Report

Yating Li(yl657), Rui Yang(ry70)

Test Method:

We open 512 threads in the client. Each thread keeps sending and receiving requests until the desired number has been sent and received. Then, the time from sending the first one to receiving the last response is the total time.

Each result is the average of 10 experiments.

Test1:

Conditions: fix bucket size = 512;

fix delay range = small(1, 3).

Changes: test method: per-thread, pre-thread;

the number of cores: 1, 2, 4.

Performance: the number of requests that could be handled per second

| #core | #request | per-time/ms | performance | pre-time/ms | performance |
|-------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1 | 10 | 3044 | 2.9069 | 4960 | 2.0161 |
| | 50 | 3307 | 15.1194 | 7832 | 6.3841 |
| | 200 | 5372 | 37.2301 | 8214 | 24.3487 |
| | 500 | 5789 | 86.3707 | 19709 | 25.3691 |
| | 1000 | 8641 | 115.7273 | 19076 | 52.4219 |
| 2 | 10 | 3022 | 3.309 | 5295 | 1.8889 |
| | 50 | 3362 | 14.8721 | 5555 | 9.0010 |
| | 200 | 4551 | 43.9464 | 6171 | 29.6428 |
| | 500 | 6732 | 74.2721 | 13250 | 37.7359 |
| | 1000 | 9726 | 102.81712 | 20789 | 48.1024 |
| 4 | 10 | 3079 | 3.2478 | 5017 | 1.9932 |

| 50 | 3296 | 15.1699 | 6238 | 8.0154 |
|------|-------|---------|-------|---------|
| 200 | 6791 | 29.4507 | 7171 | 27.8901 |
| 500 | 12580 | 39.7456 | 7725 | 64.7249 |
| 1000 | 18280 | 54.7046 | 18134 | 55.1450 |

- 1, As the number of cores increases, the performance increases. Also, the extent of the performance boost will increase when the number of requests increases.
- 2, The pre-created threading method is not as efficient as per-created threading when the number of cores is small or the number of threads is small. This is reasonable since pre-thread needs to check for available threads. When the number of cores is large, it is fast to do those check work. When the number of requests is large, the fraction of time spent on distributing the requests to specific threads decreases.

Test2:

Conditions: fix the bucket size = 512;

fix the number of cores = 4;

Changes: test method: per-thread, pre-thread;

delay range: small(1-3), large(1-20).

| delay range | #request | per-time/ ms | performance | pre-time/ ms | performance |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| small | 10 | 3079 | 3.2478 | 5017 | 1.9932 |
| | 50 | 3296 | 15.1699 | 6238 | 8.0154 |
| | 200 | 6791 | 29.4507 | 7171 | 27.8901 |
| | 500 | 12580 | 39.7456 | 7725 | 64.7249 |
| | 1000 | 18280 | 54.7046 | 18134 | 55.1450 |

| large | 10 | 17058 | 0.5862 | 18701 | 0.5347 |
|-------|------|-------|---------|-------|---------|
| | 50 | 20410 | 2.4498 | 20848 | 2.3983 |
| | 200 | 22029 | 9.079 | 21141 | 9.4603 |
| | 500 | 27334 | 19.2922 | 22561 | 22.1621 |
| | 1000 | 41237 | 24.2501 | 44658 | 22.3924 |

When the delay time is large, the pre-thread will have a better performance. For the per-thread method, it will create a lot of new threads which is very time-consuming. While pre-thread will balance the work and assign the new request to the available thread.

Test3:

Conditions: fix the number of cores = 4;

fix the delay range = small(1-3).

Changes: test method: per-thread, pre-thread;

bucket size: 32, 128, 512, 2048.

| #buc ket | #requ est | per-time/ms | performance | pre-time/ms | performance |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 32 | 10 | 3034 | 3.2960 | 4276 | 2.3386 |
| | 50 | 3657 | 13.6724 | 4328 | 11.5527 |
| | 200 | 5641 | 35.4547 | 6273 | 31.8827 |
| | 500 | 7671 | 65.1806 | 8258 | 60.5473 |
| | 1000 | 12225 | 81.7996 | 19020 | 52.5762 |
| 128 | 10 | 3031 | 3.2992 | 4916 | 2.0342 |
| | 50 | 3514 | 14.2288 | 4959 | 10.0827 |
| | 200 | 5084 | 39.3391 | 6331 | 31.5906 |

| | 500 | 9373 | 53.3447 | 8143 | 61.4024 |
|------|------|-------|---------|-------|---------|
| | 1000 | 11281 | 88.6446 | 20944 | 47.7364 |
| 512 | 10 | 3018 | 3.1334 | 5017 | 1.9932 |
| | 50 | 4147 | 12.0569 | 6238 | 8.0153 |
| | 200 | 6087 | 29.1121 | 7171 | 27.8901 |
| | 500 | 16658 | 30.0156 | 7725 | 64.7249 |
| | 1000 | 15885 | 62.9525 | 20944 | 47.7463 |
| 2048 | 10 | 3033 | 3.2971 | 6380 | 1.5673 |
| | 50 | 3192 | 15.6641 | 4864 | 10.2796 |
| | 200 | 5329 | 37.5305 | 5400 | 37.0370 |
| | 500 | 10845 | 46.1041 | 8850 | 56.4971 |
| | 1000 | 19085 | 52.3971 | 17893 | 55.8878 |

If the ratio of the number of requests over the bucket size is large, it means that there are lots of requests need to check the same bucket. However, when threads access the same bucket, we need to use the lock to prevent a race condition, which leads to the serialization of the whole process.

Reflection:

- 1, The result shows that the number of experiments is not large enough to decline the influence of random. We should have started earlier and tested more to calculate the average.
- 2, We should have managed the resources such as memory allocations better so that our server could handle more requests at the same time and run for a longer period.