

Implement Scheduler

Connor Dubois, Jim Harrell, Daniel Hoog, Eric Pereira
CSE4001

December 4th, 2018

Contents

1	Design	1
2	Implementation	1
3	Benchmark	2
3.1	Round Robin Tests:	2
3.2	FIFO Tests:	3
3.3	Discussion	4

3 Benchmark

3.1 Round Robin Tests:

```
OS/161 kernel [? for menu]: p testbin/add
testbin/add: Usage: add num1 num2
Program (pid 4) exited with status 1
Operation took 0.167452519 seconds
```

Figure 2: Round Robin Add

```
OS/161 kernel [? for menu]: p testbin/matmult
dumbvm: Ran out of TLB entries - cannot handle page fault
Fatal user mode trap 3 sig 11 (TLB miss on store, epc 0x40017c, vaddr 0x445000)
Program (pid 2) exited with signal 11
Operation took 0.547934946 seconds
```

Figure 3: Round Robin Matmult

```
OS/161 kernel [? for menu]: p testbin/hog
Program (pid 2) exited with status 0
Operation took 8.547169840 seconds
```

Figure 4: Round Robin Hog

```
OS/161 kernel [? for menu]: p testbin/farm
cat: catfile: No such file or directory
testbin/farm: pid 6: exit 1
Program (pid 2) exited with status 0
Operation took 25.988346854 seconds
```

Figure 5: Round Robin Farm

```

OS/161 kernel [? for menu]: p testbin/schedpong
Running with 2 thinkers, 0 grinders, and 1 pong groups of size 6 each.
Forking done; starting the workload.
.....
.....
Text Editor .....
Unknown syscall 68
Unknown syscall 68
Unknown syscall 68
Unknown syscall 68
Unknown syscall 68
Unknown syscall 68
Unknown syscall 68
--- Timings ---
Thinkers: 49.519217760
Pong group 0: 58.361160280
Unknown syscall 68
Program (pid 7) exited with status 0
Operation took 59.271385101 seconds

```

Figure 6: Round Robin schedpong

3.2 FIFO Tests:

```

OS/161 kernel [? for menu]: p testbin/add
testbin/add: Usage: add num1 num2
Program (pid 2) exited with status 1
Operation took 0.207588961 seconds

```

Figure 7: FIFO add

```

OS/161 kernel [? for menu]: p testbin/matmult
dumbvm: Ran out of TLB entries - cannot handle page fault
Fatal user mode trap 3 sig 11 (TLB miss on store, epc 0x40017c, vaddr 0x445000)
Program (pid 2) exited with signal 11
Operation took 0.463823066 seconds
OS/161 kernel [? for menu]:

```

Figure 8: FIFO add

```

OS/161 kernel [? for menu]: p testbin/hog
Program (pid 20) exited with status 0
Operation took 8.542975342 seconds

```

Figure 9: FIFO hog

```

OS/161 kernel [? for menu]: p testbin/farm
cat: catfile: No such file or directory
testbin/farm: pid 7: exit 1
Program (pid 3) exited with status 0
Operation took 25.808645793 seconds

```

Figure 10: FIFO farm

```

OS/161 kernel [? for menu]: p testbin/schedpong
Running with 2 thinkers, 0 grinders, and 1 pong groups of size 6 each.
Forking done; starting the workload.
.....
.....
.....
Unknown syscall 68
Unknown syscall 68
Unknown syscall 68
Unknown syscall 68
Unknown syscall 68
Unknown syscall 68
Unknown syscall 68
--- Timings ---
Thinkers: 47.666441320
Pong group 0: 57.598586200
Unknown syscall 68
Program (pid 8) exited with status 0
Operation took 58.620560295 seconds

```

Figure 11: FIFO schedpong

3.3 Discussion

There were some strange errors that we got on some of the operations, using the clone github and recompiling and setting up os161 with the source given we recieved a few errors. First being that `p testbin/schedpong` would have strange `unknown syscall 68` errors. Upon further review it looked like syscall 68 was the `sys_remove` call. When grep searching through the source we were not able to find another `sys_remove` specified anywhere else other than the `syscall.h` file. There was also an issue with the `p testbin/matmult` test, it seems that os161 could not handle the page fault. We gave os161 about 16K of memory. We started at 4K, but went up to see if memory was the problem, it was not. We included the photos in our benchmark tests, but they should not give any insight as to the scheduler's time. We also had a strange error on the farm, there seemed to be no `catfile`, one of the files that pertains to the farm, the tests still show some time difference.

Overall the results show that adding is significantly faster on round robin, at about .04 seconds faster. The matmult test, although maybe an inaccurate test, shows that FIFO is faster by .08 seconds. FIFO also ends up being faster in the hog test, at .05 seconds faster the FIFO farm test is faster than round robin at .19 seconds, and FIFO is faster than round robin at the schedpong test with about 0.65 second difference.

The tests actually show that typically it seems that FIFO is overall quicker than round robin, and according to figure 1 in the initial design portion this makes sense. Due to the scheduler not wasting time on switching it will overall be quicker, however this does not give these tests do not show the whole picture. Round-robin is used in order to allow for multiple processes to run at once, so that certain things can finish, or occur earlier than usual, and it prevents long programs from spending a large bulk of time performing a task, preventing others from doing a task.