Operating Systems Lab Project

Drop-Box Clone

BSCS23143

BSCS23102

BSCS23086

Project Report

Phase 1 Design Report

Dropbox Server Implementation

1. Architecture Overview

The server follows a three-layer producer-consumer architecture:

 $\mbox{Main Thread (Accept)} \rightarrow \mbox{Client Queue} \rightarrow \mbox{Client Thread Pool} \rightarrow \mbox{Task Queue} \rightarrow \mbox{Worker Thread Pool}$

1.1 Component Responsibilities

- Main Thread: Accepts TCP connections, pushes sockets to Client Queue
- Client Thread Pool: Handles authentication, command parsing, creates tasks
- Worker Thread Pool: Executes file operations (upload/download/delete/list)
- Queues: Thread-safe communication between components

2. Thread-Safe Queue Implementation

2.1 Data Structure

2.2 Synchronization Strategy

- Mutex: Protects all queue operations
- Condition Variables:
 - not_empty: Signals when queue has items
 - not_full: Signals when space available
- Blocking Operations:
 - dequeue() blocks when empty
 - enqueue() blocks when full

2.3 Rationale

- Prevents busy waiting with condition variables
- Ensures thread-safe access to shared gueues
- Supports multiple producers/consumers

3. Thread Pool Design

3.1 Client Thread Pool

- **Size**: 5 threads (configurable)
- Role: Handle client communication and command parsing
- Tasks: Authentication, request packaging

3.2 Worker Thread Pool

• **Size**: 5 threads (configurable)

Role: Execute file operations

• Tasks: File I/O, quota management, metadata updates

3.3 Task Structure

4. User Management System

4.1 Data Structures

```
typedef struct {
   char username[50];
   char password[50];
   UserFile files[MAX_FILES];
   int file_count;
   size_t used_quota;
   size_t quota;
   pthread_mutex_t lock; // Per-user mutex
} User;

typedef struct {
   User users[MAX_USERS];
   int user_count;
   pthread_mutex_t lock; // Global user manager mutex
} UserManager;
```

4.2 Synchronization Approach

- Global Lock: Protects user array during signup/login
- Per-user Lock: Protects individual user data during file operations
- Fine-grained Locking: Minimizes contention between different users

5. File Operations Implementation

5.1 Storage Organization

```
user_files/
```

```
username1/
| interpretation in the property of the property of
```

5.2 Operation Flow

- 1. **UPLOAD**: Copy local file → user directory, update metadata
- 2. **DOWNLOAD**: Read file from user directory → send to client
- 3. **DELETE**: Remove file, update metadata and quota
- 4. LIST: Read user's file metadata

5.3 Quota Management

- Default: 10MB per user
- Real-time tracking during upload/delete
- Pre-upload quota validation

6. Synchronization Decisions

6.1 Queue Synchronization

- Choice: Mutex + Condition Variables
- Reason: Efficient blocking without busy waiting
- Alternative Considered: Semaphores (chosen CV for clarity)

6.2 User Data Synchronization

- **Choice**: Two-level locking (global + per-user)
- Reason: Balance between contention and complexity
- Benefit: Multiple users can operate concurrently

6.3 File Operation Synchronization

- Choice: Per-user mutex for metadata
- Reason: Prevents race conditions for same user's files
- Limitation: Serializes operations for same user

7. Memory Management

7.1 Allocation Patterns

- Queue Items: Dynamic allocation in producer, freed in consumer
- Task Data: Allocated in client thread, freed in worker thread
- User Data: Static array to simplify management

7.2 Cleanup Strategy

- Graceful shutdown signal handling
- Thread pool destruction with pending task completion
- Queue destruction after thread termination

8. Testing Methodology

8.1 Functional Tests

- Single user authentication and file operations
- Quota enforcement validation
- Error condition handling

8.2 Memory Tests

- Valgrind for leak detection
- No definite memory leaks achieved
- Minor "still reachable" memory (global structures)

8.3 Concurrency Tests

- Basic thread safety verified
- No data races detected in single-user scenario

9. Design Trade-offs

9.1 Chosen Approaches

- In-memory user data: Simplicity over persistence
- Fixed thread pools: Predictable resource usage
- Per-user locking: Good balance for Phase 1 requirements

9.2 Limitations Acknowledged

- No persistence across server restarts
- Single client per user in Phase 1
- Basic error recovery

10. Phase 2 Considerations

10.1 Planned Enhancements

- Multiple concurrent sessions per user
- Worker-to-client response mechanism
- Persistent metadata storage

Enhanced conflict resolution

10.2 Open Design Questions

- Optimal worker-response communication method
- File locking strategy for concurrent access
- Metadata persistence approach

11. Conclusion

Phase 1 successfully implements the core producer-consumer architecture with proper synchronization. The design choices provide a solid foundation for Phase 2's concurrency challenges while maintaining code clarity and correctness.