

3. To test `qreceive()` and `qsend()`, I created receiver and sender processes in main that call `qreceive()` and `qsend()`. For all test cases, I always printed the contents of `prrecvqueue` and the messages returned at the end of `qreceive()` to make sure they matched up. I sent multiple messages to `qreceive()` and all the message values matched. I also changed the priorities of the processes calling `qsend()` and `qreceive()` and all the values matched up. Also, I had multiple senders send messages to the receiver and all the message values in the queue and the message values returned from `qreceive()` matched up. Lastly, I sent more than `RECVQSIZE` messages to the receiver and the messages after the fifth message were not part of `prrecvqueue` because `qsend()` returned `YSERR`. For all test cases, the `PID(s)` of the sender were all correct.

4. I did not change the content of `resched()`. In `qreceiveb()`, however, I did create a temporary variable, `temp`, to store the value of `senderpid` before I call `resched()`. I then set `senderpid` equal to the value of `temp` to preserve the value of `senderpid`. It is possible that `senderpid` may get corrupted when `resched()` is called, so utilizing a temporary local variable will prevent that issue. For all test cases, I always printed the contents of `prrecvqueue` and the messages returned at the end of `qreceiveb()` to make sure they matched up. I sent multiple messages to `qreceiveb()` and all the message values matched. I also changed the priorities of the processes calling `qsendb()` and `qreceiveb()` and all the values matched up. Also, I had multiple senders send messages to the receiver and all the message values in the queue and the message values returned from `qreceiveb()` matched up. I sent more than `RECVQSIZE` messages to the receiver to ensure that the correct `PID(s)` ended up in `prsenderblkid`. Lastly, I sent more than 8 messages to the receiver to make sure `qsendb()` returns `YSERR`, which it did, since `prsenderblkid` would be full.

5.1. In the stack, the value above the address of the newly created process, which is what we are editing, is the address of `userret`. We must examine the value of the stack directly above the newly created process to see if it is equal to the address of `userret`. By checking each of these values in `wrongturnl()` and confirming they are equal, we can verify that the process is newly created.

5.2. In the `ctxsw()` stack, we must locate the address of `ebp` (`prstkptr + 9`) and set it equal to another variable, `x`, for example. Although we obtain the address of `ebp` from the `ctxsw()` stack frame, it also points to a location in the `resched()` stack. By dereferencing `x`, it would now be equal to the value of `ebp` which we will set to another variable, `temp`. By then incrementing `temp` by one and dereferencing it, `temp` is now equal to the value of `eip`, the return address of `resched()`, in the `resched()` stack, which is what we want to modify.

5.3. There were no consequences of overwriting `ctxsw()`'s state information. The attack successfully caused the process to jump to the attacker's `malwarel()` function.