

Assignment - 3

Part - A

1. Race condition : Two people try to write different notes on the same sticky note at the same time. If both read current text, append their own & write back without coordination, one person's update can overwrite other's - result depends on timing
2. Implementation complexity : Peterson's solution is simple algorithmically ~~for~~ but limited to two processes and is tricky to extend. Semaphores provides a general high level abstraction suitable for many process.
Hardware dependency : Peterson's relies on sequential consistency and atomic writes to shared variables - it may fail on modern weak memory multiprocessors without memory fences.
3. Monitors provide structured mutual exclusion plus condition variables built in. In a multi-core system, monitors can use efficient per-monitor locks & condition queues, reducing context switch churn & avoiding busy-waiting.
4. Writers starve if readers continuously arrive because now readers can keep entering and block waiting writers forever. We can prevent it by using a fair policy so that once a writer arrives it eventually gets priority and waits readers are blocked until writer completes.
5. Eliminating Hold and Wait typically forces process to acquire all required resources at once ~~or~~ release held resource before requesting new ones). Practical drawback : poor resource utilization and reduced concurrency process may

hold many resources while idle, leading to low throughput and possible starvation increased complexity to predict all future needs.

Part - B

$$6.a) \text{ Need matrix} = \text{Max Matrix} - \text{Allocation Matrix}$$

Process	A	B	C
P ₀	7-0=7	5-1=4	3-0=3
P ₁	3-2=1	2-0=2	2-0=2
P ₂	9-3=6	0-0=0	2-2=0
P ₃	4-2=2	2-1=1	2-1=1
P ₄	5-0=5	3-0=3	3-2=1

Need matrix -

$$\begin{bmatrix} 7 & 4 & 3 \\ 1 & 2 & 2 \\ 6 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 5 & 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

b) Safe State Check

Step	Process Chosen	Available Before	Need	Available After
1	P ₁	[3, 3, 2]	[1, 2, 2]	[5, 3, 2]
2	P ₃	[5, 3, 2]	[2, 1, 1]	[7, 4, 3]
3	P ₀	[7, 4, 3]	[7, 4, 3]	[7, 5, 3]
4	P ₂	[7, 5, 3]	[6, 0, 0]	[10, 5, 5]
5	P ₄	[10, 5, 5]	[5, 3, 1]	[10, 5, 7]

Safe Sequence : P₁, P₃, P₀, P₂, P₄

System is in a Safe State

- c) Request from $P_1 : (1, 0, 2)$
 Request \leq Need?
 $[1, 0, 2] \leq [1, 2, 2] = \text{yes}$
 Request \leq Available?
 $[1, 0, 2] \leq [3, 3, 2] = \text{yes}$

Request can be granted safely.

7. All 5 philosophers pick their fork simultaneously \rightarrow each holds one fork and waits for right fork \rightarrow circular wait \rightarrow deadlock.

Semaphore solution: semaphore fork initialized to 1; each philosopher: wait(forks[left]); eat; signal(fork[right]); signal(forks[left]). Deadlock avoidance: impose an ordering or allow at most 4 philosophers to try picking forks concurrently.

8. a) ~~Interrupts per second = 512.00~~
~~CPU time spent handling per second = 0.025600 sec/sec~~
~~= 2.5600 % of CPU~~

*Estimate
22/11/28*

- b) Use larger block sizes OR use DMA (Direct Memory Access) so CPU is integrated less frequently with DMA CPU overhead for transfers is minimal while keeping same throughout.

9. a) Critical sections: shared radar buffer/queue where raw radar frames are written shared flight-state database updated by flight path calculator; communication channel logging and command queue to pilots.

- b) Deadlock detection and recovery. Detection: Periodically run a deadlock detection algorithm on resource-graph. Recovery: - preempt low-priority or less-critical process rollback process holding resources to take over critical tasks quickly.