

CMSI 387-01
OPERATING SYSTEMS
Spring 2014

Assignment 0422 Feedback

Jonathan I. Piatos

DJcbopstix13 / jpiatos13@gmail.com

Dining Philosophers

2d — The philosophers thank you for feeding them :) (+)

4a — You’ve gotten the core solution right—but you need to make it clear to the user that this is the case. Thus, suggestions given inline are primarily refinements to output format so that the user can perceive what’s happening more easily, particularly with respect to errors. But speaking of errors, you don’t include any “sanity check” code or asserts that enforces proper behavior. More inline comments give hints on how/where to do this. missing from your implementation. (|)

4b — Code is decently structured with logically separated/sequenced sections. (+)

4c — I was able to read your code pretty easily. (+)

4d — Your work demonstrates good use of the information available to you. (+)

4e — Just 2 commits for dining philosophers? That’s quite a lot of work packed into each commit. Messages are also so-so—essentially just “started” then “working.” Very little about what actually changed in the code is conveyed. (/)

4f — Submitted on time. (+)

Paged Memory Address Translation

2d — You have successfully implemented paged memory address translation from the ground up. (+)

4a — No issues with your code outside of that unnecessary bitwise-&. Otherwise works as spec’ed. (+)

4b — One small separation of concerns issue is the unhardcoding the maximum address check, but this is not as big a deal as your having to copy the code into *one monolithic file*. Nope nope, you should have figured out how to deal with multiple-source C files. I did show you *make* right? Because of this, you have divergent implementations of the algorithm, one of which is broken—it’s precisely things like that which justify why we never want to create multiple copies of our code. (/)

4c — Clean code, no issues. (+)

4d — You successfully utilized available information to implement paged memory address translation. (+)

4e — Two commits is more acceptable here because the program is that much simpler. And your messages are a tad more descriptive, e.g., “added error checking.” See how that actually gives the reader an idea about what changed from one commit to the next. (+)

4f — Submitted on time. (+)