CMSI 387-01
OPERATING SYSTEMS
Spring 2014

Assignment 0403 part 1 Feedback

Carlos Agudo

r2d32 / carlos.jorrillo@gmail.com

CSI: Process

1a — More command line practice, more proficiency goodness. (**+**)

3a — You successfully performed the requested activities on two operating systems, but never provided any useful commentary about them or the commands you performed. (**/**)

A Shell of Your Own

2c — You have written an operating system shell—yay! And it hits the requested functionality decently. (**+**)

4a — You got `chdir`, the secret system call, `&`, full use of parsing in order to execute multi-argument commands, and *almost* EOF handling. (**+**)

4b — Your code is structured decently, although you do have a couple of unused variables (see *4c*). (**|**)

4c — Your code does not always communicate with other human programmers very well. Spacing can be better than it is, you have a bunch of unnecessary comments cluttering things up, and yet there was one part that *could* have used a comment but doesn't have one (`line`? `safeline`?). And what's up with that insanely cryptic `rjhchdir` function name? At this level, such things are inexcusable. (**/**)

Points to Ponder

1b — No answers, no credit. (**−**)

All

4d — For **CSI: Process**, you did the right commands and appear to have figured some new ones out for displaying threads, but without further information from you there's no telling how much you actually understand. You do seem to have gotten the needed programming information for your shell, but on the other hand you completely missed the **Points to Ponder**. (**/**)

4e — Commit messages look good, but frequency is insufficient for the shell. 3 commits for all of that, with the first (initial copy of *fork-exec.c*) and the last (a single deleted blank line) barely counting…yeah, I think you could have phased that *much* more granularly. (**/**)

4f — Mostly submitted on time, except for **Points to Ponder**. (**/**)