

Task 1

Python code in the accompanied py file.

Output

2 cores

```

(15249633789), (True, 0.0050029754638671875),
(08296966552734), (True, 0.0030028820037841),
(e, 0.01562643051147461), (True, 0.0), (True,
011570453643798828), (True, 0.004655361175),
7001399993896484), (True, 0.00600171089172),
Overall Time: 8.729722 seconds

```

1 core

```

3), (True, 0.000001949318302734), (True, 0.00500059127806712), (True, 0.006001949318302734), (True, 0.00400090217590332), (True, 0.004001140594482422), (True, 0.00900125503540039), (True, 0.00400090217590332), (True, 0.005002021789550781), (True, 0.008019447326660156), (True, 0.006001710891723633), (True, 0.00400090217590332)
Overall Time: 14.173270 seconds

```

Lessons learned

1. When the pool size is 2 the program can run 2 tasks parallel with one another which improves performance by utilising more of the CPU.
2. The prime checking function is highly efficient since it takes close to 0 seconds to check each prime number even to 6 decimal places.
3. Larger calculations benefit more from greater parallelism. The time difference between using pool size 1 and 2 will be greater for larger calculations.
4. When the calculations are small the pool size of one can actually take less time due to the associated overhead costs of parallelism.

Task 2

Python code in the accompanied py file.

●

1

1

1

1

- 1