

SYSC 4001

Assignment 2

Process Scheduling, Memory Management  
Report

Student 1: George Tzemenakis, 101296691

Github handle: TheRealRisu (Risu)

Student 2: Sabari Mathiyalagan, 101296257

Github handle: SabariMathiyalagan (Sabari Mathiyalagan)

**Github Repo Part 2:**

[https://github.com/SabariMathiyalagan/SYSC4001\\_A2\\_P2](https://github.com/SabariMathiyalagan/SYSC4001_A2_P2)

**Github Repo Part 3:**

[https://github.com/SabariMathiyalagan/SYSC4001\\_A2\\_P3](https://github.com/SabariMathiyalagan/SYSC4001_A2_P3)

## **Mandatory Simulation Tests**

### Simulation 1: Basic Fork and Exec

This first simulation shows how `fork()` and `exec()` work together. The trace starts with a `FORK`, causing a child process to be created and run. The child process runs `EXEC` with `program1`, and once it's done, the parent runs `EXEC` `program2`. In the logs, you can clearly see the child running first, the loading of each program, 150 ms for `program1`, and 225 ms for `program2`. The snapshots show the child using partition 4 and the parent using partition 3, proving that the scheduler, memory allocation, and timing all behave as intended.

### Simulation 2: Nested Fork within a Child Program

This second simulation adds another layer of complexity with a nested `FORK` statement. After the first fork, the child process runs `program3`, which then forks again. The new child (child of the child) runs first while its parent (the initial child) and the original parent (init) wait. When the nested child finishes, the parent of `program3` continues and executes `program4`. The logs show this chain perfectly, with recursive calls to `simulate_trace()` and correct loader times for each of the programs. The system status file shows all three PCBs at one point, with one running and two waiting, confirming that the parent process only executes after the child process at all times.

### Simulation 3: System Calls and I/O Interrupts

The third simulation focuses on how the simulator handles system calls and I/O interrupts (from Assignment 1), with the new features of Assignment 2. The trace starts with a `FORK`, but then the child process immediately returns. Then the parent process executes the program, which follows the `SYSCALL` → `IRET` → `END_IO` → `IRET` pattern. The snapshot at time 277 for the system status confirms that only the parent (PID 0) is running `program5` in partition 4, proving that the parent executes the program because it resumes after both conditionals after the fork have finished.

## **Custom Simulation Tests**

### Simulation 4

This test compares two different workloads. The child runs `program6` (8 MB) first, performing the `SYSCALL` and `END_IO` operations that will end up triggering the device interrupts. The parent waits while the child finishes, then executes `program7` (25 MB), which mostly utilises the CPU. Loader times are 120 ms for the child and 375 ms for the parent, matching the expected  $15 \text{ ms} \times \text{size}$ . The snapshots show `program6` using partition 5 (8 MB) and `program7` using partition 2 (25 MB). This test highlights how I/O delays extend total runtime and shows that the simulator correctly does child-first execution and the best-fit memory allocation.

## Simulation 5

The last test shows re-EXECing a larger program within the same process. The child first execs program8 (10 MB); it then re-execs program9 (25 MB), which is meant to model the common case of a process replacing its code with something larger. Once the child finishes, the parent runs program9 too. The simulator frees the child's memory before the parent runs, so they both use the same partition (partition 2). Loader times scale from 150 ms to 375 ms and the snapshot clearly shows the process moving from partition 4 to 2. This demonstrates that re-EXEC, freeing of memory and re-allocation all work correctly.

## Conclusion

The fork/exec simulator behaved just like a real OS would across the five simulations. The child always ran first, memory allocated using a best-fit strategy, and the loader times matched the program sizes. The device delays worked as described, and I/O operations performed their respective functions exactly as described. Overall, the simulator does a great job showing how process creation, execution, and memory management fit together in a simplified kernel model.

```
1 time: 24; current trace: FORK, 10
2 +-----+
3 | PID |program name |partition number | size | state |
4 +-----+
5 | 1 | init | 5 | 1 | running |
6 | 0 | init | 6 | 1 | waiting |
7 +-----+
8 time: 247; current trace: EXEC program1, 50
9 +-----+
10 | PID |program name |partition number | size | state |
11 +-----+
12 | 1 | program1 | 4 | 10 | running |
13 | 0 | init | 6 | 1 | waiting |
14 +-----+
15 time: 620; current trace: EXEC program2, 25
16 +-----+
17 | PID |program name |partition number | size | state |
18 +-----+
19 | 0 | program2 | 3 | 15 | running |
20 +-----+
21
```

system\_status1

```
1 time: 31; current trace: FORK, 17
2 +-----+
3 | PID |program name |partition number | size | state |
4 +-----+
5 | 1 | init | 5 | 1 | running |
6 | 0 | init | 6 | 1 | waiting |
7 +-----+
8 time: 220; current trace: EXEC program3, 16
9 +-----+
10 | PID |program name |partition number | size | state |
11 +-----+
12 | 1 | program3 | 4 | 10 | running |
13 | 0 | init | 6 | 1 | waiting |
14 +-----+
15 time: 249; current trace: FORK, 15
16 +-----+
17 | PID |program name |partition number | size | state |
18 +-----+
19 | 2 | program3 | 3 | 10 | running |
20 | 0 | init | 6 | 1 | waiting |
21 | 1 | program3 | 4 | 10 | waiting |
22 +-----+
23 time: 530; current trace: EXEC program4, 33
24 +-----+
25 | PID |program name |partition number | size | state |
26 +-----+
27 | 2 | program4 | 3 | 15 | running |
28 | 0 | init | 6 | 1 | waiting |
29 | 1 | program3 | 4 | 10 | waiting |
30 +-----+
31 time: 864; current trace: EXEC program4, 33
32 +-----+
33 | PID |program name |partition number | size | state |
34 +-----+
35 | 1 | program4 | 3 | 15 | running |
36 | 0 | init | 6 | 1 | waiting |
37 +-----+
```

system\_status2

```
1 time: 28; current trace: FORK, 14
2 +-----+
3 | PID |program name |partition number | size | state |
4 +-----+
5 | 1 | init | 5 | 1 | running |
6 | 0 | init | 6 | 1 | waiting |
7 +-----+
8 time: 221; current trace: EXEC program8, 20
9 +-----+
10 | PID |program name |partition number | size | state |
11 +-----+
12 | 1 | program8 | 4 | 10 | running |
13 | 0 | init | 6 | 1 | waiting |
14 +-----+
15 time: 669; current trace: EXEC program9, 20
16 +-----+
17 | PID |program name |partition number | size | state |
18 +-----+
19 | 1 | program9 | 2 | 25 | running |
20 | 0 | init | 6 | 1 | waiting |
21 +-----+
22 time: 1142; current trace: EXEC program9, 25
23 +-----+
24 | PID |program name |partition number | size | state |
25 +-----+
26 | 0 | program9 | 1 | 25 | running |
27 +-----+
```

system\_status3

```
1 time: 26; current trace: FORK, 12
2 +-----+
3 | PID |program name |partition number | size | state |
4 +-----+
5 | 1 | init | 5 | 1 | running |
6 | 0 | init | 6 | 1 | waiting |
7 +-----+
8 time: 189; current trace: EXEC program6, 20
9 +-----+
10 | PID |program name |partition number | size | state |
11 +-----+
12 | 1 | program6 | 5 | 8 | running |
13 | 0 | init | 6 | 1 | waiting |
14 +-----+
15 time: 1000; current trace: EXEC program7, 18
16 +-----+
17 | PID |program name |partition number | size | state |
18 +-----+
19 | 0 | program7 | 2 | 25 | running |
20 +-----+
```

```
1 time: 34; current trace: FORK, 20
2 +-----+
3 | PID |program name |partition number | size | state |
4 +-----+
5 | 1 | init | 5 | 1 | running |
6 | 0 | init | 6 | 1 | waiting |
7 +-----+
8 time: 277; current trace: EXEC program5, 60
9 +-----+
10 | PID |program name |partition number | size | state |
11 +-----+
12 | 0 | program5 | 4 | 10 | running |
13 +-----+
14
```

system\_status5