Practical 2

Alejandro Pérez Bueno

December 23rd, 2022

Table of Contents

- Introduction
- Question 1
- Question 2
- Question 3
- Summary

Introduction

This practice proposes a series of activities with the aim that the student can apply on a Unix system some of the concepts introduced in the last modules of the subject. The student will have to carry out a series of experiments and answer the questions posed. You will also need to write a short program in C language.

Question 1

Write a C program that displays the current time every N seconds. To display the current time, you must execute the date command date. To wait N seconds, you cannot use signals or routines such as sleep, you must do so using a child process that executes the sleep command N.

- First, we set N equal to 2 seconds.
- Now make N a parameter that must be specified on the command line.

Answer 1

The code can be found in the files main_a.c and main_b.c in the folder for this question.

To compile the code, you can run a command like the following in the appropriate directory:

```
gcc -Wall -Wextra -Werror main_a.c
```

Note: The compilation flags -Wall -Wextra -Werror are optional, used to optimize the code and avoid having unused variables.

To run the code, you can simply run the following command:

./a.out

As an added bonus, the code I created passes the so-called norminette, a linter for .c and .h files I use to keep code clean.

Question 2

This exercise highlights the differences between the _exit system call and the exit library routine. Although we usually refer to "the exit system call", exit is a library routine that ends up invoking the _exit system call.

a)

Refer to the manual page (man order) for exit and _exit. Attach the first few lines of the result. How to know who is called and who is called by a library routine?

Answer 2 a) Here are the first lines of the output of the command man exit:

EXIT(3) Library Functions Manual EXIT(3)

NAME

exit - cause normal process termination

And here are the first lines of the output of the command man _exit:

_EXIT(2) System Calls Manual _EXIT(2)

NAME

_exit, _Exit - terminate the calling process

As we can see, _exit is the actual system call to terminate a process whereas exit is merely a command utility for shells. The exit command is typically implemented as a built-in command on most common shells (bash, zsh, fish, etc).

b)

From reading the manual pages, what two main functionalities does the exit routine add to the _exit system call?

Answer 2 b) _exit simlpy terminates the calling process and closes any open file descriptors. The exit routine has two extra features:

- 1. All open streams are flushed and closed, and temporary files from tmpfile are removed.
- 2. Every function called with atexit and on_exit is called in reverse order of registration.

c)

exitae.c is a program that uses one of these new features. Compile it, run it, and attach the result of several executions. Explain the behaviour of this program.

Answer 2 c)

```
./a.out
Houston, we have a problem
That's all folks!
 ./a.out
I'm going to count to three. There will not be a four.
That's all folks!
> ./a.out
  ./a.out
I'm going to count to three. There will not be a four.
That's all folks!
  ./a.out
Houston, we have a problem
That's all folks!
  ./a.out
Always look on the bright side of life
That's all folks!
```

Figure 1: Sample Executions

From the behavior we can clearly see how exit and _exit differ. Every case in the switch prints a unique sentence and executes the exit routine, and thanks to atexit, a unique sentence will be printed afterwards. The random number mod 4 might not be 0, 1 or 2 so it won't fall into any of the switch cases, running the _exit system call instead. In this last case we see that the atexit function is never called, thus explaining the peculiarity of the exit routine.

d)

exitwe.c, exitw_.c, exitpe.c and exitp_.c are four programs that write a message to standard output and exit. They differ in how they write the message (write vs printf) and how they terminate (exit vs _exit). Compile and run them. Attach the result of their execution. Justify why we observe different behaviours?

Hint: notice that the message to be written does not end with a line break. Find out what consequences this may have when you do a printf

Answer 2 d)

```
> gcc exitwe.c && ./a.out
Helo world!!!!! %
> gcc exitw_.c && ./a.out
Helo world!!!!! %
> gcc exitpe.c && ./a.out
Helo world!!!!! %
> gcc exitp_.c && ./a.out
> gcc exitp_.c && ./a.out
```

Figure 2: Sample Executions

In the first three cases (exitwe, exitw_ and exitpe) the output is the expected one. However, it seems like the combination of using printf instead of write with _exit instead of exit causes the last example exitp_ to not show any output. Reading the manuals for _exit we see the following:

Causes normal program termination to occur without completely cleaning the resources.

This means that the problem exits, without properly flushing stdout before terminating. Now write also "writes" to stdout in exitw_ and uses _exit, but the difference is that printf has buffer management in place whereas write does not, and because stdout is buffered per lines (which means that every line is flushed from memory when a newline \n is found) and the message has no newline, the message cannot be displayed with printf and _exit.

e)

exitp2e.c and exitp2_.c are two programs analogous to those in the previous section, but which write a message ending in a line break. If you run them without redirecting the standard output and redirecting it to a file, you will get the following result.

```
enricm@pcmartorell-i-ribas:~/.../dev$ ./exitp2e
Helo world!!!!!
enricm@pcmartorell-i-ribas:~/.../dev$ ./exitp2_
Helo world!!!!!
enricm@pcmartorell-i-ribas:~/.../dev$ ./exitp2e > out1
enricm@pcmartorell-i-ribas:~/.../dev$ ./exitp2_ > out2
enricm@pcmartorell-i-ribas:~/.../dev$ ls -l out1 out2
-rw-rw-r-- 1 enricm enricm 29 Oct 20 19:15 out1
-rw-rw-r-- 1 enricm enricm 0 Oct 20 19:15 out2
enricm@pcmartorell-i-ribas:~/.../dev$
```

Figure 3: Sample Outputs

How the file out 2 is zero bytes in size (ie it's empty, no has any message been written there)?

Hint: See the man page for the setbuf library routine

Answer 2 f) Similarly to last time, we are now trying to flush the contents of stdout into a file. However, the _exit routine does not flush contents while the exit routine does. write is unbuffered, so content will be flushed immediately to the file, whereas printf is line-buffered.

Question 3

This exercise deals with the family of exec routines (execl, execlp, execle, execv, execve, execvp execvpe), routines that allow a process to load a new executable and start its execution.

a)

Of all these routines, which one is really system call, and which are library routines that end up invoking the system call? (Proceed in the same way as exercise 2a)

Answer 3 a) From the manals:

EXEC(3)

Library Functions Manual

EXEC(3)

NAME

execl, execlp, execle, execv, execvp, execvpe - execute a file ${\tt DESCRIPTION}$

The exec() family of functions replaces the current process image with a new process image. The functions described in this manual page are layered on top of execve(2). (See the manual page for execve(2) for further details about the replacement of the current process image.)

EXECVE(2)

System Calls Manual

EXECVE(2)

NAME

execve - execute program

DESCRIPTION

execve() executes the program referred to by pathname. This causes the program that is currently being run by the calling process to be replaced with a new program, with newly initialized stack, heap, and (initialized and uninitialized) data segments.

As we can read, execve is the main system call, whereas the others are simply routines that use this call in it and add certain extras on top.

b)

Write two programs that execute the command "/bin/ls -l /". The first program should use execl and the second execv. Attach a screenshot of how they work.

Answer 3 b) Note: check the code in the folder for this question

Since both execl and execv are built on top of execve, they do essentially the same: replace the parent process to execute a new program on the process. Because it substitutes the other running process, it is generally required to only call these functions inside children, that is why my code has these function calls inside child processes (from fork). The structure of these commands is very well thought out. Here is a general overview of what each part of the command name reflects in the functionality of the function:

- exec: root name of command, executes a command.
- $\bullet\,$ v: passes the command's argument list as an array (null-terminated).
- 1: passes the command's argument list as subsequent arguments (last argument is null).
- p: the first argument of the function can be the name of the executable instead of its full path. These functions will internally look for the command in the argument using the PATH environment variable.
- e: Environment (envp) is passed to the command to be executed.

With these things explained, it is clear what the difference between execl and execv are: both take the full path of an executable as the first argument, but execl receives an undefined number of extra arguments representing the argv for the new command, while execv receives an array as argv. Neither of them get an extra argument in the end for the envp.

```
gcc -Wall -Wextra -Werror <u>execl.c</u> && ./a.out
total 20
                                 7 Oct 18 23:01 bin -> usr/bin
lrwxrwxrwx
             1 root
                       root
             1 root
                                 0 Oct 18 23:01 boot
drwxr-xr-x
                       root
drwxr-xr-x
            21 nobody nobody 4340 Dec 23 15:54 dev
                              2028 Dec 23 19:19 etc
             1 root
                       root
drwxr-xr-x
                                10 Dec 23 11:59 home
drwxr-xr-x
             1 root
                       root
                                 7 Oct 18 23:01 lib -> usr/lib
             1 root
lrwxrwxrwx
                       root
                                 7 Oct 18 23:01 lib64 -> usr/lib
             1 root
                       root
lrwxrwxrwx
                                40 Dec 23 11:41 media
             2 nobody nobody
drwxr-xr-x
drwxr-xr-x
             1 nobody nobody
                                0 Nov 13 11:19 mnt
drwxr-xr-x
             1 root
                       root
                                30 Dec 23 12:48 opt
                                0 Dec 23 12:15 proc
dr-xr-xr-x 616 nobody nobody
drwxr-x---
             1 root
                       root
                                20 Dec 23 16:44 root
drwxr-xr-x
             1 root
                               366 Dec 23 11:59 run
                       root
                                 7 Oct 18 23:01 sbin -> usr/bin
             1 root
lrwxrwxrwx
                       root
                                 0 Nov 13 11:19 srv
drwxr-xr-x
             1 nobody nobody
            13 nobody nobody
                                 0 Dec 23 11:41 sys
dr-xr-xr-x
                               540 Dec 23 19:21 tmp
            21 nobody nobody
drwxrwxrwt
             1 root
                                62 Dec 23 16:45 usr
drwxr-xr-x
                       root
drwxr-xr-x
             1 root
                       root
                                50 Dec 23 11:59 var
 gcc -Wall -Wextra -Werror <u>execv.c</u> && ./a.out
total 20
                                 7 Oct 18 23:01 bin -> usr/bin
lrwxrwxrwx
             1 root
                       root
                                   Oct 18 23:01 boot
             1 root
drwxr-xr-x
                       root
            21 nobody nobody 4340 Dec 23 15:54 dev
drwxr-xr-x
drwxr-xr-x
             1 root
                       root
                              2028 Dec 23 19:19 etc
drwxr-xr-x
             1 root
                                10 Dec 23 11:59 home
                       root
lrwxrwxrwx
                                 7 Oct 18 23:01 lib -> usr/lib
             1 root
                       root
             1 root
lrwxrwxrwx
                       root
                                 7 Oct 18 23:01 lib64 -> usr/lib
                                40 Dec 23 11:41 media
drwxr-xr-x
             2 nobody nobody
                                0 Nov 13 11:19 mnt
             1 nobody nobody
drwxr-xr-x
drwxr-xr-x
                                30 Dec 23 12:48 opt
             1 root
                       root
dr-xr-xr-x 616 nobody nobody
                                 0 Dec 23 12:15 proc
                                20 Dec 23 16:44 root
             1 root
                       root
drwxr-x---
                               366 Dec 23 11:59 run
             1 root
                       root
drwxr-xr-x
                                 7 Oct 18 23:01 sbin -> usr/bin
             1 root
lrwxrwxrwx
                       root
                                 0 Nov 13 11:19 srv
             1 nobody nobody
drwxr-xr-x
            13 nobody nobody
                                 0 Dec 23 11:41 sys
dr-xr-xr-x
            21 nobody nobody
drwxrwxrwt
                               540 Dec 23 19:21 tmp
                                62 Dec 23 16:45 usr
             1 root
                       root
drwxr-xr-x
             1 root
                                50 Dec 23 11:59 var
drwxr-xr-x
                       root
```

Figure 4: Sample Outputs

c)

The execw.c and execp.c programs differ only in that one uses the write system call while the other uses the printf routine. If you run them, you will see that the behaviour is different. What is it due to?

```
enricm@pcmartorell-i-ribas:~/.../dev$ ./execw
Current weekday is: Tuesday
enricm@pcmartorell-i-ribas:~/.../dev$ ./execp
Tuesday
enricm@pcmartorell-i-ribas:~/.../dev$
```

Figure 5: Sample Output

Answer 3 c) Just like with the case in Question 2d, printf has buffer management (it is line-buffered), and the string to be printed before the date is not printed because it has no newline \n. The family of exec functions all replace the process, so if the buffer is not flushed before it will never be printed on the screen.

Summary

This second practical activity was nice. Even though I had some background knowledge on processes, there were still various details I completely ignored.