**Exercise 1 (Clustering)** Generate partitions for the graph in Fig. 1 by *hierarchical clustering*. The edge weights in Fig. 1 denote the closeness between the objects. For the computation of the closeness between hierarchical objects use

1. the average value
2. the minimum

![Figure 1: Objects and initial closeness values](image)

**Exercise 2 (Closeness Function)** The nodes of the data flow graph shown in Fig. 2 represent arithmetic operations. The edges are labeled with the bit widths of the required data types. The following closeness function is given:

\[
\text{Closeness}(o_i, o_j) = \frac{\text{Conn}(o_i, o_j)}{\text{TotalConn}(o_i, o_j)} + \left( \frac{\text{FU}_{\text{cost}}(o_i) + \text{FU}_{\text{cost}}(o_j) - \text{FUGROUP}_{\text{cost}}(o_i, o_j)}{\text{FUGROUP}_{\text{cost}}(o_i, o_j)} \right)
\]

The different terms in this function have the following meanings:

- \(\text{Conn}(o_i, o_j)\): the number of common wires between objects \(o_i\) and \(o_j\).
- \(\text{TotalConn}(o_i, o_j)\): the sum of all wires that connect to objects \(o_i\) and \(o_j\). Common wires are counted twice - once for each object.
- \(\text{FU}_{\text{cost}}(o_i)\): the cost of the functional unit that implements \(o_i\).
- \(\text{FUGROUP}_{\text{cost}}(o_i, o_j)\): the cost of the minimal number of functional units that are required to execute objects \(o_i\) and \(o_j\). (For example, should both \(o_i\) and \(o_j\) be additions, they would be assigned to one functional unit of type adder.)
Compute the closeness values for all pairs of objects in Fig. 2 according to the given closeness function. The cost of an adder and the cost of a subtractor are 1. Define a suitable closeness function for clustering hierarchical objects based on the function given above. Cluster the graph until you receive a bi-partitioning.

Exercise 3 (HW/SW Partitioning) Fig. 3 shows the pseudo code of a greedy algorithm for HW/SW partitioning. The algorithm starts with a partition where all objects are realized in hardware. Then, objects are migrated to software as long as the performance requirement is satisfied (function $SatisfiesPerformance(P)$) and the cost of the new partitioning is lower (function $f$). If an object is migrated, the algorithm also tries to migrate all successor nodes (function $Successors$).

- Apply the algorithm to the sequence graph shown in Fig. 4. The function $SatisfiesPerformance(P)$ should return $\text{TRUE}$ if $P$ satisfies the latency bound $\bar{L} = 7$. To determine the latency of a partitioning, you have to construct a valid schedule. The execution times of start- and end nodes of the sequence graph are 0, all other node execution times are given in Fig. 4, split into HW ($d_{HW}$) and SW ($d_{SW}$). For a communication between HW and SW, a delay of 0.5 per edge has to be accounted for. For HW nodes there are no resource constraints, i.e., all ready nodes can be executed in parallel. The SW nodes have to share one processor. The function $f$ determines the cost. For a SW node the cost is 0, and for a HW node the cost is 1.
\( P = \{\{\}, O\}; /* all in HW */ \)

**PROCEDURE PARTITIONING**

REPEAT
\( P_{old} = P; \)
FORALL \( o_i \in HW \)
AttemptMove(\( P, o_i \));
ENDFOR
UNTIL (\( P == P_{old} \))
END PROCEDURE

**PROCEDURE AttemptMove(\( P, o_x \))**

IF SatisfiesPerformance(Move(\( P, o_x \))) AND
\( (f(Move(P, o_x)) \leq f(P)) \)
\( P = Move(P, o_x); \)
FORALL \( (o_y \in Successors(o_x)) \)
AttemptMove(\( P, o_y \));
ENDFOR
ENDIF
END PROCEDURE

Figure 3: Pseudo code for a greedy HW/SW partitioner

Figure 4: Sequence Graph