

FPGA-based Hybrid Memory Emulation System

Fei Wen, Mian Qin, Paul V. Gratz, A.L.Narasimha Reddy
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843
{fwen, celery1124, pgratz, reddy}@tamu.edu

Abstract—Hybrid memory systems, comprised of emerging non-volatile memory (NVM) and DRAM, have been proposed to address the growing memory demand of applications. Emerging NVM technologies, such as phase-change memories (PCM), memristor, and 3D XPoint, have higher capacity density, minimal static power consumption and lower cost per GB. However, NVM has longer access latency and limited write endurance as opposed to DRAM. The different characteristics of two memory classes point towards the design of hybrid memory systems containing multiple classes of main memory.

In the iterative and incremental development of new architectures, the timeliness of simulation completion is critical to project progression. Hence, a highly efficient simulation method is needed to evaluate the performance of different hybrid memory system designs. Design exploration for hybrid memory systems is challenging, because it requires emulation of the full system stack, including the OS, memory controller, and interconnect. Moreover, benchmark applications for memory performance test typically have much larger working sets, thus taking even longer simulation warm-up period.

In this paper, we propose a FPGA-based hybrid memory system emulation platform. We target at the mobile computing system, which is sensitive to energy consumption and is likely to adopt NVM for its power efficiency. Here, because the focus of our platform is on the design of the hybrid memory system, we leverage the on-board hard IP ARM processors to both improve simulation performance while improving accuracy of the results. Thus, users can implement their data placement/migration policies with the FPGA logic elements and evaluate new designs quickly and effectively. Results show that our emulation platform provides a speedup of 9280x in simulation time compared to the software counterpart Gem5.

Index Terms—Hardware emulation, FPGA accelerator, memory system, NVM

I. INTRODUCTION

In the era of big data, the memory footprint of applications has expanded enormously. DRAM energy consumption grows linearly with its capacity, as DRAM cells constantly draw energy to refresh its stored data. The non-volatile-memory (NVM) technologies, such as Intel 3D Xpoint [1], memristor [2], and Phase-change-memory (PCM) [3] have emerged as alternative memory technologies to DRAM. These new memory technologies promise an order of magnitude higher density [4] and minimal background power consumption. Their access delay is typically within one order of magnitude larger than that of DRAM while the write access has significantly higher overheads. Such different characteristics require a significant redesign of the memory system architecture, in both data management policies and mechanisms. Hybrid

memory systems, comprised of emerging non-volatile memory (NVM) and DRAM, in particular, look promising for future system design. As to date these new NVM technologies are only beginning to become widely available, many open questions have yet to be worked out in management policy and implementation. Evaluating many alternative approaches in hybrid memory design is essential for future system design.

Evaluating hybrid memory systems presents several unique challenges because we aim to test the whole system stack, comprising not only the CPU, but also the memory controller, memory devices and the interconnections. Further, since the study is focused on main memory, accurate modeling of DRAM is required. Much of the prior work in the processor memory domain relies upon software simulation as the primary evaluation framework with tools such as Champsim [9] and gem5 [10]. However, cycle-level software simulators that meets our requirement of system complexity and flexibility, impose huge simulation time slow-downs versus real hardware. Moreover, there are often questions of the degree of fidelity of the outcome of arbitrary additions to software simulators [11].

In this paper, we propose an evaluation system with the flexibility to allow the user to define their own hybrid memory management policy and with the performance to run full applications at near native speed. In particular our evaluation platform leverages an FPGA platform with a hard IP ARM Cortex A57 processors and two memory controllers connecting the FPGA to DRAM DIMMS. This platform with our framework allows the hybrid memory management unit to be implemented in the FPGA in RTL, where the real application memory requests on the host ARM cores are redirected to memory DIMMs connected to the FPGA. Thus we successfully decouple the design under test, i.e, the memory management policies, from the detailed modelling of memory device. Our FPGA-based emulation platform provides the flexibility to develop and test sophisticated memory management policies, while its hardware-like nature provides near-native simulation speed.

In this paper we detail the evaluation platform and compare its performance to comparable simulation based approaches to hybrid memory management simulation. In particular, experimental results show that our platform provides 2286x speedup compared to Champsim, and 9280x speedup over Gem5.

TABLE I: Approximate Performance Comparison of Different Memory Technologies [5]–[7]

Technology	HDD	FLASH	3D XPoint	DRAM	STT-RAM	MRAM
Read Latency	5ms	100 μ s	50 - 150ns	50ns	20ns	20ns
Write Latency	5ms	100 μ s	50 - 500ns	50ns	20ns	20ns
Endurance (Cycles)	$> 10^{15}$	10^4	10^9	$> 10^{16}$	$> 10^{16}$	$> 10^{15}$
\$ per GB	0.025-0.5	0.25-0.83	6.5 [8]	5.3-8	N/A	N/A
Cell Size	N/A	4 – 6F ²	4.5F ² [4]	10F ²	6 – 20F ²	25F ²

II. BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

Hybrid memories, comprised of DRAM and NVM, have recently become a hot research topic, with numerous works [12]–[16] in this domain. For design evaluation, these works predominantly use either software-based platform simulation, with simulator runtime limiting the workloads that can be examined, or they use analytical modeling, which has a large impact on accuracy.

In other domains, FPGA-accelerated simulators have demonstrated high time efficiency and accuracy, far beyond the scope of typical software-based alternatives. Below we summarize the main advantages of FPGA-accelerated simulators and show how this approach can be applied to hybrid memory emulation system.

A. Speed and Accuracy

FPGAs are composed of millions of lookup tables, each of them programmable to fulfill certain logic functions. Owing to its hardware nature, FPGAs are great for parallel tasks and concurrent execution. Software-simulators, which are by nature sequentially executed, have hit the simulation wall; a phenomenon that the simulation efficiency declines as the target hardware system becomes more complex. While software-based simulators are easier to build, they are slower, and less accurate. Therefore several prior works have turned to FPGA-accelerated simulators.

Chung *et al.* [17] introduced ProtOflex for multiprocessor simulation, which greatly reduced the simulation duration for complex commercial applications. ReSim [18] is a trace-driven hardware simulator using FPGA. It improves the timing accuracy of simulation results, while lowering both hardware and time cost.

When it comes to studies on memory systems, the efficiency problem deteriorates for software-based simulation. First, the traffic events in interconnections are highly unpredictable, thus the latency shows a wide variability. In contrast, the CPU events can be modeled by a fixed number of pipeline stages. Thus, prior works [19] simply use a one-cycle “magic” memory to avoid modeling a realistic memory hierarchy, due to the timing complexity.

Memory performance benchmark applications leverage large working sets to exert pressure on memory systems. Multi-GB data of the working set must be warmed up before we could exclude the transient performance fluctuation at cold start. Simulation acceleration techniques such as SimPoint and sampling, also require repetitive memory warm-up each time before we can obtain correct and representative sample. All

these factors makes the simulation time prohibitive long with traditional software simulators. Hence, an efficient FPGA-based emulation platform is highly desired for studies on hybrid memory systems.

B. Flexibility and Completeness

While FPGA-based simulators are primarily recognized for their high simulation efficiency and accuracy, they also provide unique scopes to other system metrics. PrEsto [20] is a simulator created by Sunwoo *et al.* for power consumption estimation. It’s able to predict cycle-by-cycle power dissipation, at a speed several orders of magnitude faster than the software-based competitors. Such detailed dynamic power information is essential for modern processor designs. ATLAS [21] is the first FPGA prototyping of a chip-multiprocessors, with hardware-level support for transactional memories.


The programmability of FPGA is also crucial to hybrid memory system emulation. Researchers are free to implement their own memory management policies in the logic blocks. Further, they don’t have to deal with the modelling of memory device itself, as all memory requests are automatically directed to the real memory DIMMs in our platform.

The flexibility of FPGA also allow us to emulate various NMV technologies which has different access characteristic, as shown in Table I. Our platform provides a simple way for customizing critical parameters such as latency. FPGA also meets the completeness requirement for memory system evaluations: users can easily add a variety of performance counters of their choice. For example, we implemented counters for read/write transactions to each memory device respectively, and obtained a fairly accurate estimate of the dynamic power consumption.


III. DESIGN

Figure 1a shows the target system and emulation system of our proposed scheme. The target design is the Hybrid Memory Manger Unit (HMMU) that will be integrated to the processor die. The HMMU directly manages two memory device and receives the memory requests from the host CPU after cache filtering. The received memory requests are then processed based on the user-defined data placement policies, and forwarded correspondingly to either DRAM or NVM. The HMMU also manages the data migration between DRAM and NVM, by controlling the high-bandwidth DMA engine that connects to the both memory devices.

In the emulation system, as illustrated in Figure 1b, the HMMU and DMA engine are implemented in FPGA, and connects to the host via PCIe links.



(a) Target System Architecture



(b) Emulation System Architecture

Fig. 1: Target System and Emulation System Architecture

A. Memory Request Processing Workflow

Figure 2 briefly walks through the memory request processing workflow: PCIe hard IP block receives TLPs carrying the memory requests from the host CPU, and then forwards them to the RX module of the FPGA logic. RX Control module extracts the TLP header into the FIFO by the order they were received. Meanwhile the TLPs are also forwarded to the control logic which is highly pipelined. In the first stage, TLPs were decoded and the interpreted memory requests are populated into the following stages. Here, you can design your own memory management policies, which usually have three aspects: the memory access pattern recognition, data placement policy, and data migration policy. We'd elaborate these policies in the later sections. The outcome of the control logic can also contain actions corresponding to these policies:

- Memory requests are forwarded to the memory controller (MC) of target device.

- Trigger data migration in the DMA.

The journey ends for write memory request, when they arrive at the MC and the payload data were written into target memory device. As for the read requests, the read back data are retrieved from memory, and returned in the same order as the requests were received. The TX CNTL module receives the read back data from both NVM and DRAM, and assembles them with the corresponding header into a complete response message. The response messages are then encapsulated into PCIe transactional layer packets (TLP) at TX and then are sent back to the CPU host by the PCIe hard IP block.

B. Heterogeneity Transparency

Although hybrid memory is composed of two separate memory devices, designer might want to hide such heterogeneity from OS, and present one single flat memory space. Thus, all the data placement and migration between DRAM and NVM becomes transparent from the user applications' perspective. This mechanism is beneficial in several aspects:

- 1) All the data movement are executed by purely hardware-based HMMU, without interrupting the OS and user applications.
- 2) Programmers don't have to learn about data allocation among separate memory devices.
- 3) Compatible with legacy applications.

There are many implementation methods to realize this design. A straightforward approach is to build another layer of address redirection table within the HMMU, where the physical address is translated to the actual memory device address. The mapping rule becomes part of the data placement policy.

C. Memory Consistency

A risk of memory consistency error arises here as the memory requests are split into the two channels for NVM and DRAM, respectively. From the perspective of OS, there is only one single memory space and the OS cannot tell which memory device is the request for. Hence, a consistency error is possible as shown in Fig. 3, when the data was not returned in the same order as it was requested. Such errors are prone to happen when the later request is aimed at DRAM, which has a lower access latency. We adopt a tag-matching mechanism to guarantee the consistency, while still allowing out-of-order memory media access for higher performance. In particular, we use the header information, stored at HDR FIFO in Fig. 2, as the tag to save the order of memory requests.

D. DMA Engine

To efficiently migrate data between DRAM and NVM, without interfering processor memory requests, we need to implement a dedicated DMA engine.

The bit width of DMA shall be compliant with the memory controller for maximum throughput. Due to the unbalanced data rates of the two memory devices, and the discrepancy of clock frequencies between the DMA module and memory controllers, an internal buffer is needed to temporarily hold the data during migration. Besides the choice of these two




Fig. 2: Request Processing Workflow




Fig. 3: Memory Consistency Risk

primary design parameters, bit width and buffer size, a major concern is how to guarantee data coherence when a memory access conflicts with ongoing DMA data migration.

When DMA swaps two pages, the data is transferred in units of 512B-block. We carefully designed the DMA so that it keeps track of the detailed page swap progress, to be specific, the address range of sub-blocks that have been transferred. When a memory request is targeted at the page being swapped, we use the swap progress indicator to decide where to redirect the memory requests. For instance, if it's a read request and the targeting cache-line falls behind the current swap progress, i.e., the requested data has been transferred to the new location, the DMA redirects the memory request to the destination device. We spent considerable time to design and verify the logic design to ensure all possible cases are covered and processed properly.

E. PCIe BAR Memory Mapping

In order to have the applications run on PCIe attached memory, we first need to map the memory space into system address space. PCIe devices have a set of Base Address Registers (BAR), which are assigned by the platform firmware during the booting process. These BARs carry the base address where the PCIe device is mapped in the system memory-mapped or IO-mapped space. Here we chose the memory-mapped mode as it supports prefetching on our PCIe attached

memory. The size of each BAR was programmed into the PCIe IP before FPGA project compilation.

However, some embedded system might not have enough free system address space for our PCIe memories, which is usually larger than 2GB. Hence we need to adjust the system mapping appropriately in the device tree of firmware image (e.g. U-boot), to reserve enough address range for the required sizes of PCIe devices.

F. Arbitrary Latency Cycles

A great advantage of our platform is the flexibility of emulating different memory technologies, by adding arbitrary stall cycles to the access latency. This is essential when you don't have access to a real NVM DIMM, which is the case for many architecture research studies.

There are multiple blocks in the workflow (Fig. 2) where you can insert extra cycles of delay, e.g., between the control logic and MC, or on the data return path. Here we use 3D Xpoint as an example to show how we calculated the number of stalling cycles to be inserted.

We measured the round trip time in FPGA cycles to access external DRAM DIMM first, and then scaled the number of stall cycles according to the speed ratio between DRAM and 3D Xpoint, as described in the Table I. Thus we have one DRAM DIMM running at full speed and the other DRAM DIMM emulating the approximate speed of 3D XPoint. Hence the platform is not constrained to any specific type of NVM, but rather allows us to study and compare the behaviors across any arbitrary combinations of hybrid memories.

G. Driver and Memory Allocator

The PCIe BAR mapping renders the targeted hybrid memories as a continuous range in the system physical address space, which is presented as a device file `/dev/mem`. To mandate the application to only run on the hybrid memories, we need middleware as shown in Fig. 4:

- 1) The driver (`mem_driver.ko`) manages the physical frames of the hybrid memories (`/dev/mem`), with the help of the kernel's `genpool` subsystem. It sets up the page table using the `remap_pfn_range` kernel function.
- 2) We modify the `pages.c` of `jemalloc` allocator [22], and use the `mmap` function to enforce the application




Fig. 4: Middleware

allocations within the address range of the specified device file (`/dev/mem_driver`).

Users are free to implement their own optimized strategies of virtual memory management inside the allocator, or physical frames management inside the driver. For example, we extended the `malloc` API, to accept users' hints of memory device preference regarding data placement, and populate these information through the stack to the hardware hybrid memory controller.

IV. EVALUATION

We implemented an emulation platform that's targeted at the ARM-based mobile computing hybrid memory system. Mobile systems have limited energy budgets, and they're more sensitive to memory power consumption. Hence, we believe the NVM's advantage of minimal standby power will be highly valued.

In this section, we first present the hardware implementation, and the benchmark software applications. Then we evaluate the performance of our proposed emulation scheme, by comparing against the two popular software-based simulators, namely Gem5 [10] and Champsim [9]. Finally we analyze and discuss some of the more interesting data points.

A. Methodology

1) *Platform Implementation:* The system implementation is illustrated in Figure 6. We used the customized LS2085A board produced by Freescale which has 8 ARM Cortex A57 cores. The LS2085a connects to the FPGA board via a high-speed PCI Express 3.0 link, and manages the two memory modules (DRAM and NVM) directly. The platform is physically set up as shown in Figure 5. Since 3D Xpoint is the only NVM technology that has turned into mass-production (Intel Optane series), we chose it for the presented experiments. We emulated the 3D XPoint device with regular DRAM DIMM, using the approach explained in III-F.

The DRAM and NVM memories are mapped to the address range $[0x124000000, 0x128800000)$ of the physical memory space via the PCIe BAR (Base Address Register) window.




Fig. 5: Hardware Boards Setup

Note that the CPU caching is still enabled on the mapped memory space, due to the PCIe BAR configurations.




Fig. 6: System Implementation

The detailed system specification is listed in Table II.

TABLE II: Emulation System Specification

Component	Description
CPU	ARM Cortex-A57 @ 2.0GHz, 8 cores, ARM v8 architecture
L1 I-Cache	48 KB instruction cache, 3-way set-associative
L1 D-Cache	32 KB data cache, 2-way set-associative
L2 Cache	1MB, 16-way associative, 64KB cache line size
Interconnection	PCI Express Gen3 (8.0 Gbps)
DRAM	128MB DDR4
NVM	1GB 3DXpoint(emulated by DDR4 with added latency)
OS	Linux version 4.1.8

2) *Workloads:* We choose applications from the latest version SPEC CPU 2017 benchmark suite [23]. To emulate memory pressures of future mobile applications, we prefer those SPEC CPU 2017 benchmarks which require a larger working set than the DRAM size in our system. The details of tested benchmark applications are listed in Table III.




Fig. 7: Simulation Time Normalized against Native Execution

TABLE III: Tested Workloads of SPEC 2017 [23]

Benchmark	Description	Memory footprint
Integer Applications		
500.perlbenc	Perl interpreter	202MB
505.mcf	Vehicle route scheduling	602MB
508.namd	Molecular dynamics	172MB
520.omnetpp	Discrete Event simulation - computer network	241MB
523.xalancbmk	XML to HTML conversion via XSLT	481MB
525.x264	Video compressing	165MB
531.deepsjeng	Artificial Intelligence: alpha-beta tree search (Chess)	700MB
541.leela	AI: Monte Carlo tree search	22MB
557.xz	General data compression	727MB
Float Point Applications		
519.lbm	Fluid dynamics	410MB
538.imagick	Image Manipulation	287MB
544.nab	Molecular Dynamics	147MB




Fig. 8: Memory Requests (Bytes)

3) Designs Under Test:

- Software-based simulators: Gem5, Champsim:
We run the workloads III in Gem5 (SE mode) and Champsim, on a x86 workstation with 2 Six-Core Intel Xeon Processor E5-2643 v3 (20M Cache, 3.40 GHz), and 128GB DDR4 Memory. We normalized the simulation time against the running time of native execution on the same machine.
- Our proposed FPGA-based emulation platform
We run the same set of workloads on our emulation system II, then we normalized the run time against the time taken by native execution. Note that in native execution, the applications run in the on-board DDR4 (16GB) of the LS2085a board.

B. Results

Figure 7 shows the simulation time of each methods, normalized against the run time of native execution. The geometric mean of slowdown factors indicates the overall time efficiency of each tested design (lower the better).

Our FPGA-based emulation system merely experienced 3.17x slowdown versus the native execution, while Gem5 showed 29397.82x slowdown, and Champsim yielded 7241.4x. Among all the tested workloads, 538.imagick had smallest slowdown (1.17x), and 505.mcf suffered the largest performance penalty (15.36x).

To investigate the memory behaviors of these applications, we implemented a variety of performance counters in the

FPGA. We used one set of the counters to collect numbers of memory requests generated by each application, as presented in Figure 8. We found that 538.imagick created the fewest memory requests (Read: 4.47GB, Write: 4.49GB); while 505.mcf incurred the most requests (Read: 2.83TB, Write: 2.82TB). Our observation is also confirmed by [24], which reports that 505.mcf has the highest cache miss rate, and 538.imagick has the lowest L2/L3 cache miss rates among the tested workloads. Based on our experience developing the emulation system, we presume the major impact comes from the latency of the PCIe links. Consequently, applications with higher volume of memory accesses will be affected negatively.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Emerging non-volatile memory (NVM) technologies provide higher capacity and less static power consumption than traditional DRAM. Hybrid memories comprised of both NVM and DRAM promise to mitigate the energy limits on mobile computing/embedded system. The design space for hybrid memory management policies are broad, with many possibilities for HW/SW cross-layer data allocation and migration. Evaluating hybrid memory systems requires full-stack system simulation involving bus/interconnection, memory controllers, memory devices, etc. With such level of complexity, cycle-level simulation becomes prohibitive slow for traditional simulation-based techniques.

Here we propose an FPGA based platform for rapid, accurate hybrid memory system evaluation. In this platform, only the hybrid memory management policies themselves are emulated in the FPGA hardware, the other system components (i.e. the processor, DRAM, etc) are all real components. Thus users can focus on the core design and don't have to bother modelling system environments. Experiments on SPEC 2017 show that our design is 2286 times faster than Champsim, and 9280 times faster than Gem5.

The flexibility of FPGA allow users to build performance counter of various functions, providing rich information and new scopes to design exploration.

REFERENCES

- [1] INTEL CORPORATION, "Intel optane technology," 2016, <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/architecture-and-technology/intel-optane-technology.html>.
- [2] K. Eshraghian, K.-R. Cho, O. Kavehei, S.-K. Kang, D. Abbott, and S.-M. S. Kang, "Memristor mos content addressable memory (mcam): Hybrid architecture for future high performance search engines," *Very Large Scale Integration (VLSI) Systems, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 19, no. 8, pp. 1407–1417, Aug 2011.
- [3] S. Raoux, G. W. Burr, M. J. Breitwisch, C. T. Rettner, Y. . Chen, R. M. Shelby, M. Salinga, D. Krebs, S. . Chen, H. . Lung, and C. H. Lam, "Phase-change random access memory: A scalable technology," *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, vol. 52, no. 4.5, pp. 465–479, July 2008.
- [4] J. Choe, "Intel 3d xpoint memory die removed from intel optane pcm," 2017, <https://bit.ly/3edy4Ev>.
- [5] A. Chen, "A review of emerging non-volatile memory (nvm) technologies and applications," *Solid-State Electronics*, vol. 125, pp. 25–38, 2016. [Online]. Available: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0038110116300867https://ac.els-cdn.com/S0038110116300867/1-s2.0-S0038110116300867-main.pdf?_tid=ca6cf681-9266-4eab-b2b1-b5fc588a1cbc&acdnat=1533662521_dc98aa6ba5b7f6da59bc748a06b160b0

- [6] S. Mittal and J. S. Vetter, "A survey of software techniques for using non-volatile memories for storage and main memory systems," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 1537–1550, 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/ielx7/71/7449033/07120149.pdf?tp=&arnumber=7120149&isnumber=7449033>
- [7] J. J. Yang, D. B. Strukov, and D. R. Stewart, "Memristive devices for computing," *Nature Nanotechnology*, Dec 2012.
- [8] A. Shilov, "Pricing of intel's optane dc persistent memory modules," 2019, <https://www.anandtech.com/show/14180/pricing-of-intels-optane-dc-persistent-memory-modules-leaks>.
- [9] ChampSim, "Champsim," 2016, <https://github.com/ChampSim/ChampSim>.
- [10] N. Binkert, B. Beckmann, G. Black, S. K. Reinhardt, A. Saidi, A. Basu, J. Hestness, D. R. Hower, T. Krishna, S. Sardashti, R. Sen, K. Sewell, M. Shoaib, N. Vaish, M. D. Hill, and D. A. Wood, "The gem5 simulator," *SIGARCH Comput. Archit. News*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 1–7, Aug. 2011. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2024716.2024718>
- [11] T. Nowatzki, J. Menon, C. Ho, and K. Sankaralingam, "Architectural simulators considered harmful," *IEEE Micro*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 4–12, Nov 2015.
- [12] A. Hassan, H. Vandierendonck, and D. S. Nikolopoulos, "Software-managed energy-efficient hybrid dram/nvm main memory," in *Proceedings of the 12th ACM International Conference on Computing Frontiers*, ser. CF '15. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2015, pp. 23:1–23:8. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2742854.2742886>
- [13] V. Fedorov, J. Kim, M. Qin, P. V. Gratz, and A. L. N. Reddy, "Speculative paging for future nvm storage," in *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Memory Systems*, ser. MEMSYS '17. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2017, pp. 399–410. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3132402.3132409>
- [14] H. Liu, Y. Chen, X. Liao, H. Jin, B. He, L. Zheng, and R. Guo, "Hardware/software cooperative caching for hybrid dram/nvm memory architectures," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Supercomputing*, ser. ICS '17. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2017, pp. 26:1–26:10. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3079079.3079089>
- [15] L. E. Ramos, E. Gorbatov, and R. Bianchini, "Page placement in hybrid memory systems," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Supercomputing*, ser. ICS '11. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2011, p. 85–95.
- [16] C. Su, D. Roberts, E. A. León, K. W. Cameron, B. R. de Supinski, G. H. Loh, and D. S. Nikolopoulos, "Hpmc: An energy-aware management system of multi-level memory architectures," in *Proceedings of the 2015 International Symposium on Memory Systems*, ser. MEMSYS '15. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2015, p. 167–178. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2818950.2818974>
- [17] E. S. Chung, E. Nurvitadhi, J. C. Hoe, B. Falsafi, and K. Mai, "A complexity-effective architecture for accelerating full-system multiprocessor simulations using fpgas," in *Proceedings of the 16th International ACM/SIGDA Symposium on Field Programmable Gate Arrays*, ser. FPGA '08. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2008, p. 77–86. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1344671.1344684>
- [18] S. Fytraki and D. Pnevmatikatos, "Resim, a trace-driven, reconfigurable ilp processor simulator," in *2009 Design, Automation Test in Europe Conference Exhibition*, 2009, pp. 536–541.
- [19] M. Pellauer, M. Vijayaraghavan, M. Adler, Arvind, and J. Emer, "A-ports: An efficient abstraction for cycle-accurate performance models on fpgas," in *Proceedings of the 16th International ACM/SIGDA Symposium on Field Programmable Gate Arrays*, ser. FPGA '08. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2008, p. 87–96.
- [20] D. Sunwoo, G. Y. Wu, N. A. Patil, and D. Chiou, "Presto: An fpga-accelerated power estimation methodology for complex systems," in *2010 International Conference on Field Programmable Logic and Applications*, 2010, pp. 310–317.
- [21] N. Njoroge, J. Casper, S. Wee, Y. Teslyar, D. Ge, C. Kozyrakis, and K. Olukotun, "Atlas: A chip-multiprocessor with transactional memory support," in *2007 Design, Automation Test in Europe Conference Exhibition*, 2007, pp. 1–6.
- [22] J. Evans, "Jemalloc," 2016, <http://jemalloc.net/>.
- [23] SPEC, "SPEC CPU2017 Documentation," 2017, <https://www.spec.org/cpu2017/Docs/>.

- [24] A. Limaye and T. Adebija, "A workload characterization of the spec cpu2017 benchmark suite," in *2018 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS)*, 2018, Conference Proceedings, pp. 149–158. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/ielx7/8360838/8366921/08366949.pdf?tp=&arnumber=8366949&isnumber=8366921&ref=>