

2301010433

Operating System

Assignment - 4

Part - A

- 1) Race condition with real world example and mutual exclusion.

Race condition: occurs when multiple entities ~~can~~ access shared resources simultaneously, causing inconsistent results.

Example (non-computing): two cashiers updating the same cash register balance at the same time. Both read ₹100, add ₹50 & ₹30 respectively, and write ₹150 and ₹130. The final balance is incorrect.

Mutual Exclusion: ensures only one cashier updates the register at a time, preventing conflicts.

2) Peterson's Solution vs Semaphores.

Features.	Peterson's solution	Semaphores.
Implementation complexity.	Simple s/w-based solution using flags and turn variable.	Requires OS-level support and system calls.
Hardware Dependency.	Works only on single-processor system with sequential consistency.	Works on multi-core systems, less hardware dependent.

3) Advantage of monitors over semaphores in multi-core systems.

- Monitors encapsulate synchronization, reducing errors from manual semaphores handling.
- Advantages: Automatic mutual exclusion avoids race conditions in multi-core systems, simplifying concurrency management.

4) Reader - Writer starvation & Prevention

Starvation: Writers may starve if readers continuously access the resource.

Prevention: Use a writer-priority protocol or queue-based scheduling to ensure writers eventually get access.

5) Drawback of eliminating "Hold and Wait" in deadlock prevention

Elimination: Processes must request all resources at once.

Drawback: can lead to resource under utilization and longer waiting times, reducing system throughput.

Part - B

6) Distributed Deadlock Detection Simulation

Given: $S1: P1 \rightarrow P2$, $P3 \rightarrow P4$
 $S2: P2 \rightarrow P5$, $P5 \rightarrow P6$
 $S3: P6 \rightarrow P1$

a) Global wait-for Graph:

$P1 \rightarrow P2 \rightarrow P5 \rightarrow P6 \rightarrow P1$
 $P3 \rightarrow P4$

b) Deadlock Detection:

Cycle exists: $P1 \rightarrow P2 \rightarrow P5 \rightarrow P6 \rightarrow P1$
Deadlock Processes: $P1, P2, P5, P6$.

c) Distributed Algorithms:

Cheney - Misra - Hass algorithm for distributed deadlock detection.

7) Distributed file system performance.

Given : local access : 5ms.

remote access : 25ms.

remote probability : 0.3ms.

a) Expected file access time $E[T]$:

$$E[T] = (0.7 \times 5) + (0.3 \times 25) = 3.5 + 7.5 = 11 \text{ms.}$$

b) Caching Strategy :

→ Client-side caching - store frequently accessed remote file locally.

→ Justification - reduces repeated remote access latency and network load.

8) Checkpointing in a concurrent system.

Given : Full : 200ms

Incremental : 50ms.

RPO : 1s.

e) Optimal Mix : perform 1 full checkpoint every 1s, followed by incremental checkpoints every 250 ms.

b) Reasoning : Incremental checkpoints are faster, reducing overhead. Full checkpoints ensure complete recovery. Combination meets RPO without blocking the system.

9) Case study - Global E-commerce platform

a) Distributed Scheduling Challenges:
Flash sales create sudden load spikes, uneven across regions.
Suitable Algorithms : Weighted Round Robin or Dynamic Load Balancing using Least-Loaded server.

b) Fault Tolerance strategy:

Geo-redundant deployment - replicate services across multiple data centres

RTO/RPO: Use synchronous replication for critical services (low RPO) and asynchronous replication for less critical services (acceptance RTO)

Result: High availability even if a region fails.