

Lab-10 Report

Group Members:

130050007 : Vaibhav Bhosale
130050046 : Dibyendu Mondal

Part A:

Command used: pmap -x 12086

Question 1:

```
12086: ./A
Address      Kbytes  RSS  Dirty Mode Mapping
0000000000400000    4    4    0 r-x-- A
0000000000600000    4    4    4 r---- A
0000000000601000    4    4    4 rw--- A
00007f165fa10000  1792  1020    0 r-x-- libc-2.21.so
00007f165fbd0000  2048    0    0 ----- libc-2.21.so
00007f165fdd0000   16   16   16 r---- libc-2.21.so
00007f165fdd4000    8    8    8 rw--- libc-2.21.so
00007f165fdd6000   16   12   12 rw--- [ anon ]
00007f165fdda000  144  144    0 r-x-- ld-2.21.so
00007f165ffd2000   12   12   12 rw--- [ anon ]
00007f165fff9000   16   12   12 rw--- [ anon ]
00007f165fffd000    4    4    4 r---- ld-2.21.so
00007f165fffe000    4    4    4 rw--- ld-2.21.so
00007f165ffff000    4    4    4 rw--- [ anon ]
00007ffca255e000  132   12   12 rw--- [ stack ]
00007ffca25b6000    8    0    0 r---- [ anon ]
00007ffca25b8000    8    4    0 r-x-- [ anon ]
fffffffff600000    4    0    0 r-x-- [ anon ]
-----
total kB      4228  1264   92
```

VmSize: 4228 kB
VmRSS: 1264 kB

Question 2:

```
12086: ./A
Address      Kbytes  RSS  Dirty Mode Mapping
0000000000400000    4    4    0 r-x-- A
0000000000600000    4    4    4 r---- A
```

```

0000000000601000    4    4    4 rw--- A
00007f165f010000 10240    0    0 rw-s- foo0.txt
00007f165fa10000   1792   1020    0 r-x-- libc-2.21.so
00007f165fbd0000   2048    0    0 ----- libc-2.21.so
00007f165fdd0000    16    16    16 r---- libc-2.21.so
00007f165fdd4000    8     8     8 rw--- libc-2.21.so
00007f165fdd6000    16    12    12 rw--- [ anon ]
00007f165fdda000   144    144    0 r-x-- ld-2.21.so
00007f165ffd2000    12    12    12 rw--- [ anon ]
00007f165fff9000    16    16    16 rw--- [ anon ]
00007f165fffd000    4     4     4 r---- ld-2.21.so
00007f165fffe000    4     4     4 rw--- ld-2.21.so
00007f165ffff000    4     4     4 rw--- [ anon ]
00007ffca255e000   132    12    12 rw--- [ stack ]
00007ffca25b6000    8     0     0 r---- [ anon ]
00007ffca25b8000    8     4     0 r-x-- [ anon ]
fffffffff600000    4     0     0 r-x-- [ anon ]
-----
total kB          24708  1268   96

```

```

VmSize:          14468 kB
VmRSS:           1268 kB

```

The virtual memory allocated to the process increases by 10MB, thus incorporating the mapping of the file(10MB) onto the virtual memory. VmRSS increases as some library is loaded.

The mapping is created in the virtual memory space, therefore the memory resident in the physical RAM won't change.

Question 3:

```

12086: ./A
Address          Kbytes   RSS   Dirty Mode Mapping
0000000000400000    4     4     0 r-x-- A
0000000000600000    4     4     4 r---- A
0000000000601000    4     4     4 rw--- A
00007f165f010000 10240    64    0 rw-s- foo0.txt
00007f165fa10000   1792   1084    0 r-x-- libc-2.21.so
00007f165fbd0000   2048    0     0 ----- libc-2.21.so
00007f165fdd0000    16    16    16 r---- libc-2.21.so
00007f165fdd4000    8     8     8 rw--- libc-2.21.so
00007f165fdd6000    16    12    12 rw--- [ anon ]
00007f165fdda000   144    144    0 r-x-- ld-2.21.so
00007f165ffd2000    12    12    12 rw--- [ anon ]
00007f165fff9000    16    16    16 rw--- [ anon ]
00007f165fffd000    4     4     4 r---- ld-2.21.so

```

| | | | | |
|------------------|-----|----|----------|------------|
| 00007f165fffe000 | 4 | 4 | 4 rw--- | ld-2.21.so |
| 00007f165fff000 | 4 | 4 | 4 rw--- | [anon] |
| 00007ffca255e000 | 132 | 12 | 12 rw--- | [stack] |
| 00007ffca25b6000 | 8 | 0 | 0 r---- | [anon] |
| 00007ffca25b8000 | 8 | 4 | 0 r-x-- | [anon] |
| ffffffff600000 | 4 | 0 | 0 r-x-- | [anon] |

| | | | |
|----------|-------|------|----|
| total kB | 24708 | 1396 | 96 |
|----------|-------|------|----|

VmSize: 14468 kB
VmRSS: 1396 kB

The virtual memory allocated remains the same, since now the file is completely loaded on the virtual memory and available as an array to the process. VmRSS increases by 64 kB as a file is loaded on accessing the 1st character.

Question 4:

12086: ./A

| Address | Kbytes | RSS | Dirty | Mode | Mapping |
|-------------------------|--------------|-----------|----------|--------------|-----------------|
| 0000000000400000 | 4 | 4 | 0 | r-x-- | A |
| 0000000000600000 | 4 | 4 | 4 | r---- | A |
| 0000000000601000 | 4 | 4 | 4 | rw--- | A |
| 00007f165f010000 | 10240 | 64 | 0 | rw-s- | foo0.txt |
| 00007f165fa10000 | 1792 | 1084 | 0 | r-x-- | libc-2.21.so |
| 00007f165fbd0000 | 2048 | 0 | 0 | ----- | libc-2.21.so |
| 00007f165fdd0000 | 16 | 16 | 16 | r---- | libc-2.21.so |
| 00007f165fdd4000 | 8 | 8 | 8 | rw--- | libc-2.21.so |
| 00007f165fdd6000 | 16 | 12 | 12 | rw--- | [anon] |
| 00007f165fdda000 | 144 | 144 | 0 | r-x-- | ld-2.21.so |
| 00007f165ffd2000 | 12 | 12 | 12 | rw--- | [anon] |
| 00007f165fff9000 | 16 | 16 | 16 | rw--- | [anon] |
| 00007f165fffd000 | 4 | 4 | 4 | r---- | ld-2.21.so |
| 00007f165fffe000 | 4 | 4 | 4 | rw--- | ld-2.21.so |
| 00007f165fff000 | 4 | 4 | 4 | rw--- | [anon] |
| 00007ffca255e000 | 132 | 12 | 12 | rw--- | [stack] |
| 00007ffca25b6000 | 8 | 0 | 0 | r---- | [anon] |
| 00007ffca25b8000 | 8 | 4 | 0 | r-x-- | [anon] |
| ffffffff600000 | 4 | 0 | 0 | r-x-- | [anon] |

| | | | |
|----------|-------|------|----|
| total kB | 24708 | 1396 | 96 |
|----------|-------|------|----|

VmSize: 14468 kB
VmRSS: 1396 kB

The virtual memory allocated remains the same, since now the file is completely loaded on the virtual memory and available as an array to the process. Therefore, to access the character at an offset 10000 bytes(basically the 10000th character in the file), nothing new needs to be loaded onto the virtual memory.

The character would be accessed using the already loaded page, hence no change in the VM-RSS part.

Part B:

Question 1:

Before:

| | total | used | free | shared | buffers | cached |
|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| Mem: | 8065444 | 4650880 | 3414564 | 481748 | 1080 | 863816 |
| -/+ buffers/cache: | | 3785984 | 4279460 | | | |
| Swap: | 7813116 | 0 | 7813116 | | | |

After:

| | total | used | free | shared | buffers | cached |
|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|
| Mem: | 8065444 | 4911820 | 3153624 | 481952 | 11980 | 1143336 |
| -/+ buffers/cache: | | 3756504 | 4308940 | | | |
| Swap: | 7813116 | 0 | 7813116 | | | |

Throughput 43.507195 MB/s

The bottleneck in this case is the disk (checked using iostat).

Question 2:

Before:

| | total | used | free | shared | buffers | cached |
|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| Mem: | 8065444 | 4625444 | 3440000 | 482368 | 1224 | 864460 |
| -/+ buffers/cache: | | 3759760 | 4305684 | | | |
| Swap: | 7813116 | 0 | 7813116 | | | |

After:

| | total | used | free | shared | buffers | cached |
|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|
| Mem: | 8065444 | 4955776 | 3109668 | 482272 | 12216 | 1165920 |
| -/+ buffers/cache: | | 3777640 | 4287804 | | | |
| Swap: | 7813116 | 0 | 7813116 | | | |

Throughput 37.689921 MB/s

The bottleneck in this case is the disk (checked using iostat).

Question 3:

No, using memory-mapped files do not give any added performance benefits over regular files. We get roughly the same value of throughput in both the cases.

Question 4:

The disk buffer cache is used in the same way when reading from regular and memory-mapped files. Therefore, the difference before and after in both the cases is roughly the same.

Question 5:

Before:

| | total | used | free | shared | buffers | cached |
|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| Mem: | 8065444 | 4915440 | 3150004 | 515216 | 1248 | 902112 |
| -/+ buffers/cache: | | 4012080 | 4053364 | | | |
| Swap: | 7813116 | 0 | 7813116 | | | |

After:

| | total | used | free | shared | buffers | cached |
|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|
| Mem: | 8065444 | 5206768 | 2858676 | 516720 | 5052 | 1164108 |
| -/+ buffers/cache: | | 4037608 | 4027836 | | | |
| Swap: | 7813116 | 0 | 7813116 | | | |

Throughput 16.036659 MB/s

The bottleneck is disc (checked using iostat).

Question 6:

Before:

| | total | used | free | shared | buffers | cached |
|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| Mem: | 8065444 | 5040248 | 3025196 | 521604 | 2044 | 908648 |
| -/+ buffers/cache: | | 4129556 | 3935888 | | | |
| Swap: | 7813116 | 0 | 7813116 | | | |

After:

| | total | used | free | shared | buffers | cached |
|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|
| Mem: | 8065444 | 5310232 | 2755212 | 521620 | 5784 | 1167444 |
| -/+ buffers/cache: | | 4137004 | 3928440 | | | |
| Swap: | 7813116 | 0 | 7813116 | | | |

Throughput 34.076821 MB/s

The bottleneck is disc (checked using iostat).

Question 7:

The throughput in case of memory-mapped files is lesser than that of regular files. The reason being that when writing to memory mapped files, we need to run the “msync” function to ensure that the changes are written on the actual location of the file, as we used MAP_SHARED.

Question 8:

In case of Memory map:

Throughput 37.852549 MB/s

In case of Regular Files:

Throughput 294.565271 MB/s

No, memory-mapped files do not give any performance benefits over regular files for frequent writes. On the contrary, it performs worse than regular files giving poor throughput values. Memory-mapping does not utilise the disk buffer cache to the extent utilised by the regular files.