

Assignment - 4

Name :- Saihiti Mishra

Roll no :- 2301410005

Course :- Btech CSE (Cyber Security)

Ques 1:- Explain race conditions with a real-world example outside of computing, and show how mutual exclusion addresses it.

Ans:- Imagine two people trying to withdraw money from the same bank account at the same ATM at the same time. Both see the balance as 500. Each withdraws ₹500, and the system allows both, causing inconsistency. The final outcome depends on "who finishes first" not on correct logic → This is a race condition.

→ How mutual exclusion solves it:

A mutex would allow only one user to access/update the account at a time. When one withdrawal is in progress, the other must wait. This prevents conflicting updates and ensures consistent balance.

Ques 2:- Compare Peterson's solution and semaphores in terms of implementation complexity and hardware dependency.

Ans:- Peterson's solutions:-

- Pure software-level algorithm; Simple but error-prone; limited to 2 processes.
- Requires strict assumptions about atomic read/write ordering → not reliable on modern multi-core CPUs.

→ Semaphores:-

- More general:- easier for programmers; widely supported.
- Depends on hardware atomic operations like test-and-set; explicitly supported by processors.

Ques 3. The producer-consumer problem can be solved using either semaphores or monitors. Identify one advantage of using monitors in a multi-core system.

Ans:- Monitors automatically combine mutual exclusion with Condition Variables, so synchronization is handled implicitly by the language / runtime.

Advantage:- They prevent low-level race conditions automatically, allowing threads on multiple cores to safely access shared data without manually managing semaphores, reducing bugs and complexity.

Ques 4:- For the Reader-writer problem, explain how starvation can occur and describe one method to prevent it.

Ans:- Starvation:- If the system gives priority to readers, a continuous stream of readers can keep arriving, causing a waiting writer to never get access \rightarrow writer starvation.

Prevention Method:- use writer preference: Once a writer requests the lock, no new readers are allowed to enter. Existing readers finish, then the writer is served. This ensures no indefinite waiting.

Ques 5:- In deadlock prevention, the "Hold and wait" condition can be eliminated. Explain one practical drawback of doing so in an OS.

Ans:- To prevent deadlock, processes must request all resources at once before starting.

\rightarrow Practical drawback:-

This leads to low resource utilization. A process may hold several resources it is not currently using, while others wait unnecessarily. This increases waiting time and reduces system throughput.

Ques 6:- Distributed Deadlock Detection Simulation:

Three sites S_1 , S_2 and S_3 have the following wait-for graph fragments:

- S_1 : $P_1 \rightarrow P_2$, $P_3 \rightarrow P_4$
- S_2 : $P_2 \rightarrow P_5$, $P_5 \rightarrow P_6$
- S_3 : $P_6 \rightarrow P_1$

- Combine these fragments to form the global wait-for graph.
- Detect if a deadlock exists, and list the processes involved.
- Suggest one distributed algorithm that could be applied to detect it.

Ans. (a) Combining all edges from the three edge fragments.

Graphically:

$P_1 \rightarrow P_2 \rightarrow P_5 \rightarrow P_6$

and separately $P_3 \rightarrow P_4$

(b) Detect deadlock and list processes involved

→ A deadlock exist if there is a cycle in the wait-for-graph
→ we have the cycle $P_1 \rightarrow P_2 \rightarrow P_5 \rightarrow P_6 \rightarrow P_1$. Process involved in the deadlock → P_1, P_2, P_5, P_6

(c) Suggest one distributed deadlock detection.

→ Chandy - Misra - Hass (Probe) algorithm is standard choice for distributed deadlock detection

How it work :-

- A process that suspect it is blocked (or a site periodically) initiates probe messages if from.

Ques 7:- Distributed file system performance:

A DFS has the following characteristics:

- Average local file access time: 5ms
- Average remote file access time: 25ms
- Probability of file being remote: 0.3

- a) Calculate the expected file access time.
- b) Suggest one caching strategy to improve performance, and justify your choice.

Ans. Given:

- Local access time $T_L = 5\text{ms}$
- Remote access time $T_R = 25\text{ms}$
- Probability of file is remote $P \rightarrow 0.3$

- a) Expected time $E[T]$ is:

$$E[T] = P \cdot T_R + (1-P) \cdot T_L$$

Plug numbers:

$$E[T] = 0.3 \times 25 + 0.7 \times 5 = 7.5 + 3.5 \\ = 11.0\text{ms}.$$

- b) Caching strategy suggestion.

→ Suggested strategy:- client side LRU caching with write-back for read-heavy file and validation TTL.

Justification:-

- LRU (Least Recently used):- works well in practice because file access pattern often show temporal locality or recently used file are likely to be reused.

Ques:- In a Concurrent system, a full checkpoint takes 200ms, while an incremental checkpoint takes 50ms. The system must maintain recovery capability within a 1-second recovery point objective (RPO).

- Propose an optimal mix of checkpointing methods over a 10-second period to meet the RPO with minimal overhead.
- Explain your reasoning.

Ans:- a.) Proposed optimal mix

Steps:-

- Take one full checkpoint every 10s.
- Take incremental checkpoint every 1s between full checkpoints.

Total Checkpoint overhead periods:-

- Fulls : $1 \times 200 \text{ ms} = 200 \text{ ms}$
- incrementals : $9 \times 50 \text{ ms} = 450 \text{ ms}$

Total = 650 ms per 10s

→ average overhead :- 65 ms/s

b.) Reasoning :-

- RPO Constraint: The system must be prepared to restore a state no older than 1s; Therefore an incremental checkpoint must be taken at least once per second.
- Full checkpoint are expensive (200ms). Doing them less frequently reduces heavy overhead full checkpoint reduce recovery time because only one full.
- Trade off :- Frequent incremental add modest overhead but keep RPO tight Periodic fulls keeps recovery efficient.

Ques 9: Case Study — Global E-Commerce Platform:

A global e-commerce company runs its services using a distributed operating system deployed across multiple continents.

a.) Key challenges:

- 1.) Sudden bursty traffic :- Requests spike order of magnitude within seconds.
- 2.) Geographic latency & data locality :- User should be served from the nearest region when possible.
- 3.) Hot-spots / skewed load :- Certain products / regions get disproportionate attention.
- 4.) Fairness & SLA guarantees :- Mission-critical request (payment) must get prioritized.

b.) fault-tolerance strategy :-

1. Use multi-region Deployment.
2. Replicate data based on RPO Requirements.
3. Enable Automated failover to meet RTO.
4. Maintain Cross-region Backups & Regular DR Drills.