

Part 3 Report: Design and Implementation of the API Simulator (fork/exec)

Overview:

This project models process management system calls, `fork()` and `exec()`, within an operating system level simulator. Each instruction in the simulator represents a CPU level sequence of events: entering kernel mode, saving context, locating the interrupt vector, updating the Program Counter (PC), executing the appropriate Interrupt Service Routine (ISR), and returning to user mode via `IRET`. The simulator reproduces the control flow of a simple OS kernel: process creation (`fork()`), process image replacement (`exec()`), scheduling, and memory partitioning. It was implemented in C++ using structured data types (`PCB`, `memory_partition_t`, `external_file`) and vector-based trace simulation.

1. System Behavior:

Every simulated instruction begins with a transition to kernel mode, followed by context saving and vector lookup. The vector table determines which ISR is triggered (`CPU`, `SYSCALL`, `END_IO`, etc.). In code, this logic is shown in `intr_boilerplate()` and `simulate_trace()`. Each system call follows this sequence:

Context save: `intr_boilerplate()`

Vector lookup: update PC to ISR address

ISR execution: modify PCB and memory state

Return to user mode: `IRET`

This ensures each system call realistically mirrors an OS level interrupt cycle.

2. The `fork()` System Call:

When `fork()` executes, the simulator clones the parent process, producing a new PCB with its own PID and partition. The parent process transitions to waiting, and the new child becomes running. Typical log segment:

24, 1, switch to kernel mode

34,10, cloning the PCB

44, 0, scheduler called

45, 1, `IRET`

And corresponding system status table:

time: 24; current trace: `FORK`, 10

```
+-----+
| PID | program name | partition number | size | state |
+-----+
```

1	init	5	1	running
0	init	6	1	waiting

+-----+

This matches actual fork() semantics: the parent waits while the child continues execution independently.

3. The exec() System Call:

exec() replaces the current process's program image with a new one. The simulator frees the previous memory partition (if required), allocates a new partition based on external_files.txt, and updates the PCB's program name and size. Illustrative log sequence:

```
247, 1, switch to kernel mode
260,50, Program is 10MB large
310,150, loading program into memory
470, 6, updating PCB
477, 1, IRET
```

Status table:

time: 247; current trace: EXEC program1_1, 50

PID	program name	partition number	size	state
1	program1_1	4	10	running
0	init	6	1	waiting

The PCB now shows program1_1 in partition 4, confirming that the child's process image was successfully replaced.

4. Extended Simulation Testing:

To evaluate robustness, a multi-fork/exec trace was executed (e.g., trace_4.txt). This verified the simulator's ability to handle nested process creation and replacement without memory conflicts. Example snippet:

```
965, 1, switch to kernel mode // second fork
975,10, cloning PCB
985, 0, scheduler called
990, 1, IRET
1122, 1, switch to kernel mode // exec()
```

1135,564, SYSCALL ISR

Each new child process received a unique PID and partition, and memory was properly freed and re-allocated for subsequent exec calls.

5. Interpretation of Results:

Across all five simulation traces in /input_files, the output logs confirm:

- Correct kernel/user mode transitions
- Accurate PCB duplication and memory allocation during fork()
- Proper image replacement and PCB updates during exec()
- Valid scheduling and parent child synchronization (running vs waiting)
- Realistic interrupt and IRET logging within execution traces

The formatted system status tables display each process's current state and memory assignment, matching the expected behavior of a multitasking system.

Conclusion:

The final version of the simulator (Interrupts_101297993_101302793.cpp + main.cpp) faithfully models the fork() and exec() mechanisms within a simplified OS environment. It manages multiple processes, context switches, and partition based memory allocation while maintaining distinct PCB entries for running and waiting states. The test results in /output_files demonstrate accurate system behavior and validate the correctness of the implementation in the provided repository (https://github.com/Noor-e001/SYSC4001_A2_P3). Together, the code and logs confirm that the simulator achieves the learning objectives of Part 3 by accurately emulating OS process creation and execution dynamics.