 - Suppose we have a RAID with four drives.
 - Each drive has a mean time to failure of 20,000 hours.
 - Then, the RAID has a mean time to failure that is ??? hours?

RAID-0: Pros and Cons

- RAID-0 works the best for large read/write requests.
- RAID-0 speed deteriorates into that of a single drive if the software asks for data in chunks of one strip (or less) at a time.
- How about reliability? A RAID-0 is **less** reliable, and more prone to failure than that of a single drive.
 - Suppose we have a RAID with four drives.
 - Each drive has a mean time to failure of 20,000 hours.
 - Then, the RAID has a mean time to failure that is only 5000 hours.
- RAID-0 is not a "true" RAID, no drive is redundant.

RAID-1

- In RAID-1, we need to have an even number of drives.
- For each drive, there is an identical copy.
- When we write data, we write it to both drives.
- When we read data, we read from either of the drives.
- NO STRIPING IS USED.
- Compared to a single disk:
 - The write performance is:
 - The read performance is:
 - Reliability is:

RAID-1

- In RAID-1, we need to have an even number of drives.
- For each drive, there is an identical copy.
- When we write data, we write it to both drives.
- When we read data, we read from either of the drives.
- NO STRIPING IS USED.
- Compared to a single disk:
 - The write performance is: twice as slow.
 - The read performance is: the same.
 - Reliability is: far better, drive failure is not catastrophic.

The Need for RAID-5.

- RAID-0: great for performance, bad for reliability.
 - striping, but no redundant data.
- RAID-1: bad for performance, great for reliability.
 - redundant data, no striping
- RAID-2, RAID-3, RAID-4: have problems of their own.
 - You can read about them in the textbook if you are curious, but they are not very popular.
- RAID-5: great for performance, great for reliability.
 - both redundant data and striping.


RAID-5

- Data is striped for writing.
- If we have N disks, we can process $N-1$ data strips in parallel.
- For every $N-1$ data strips, we create an N th strip, called **parity strip**.
 - The k -th bit in the parity strip ensures that there is an even number of 1-bits in position k in all N strips.
- If any strip fails, its data can be recovered from the other $N-1$ strips.
- This way, the contents of an entire disk can be recovered.

- Suppose we have a RAID-5 system with 8 disks.
- Compared to a single disk, in the **best** case:
 - The write performance of RAID-5 is: ???
 - The read performance of RAID-5 is: ???
- Compared to a single disk, in the **worst** case:
 - The write performance of RAID-5 is: ???
 - The read performance of RAID-5 is: ???




- Suppose we have a RAID-5 system with 8 disks.
- Compared to a single disk, in the **best** case:
 - The write performance of RAID-5 is: 7 times faster than a single disk. (writes non-parity data on 7 disks simultaneously).
 - The read performance of RAID-5 is: 7 times faster than a single disk. (reads non-parity data on 7 disks simultaneously).
- Compared to a single disk, in the **worst** case:
 - The write performance of RAID-5 is: the same as that of a single disk.
 - The read performance of RAID-5 is: the same as that of a single disk.
 - Why? Because striping is not useful when reading/writing one byte at a time.

RAID-0, RAID-1, RAID-2



RAID levels 0 through 5. Backup and parity drives are shown shaded.

RAID-3, RAID-4, RAID-5



RAID levels 0 through 5. Backup and parity drives are shown shaded.