The two curves of time consumption show that both the methods are stable for different size files. As we can observe in the chart of performance of the two methods for files with different size, the bigger the file is, the more time these two methods consummate. Theatrically, the map reduce method consummate much less time than the trivial one. But, in the chart, we have the opposite result. And we will analyze the reasons below.

* The transmission and input of the files cost too much time for the map reduce methods. We can see that for the map reduce method, even the smallest file costs more than 11 seconds in average. The execution time of the method is impossible to be so lang.
* We’ve done the work with docker on one computer. That increases the time of input and output and decrease the speed of execution. So, it appears that the map reduce method is even worse than the trivial one.
* The file is not big enough to show the priority of the map reduce method. If the text file is much bigger, the three slaves reduce more time than the transmission and input need.
* The operation system may use more than one cores or threads of the processor to run the trivial method. But as we generated three slaves on one computer, each slave has at most one core to use (the processor has only four cores). The used threads for each slave is smaller than the trivial process can have.