CSE 344 HW5 REPORT

Ömer Faruk SAYAR 171044038

Global Variables:

```
typedef struct {
   int dest_fd;
    char src_path[MAX_PATH_LENGTH];
   char dest path[MAX PATH LENGTH];
pthread_mutex_t buffer_mutex = PTHREAD_MUTEX_INITIALIZER;
pthread mutex t output mutex = PTHREAD MUTEX INITIALIZER;
pthread_mutex_t total_bytes_mutex = PTHREAD_MUTEX_INITIALIZER;
pthread_mutex_t total_files_mutex = PTHREAD_MUTEX_INITIALIZER;
pthread_cond_t buffer_not_full_cond = PTHREAD_COND_INITIALIZER;
pthread_cond_t buffer_not_empty_cond = PTHREAD_COND_INITIALIZER;
int buffer_size = 0;
int buffer_capacity = 0;
int buffer_front = 0;
int buffer_rear = 0;
int num_consumers = 0;
long long total_file = 0;
long long total byte = 0;
long long total directory = 0;
__sig_atomic_t done = 0;
 _sig_atomic_t total_fifo = 0;
pthread_t producer_thread;
pthread_t* consumer_threads;
```

To provide synchronization between producer thread and consumer threads I used mutex and condition variables.

Since our buffer is the critical section, producer locks the buffer and wait until buffer_not_full signal comes using pthread_cond_wait before enqueue the Copy struct. After the enqueue operation it signals to buffer_not_emtpy condition variable.

Consumers also lock the buffer using mutex and wait until buffer_not_empty signal comes using pthread_cond_wait. After the dequeue operation consumer send signal to buffer_not_full variable.

Producer:

```
Copy request;
request.src_fd = src_fd;
request.dest_fd = dest_fd;
strncpy(request.src_path, src_file, sizeof(request.src_path));
strncpy(request.dest_path, dest_file, sizeof(request.dest_path));
pthread_mutex_lock(&buffer_mutex);
while (is_buffer_full()) {
    pthread_cond_wait(&buffer_not_full_cond, &buffer_mutex);
}
enqueue(request);
pthread_cond_signal(&buffer_not_empty_cond);
pthread_mutex_unlock(&buffer_mutex);
```

Consumer:

```
void* consumer(void* arg) {
   while (1) {
      pthread_mutex_lock(&buffer_mutex);

   while (is_buffer_empty() && !done) {
            pthread_cond_wait(&buffer_not_empty_cond, &buffer_mutex);
      }

   if (is_buffer_empty() && done) {
            pthread_mutex_unlock(&buffer_mutex);
            break;
      }

   Copy request = dequeue();
    pthread_cond_signal(&buffer_not_full_cond);
   pthread_mutex_unlock(&buffer_mutex);

   copy_file(request);
   }

pthread_exit(NULL);
```

I also used a mutex for writing to stdout and another mutex to sum total byte copied and total regular file number copied. I used sig_atomic_t type for counting number of FIFO files copied.

```
void signal handler(int signum){
   pthread mutex lock(&buffer mutex);
   done = 1:
   pthread cond broadcast(&buffer not empty cond):
   pthread mutex unlock(&buffer mutex);
   {\tt pthread\_cancel(producer\_thread);}
    for (int i = 0; i < num consumers; <math>i++) {
       pthread cancel(consumer threads[i]);
   // Wait for producer and consumer threads to terminate
   pthread join(producer thread, NULL);
   for (int i = 0; i < num consumers; i++) {
       pthread join(consumer threads[i], NULL);
   free(buffer):
   free(consumer_threads);
   printf("Exit signal received! \n");
   printf("Total number of regular files: %lld\n", total_file);
   printf("Total number of directories: %lld\n", total_directory);
   printf("Total number of bytes: %lld\n", total_byte);
   printf("Total number of FIFOs: %d\n", total fifo);
   exit(signum);
```

There is a signal handler for SIGINT, SIGTERM and SIGQUIT signals. This handler makes done flag 1 and broadcasts buffer_not_empty signal then cancels producer thread and consumer threads. After wait until all threads terminates. Then frees all resources that allocated and prints the results.

I implemented buffer as a circular array queue with fixed size for better performance.

```
void init buffer(int size) {
   buffer = (Copy*)malloc(sizeof(Copy) * size);
   buffer size = 0;
   buffer capacity = size;
   buffer front = 0;
   buffer rear = 0;
int is_buffer_empty() {
   return buffer_size == 0;
int is buffer full() {
   return buffer size == buffer capacity;
void enqueue(Copy request) {
   buffer[buffer_rear] = request;
   buffer_rear = (buffer_rear + 1) % buffer_capacity;
   buffer size++;
Copy dequeue() {
   Copy request = buffer[buffer front];
   buffer front = (buffer front + 1) % buffer capacity;
   buffer_size--;
   return request;
```

TEST RESULTS

Consumer: 2

Buffer Size vs. Performance:

```
Total time taken: 0.67 seconds
Buffer size: 10
                             Total file copied: 7108
Consumer: 2
                             Total directory copied: 1581
                             Total FIFO copied: 1
                            Total byte copied: 761571694
Buffer size: 50
                            Total time taken: 0.66 seconds
Consumer: 2
                             Total file copied: 7108
                             Total directory copied: 1581 COM
                             Total FIFO copied: 1
                            Total byte copied: 761571694
                             Total time taken: 0.63 seconds
Buffer size: 100
                             Total file copied: 7108
Consumer: 2
                             Total directory copied: 1581 COMM
                             Total FIFO copied: 1
                             Total byte copied: 761571694
                            Total time taken: 0.62 seconds
Buffer size: 500
                            Total file copied: 7108
```

Total directory copied: 1581 COMM

Total byte copied: 761571694

Total FIFO copied: 1

Observations: From the results, increasing the buffer size from 10 to 500 generally leads to a decrease in the total time taken, indicating improved performance. However, after a certain threshold (around 500), the performance gain becomes marginal. Therefore, a buffer size of around 100-500 seems to provide a good balance between performance and memory usage.

Number of Consumer Threads vs. Performance:

Buffer Size: 500

Number of Consumers: 2

Buffer Size: 500

Number of Consumers: 4

Buffer Size: 500

Number of Consumers: 8

Buffer Size: 500

Number of Consumers: 16

Buffer Size: 500

Number of Consumers:32

Total time taken: 0.64 seconds

Total file copied: 7108

Total directory copied: 1581

Total FIFO copied: 1

Total byte copied: 761571694

Total time taken: 0.56 seconds

Total file copied: 7108

Total directory copied: 1581

Total FIFO copied: 1

Total byte copied: 761571694

Total time taken: 0.55 seconds

Total file copied: 7108

Total directory copied: 1581

Total FIFO copied: 1

Total byte copied: 761571694

Total time taken: 0.58 seconds

Total file copied: 7108

Total directory copied: 1581

Total FIFO copied: 1

Total byte copied: 761571694

Total time taken: 0.57 seconds

Total file copied: 7108

Total directory copied: 1581

Total FIFO copied: 1

Total byte copied: 761571694

Observations: Increasing the number of consumer threads from 2 to 4 leads to a significant improvement in performance, reducing the total time taken. However, further increasing the number of consumer threads beyond 4 does not result in a significant improvement. In fact, in some cases, it may slightly degrade performance due to increased thread coordination overhead. Therefore, a number of consumer threads between 4 and 8 seems to provide the best performance.

Conclusion: Based on the conducted experiments, the following combinations of buffer size and number of consumer threads produce the best results for my code:

• Buffer Size: 500

• Number of Consumer Threads: 8