Producers = 1				
Consumers	**FCFS Run Time**	**SJF Run Time**	**FCFS Avg Wait (s)**	**SJF Avg Wait (s)**
1	0:20	0:32	0.028431	0.026997
5	0:09	0:08	0.000071	0.000092
10	0:09	0:06	0.000094	0.000113
25	0:07	0:09	0.000064	0.000073
50	0:09	0:09	0.000080	0.000096
Producers = 5				
Consumers	**FCFS Run Time**	**SJF Run Time**	**FCFS Avg Wait (s)**	**SJF Avg Wait (s)**
5	0:28	0:30	0.021252	0.020756
10	0:17	0:15	0.022267	0.014015
25	0:10	0:09	0.001948	0.002194
50	0:09	0:09	0.001886	0.002001
Producers = 10				
Consumers	**FCFS Run Time**	**SJF Run Time**	**FCFS Avg Wait (s)**	**SJF Avg Wait (s)**
5	0:50	0:55	0.025293	0.027864
10	0:32	0:27	0.025871	0.021157
25	0:15	0:16	0.014043	0.018479
50	0:10	0:09	0.004726	0.003790
Producers = 50				
Consumers	**FCFS Run Time**	**SJF Run Time**	**FCFS Avg Wait (s)**	**SJF Avg Wait (s)**
5	4:21	4:17	0.032384	0.032339
10	2:20	2:09	0.032029	0.031880
25	0:58	0:53	0.031089	0.030347
50	0:31	0:29	0.027996	0.027511

SJF showed a smaller average wait time than FCFS as expected, but there was some error. I set the number of jobs for each producer to 5 to cut down on the error generated from that randomness, but the size of the jobs was still random, so the consumers having to wait on that could be the cause.