CSC 345 Report for Project: 02

Full Name: Robert Bjorklund,

Sam Blamo

Section: 01

0. Project Discussion Note

Sam: As we were working on this project, Bob and I talked greatly about the implementation of the project over the phone, and in person several times. However, most of the actual coding of this project was done separately, at different times. We were able to smoothly build on top of each other's code, with the help of Git and GitHub. A log of our commits was included in the zip file.

Bob: We discussed division of labor early on, and started a git to collaborate. Sam and I each took 2 parts to implement, I took the 3 thread implementation and took charge of testing / collecting statistical data.

Sam implemented the 27 thread and 3 process options, building off the 3 thread solution. We both worked through the stats individually with different tools, arriving at similar conclusions. We also both contributed to this file.

1. Sudoku Solution Validator

1.1. Source Code

```
for (int j = 0; j < 9; j++) {
    if (c[j] != i+1) {
        sprintf(ptr, "%s", "NO");
}</pre>
          waitpid(pid1, NULL, 0);
waitpid(pid2, NULL, 0);
waitpid(pid3, NULL, 0);
          solved = ptr;
main(int argc, char **argv){
FILE *fp = fopen("input.txt","r");
time_t st = clock();
time_t msPerS = CLOCKS_PER_SEC/100000;
time_time_time_textend=_textended;
int option = atoi(argy[1]);
for (int i = 0; i < 9; i++) {
    fscanf(fp, "%d %d %d %d %d %d %d %d %d %d",&s[i][0],&s[i][1],&s[i][2],&s[i][3],&s[i][4],&s[i][5],&s[i][6],&s[i][7],&s[i][8]);
    printf("%d %d %d %d %d %d %d %d %d %d\n",s[i][0],s[i][1],s[i][2],s[i][3],s[i][4],s[i][5],s[i][6],s[i][7],s[i][8]);</pre>
if(option == 1){ You, 3 days ago * Organized Branch _
// for(int att = 0; att < 10; att++){
    pthread_t threads[3];
    gridCoord* sqPos = malloc(9 * sizeof(gridCoord));</pre>
                       gradcoord* sqPos = malloc(9 * size
int index = 0;
for(int i = 0; i < 3; i++){
    for(int j = 0; j <= 6; j+=3){
        sqPos[index].x = i * 3;
        sqPos[index].y = 4</pre>
                                           sqPos[index].y = j;
index++;
                      pthread_create(&threads[1], NULL, checkCols, NULL);
pthread_create(&threads[2], NULL, checkSquares, sqPos);
                      pthread_join(threads[0], NULL);
pthread_join(threads[1], NULL);
pthread_join(threads[2], NULL);
if(option == 2){
   // for(int att = 0; att < 10; att++){
     pthread_t threads[27];
     gridCoord* spos = malloc(9 * sizeof(gridCoord));
   int index = 0;</pre>
                     for(int i = 0; i < 3; i++){
   for(int j = 0; j <= 6; j+=3){
      sqPos[index].x = i * 3;
      sqPos[index].y = j;
   index++;</pre>
                     int params[9] = {0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8};
for(int i = 0; i < 9; i++) {
    pthread_create(&threads[i], NULL, checkSingleRow, &params[i]);
    pthread_create(&threads[i+9], NULL, checkSingleCol, &params[i]);
    pthread_create(&threads[i+18], NULL, checkSingleSquare, &sqPos[i]);</pre>
                       for(int i = 0; i < 27; i++) {
    pthread_join(threads[i], NULL);</pre>
```

```
if(option == 3){
    // for(int att = 0; att < 10; att++){
    multiProcessCheck();
    // }

// time_t ft = clock() - st;
    // printf("SOLUTION: %s (%ld ns)\n",solved, ft/msPerS);

//

// time_t ft = clock() - st;
    // printf("SOLUTION: %s (%ld ns)\n",solved, ft/msPerS);

//

// time_t ft = clock() - st;
    printf("SOLUTION: %s (%ld ns)\n",solved, ft/msPerS);

// printf("SOLUTION
```

1.2. Output

```
phoenix@thephoenix:~/Documents/sudoku$ ./main 3
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1
 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 2
 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 2 3
 5 6 7 8 9 1 2 3 4
 6 7 8 9 1 2 3 4 5
 7 8 9 1 2 3 4 5 6
 8 9 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 9 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 SOLUTION: NO (29 ns)
phoenix@thephoenix:~/Documents/sudoku$ ./main 2
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 2 3
 7 8 9 1 2 3 4 5 6
 8 9 7 2 3 1 5 6 4
 5 6 4 8 9 7 2 3 1
 2 3 1 5 6 4 8 9 7
 3 1 2 6 4 5 9 7 8
 9 7 8 3 1 2 6 4 5
 6 4 5 9 7 8 3 1 2
 SOLUTION: YES (170 ns)
```

2. Breakdown of Sudoku Solution Validator Implementation

2.1. int main(int argc, char** argv)

The main function's primary responsibility is interpreting the *option* parameter given by the user and calling the other functions from within the code.

Option 1 uses the strategy of making three separate threads to validate the sudoku within input.txt; One thread to check every row, one to check every column, and one to check every square.

Option 2 uses 27 separate threads to check each column, row, and square for the digits 1-9 respectively. The 27 threads are stored within a thread array named *threads*.

Option 3 uses the multi-process approach, having three children processes to check the given input's rows, columns, and squares to validate whether it's solved.

It is also important to note that when the program begins execution, the time is recorded in the *st* variable until the given option finishes executing, and we return the time taken to execute along with whether or not the sudoku puzzle given was a valid solution.

2.2. void* checkRows(void* param)

This thread function is called in the (option == 1) if-statement block in main(). The param argument passed is NULL.

This function's responsibility is to check every row within input.txt to validate that each row only contains one occurrence of a value within the range of 1-9. If there is more than one occurrence of a specific value at any row, the global variable *solved* will be set to *NO*.

2.3. void* checkCols(void* param)

This thread function is called in the (option == 1) if-statement block in main(). The param argument passed is NULL.

This function's responsibility is to check every column within input.txt to validate that each column only contains one occurrence of a value within the range of 1-9. If there is more than one occurrence of a specific value at any column, the global variable *solved* will be set to *NO*.

2.4. void* checkSquares(void* param)

This thread function is called within the (option == 1) if-statement block in main(). The param argument passed is the memory address to an array of user-defined structs gridCoord. A gridCoord struct has attributes int x and int y which are used to properly loop through non-overlapping squares in the given sudoku input.

This function's responsibility is to check every non-overlapping 3x3 square within input.txt to validate that each square only contains one occurrence of a value within the range of 1-9. If there is more than one occurrence of a specific value at any square, the global variable *solved* will be set to *NO*.

2.5. void* checkSingleRow(void* param)

This thread function is called in the (option == 2) if-statement block in main(). The param argument passed is the memory address of the corresponding row index in the params array initialized in the (option == 2) if-statement block.

This function's responsibility is to check the row that corresponds with the index passed in the function's parameter and validate that the row only contains one occurrence of a value within the range of 1-9. If there is more than one occurrence of a specific value in the given row, the global variable *solved* will be set to *NO*.

2.6. void* checkSingleColumn(void* param)

This thread function is called in the (option == 2) if-statement block in main(). The param argument passed is the memory address of the corresponding column index in the params array initialized in the (option == 2) if-statement block.

This function's responsibility is to check the column that corresponds with the index passed in the function's parameter and validate that the column only contains one occurrence of a value within the range of 1-9. If there is more than one occurrence of a specific value in the given column, the global variable *solved* will be set to *NO*.

2.7. void* checkSingleSquare(void* param)

This thread function is called in the (option == 2) if-statement block in main(). The param argument passed is the memory address to an element within an array of user-defined structs gridCoord. A gridCoord struct has attributes int x and int y which are used to properly loop through non-overlapping squares in the given sudoku input.

This function's responsibility is to check the square that corresponds with the index passed in the function's parameter and validate that the square only contains one occurrence of a value within the range of 1-9. If there is more than one occurrence of a specific value in the given square, the global variable *solved* will be set to *NO*.

2.8. void multiProcessCheck()

This function is called in the (option == 3) if-statement block in main(). Its responsibility is to create three child processes and use each child process to validate if the rows, columns, and squares are solved respectively. If the given sudoku input is not a valid solution, the parent will change the global variable solved to reflect that.

3. Breakdown of Statistical Experimentation.

3.1. Preface

Since we were tasked to provide an analytical conclusion if there was any statistical difference between any of the methods, we used the *t-tes*t to determine whether our hypothesis was correct.

| | negual Variances | t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Ur | ults: | method 1 res | 39 42 | d 2 results: method 312 272 | 81 |
|-----------------|---|---|----------------------|-----------------------------|----------|-----------------------------------|----------|
| | icquai variances | t rest. two-sample Assuming on | uits. | method 1 res | | | 65 |
| method 2 result | method 1 results: | | 58.16 | Mean | 37 | 327 | 66 |
| 274.5 | 58.16 | Mean | 1.116247 | Standard Error | 35 | 317 | 61 |
| 1464.98326 | 62.30040816 | Variance | 60 | Median | 38 | 325 | 59 |
| 50 | 50 | Observations | 60 | Mode | 42 | 218 | 56 |
| | 0 | Hypothesized Mean Difference | | Standard Deviation | 38 | 251 | 62 |
| | 53 | df | 62.30041 | Sample Variance | 38 | 275 | 57 |
| | -39.15818378 | t Stat | 0.371706 | Kurtosis | 45 | 308 | 64 |
| | 4.23126E-41 | P(T<=t) one-tail | -0.08324 | Skewness | 37 | 210 | 59 |
| | 1.674116237 | t Critical one-tail | 39 | Range | 34 | 248 | 53 |
| | 8.46E-41 | P(T<=t) two-tail | 42 | Minimum | 35 | 284 | 62 |
| | 2.005745995 | t Critical two-tail | 81 | Maximum | 37 | 280 | 70 |
| | 2,000,740,330 | Conticui two tan | 2908 | Sum | 36 | 310 | 63 |
| | | | 50 | Count | 35 | 244 | 53 |
| | | | 30 | Count | 37 | 259 | 60 |
| | t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances | | method 2 results: | | 44 | 278 | 48 |
| | lequal variances | t-lest: Iwo-sample Assuming Or | uits: | method 2 res | 44 | 251 | 68 |
| | method 2 results: | | 274.58 | | 40 | 301 | 59 |
| | | | | Mean | 45 | | |
| 38.3 | 274.58 1464.983265 | Mean Variance | 5.412917 | Standard Error | 39 | 292 | 64 61 |
| 8.036326531 | | | 269.5 | Median | | 280 | |
| | 50 | Observations | 257 | Mode | 39 39 | 313 | 48 |
| | 0 50 | Hypothesized Mean Difference df | 38.2751 1464.983 | Standard Deviation | 43 | 268 301 | 46 49 |
| | | | | Sample Variance Kurtosis | 43 | 271 | 50 |
| | 43.51716892 1.03031E-41 | t Stat | 2.042952 0.767066 | Skewness | 39 | 233 | 61 |
| | | P(T<=t) one-tail | 221 | | 37 | 257 | 60 |
| | 1.675905025 2.06061E-41 | t Critical one-tail P(T<=t) two-tail | 182 | Range Minimum | 38 | 278 | 57 |
| | 2.008559112 | t Critical two-tail | 403 | Maximum | 36 | 261 | 47 |
| | 2.006333112 | t Critical two-tall | | | 36 | | 44 |
| | | | 13729 | Sum | | 250 | |
| | | | 50 | Count | 38 | 252 | 66 |
| | | | | | 34 | 249 | 60 |
| | t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances | | ults: | method 3 res | 37 | 242 | 63 |
| | | | | | 35 | 237 | 61 |
| | method 1 results: | | 38.38 | Mean | 36 | 257 | 61 |
| 38.3 | 58.16 | Mean | 0.400907 | Standard Error | 39 | 182 | 44 |
| 50 | 62.30040816 | Variance | 38 | Median | 38 | 241 | 42 |
| | 50 | Observations | 39 | Mode | 37 | 293 | 45 |
| | 0 | Hypothesized Mean Difference | | Standard Deviation | 37 | 260 | 48 |
| | 61 | df | 8.036327 | Sample Variance | 35 | 254 | 50 |
| | 16.67708676 | t Stat | 0.155985 | Kurtosis | 37 | 266 | 60 |
| | 1.05829E-24 | P(T<=t) one-tail | 0.800024 | Skewness | 41 | 294 | 60 |
| | 1.670219484 | t Critical one-tail | 11 | Range | 39 | 365 | 60 |
| | 2.11657E-24 | P(T<=t) two-tail | 34 | Minimum | 39 | 403 | 59 |
| | 1.999623585 | t Critical two-tail | 45 | Maximum | 39 | 331 | 58 |
| | | | 1919 | Sum | 39 | 258 | 68 |
| | | | 50 | Count | 40 | 257 | 63 |
| | | | | | 38 | 275 | 68 |
| | | | | | 38 | 289 | 59 |

3.2. Results

3.2.1. Method 1 vs Method 2

Null hypothesis: There is no statistically significant difference between the means of Method 1 and Method 2.

Alternative Hypothesis: There is a statistically significant difference between the means of Method 1 and Method 2.

Assumptions:

- Observations are independent? Yes.
- Number of samples is greater than 30 in each group? Yes.

Conclusion: After performing a t-test between the two sample groups, method 1 and method 2, a p-value that was closely estimated to 0 was returned (8.46e-41). This is significantly less than alpha, and therefore concludes that we have enough evidence to prove that there is a statistically significant difference between the means of Method 1 and Method 2.

3.2.2. Method 3 vs Method 2

Null hypothesis: There is no statistically significant difference between the means of Method 3 and Method 2.

Alternative Hypothesis: There is a statistically significant difference between the means of Method 3 and Method 2.

Assumptions:

- Observations are independent? Yes.
- Number of samples is greater than 30 in each group? Yes.

Conclusion: After performing a t-test between the two sample groups, method 3 and method 2, a p-value that was closely estimated to 0 was returned (2.06061e-41). This is significantly less than alpha, and therefore concludes that we have enough evidence to prove that there is a statistically significant difference between the means of Method 3 and Method 2.

3.2.3. Method 3 vs Method 1

Null hypothesis: There is no statistically significant difference between the means of Method 3 and Method 1.

Alternative Hypothesis: There is a statistically significant difference between the means of Method 3 and Method 1.

Assumptions:

- Observations are independent? Yes.
- Number of samples is greater than 30 in each group? Yes.

Conclusion: After performing a t-test between the two sample groups, method 3 and method 1, a p-value that was closely estimated to 0 was returned (2.11657e-24). This is significantly less than alpha, and therefore concludes that we have enough evidence to prove that there is a statistically significant difference between the means of Method 3 and Method 1.