

## **Benchmark program (benchmark.c):**

This file is used to test all the scheduling algorithms. It forks 10 times and the parent waits for the 10 child processes to terminate. The child processes are of different types as the I/O and CPU loops depend on the child number and so there is a good blend of both CPU and IO times.

*Writing the output of executing benchmark program using different schedulers:-*

### **1)RR:-**

Total Time: 2024  
Total Time: 2528  
Total Time: 2951  
Total Time: 3284  
Total Time: 3298  
Total Time: 3517  
Total Time: 3669  
Total Time: 3713  
Total Time: 3735  
Total Time: 3744

### **2)FCFS:-**

Total Time: 907  
Total Time: 1728  
Total Time: 2475  
Total Time: 3139  
Total Time: 3723  
Total Time: 4230  
Total Time: 4666  
Total Time: 5024  
Total Time: 5299  
Total Time: 5500

### **3)PBS:-**

Total Time: 1763  
Total Time: 1886  
Total Time: 1891  
Total Time: 2001  
Total Time: 2014  
Total Time: 2230  
Total Time: 2523  
Total Time: 2902  
Total Time: 3361  
Total Time: 3897

#### **4)MLFQ:-**

Total Time: 2067  
Total Time: 2531  
Total Time: 2947  
Total Time: 3187  
Total Time: 3275  
Total Time: 3521  
Total Time: 3705  
Total Time: 3723  
Total Time: 3752  
Total Time: 3779

#### **RANKING:-**

- 1)PBS
- 2)RR
- 3)MLFQ
- 4)FCFS

#### **Conclusions:**

1.Although the total time for the 1<sup>st</sup> process is much less than the others but the total time for the last process and on average\_total\_time is too high making it a bad choice of scheduling algorithm.

2. RR, MLFQ gave somewhat similar results,but RR worked slightly better.

3.PBS turnout to be the best scheduling algorithm for the scenario.Although it was comparable with the RR,MLFQ but by looking at the total time one can infer that PBS outperforms rest of the implementations.

#### **Inferences:-**

**FCFS:-**It turn out to be least productive scheduling algorithm because it executes process one by one making other processes to wait for long for their execution.

**MLFQ:-**This is comparatively good algorithm but instead not up to the mark.It also has overhead of switching processes from one queue to another making it somewhat less efficient.

**RR:-**Quite good scheduling algorithm and gave reasonable performance but it also has overhead in switching the process after particular time interval.

**PBS:-**Fantastic scheduling algorithm.Sort the processes by their priorities and executes them accordingly.Also if priority of some process gets changed then it reschedules and afterwards start execution.