1.We'll start by redoing the measurements within this chapter. Use the call gettimeofday() to measure time within your program. How accurate is this timer? What is the smallest interval it can measure? Gain confidence in its workings, as we will need it in all subsequent questions. You can also look into other timers, such as the cycle counter available on x86 via the rdtsc instruction.

I use gettimeofday() to measure, and it is pretty accurate.

2. Now, build a simple concurrent counter and measure how long it takes to increment the counter many times as the number of threads increases. How many CPUs are available on the system you are using? Does this number impact your measurements at all?

```
./simple_count_lock [num_thread]
```

There are 8 CPU are available on my system. So each time increase the number of the thread, per thread to increment 1 million count increase around 20%.

3. Next, build a version of the sloppy counter. Once again, measure its performance as the number of threads varies, as well as the threshold. Do the numbers match what you see in the chapter?

./approximate counter [threshold]

It actually not match what I see in the chapter. My best guess is I didn't use condition variable, thus, cause the threads spinning and waste cpu time.

4. Build a version of a linked list that uses hand-over-hand locking [MS04], as cited in the chapter. You should read the paper first to understand how it works, and then implement it. Measure its performance. When does a hand-over-hand list work better than a standard list as shown in the chapter?

The lookup time doing much better than the standard one.

5. Pick your favorite data structure, such as a B-tree or other slightly more interesting structure. Implement it, and start with a simple locking strategy such as a single lock. Measure its performance as the number of concurrent threads increases.

I'm going to pick the stack.

```
nick@ubuntu:~/CS5600 hw/week11/chapter29/g5&6$ ./stand stack 1
 Stack size is 1000000
 Total time 0.060653
 Average thread_time 0.060653
 Stack size is 0
 Total time to pop is 0.036509
 Average thread_time to pop is 0.036509
nick@ubuntu:~/CS5600_hw/week11/chapter29/q5&6$ ./stand_stack 2
 Stack size is 2000000
 Total time 0.177667
 Average thread time 0.088833
 Stack size is 0
 Total time to pop is 0.353454
 Average thread_time to pop is 0.176727
nick@ubuntu:~/CS5600 hw/week11/chapter29/g5&6$ ./stand_stack 3
 Stack size is 3000000
 Total time 0.255657
 Average thread_time 0.085219
 Stack size is 0
 Total time to pop is 0.300428
 Average thread_time to pop is 0.100143
nick@ubuntu:~/CS5600 hw/week11/chapter29/g5&6$ ./stand stack 4
 Stack size is 4000000
 Total time 0.343108
 Average thread_time 0.085777
 Stack size is 0
 Total time to pop is 0.304057
 Average thread_time to pop is 0.076014
nick@ubuntu:~/CS5600_hw/week11/chapter29/q5&6$ ./stand_stack 5
 Stack size is 5000000
 Total time 0.436655
 Average thread_time 0.087331
 Stack size is 0
 Total time to pop is 0.360178
 Average thread_time to pop is 0.072036
nick@ubuntu:~/CS5600_hw/week11/chapter29/q5&6$
```

6. Finally, think of a more interesting locking strategy for this favorite data structure of yours. Implement it, and measure its performance. How does it compare to the straightforward locking approach?

```
nick@ubuntu:~/CS5600_hw/week11/chapter29/q5&6$ ./stand_stack 8
Stack size is 8000000
Total time 0.769523
Average thread_time 0.096190
________
Stack size is 0
Total time to pop is 0.574505
Average thread_time to pop is 0.071813

nick@ubuntu:~/CS5600_hw/week11/chapter29/q5&6$ ./advance_stack 8
Stack size is 8000000
Total time 1.693217
Average thread_time 0.211652
________
Stack size is 0
Total time to pop is 0.594394
Average thread_time to pop is 0.074299
nick@ubuntu:~/CS5600_hw/week11/chapter29/q5&6$
```

When I put more lock on the stack, the actual performance to push decrease. The pop performance remain the same.