Homework #3 Solutions

1. Suppose that the following processes arrive for execution at the times indicated. Each process will run with a single burst of CPU activity (i.e., no I/O) which lasts for the listed amount of time.

process	arrival time	CPU burst time	priority
pl	Oms	18ms	2
p2	1ms	12ms	1
р3	20ms	16ms	3
p4	31ms	14ms	4

a. What is the job throughput, average waiting time and average turnaround time for these processes with non-preemptive, FCFS scheduling?

	0 0	0 1	0 2	0 3	0 4	0 5	0 6	0 7	0 8	0 9	1 0	1 1	1 2	1 3	1 4	1 5	1 6	1 7	1 8	1 9	2 0	2 1	2 2	2 3	2 4	2 5	2 6	2 7	2 8	2 9
P1	х	х	x	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	x												
P2		R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	x	х
Р3																					R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
P4																														
	3	3 1	3 2	3	3 4	3 5	3 6	3 7	3 8	3 9	4 0	4	4	4 3	4	4 5	4 6	4	4 8	4 9	5 0	5 1	2	3	5 4	5 5	5	5 7	5 8	5 9
Р1																														
Р2																														
₽3	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х														
P4		R	R	R	R	R	R	x x															x							
Jol Av	o tł vg v	nro wai	ugł	npu g ti	t: me	-	4 i: tl	joł f wa hen	os i ait th	in 6 tim is is	$e = \frac{1}{2}$	im€ ≔ t) +	e ur ime 17	nits e oi + 1	, or n re 0 +	• (4) eady - 15	/ 60 y q 5)/4) jo ueu ! =	obs ie († 42/	pe tex 4 t	r ti tbo imo	i me ok e u	e un def nits	nit fini S	tio	1),				
Av	rg 1	turr	naro	oun	ıd t	ime	i tl e: t s	f wa hen urn ubr	ait th arc	tim is is oun sion	e = s 0 d ti n o:	≕ t tim me f pr	$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n}$	e oi init tim ess	n w s. e o	rait f co	qu om	eue ple	e (m tior	ny c n of	lefi f pr	init oce	ion ess	frc – ti	m	slic e of	les)),		
							a	vg	tur	nar	our	nd = =	= (= 1((18)2 /-	-0) 4 ti	+ (me	(30 e ui	-1) nits	+ (;	(46	-20)+	(6	0-3	1))	/4				

b.With preemptive RR (quantum = 10ms) scheduling? (Different strategies might be used to add a newly submitted process to the ready queue. Explain what strategy you're using.)

Assume new processes go on the TAIL of the ready queue:

_	0 0	0 1	0 2	0 3	0 4	0 5	0 6	0 7	0 8	0 9	1 0	1 1	1 2	1 3	1 4	1 5	1 6	1 7	1 8	1 9	2 0	2 1	2 2	2 3	2 4	2 5	2 6	2 7	2 8	2 9
P1	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	x	х	х	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х		
P2		R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	х	х
Р3																					R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
P4																														
	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
P1																														
P2																														
Р3	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	х	х	х	х	х	х				
P4		R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	R	R	R	R	R	R	х	х	х	х

Job throughput:	4 jobs in 60 time units, or (4/60) jobs per time unit
Avg waiting time:	if wait time = time on ready queue (textbook definition), then this is $(10 + 17 + 20 + 15)/4 = 62/4$ time units
	if wait time == time on wait queue (my definition from slides), then this is 0 time units.
Avg turnaround time:	turnaround time = time of completion of process – time of submission of process (page 128 of textbook)
	avg turnaround = $((28-0) + (30-1) + (56-20) + (60-31))/4$ = 122/4 time units

	0 0	0 1	0 2	0 3	0 4	0 5	0 6	0 7	0 8	0 9	1 0	1 1	1 2	1 3	1 4	1 5	1 6	1 7	1 8	1 9	2 0	2 1	2 2	2 3	2 4	2 5	2 6	2 7	2 8	2 9
Р1	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
P2		R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	х	x	x	х	x	х	x	x	х	x	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Р3																					х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х
P4																														
		1 -		1 -		1 -	1 -	1 -				1.	1.				1.		1.	1.	I _	I _	1 _	1 -			I _	1 _	1 _	
	3 0	3 1	3	3	3	3 5	3 6	3 7	3 8	3 9	4 0	4 1	4 2	4 3	4 4	4 5	4 6	4 7	4 8	4 9	5 0	5 1	5 2	5 3	5 4	5 5	5 6	5 7	5 8	5 9
Р1	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х																						
P2	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	х	х										
Р3	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	x	x	x	x	x	x				
P4		R	R	R	R	R	R	R	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	x	х	х	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	х	х	х	х

Assume new processes go on the HEAD of the ready queue:

Job throughput:	4 jobs in 60 time units, or (4/60) jobs per time unit
Avg waiting time:	if wait time = time on ready queue (textbook definition), then this is $(20 + 37 + 18 + 15)/4 = 90/4$ time units
	if wait time == time on wait queue (my definition), then this is 0 time units.
Avg turnaround time:	turnaround time = time of completion of process – time of submission of process (page 128 of textbook)
	avg turnaround = $((38-0) + (50-1) + (56-20) + (60-31))/4$

avg turnaround = ((38-0) + (50-1) + (56-20) + (60-31))/= 152/4 time units c. With preemptive priority scheduling (given the above priorities)?

Assuming higher numbers mean	higher _l	priority:
------------------------------	---------------------	-----------

	0 0	0 1	0 2	0 3	0 4	0 5	0 6	C 7	0	C g	1	L 1) 1	. 1	2 3	- 1 3 4	L 4	1 5	1 6	1 7	1 8	1 9) (2 L	2 2	2 3	2 4	2 5	2 6	2 7	2 8	2	:)
P1	x	х	х	x	x	X	: Х	2	x >	C 2	2	K 3	K Z	x x	K 3	X :	x	x	x											Ī	T		_
P2		R	R	R	R	R	F	R F	R F	R F	RI	RI	RI	RI	RI	R	R	R	R	X	2	C I	R I	R	R	R	R	R	R	P	t F	۲F	2
Р3																						2	K 3	X	х	x	х	х	х	Х	: 2	2 ک	K
P4																																	
	1 3	1 3	1	ч I	۲	۲ ۱	3	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4		1	4	A	4	5	5	5	15		5 0	5 1	5	5	5	5
	0	1	2	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	5	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	t :	5	6	7	8	9
Р1																																	
P2	R	R]	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	F	t I	R	R	R	R	х	x	x	: х	2	<u> </u>	x :	х	х	х	х
Р3	х	R]	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	X	: 3	x	х	х	х											
P4		х	2	x	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х																	
Jol Av	o th yg v	nron wai	ugł tin	npu g t	ıt: im	e:		4 j if the	obs wai en t	s in t ti his	60 me is	tir = $\frac{1}{(0^{-1})}$	ne tim + 4	uni e o 7 +	ts, n re 14	or eac	(4/ ly (0),	′ 60 qu¢ /4 =)) j eu = (job e (1 61/	os p tex '4 t	oer tbo	tin ook e u	ne de ini	un efin ts	i t	on)	,					
								if v the	wai en t	t ti his	me is	== 0 ti	tiı me	ne un	on its	wa	ait	qu	eu	e (my	v de	efir	iti	on)),							
Av	∕g t	urr	naro	oui	nd	tim	ne:	tu sul	rna omi	rou issi	nd on	tin of	ne ≖ prc	= ti	me ss	of (pa	cc ige	om 12	ple 28	etic of	on (tex	of j xtb	pro ool	ces ()	SS -	- ti	me	; of					

avg turnaround = ((18-0) + (60-1) + (50-20) + (45-31))/4= 121/4 time units 2. Consider the Sleeping-Barber Problem (p233, question 6.11 in the textbook,) with the modification that there are k barbers and k barber chairs in the barber room, intead of just one. Write a program to coordinate the barbers and the customers using Java, C, or pseudo-code. You can use either semaphores or monitors.

Here's a solution that uses semaphores:

```
// shared data
Semaphore waiting room mutex = 1;
Semaphore barber room mutex = 1;
Semaphore barber chair free = k;
Semaphore sleepy barbers = 0;
Semaphore barber chairs [k] = \{0, 0, 0, ...\};
          barber chair states[k] = {0, 0, 0, ...};
int
          num waiting chairs free = N;
int
boolean customer entry( ) {
   // try to make it into waiting room
   wait(waiting room mutex);
   if (num waiting chairs free == 0) {
      signal(waiting room mutex);
      return false;
   }
   num waiting chairs free--; // grabbed a chair
   signal(waiting room mutex);
   // now, wait until there is a barber chair free
   wait(barber chair free);
   // a barber chair is free, so release waiting room chair
   wait(waiting room mutex);
   wait(barber room mutex);
   num waiting chairs free++;
   signal(waiting room mutex);
   // now grab a barber chair
   int mychair;
   for (int I=0; I<k; I++) {</pre>
     if (barber chair states[I] == 0) { // 0 = empty chair
        mychair = I;
        break;
```

```
}
   }
   barber chair states[mychair] = 1; // 1 = haircut needed
   signal(barber room mutex);
   // now wake up barber, and sleep until haircut done
   signal(sleepy barbers);
   wait(barber chairs[mychair]);
   // great! haircut is done, let's leave. barber
   // has taken care of the barber chair states array.
   signal(barber chair free);
   return true;
}
void barber enters() {
  while(1) {
    // wait for a customer
    wait(sleepy barbers);
    // find the customer
    wait(barber room mutex);
    int mychair;
    for (int I=0; I<k; I++) {</pre>
      if (barber chair states[I] == 1) {
        mychair = I;
        break;
      }
    }
    barber chair states[mychair] = 2; // 2 = cutting hair
    signal(barber room mutex);
    // CUT HAIR HERE
    cut hair(mychair);
    // now wake up customer
    wait(barber room mutex);
    barber chair states[mychair] = 0; // 0 = empty chair
    signal(barber chair[mychair]);
    signal(barber room mutex);
    // all done, we'll loop and sleep again
  }
}
```

3. "Spot the bugs"

a & b: Here are all the bugs I deliberately planted...

- i. The return values of pthread_* functions are not checked. These functions can return error codes; since they aren't checked, all sorts of bad things could go wrong. For example, if the pthread_mutex_init() functions fail, the mutex may not function correctly. The fix is simply to check the return values, and exit the program if the return values indicate an error. The bug is potentially non-deterministic, especially if the mutexes aren't working correctly.
- ii. Malloc return value not checked. This means the malloc might fail, and depending on what the compiler sets an uninitialized pointer to point at, pretty much anything could happen. The fix is to check the return value of malloc, and exit if malloc fails
- iii. The 4th arguments to pthread_create point to memory that is dynamically allocated by malloc but free()'d a short time later. Depending on whether the created threads run first, they may attempt to reference memory that has been freed, or worse, allocated and handed to somebody else! The fix is to not free the memory until after the pthread_join().
- iv. The producer and consumer threads both busy wait, but this assumes that the threads are preemptively scheduled (as opposed to cooperatively context switched). The fix is to check the man pages for the thread package and operating system carefully. The bug would manifest itself as an infinite loop (deterministically) if the thread package is not preemptive.
- v. (not really a bug, but a performance flaw) Busy waiting is wasteful you ought to use a condition variable, or use sched_yield() if the OS or thread package supports that system call.
- vi. The line:

if (production_done) return NULL;"

might return before consuming everything that is produced. Replace with:

if (production_done && (items_in_buffer == 0))

This bug is timing dependent.

vii. There is the potential for a deadlock, as the locks are grabbed in different orders by the different threads. Whether or not a deadlock happens is timing dependent. The fix is for both threads to grab the locks in the same order.

- viii. The consume rthread releases the locks before it should -- if a context switch happens between the time the consumer releases the locks and the time the consumer does its printf, the producer could overwrite the item being printed by the printf.
- c. There's no reason to have two locks you could replace the two locks with a single lock, as long as you made sure the single lock was held when reading or writing from any of the shared variables.
- d. (hard) It is possible to build a producer-consumer solution that uses no locks, but only if there is a single producer and a single consumer. The trick is to define the buffer as a circular array, with the producer having the right to modify a pointer into the head of the array, and the consumer having the right to modify a pointer to the tail. When the producer wants to add, it makes sure there is empty space by comparing the tail to the head. When the consumer wants to consume, it does the same thing. However, if there are more than one producer or consumer threads, then you will need some kind of synchronization.
- 4. Use Java, C, or pseudo-code to implement:
 - monitors using semaphores
 - semaphores using monitors

Your solution may *not* busy-wait.

```
monitors using semaphores:
    - the answer, for the most part, is in section 6.7 of the text.
    here's some brief pseudocode to fill in the blanks.
    Semaphore mutex = 1, next = 0;
    int next_count = 0;
    For each external procedure F:
    wait(mutex);
    ...
    body of F;
    ...
    if (next_count > 0)
        signal(next);
    else
        signal(mutex);
    };
}
```

```
For each condition x
     int x count = 0;
     semaphore x sem = 0;
     // x.wait
    x_count = x_count + 1;
if (next_count > 0)
         signal(next);
     else
         signal(mutex);
     wait(x sem);
     x \text{ count} = x \text{ count} - 1;
     // x.signal
     if (x \text{ count } > 0) {
        next count = next_count + 1;
         signal(x sem);
         wait(next);
         next_count = next_count - 1;
     }
- semaphores using monitors:
   class Semaphore : public Monitor
   {
   protected:
      int count;
       condition cond;
   public:
       Semaphore(int initial) {
          count = initial;
       }
      void wait() {
           count = count - 1;
           while (count < 0) {
              cond.wait();
           }
       }
      void signal() {
           count = count + 1;
           cond.signal();
       }
   };
```