University of Warsaw

Faculty of Mathematics, Informatics and Mechanics

Krzysztof Małysa

Student no. 394442

Multi-process sandbox for unprivileged users on Linux

Master's thesis in COMPUTER SCIENCE

Supervisor: **dr Janina Mincer-Daszkiewicz** Institute of Informatics

Abstract

TODO

Keywords

sandboxing, security, Linux, secure execution, arbitrary code execution, judging system,

Thesis domain (Socrates-Erasmus subject area codes)

11.3 Informatics, Computer Science

Subject classification

Security and privacy – Systems security – Operating systems security

Tytuł pracy w języku polskim

Sandbox wielu procesów dla nieuprzywilejowanych użytkowników systemu Linux

Contents

1.	Intr	oduction
	1.1.	Background
	1.2.	Goal of the thesis
		1.2.1. Requirements
		1.2.2. Existing solutions
	1.3.	Structure of the Thesis
2.	Lite	rature overview
	2.1.	Overview of Sandboxing Techniques
	2.2.	Existing Implementations
		2.2.1. Modifying OS kernel
		2.2.2. ptrace-based
		2.2.3. Using Linux namespaces
		2.2.4. Other
	2.3.	Conclusion
3.	Des	ign and Architecture
	3.1.	Client-server architecture
		3.1.1. Sandboxing request handling
	3.2.	Cgroups
		Linux namespaces
		Inter-process communication
	3.5.	Capabilities
	3.6.	Hardening
	3.7.	Conclusion
4.	Imp	
		<u>Interface</u>
	4.2.	Time limits
		4.2.1. Real time limit
		4.2.2. CPU time limit
	4.3.	Runtime statistics
	4.4.	Error handling
	4.5.	Request sending and receiving
	4.6.	File descriptors
	4.7.	Canceling the request
		Killing the request
		Sandbox server upon client death

	4.10	. PID 1 process upon supervisor death
	4.11	. <mark>Signals</mark>
		4.11.1. Tracee signals
		4.11.2. SIGPIPE in the supervisor process
		4.11.3. Undefined Behavior Sanitizer
	4.12	. Running as superuser
	4.13	. Performance optimizations
		4.13.1. Seccomp filter of the PID 1 process
		4.13.2. Seccomp filter as file descriptor
		4.13.3. Unsharing network, ipc, uts and time namespace
	4.14	. Integration with Online Judge Platform
		4.14.1. Interactive problems
		4.14.2. Non-interactive problems
		4.14.3. Conclusion 27
	4.15	. Testing and validation
	4.16	. Challenges faced
		4.16.1. execveat returns EINVAL
		4.16.2. execveat returns ENOENT 27
	4.17	. Conclusion
_	_	
5.		formance Evaluation
	5.1.	In the context of the online judge
		5.1.1. Compilation
		5.1.2. Model solutions' run times
	5.2.	Short-running programs and comparison with nsjail
	- 0	5.2.1. Comparison with nsjail
		Impact of some optimizations
	5.4.	Conclusion
6	Cor	iclusion
٠.		Future work
	0.1.	6.1.1. CPU affinity
		6.1.2. Adding support for networking
		6.1.3. Rust frontend
		6.1.4. Further experimentation
	6.2	Acknowledgements 65

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. Background

Secure execution environments are commonplace these days, from containers and virtual machines on servers to sandboxes on laptop and smartphones — most of which run on Linux. They are used to securely execute untrusted code, as well as trusted programs to prevent damage escalation in the event of unknown vulnerabilities. Their key features are isolation, limiting resource usage, and accounting for resource consumption.

The features of Linux allow the creation of simple yet effective and efficient secure environments. They work at application runtime, so in most cases existing software does not need to be adapted to use them. This makes them easily applicable, and explains why their adoption is growing.

In this thesis, the most important application of sandboxing are online judge systems. Online judge systems have beneficial role in programming education and competitive programming. They allow testing user-provided solution to a specific problem. The solution is run on a predefined test cases in order to check if it is valid. In such platforms isolating the compilation and running of the tested program is essential to provide security and robustness of the platform itself.

Historically, isolation techniques evolved together with the online judge platforms. The most primitive (yet insecure) was usage of chroot(2) [29] to restrict access to part of the filesystem. To increase isolation virtual machines were used [2]. Later, containerization became a new way to provide isolation [20, 40].

Online education platforms greatly facilitate teaching and learning programming. They provide quick feedback on the correctness of the code the user submits. They are used in schools and universities and provide great learning opportunities for all.

Moreover, a versatile sandbox has applications outside online judging platforms. For example, it can be used to sanitize compiling a PDF form LATEX sources or for safe execution of untrusted server-side scripts in web applications.

1.2. Goal of the thesis

The goal of the thesis is to design, implement and integrate a new sandbox for the Sim project [16]. The Sim project is an online platform for preparing people for and carrying out algorithmic contests. The project started in 2012 and is developed by me since the beginning. It is used at the XIII High School in Szczecin and programming camps to teach young people programming and algorithms. It has an online judge with a sandbox specially developed for

this use case. Over the years the sandbox became a limitation. It only allows running a single-threaded statically linked executable of programs written in C, C++ or Pascal. The new sandbox will allow supporting more programming languages and improve security of the tested program compilation stage.

1.2.1. Requirements

The new sandbox needs to be optimized for running short-running programs as well as have minimal runtime overhead. Most of the test cases the tested program is run on are small and it completes them in less than 10ms. The goal is to allow hundreds of such sort-running runs per second, hence optimizing for short-running programs is important. However, minimizing overhead of the sandbox during the run is also important i.e. if the program runs X ms normally, the objective is that the program inside the new sandbox will also run approximately X ms.

The new sandbox needs to be versatile. It will be used to secure the compilation of the tested programs as well as running of the tested programs. Compilation is a complicated process that involves parsing, translating, optimizing and linking the final program. For languages like C, C++ and Rust it involves running several executables in coordination e.g. compiler and linker i.e. more than one process at a moment — the sandbox needs to support that.

Sandboxing needs to have a low overhead. Apart from small test where tested program runs quickly (a matter of milliseconds), almost always the tested program is run on big test cases, where it may need several seconds for it to solve the problem. Increasing this time as little as possible while the tested program is running inside the sandbox is one of the primary objectives.

It often requires running several executables e.g. compiler and linker, so allowing a single process inside sandbox is not enough. Sandboxing the tested program is simpler, because it is a single process. But since it is often short-running, the overhead needs to be minimal.

The sandbox needs to allow limiting resources. Real time, CPU time, memory – these need to be limited not only for the robustness of the platform, but specific problems require different limits. The goal of some problems is to solve it with very restricted memory e.g. find a missing integer in a random permutation of integers $1, \ldots, n$ without one element, but in constant memory.

The sandbox needs to account resource usage. For every test, the user is presented with consumed memory and CPU time by their solution. The sandbox needs to provide this information.

The last requirement is the sandbox will not require any privileges. There is a tool called Sip [17] for preparing the problem packages for the Sim platform. One of the purposes of the tool is to run the solutions inside the same secure environment as on the Sim platform. The user should not need any privileges to run this tool, so the sandbox should not require them either.

1.2.2. Existing solutions

Approaches to form a secure execution environments differ. One of them is virtualization or emulation e.g. QEMU [27] and KVM [26], VirtualBox [28], VMWare Workstation [44]. Although powerful and effective, they come with an enormous overhead i.e. booting up an entire operating system. Moreover, emulation noticeably slows down the runtime of an emulated application, rendering such solutions inapplicable.

Containers provide much lower overhead: setup of an order of milliseconds and negligible runtime overhead. But, Docker [22], LXC [1] require root privileges to create a container. systemd-nspawn [42] requires root privileges to run.

Rootless containers are containers [38] that can be created and run by an unprivileged user are the almost perfect solution to the problem. They provide almost all of the functionality of the normal containers but without the need to engage a privileged user. However, they often use setuid binaries and that is undesirable [39]. Also they are not optimized to run sequences of short-running programs. In this thesis we will create a sandbox that uses the same techniques as rootless containers but will be optimized for running sequences of short-running programs.

1.3. Structure of the Thesis

Chapter 2 contains overview of sandboxing techniques and existing implementations and comparative analysis of them. Details of design and architecture are described in chapter 3. Implementation is described in 4. Chapter 5 contains performance evaluation of the final implementation and impact of some optimizations. Finally, chapter 6 contains the conclusion and future work.

Chapter 2

Literature overview

2.1. Overview of Sandboxing Techniques

During the first programming competitions, the human judges manually read and verified the source code of the contestants' solutions [43]. Over time this became infeasible and gave birth to automatic judge systems.

To prevent people from interfering with the normal workflow of the competition e.g. Denial of Service Attack by exhausting memory resources, the automatic judge systems need a secure way to compile and execute a contest's solution. This is where sandboxes come into place.

First sandboxes required modification of the OS kernel [36, 7, 8, 10, 13]. While they had little run-time overhead, some of them were limited to single-threaded applications [24].

Later, as support for process tracing matured, ptrace-based sandboxes arose [19, 12, 11]. The problem with those solutions is the overhead that varies from around 75% [23] to 160% [20] for syscall-intensive programs. This overhead however, does not affect programming contest fairness much [18]. Supporting multi-threaded and multi-process programs while using ptrace is tricky, but possible [11], because of Time of Check/Time of Use (TOCTOU) problem [5]. ptrace-based sandbox needs to inspect syscall arguments. To do so it has to read them, but the multi-threaded or multi-process program can change the indirect argument after the reading but before the kernel uses the argument. This creates a dangerous race condition that has to be addressed.

Finally, after the kernel support for containerization materialized, namespace and cgroup based sandboxes came into place [20, 25, 37, 9, 6, 40]. Contrary to ptrace-based sandboxes, namespace-based sandboxes have negligible runtime overhead [20]. Moreover, they don't require modifications of the Linux kernel and work on major Linux distributions out of the box.

2.2. Existing Implementations

2.2.1. Modifying OS kernel

Systrace

Systrace [36] intercepts all system calls in the kernel. It then decides if the syscall is safe by first checking a static list of safe syscalls. This step exists to reduce sandboxing performance overhead. If the syscall is not on the list, Systrace consults user space for a decision.

The system avoids TOCTOU problem [5] by copying syscall arguments to kernel memory before asking user space for a decision.

Janus

Janus [7] adds a module to extend Linux ptrace API. Policies are defined using configuration files. By default all syscalls are denied. The configuration directive refers to the policy module that provides the logic for deciding whether to allow a particular system call or not. For example, path module could be used to restrict IO on certain file paths.

Ostia

Ostia [8] instead of filtering system calls delegates them to an external agent that performs syscalls on behalf of the sandboxed process. Authors emphasize that such architecture simplifies the system and protects from TOCTOU problems [5].

Ostia is implemented as two components: a small kernel module and a user space part. The module intercepts the syscall and copies its arguments via IPC link to the user space agent. The agent decides whether the call should be allowed, executes it and returns the results back over the IPC link. Worth noting is that not all syscalls have to be delegated — some can be always allowed while others always denied.

TxBox

TxBox [10] introduces system-level transaction support. Impact of the untrusted insecure code is limited by rolling back the system state after the execution. This provides strong isolation and works with arbitrary executables but requires significant out-of-tree patches of the OS kernel.

MiniBox

MiniBox [13] is a two-way sandbox that protects operating system from the application as well as application from the operating system. A modified version of TrustVisor [21] hypervisor runs OS and sandboxed application separately in a Mutually Isolated Execution Environment. The hypervisor is the only communication channel between the isolated application and the regular OS. This way application is protected from the malicious operating system. To protect the OS from the application, MiniBox uses Software Fault Isolation techniques from NaCl [45].

SACO sandbox

South African Computer Olympiad (SACO) sandbox [24] inserts a custom kernel module that hooks up to Linux Security Module infrastructure. Although it has negligible time and memory overhead, it only supports single-threaded programs.

2.2.2. ptrace-based

MO sandbox

MO sandbox [19, 12] allows only single-threaded programs. It simply inspects arguments using ptrace and uses setrlimit [31] to limit resources. It is used by USA Computer Olympiad (USACO).

MBOX

MBOX [11] requires no superuser privileges. It makes use of seccomp BPF system call filtering to restrict allowed syscalls. BPF filtering is effective only for non-indirect arguments. To

address this issue, the installed BPF filter notifies the ptrace monitoring process if further argument inspection is necessary to make a decision. To avoid TOCTOU problem [5], the MBOX allocates a read-only page to which it copies the indirect arguments before inspecting them and rewrites the syscall to use the rewritten arguments. The copied arguments are protected against modification because changing page access permissions is impossible without a syscall.

2.2.3. Using Linux namespaces

Firejail

Firejail [25] uses secomp BPF system call filtering and mount namespaces to restrict filesystem access. Similarly it uses process namespaces to limit view of running processes and network namespaces to restrict access to network devices. However, Firejail uses a setuid [34] helper binary to achieve that. It allows resource limiting through prlimit [31].

nsjail

nsjail [9] uses Linux namespaces, secomp BPF system call filtering, setrlimit [31] and cgroups to limit resources. It does not require superuser privileges. However, it is not optimized for running short-running programs. Also, it does not provide statistics of the run.

nsroot

nsroot [37] does not support resource limiting. It only makes use of Linux namespaces to restrict view of the file system, IPC and network devices.

Flatpak

Flatpak [6], previously xdg-app, is a software packaging and sandboxing tool. Internally, it uses Bubblewrap sandbox. The Bubblewrap [14] is a setuid [34] program that uses Linux namespaces and seccomp filters.

New Contest Sandbox

New Contest Sandbox [20] uses Linux namespaces and cgroups but not secomp filters. It is used by Moe modular contest system (2012) [20]. Linux namespaces and cgroups have negligible overhead compared to ptrace.

APAC

APAC (Automatic Programming Assignment Checker) [40] uses Docker for sandboxing. It sets up a container for each run. Docker uses runC under the hood. While runtime overhead of Docker is low, the setup phase is primary source of overhead for short-running programs.

runC

runC [3] uses the same features of Linux kernel as nsjail. However, configuration is stored as files instead of passed as command-line arguments. It has a special **rootless** mode which does not require superuser privileges. Given all of the above however, it is not optimized for running short-running programs. runC is used internally by Docker.

2.2.4. Other

Google Native Client

Native Client (NaCl) [45] uses static analysis and Software Fault Isolation. After the static analysis, the program runs at native speed but requires recompilation with special compiler and libraries. NaCl only works for x86 architecture.

2.3. Conclusion

Many sandboxing solutions exist. From all of the above, closest to our requirements is nsjail (see Section 2.2.3). However, it is not optimised for running short-running programs. In fact, none of the above solutions is optimised to run hundreds of short-running programs per second

Considering the similarities of nsjail and our solution, in the performance analysis we will compare our sandbox to nsjail sandbox.

Chapter 3

Design and Architecture

3.1. Client-server architecture

From the start the sandbox was based on the client-server architecture. This was the choice to minimize process cloning overhead [15], since it is a costly operation and happens for every sandboxing request. fork/clone needs to clone the whole address space of the process and the client process could have a large address space. Server process that is executed from a separate executable has a minimal required address space size therefore the cloning overhead is minimal for every request. Moreover, this architecture easily and safely allows sharing as much work as possible between the sandboxing requests which is the key to low overhead of running short-running programs.

The client spawns the sandboxing server and sends sandboxing requests via UNIX domain socket to the server. This is illustrated on Figure 3.1. The request contains executable, arguments, namespace configuration, resource limits, seccomp BPF filters and a pipe through which the result will be sent back.

At startup, the server creates cgroup hierarchy and some namespaces so that they won't have to be created later or their creation will be faster. Other utilities are also setup here to do it once instead of for every request. Then it starts accepting requests.




Figure 3.1: Sandbox server waits for requests. Client sends requests through the UNIX socket. Sandbox server will die on fatal error leaving the error message for the client in the anonymous file.

3.1.1. Sandboxing request handling

For each request, the server process (aka supervisor) spawns the PID 1 process of the new PID namespace. Then the init process setups namespaces and some of the resource limits. Finally the PID 1 process spawns the tracee process that finishes configuration and executes the requested executable. So for each sandboxing request we spawn exactly 2 processes. However, the executed program can spawn new processes — each of them is referred to as a "tracee process". The PID 1 process is necessary for a couple of reasons:

- It reaps the zombie processes in the tracee PID namespace.
- It allows locking mount-points in the mount namespace. The tracee process is spawned in a new user and mount namespace. Mounts are performed by the PID 1 process, therefore all mounts become locked together and cannot be individually unmounted by the tracee [32]. These mounts cannot be performed by the supervisor process instead, because it would alter the mount namespace for subsequent requests.
- Inside a PID namespace, sending signals to the PID 1 process is allowed only for signals that the PID 1 process installed signal handler for. This could change the behavior for some programs, therefore a helper PID 1 process is needed.

This is shown on Figure 3.2.




Figure 3.2: Sandbox server handles a request, at the moment after executing the requested executable. Sandbox server will die on fatal error leaving the error message for the client in the anonymous file. Sandbox server consist of the supervisor process and its child — the PID 1 process that is spawned for each request. The PID 1 process performs a role of the init process in the PID namespace of the tracee processes.

3.2. Cgroups

The server gains write access to cgroup hierarchy by being executed through systemd-run --user --scope --property=Delegate=yes --collect. It enables pid, memory, and cpu controllers for the below subgroups.

At startup, the server process creates the cgroup v2 hierarchy that looks as follows:

- /supervisor cgroup of the supervisor process,
- /pid1 cgroup of the pid1 process,
- /tracee cgroup of the tracee processes.

After creation of the hierarchy it places the supervisor process in its cgroup. Subsequent processes are placed in their cgroups by making use of CLONE_INTO_CGROUP flag. /tracee cgroup allows:

- Killing all tracee processes by writing 1 to /tracee/cgroup.kill file.
- Reading CPU user and CPU system time via /tracee/cpu.stat file.
- Reading peak memory usage via /tracee/memory.peak file.
- Setting process/tread number limit by writing /tracee/pids.max.
- Setting memory hard limit by writing /tracee/memory.max.
- Setting CPU usage limit by writing /tracee/cpu.max.
- Disabling PSI accounting to reduce the sandboxing overhead by writing 0 to /tracee/cgroup.pressure file.

/tracee cgroup needs to be deleted and recreated after each request to reset /tracee/cpu.stat and /tracee/memory.peak files.

3.3. Linux namespaces

Linux allows unprivileged users to create user namespaces only. However, after entering a new user namespace the process gains all privileges inside the namespace and can create other namespaces.

The supervisor process creates the following namespaces:

- user namespace in order to create other namespaces and hide user ID and group ID,
- mount namespace to allow mounting detached cgroups v2 hierarchy,
- cgroup namespace to allow mounting detached cgroups v2 hierarchy,
- network namespace to disconnect every tracee from network devices, done once, as it is costly,
- IPC namespace to isolate every tracee from other processes' IPC, done once, for optimization,
- UTS namespace to isolate every tracee from host's hostname, done once, for optimization,
- time namespace to isolate every tracee from host's time namespace, done once, for optimization.

The pid1 process creates the following namespaces:

- user namespace in order to create other namespaces and hide user ID and group ID,
- mount namespace to allow mounting requested mount-point hierarchy,
- PID namespace to isolate tracee from accessing other processes.

The tracee process creates the following namespaces:

- user namespace in order to create other namespaces and hide user ID and group ID and lock the mount tree,
- mount namespace in lock the mount tree created by pid1.

The listed namespaces hierarchy is illustrated on Figure 3.3.




Figure 3.3: Namespaces hierarchy of the sandbox server processes.

3.4. Inter-process communication

The client sends requests via UNIX domain socket to the supervisor process. The results are sent via a pipe attached to the request. The pipe is attached to the request as a file descriptor using SCM_RIGHTS control message [35].

The supervisor, pid1 and tracee process communicate via shared anonymous memory page. Figure 3.4 illustrates this communication. Such communication requires no syscalls, is fast and reliable. This page is automatically unmapped upon execveat syscall [30] in the tracee process, so it is protected from the tracee access.

3.5. Capabilities

The supervisor process drops all capabilities, sets securebits and NO_NEW_PRIVS flag. This ensures minimal possible capabilities in its and ancestor user namespace and prevents gaining any new privileges.




Figure 3.4: Sandbox server handles a request, at the moment before executing the requested executable. Sandbox server will die on fatal error leaving the error message for the client in the anonymous file. Sandbox server consist of the supervisor process and its child — the PID 1 process that is spawned for each request and its child — the tracee process that will execute the requested executable. The tracee process saves in the shared memory the time just before execveat and signals the PID 1 process. The PID 1 process reads the time saved in the shared memory and starts the real and CPU timers. After the tracee process dies, the PID 1 process writes exit code and status of the tracee process and the time it died. Moreover, the shared memory is used to communicate fatal errors to the supervisor process.

3.6. Hardening

The pid1 process, after spawning the tracee enters a new cgroup namespace to limit view of other namespaces i.e. if the tracee somehow takes control of the pid1 process, it will not be able to raise its PID and memory limit. Moreover a seccomp filter is installed to limit allowed syscalls only to those needed for reaping the orphaned zombie process, managing time limits and exiting upon tracee death.

3.7. Conclusion

Client-server architecture allows time-performance optimizations. Furthermore, it allows more common work to be done once and simplifies implementation. For instance, file descriptors do not leak to other processes because there are no threads that could fork a new process. Request handling requires creation of 2 processes — the PID 1 process and the tracee process that later executes the requested program. Resource limits and accounting is mostly performed by cgroups. Isolation is achieved by deft usage of Linux namespaces.

Chapter 4

Implementation

The project is written in C++, as it is a low-overhead, low-level language, but more convenient than C. Git is used as a Version Control System to track incremental implementation. Invaluable tool used during development was **strace** [41]. It allowed easy inspection of system calls and their return values without any modification to the source code.

4.1. Interface

The client has to spawn the sandbox server — the supervisor process. It then operates on the connection handle. Using the connection handle, the client can send requests to execute programs in the sandbox.

After sending a request, a request handle object is constructed. It can be used to obtain result of the execution, cancel execution or kill the tracee processes. Canceling execution is useful in case of errors in the client, where the result of the execution as well as the execution itself are no longer needed. Upon cancellation of the request, tracee process are immediately killed. Result of running the request is discarded. Canceling an already finished request discards the result. Canceling the request before the server started handling it causes it to be skipped. Killing an already finished request is no-op. Killing the request before the server started handling it causes tracee to be immediately killed after the execveat.

The client can then await the result of the request using the request handle. The result can either be a successful result or an error with a textual description. This error is not fatal to the supervisor process i.e. new requests can be sent. The successful result consists of the exit code and status, and runtime statistics:

- real time,
- CPU user and CPU system time,
- peak tracee cgroup memory usage.

Each request has a set of accompanying options:

- Optional stdin, stdout, and stderr file descriptors. If optional is specified as empty, /dev/null is opened as the file descriptor.
- Environment as an array view of string views.
- Linux namespace configuration:

- user ID and group ID mapping,
- mounts and new root mount,
- Cgroup resource limits: process and thread limit, memory limit, CPU maximum bandwidth.
- prlimit hard limits.
- Real time limit.
- CPU time limit.
- Seccomp BPF filter as a file descriptor. The decision to pass it as a file descriptor is that it lowers the overhead of repeatedly using the same filter a common scenario in a judge system. Only the file descriptor needs to be sent with each request instead of the whole BPF filter content. This allows the filter to be compiled once and passed for multiple requests with minimal overhead. An alternative is to extend the API to save seccomp filters but it was considered unnecessary given how small is the overhead of passing a single file descriptor.

4.2. Time limits

The PID 1 process controls the time limits. The tracee process, just before execveat saves current real time from CLOCK_MONOTONIC_RAW and CPU time from cpu.stat tracee cgroup file to the shared memory (see Figure 3.4). The problem with cpu.stat file is that it is updated infrequently. For a young tracee process, this file often reports consumed CPU time equal to 0 microseconds instead of a few hundred microseconds. Fortunately, executing sched_yield() system call forces recalculation of the file and the values are no longer 0. This is why this syscall is required as allowed in the seccomp BPF filter.

4.2.1. Real time limit

After saving the current real time the tracee process signals the PID 1 process with SIGUSR2. The PID 1 process reads the saved real time and sets up a POSIX timer to expire at the moment of saved time + real time limit. When the timer expires, SIGUSR1 is sent by the kernel to the PID 1 process and it terminates all tracee processes by writing 1 to the cgroup.kill file of the tracee cgroup.

4.2.2. CPU time limit

In case the tracee is not restricted to one process, the setup is analogous to real time except that there is no CPU timer for a cgroup of processes. Instead we calculate minimal period of time in which the CPU time limit could expire as follows: $\frac{\text{remaining cpu time}}{\text{max parallelism}}, \text{ where max parallelism}$ allelism equals: $\min(\text{available threads}, \text{process_num_limit}, \text{cpu_max_bandwidth in threads}).$ Upon the timer expiration the remaining cpu time is recalculated and the timer is rescheduled if the remaining cpu time is greater than 0. Timer expiration is signaled by the kernel as signal SIGXCPU. To prevent polling, the minimal timer expiration period is capped to have minimum value of 1ms — this gives at most 1000 checks per second.

In case the tracee is restricted to one process, the setup is different. After saving the current CPU time the tracee process signals the PID 1 process through a pipe. A signal

cannot be used because timer_create syscall and clock_getcpuclockid library function are not marked async-signal-safe — they are not specified to be safe to call inside a signal handler. An eventfd cannot be used either, because if tracee dies before writing to the eventfd, the PID 1 process will wait indefinitely on the read syscall. With a pipe, read syscall returns 0 when the other end becomes closed. With the limit of one process we use the CPU timer of the tracee process and set up a timer to expire when the tracee exceeds the CPU time limit.

In both cases, when the CPU time limit is exceeded, the PID 1 process is signaled about it and it terminates all tracee processes by writing 1 to cgroup.kill file of the tracee cgroup.

4.3. Runtime statistics

After the main tracee process (the first spawned process) exits, the PID 1 process saves the current real time and the exit status in the shared memory, unless the tracee set an error, and exits. The kernel kills all remaining tracee processes (because the PID namespace's init process died). After the PID 1 process exits, the supervisor process reads the shared memory (see Figure 3.4). It checks if there is an error of either tracee or PID 1 process. If there is one, it becomes the result of the request. If there is none, the supervisor process calculates:

- real time using formula: time of tracee death saved execveat real time,
- CPU time using formula: CPU time read from cpu.stat file-saved execveat CPU time,
- Peak memory usage by reading memory.peak tracee cgroup file.

4.4. Error handling

Errors in the supervisor process are considered fatal and are reported by writing to stderr. After writing errors, the supervisor process exits immediately. When the client tries to read the request result, the read will fail with read returning unexpected value 0. The client then ensures the supervisor process is dead (in case the communication failed) and tries to read the error the supervisor wrote. If the client finds one it throws exception with this error, otherwise it throws the exception with the read error.

The PID 1 process and tracee process write error to the shared memory (see Figure 3.4) and exit immediately. The supervisor process reports these errors as a request result.

4.5. Request sending and receiving

The request is sent via UNIX domain socket (see Figure 3.1). The request consists of a constant-length with file descriptors and a variable length body. The request header contains only the length of the request body. The request body contains all parameters of the request that are serialized to a custom binary format.

4.6. File descriptors

The sandbox server closes all file descriptors except the UNIX socket fd and opens /dev/null as stdin, stdout, and stderr. This is a small optimization, in case the request does not specify a standard file descriptor. For instance, if the request is to execute a program without stdin, the sandbox server has to set up the stdin of the tracee process to be /dev/null

opened for reading. However, the tracee process inherits the file descriptors of the PID 1 process that inherits the file descriptors of the supervisor process. The supervisor process has already opened /dev/null as the stdin file descriptor. Therefore no action is needed in the PID 1 process and the tracee process for stdin of the tracee process to be /dev/null opened for reading. The same principle applies to stdout and stderr file descriptors.

All file descriptors are opened with O_CLOEXEC flag so that they will not leak to the executed process. A unit test to check if any file descriptor leaks to the sandboxed program is in the test suite.

The PID 1 process inherits all request standard file descriptors and passes them to the tracee process. It has to close them after spawning the tracee process. To see why, let's consider a pipe of which one end is passed as a stdin to the sandboxed program. A pipe is broken if all file descriptors of one end become closed. If the PID 1 process did not close the standard file descriptors of the tracee, the pipe could not become broken until the PID 1 process dies. This changes the semantics of the pipe if the program is run inside the sandbox and is undesirable. Moreover, for hardening purposes the PID 1 process closes all unnecessary file descriptors after spawning tracee — in case, the tracee somehow takes control of the PID 1 process.

4.7. Canceling the request

The response to the request is passed via pipe that is provided alongside the request. If the pipe becomes broken i.e. the client closes the read end of the pipe, the request is considered cancelled and is immediately discarded if currently handled and omitted otherwise.

4.8. Killing the request

Alongside request is send an eventfd file descriptor. The supervisor process monitors this file descriptor and if it becomes readable i.e. the client writes a value to it, the tracee is killed immediately. To avoid false-positive errors (the tracee process is killed unexpectedly), if the request is killed before execveat syscall executing the requested program, killing of the tracee is delayed to the execve moment.

4.9. Sandbox server upon client death

The supervisor process monitors the UNIX socket through which the requests flow in. If the other end becomes read and write closed, the supervisor recognises it as a death of the client process and dies immediately. The PID 1 process is configured to die upon the supervisor process death, and the kernel kills all tracee processes when the PID 1 process dies. Therefore, all server processes die.

4.10. PID 1 process upon supervisor death

The PID 1 process configures kernel to kill it upon the supervisor process death. This is done using prctl's option PR_SET_PDEATHSIG. However, if the supervisor dies before the kernel configures the PID 1 process to die, the PID 1 process will still be alive and waste the resources. To solve this, one could check if the getppid() returns the expected PID of the supervisor process. However, this will not work, since the PID 1 process is in a new PID

namespace, and getppid() will always return 0. A reliable solution is to pass a pidfd file descriptor of the supervisor process and check if the supervisor process is dead by checking if the pidfd file descriptor became readable. This way, upon supervisor process death, the PID 1 process is either killed by the kernel or it detects the death of the supervisor process and kills itself.

4.11. Signals

Signals are another way the processes can communicate with each other. They have their nuances and have to be isolated as well.

4.11.1. Tracee signals

Tracee can signal only to the visible processes and those are limited by the PID namespace. However, it can also send signals to its process group that can span multiple PID namespaces. Figure 4.1 illustrates this situation. Therefore it is necessary to set new process group for the tracee processes. Furthermore, as a hardening, a new process group is set for the PID 1 process as well, in case the tracee takes control of it.

However, it is better to also set a new session id using setsid syscall instead of just the process group id to avoid vulnerabilities connected to the current controlling terminal [4].




Figure 4.1: Process group can span multiple PID namespaces.

4.11.2. SIGPIPE in the supervisor process

Sending response to the client may generate SIGPIPE signal for the supervisor process if the client cancels the request approximately in the same moment. We have to ignore this signal in the supervisor process. However, this cannot be done using SIG_IGN because this signal disposition is not reset upon execveat system call and it had to be reset manually. As an alternative, it was chosen to install an empty signal handler for SIGPIPE so that the disposition of the signal handler is reset upon execveat in the tracee process automatically by the kernel.

4.11.3. Undefined Behavior Sanitizer

The code of the sandbox may be compiled with the Undefined Behavior Sanitizer (UBSan) enabled. UBSan installs signal handlers for SIGBUS, SIGFPE and SIGSEGV signals. This is problematic, because tracee could send these signals to the PID 1 process. For the init process in the PID namespace, the kernel only allows sending signals for which the init process (here the PID 1 process) has installed the signal handlers [33]. Therefore the PID 1 process resets signal dispositions of these handlers if the UBSan is used to prevent tracee from sending these signals to the PID 1 process.

4.12. Running as superuser

The sandbox is not safe to be run by the superuser. If this is needed, then you have to switch to some unprivileged user first. This is because many global system resources are still available, even after dropping the capabilities, e.g. rising privileges works. The check is done in the supervisor process at startup. To make it user namespace-proof it is checked if <code>/dev/null</code> is the null device and if the effective user id of the process equals the owner of the <code>/dev/null</code> file.

4.13. Performance optimizations

Everything that can be done is done in the supervisor process at startup, before handling requests e.g. creating cgroups, entering the network namespace, opening /dev/null as standard file descriptors. Sharing this work between requests ensures minimal overhead of handling the request i.e. it increases throughput (handled requests per second). Some of the optimizations are described in this section.

4.13.1. Seccomp filter of the PID 1 process

The secomp filter of the PID 1 process is created and compiled in the supervisor process. Therefore it is done once instead of for every request.

4.13.2. Seccomp filter as file descriptor

The secomp filter in a request is sent as a file descriptor. This avoids unnecessary copies of the secomp filter contents in case the filter is large. Moreover, the gain is more evident if the same filter is used for subsequent requests.

4.13.3. Unsharing network, ipc, uts and time namespace

Unsharing of network, ipc, uts and time namespace is done in the supervisor process, only once, at startup. This avoids doing it for every request in the PID 1 process and has non-negligible impact on the performance (see Chapter 5).

4.14. Integration with Online Judge Platform

To integrate the new sandbox with the Online Judge Platform, a suite for each language was needed. The suite sandboxes the compiler if the language is compiled and sandboxes the runtime of the tested program. The following suites were implemented:

- C, C++, Pascal and Rust fully compiled languages, the suite has to sandbox the compilation process and a fully compiled executable.
- Python, Bash fully interpreted languages, the suite does not have a compilation stage, but requires sandboxing the interpreter when it runs the solution.

The Bash language is used only for testing due to its short start-up time.

Each of the compilation and run stages requires creating a root file system and a seccomp BPF filter. Root file system has to include the following bind mounts (due to dynamically linked executables):

- /lib
- /lib64
- /usr/lib
- /usr/lib64

Additionally, C, and C++ compilers require /usr/bin and /usr/include. Pascal compiler requires /usr/bin and /tmp. Rust compiler requires /usr/bin, /tmp, and on Debian /proc. Bash and Python require no additional bind mounts.

4.14.1. Interactive problems

Interactive problems require the tested program to communicate with the checker program i.e. the standard input of the tested program is the standard output of the checker program and the standard output of the tested program is the standard input of the checker program. Figure 4.2 illustrates this configuration. To accomplish this we need two pipes, one for each communication channel. However, the judge needs to know which process died first to provide a reasonable verdict of checking the tested program on the test.

To see why, lets consider the two examples. In the first one, the checker decides early that the tested program answered wrong, it terminates with a message "Wrong answer". Then, the pipe closes and the tested program may get terminated by SIGPIPE for trying to write to the closed pipe. If this happens, the tested program's abnormal death is caused by the checker exiting early. In this situation verdict "Wrong answer" is the expected verdict. In the second example, an incorrect tested program terminates early and abnormally. In this case, the pipe closes after tested program's death and the checker sees the output of the tested program as incomplete and decides "Wrong answer". However, in this example an expected verdict would be "Runtime error" because the tested program's death caused checker to decide "Wrong answer", therefore tested program's abnormal death takes precedence here. If we don't know who died first in such cases, we cannot reliably deduce the primary cause and therefore cannot decide what is more important, a tested program's abnormal death or the checker's verdict.




Figure 4.2: Schema of the communication between the tested program and the checker in an interactive problem.

To solve this, one could monitor the ends of the two pipes and see which end closes first. This is possible with e.g. poll syscall. However, it is prone to a race condition because the process monitoring the ends of the pipes may be scheduled after the checker and the tested program process and see them as if they died at the same moment. For example, the tested program process dies abnormally, then checker decides "Wrong answer" and exits and only then the poll syscall returns reporting all ends of the pipes as closed without the information which closed first. To avoid this race condition and decide reliably 4 pipes are needed and a

process that glues both pairs of pipes together and detects which end is closed first. Figure 4.3 illustrates this configuration. As long as, the third process holds open inner four ends of the pipe pairs, the tested program and the checker will not see their stdin and stdout as broken and will not proceed (to terminate, either normally or not). This way we can reliably detect who dies first and give a correct verdict in the scenarios where one's death causes the other's death. To efficiently pass messages in the third process, the splice syscall is used.




Figure 4.3: This is how communication between the tested program and the checker is implemented. Two pairs of pipes are used. This allows detection which process dies first — the tested program or the checker. Because the communication process does not close its ends of the pipes first, it can detect which process died first without causing the second to die because of a broken pipe. To efficiently pass messages in the communication process, the splice syscall is used.

4.14.2. Non-interactive problems

In the non-interactive problems, the semantics of the input is read-once and of the output is write-once. To achieve this without disallowing dup'ing, close'ing, mmap'ping, pread'ing etc. of the standard input and output file descriptors, we use pipes that are read-once and write-once. Input file is piped to stdin of the tested program, and the tested program's output is piped to the output file. Figure 4.4 illustrates this configuration. To efficiently pass messages between a pipe and a file the splice syscall is used.




Figure 4.4: To provide the read-once semantics of the standard input and the write-once semantics of the standard output the pipes are used. The communication process passes contents of the file to the input pipe that outputs to the tested program's stdin. The tested program's stdout is piped to the output file. To efficiently pass data between files and pipes in the communication process, the splice syscall is used.

4.14.3. Conclusion

Apart from the above difficulties, the integration was rather easy. It required changing usage of the old sandbox to the new sandbox knobs. A lot of code was simplified along the way.

4.15. Testing and validation

To test and validate the new sandbox a comprehensive set of unit tests was developed. Tests check that namespaces are used appropriately, the interface is implemented correctly, the limits are enforced, runtime statistics are provided and are correct, no file descriptor leaks to the traced process, etc. Error reporting was also tested e.g. that unexpected supervisor death is reported, the supervisor terminates as soon as the socket connection with the client becomes broken etc. These tests ensured no regressions during the development and in the end eased the development process.

4.16. Challenges faced

There were many challenges during the development of the sandbox. First was to understand the semantics of the kernel's interfaces i.e. namespaces, cgroups and capabilities, and nuances in every one of them. One of the great achievements was to desist from using ptrace and all its complexity, while controlling a group of processes. This reduced the overhead and simplified things a lot. It was possible thanks to the Linux namespaces and cgroups.

Another challenge was to orchestrate everything to work together: resource limits, file descriptors, communication between processes, setting up namespaces and cgroups, dropping capabilities etc. It all has to be done in the right order and was often unobvious how to do it right.

The hardest of all was to debug very obscure errors happening during setup of the namespaces and cgroups. Often configuration failed with EPERM or EINVAL and it required figuring out what was wrong with just such vague information. For example, mounting cgroup2 file system is not allowed without unsharing cgroup namespace first. It also requires unsharing mount namespace and user namespace, but this is completely reasonable. In Sections 4.16.1 and 4.16.2 two examples are shown of the hard to debug errors.

4.16.1. execveat returns EINVAL

Executing a dynamically linked executable may fail with an error EINVAL. The executable needs the dynamic linker, so one reason of the error is the missing dynamic linker in the new root file system, on x86_64 it is at /lib64/ld-linux-x86-64.so.2. Another reason may be a missing shared library that usually resides in the directory /usr/lib/. It is important to bind mount all of these paths during creation of the root file system for the dynamic executables to work.

4.16.2. execveat returns ENOENT

Executing a file may fail with ENOENT, even though the file exists. This may happen because the file is a symbolic link and the destination does not exist, or if the symbolic link is recursive (refers to a symbolic link) and one of the intermediate files is non-existent in the new root file system. One of the solutions is to bind mount the executable without AT_SYMLINK_NOFOLLOW.

4.17. Conclusion

Despite challenges and complexity the sandbox was implemented and tested successfully. The usage of Linux namespaces provides isolation while cgroups and prlimits limit the resources. The sandbox is versatile enough to be used both as a sandbox for running a tested program as well as for running the compiler. The goal of optimizing the implementation for short-running programs was achieved with several optimizations.

Chapter 5

Performance Evaluation

All performance tests were made on a laptop with Intel i5-8250U processor and 16 GB of RAM. The purpose of this chapter is to verify the efficiency of the sandbox in the context of the online judge platform and briefly compare it with nsjail.

5.1. In the context of the online judge

For the testing we use tasks from the finale of XXII Polish Olimpiad in Informatics: Myjnie (myj), Tablice kierunkowe (tab), Modernizacja autostrady (mod), Wycieczki (wyc). The solutions programs are written by the problem package makers, they are used to verify the test cases will distinguish the different solutions of the users e.g. those running in O(n) and $O(n^2)$. The model solution program is the main solution program that is the best solution program for the problem. In Polish it is called "rozwiązanie wzorcowe". The term "solution" can be misleading but is currently used in the English literature regarding Olympiads in Informatics [12, 20, 23, 24].

First, we compare the compilation times of all solution programs outside sandbox, inside sandbox and inside sandbox with BPF filters disabled. Then we compare the running times of the model solution program of each problem.

5.1.1. Compilation

Table 5.1 contains the compilation times of solution programs of problem Myjnie. Table 5.2 contains the compilation times of solution programs of problem Tablice kierunkowe. Table 5.3 contains the compilation times of solution programs of problem Modernizacja autostrady. Table 5.4 contains the compilation times of solution programs of problem Wycieczki.

From the measurements we see that most of the overhead comes from BPF filters that cause up to 10% slowdown. The compilation in the sandbox can be slower by up to 24%, but can be also be faster by up to 12%. We could not identify where the speedup comes from, it requires further investigation. Most of the time, the sandbox's slowdown is below 10% compared to compilation time without the sandbox.

Commands used in testing:

- C /usr/bin/gcc -std=c11 -02 -static -o exe source.c. Compiler version: 13.2.1.
- C++ /usr/bin/g++ -std=c++17 -02 -static -o exe source.cc. Compiler version: 13.2.1.
- Pascal /usr/bin/fpc -02 -XS -Xt -oexe source.pas. Compiler version 3.3.2.

Myjnie (myj)

Solution	Sandbox	Time	Mean	Std. dev.	Std. err. on the mean	Slowdown
program		real	362.60ms	8.85ms (2.44%)	2.80ms (0.77%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	356.96ms	5.01 ms (2.44%)	1.59ms (0.44%)	0.00%
		real	386.11ms	7.27ms (1.88%)	2.30ms (0.60%)	6.48%
myj.cpp	yes	CPU	379.41ms	6.12ms (1.61%)	1.93ms (0.51%)	6.29%
		real	359.60ms	6.73ms (1.87%)	2.13ms (0.59%)	-0.83%
	no BPF	CPU	350.94ms	5.31ms (1.51%)	1.68ms (0.48%)	-1.69%
		real	72.18ms	6.26ms (8.68%)	1.98ms (2.74%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	69.66ms	4.93 ms (7.07%)	1.56 ms (2.74%) 1.56 ms (2.24%)	0.00%
		real	70.10ms	4.26ms (6.07%)	1.35ms (2.2470) 1.35ms (1.92%)	-2.87%
myj1.pas	yes	CPU	67.60ms	3.52 ms (5.21%)	1.11ms (1.65%)	-2.96%
		real	69.68ms	5.00ms (7.17%)	1.58ms (2.27%)	-3.46%
	no BPF	CPU	67.99ms	5.09 ms (7.17%)	1.61 ms (2.37%)	-2.39%
		real	369.42ms	7.44ms (2.01%)	2.35 ms (0.64%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	362.72 ms	4.64 ms (1.28%)	1.47 ms (0.40%)	0.00%
		real	388.42ms	8.44ms (2.17%)	2.67 ms (0.40%)	5.14%
myj2.cpp	yes	CPU	377.39ms	6.00 ms (1.59%)	1.90 ms (0.50%)	4.04%
		real	352.86ms	5.79ms (1.64%)	1.83 ms (0.50%)	-4.48%
	no BPF	CPU	348.17ms	5.48ms (1.57%)	1.73 ms (0.52%)	-4.01%
		real	394.17ms	6.51ms (1.65%)	2.06 ms (0.52%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	384.30ms	5.93 ms (1.54%)	1.88ms (0.49%)	0.00%
		real	404.30ms	6.35ms (1.57%)	2.01 ms (0.49%)	2.57%
myj3.cpp	yes	CPU	396.11ms	5.26 ms (1.33%)	1.66 ms (0.42%)	3.07%
	no BPF	real	378.24ms	8.30ms (2.20%)	2.63 ms (0.42%)	-4.04%
		CPU	373.52ms	5.86ms (1.57%)	1.85 ms (0.50%)	-2.81%
		real	2105.00ms	32.27ms (1.53%)	10.20ms (0.48%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	2083.61ms	29.28ms (1.41%)	9.26 ms (0.44%)	0.00%
		real	2244.82ms	184.78ms (8.23%)	58.43ms (2.60%)	6.64%
myj4.cpp	yes	CPU	2222.96ms	183.39ms (8.25%)	57.99ms (2.61%)	6.69%
		real	2093.29ms	39.94ms (1.91%)	12.63ms (0.60%)	-0.56%
	no BPF	CPU	2069.41ms	32.68 ms (1.58%)	10.33 ms (0.50%)	-0.68%
		real	366.94ms	7.57ms (2.06%)	2.40 ms (0.65%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	359.89ms	4.60 ms (1.28%)	1.46ms (0.40%)	0.00%
		real	384.46ms	6.89ms (1.79%)	2.18 ms (0.57%)	4.77%
myjb1.cpp	yes	CPU	376.95ms	5.20 ms (1.38%)	1.65 ms (0.44%)	4.74%
		real	353.91ms	8.68ms (2.45%)	2.74 ms (0.78%)	-3.55%
	no BPF	CPU	$346.75 \mathrm{ms}$	4.14ms (1.19%)	1.31 ms (0.38%)	-3.65%
		real	334.10ms	3.68 ms (1.10%)	1.16 ms (0.35%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	329.16ms	4.85ms (1.47%)	1.53 ms (0.47%)	0.00%
_		real	336.05ms	6.57 ms (1.96%)	2.08 ms (0.62%)	0.58%
myjb2.cpp	yes	CPU	$328.03 \mathrm{ms}$	4.88 ms (1.49%)	1.54 ms (0.47%)	-0.34%
		real	321.29ms	6.00ms (1.87%)	1.90 ms (0.59%)	-3.84%
	no BPF	CPU	314.97ms	5.34 ms (1.70%)	1.69 ms (0.54%)	-4.31%
		real	$369.83 \mathrm{ms}$	6.01 ms (1.63%)	$1.90 \text{ms} \ (0.51\%)$	0.00%
	no	CPU	365.12ms	7.22 ms (1.98%)	2.28 ms (0.63%)	0.00%
		real	380.30ms	6.99ms (1.84%)	2.21ms (0.58%)	2.83%
myjb3.cpp	yes	CPU	373.70ms	2.52 ms (0.67%)	0.80ms (0.21%)	2.35%
		real	351.72ms	3.58 ms (1.02%)	1.13ms (0.32%)	-4.90%
	no BPF					

Т			255 25	0.00 (0.00%)	0.05 (0.550)	0.0001
	no	real	355.35ms	8.39 ms (2.36%)	2.65ms (0.75%)	0.00%
		CPU	348.56ms	6.47ms (1.86%)	2.05ms (0.59%)	0.00%
myjb4.cpp	yes	real	364.72ms	6.54ms (1.79%)	2.07ms (0.57%)	2.64%
<i>J</i> J J J J J J J J J J		CPU	358.57ms	6.47ms (1.80%)	2.04ms (0.57%)	2.87%
	no BPF	real	343.04ms	7.69 ms (2.24%)	2.43ms (0.71%)	-3.46%
		CPU	$333.60 \mathrm{ms}$	3.65 ms (1.09%)	$1.16 \text{ms} \ (0.35\%)$	-4.29%
	no	real	$358.90 \mathrm{ms}$	$8.32 \text{ms} \ (2.32\%)$	$2.63 \text{ms} \ (0.73\%)$	0.00%
		CPU	349.96 ms	8.32 ms (2.38%)	2.63 ms (0.75%)	0.00%
myjb5.cpp	yes	real	370.24 ms	8.78ms (2.37%)	$2.78 \text{ms} \ (0.75\%)$	3.16%
пујостерр	<i>y</i> es	CPU	362.40 ms	4.99 ms (1.38%)	1.58 ms (0.44%)	3.55%
	no BPF	real	342.85ms	7.98 ms (2.33%)	2.52 ms (0.74%)	-4.47%
	по Вгт	CPU	$336.04 \mathrm{ms}$	5.80 ms (1.72%)	$1.83 \text{ms} \ (0.55\%)$	-3.98%
	no	real	$336.79 \mathrm{ms}$	31.10 ms (9.23%)	9.83ms (2.92%)	0.00%
	110	CPU	$332.67 \mathrm{ms}$	29.36 ms (8.83%)	9.29ms (2.79%)	0.00%
myrial ann	TTOG	real	$338.45 \mathrm{ms}$	35.76ms (10.57%)	11.31ms (3.34%)	0.49%
myjs1.cpp	yes	CPU	$330.57 \mathrm{ms}$	$28.16 \text{ms} \ (8.52\%)$	8.91ms (2.69%)	-0.63%
	DDE	real	$356.88 \mathrm{ms}$	6.26ms (1.75%)	$1.98 \text{ms} \ (0.55\%)$	5.97%
	no BPF	CPU	$348.74 \mathrm{ms}$	6.58 ms (1.89%)	2.08 ms (0.60%)	4.83%
		real	$69.89 \mathrm{ms}$	4.75ms (6.80%)	1.50ms (2.15%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$68.40 \mathrm{ms}$	4.49 ms (6.57%)	1.42 ms (2.08%)	0.00%
		real	69.28ms	5.55ms (8.02%)	1.76ms (2.53%)	-0.86%
myjs2.pas	yes	CPU	$66.16 \mathrm{ms}$	5.26 ms (7.95%)	$1.66 \text{ms} \ (2.51\%)$	-3.28%
	DDD	real	67.74ms	5.00ms (7.39%)	1.58ms (2.34%)	-3.07%
	no BPF	CPU	$65.72 \mathrm{ms}$	4.25 ms (6.46%)	1.34 ms (2.04%)	-3.92%
		real	369.35ms	7.23 ms (1.96%)	2.29 ms (0.62%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$360.47 \mathrm{ms}$	6.47 ms (1.79%)	2.04 ms (0.57%)	0.00%
		real	380.47ms	7.97 ms (2.09%)	2.52 ms (0.66%)	3.01%
myjs3.cpp	yes	CPU	371.12ms	6.12 ms (1.65%)	1.93 ms (0.52%)	2.95%
		real	354.97ms	7.63 ms (2.15%)	2.41ms (0.68%)	-3.89%
	no BPF	CPU	345.67ms	6.99 ms (2.02%)	2.21 ms (0.64%)	-4.11%
		real	72.02ms	4.68ms (6.50%)	1.48ms (2.05%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	70.75ms	4.86ms (6.87%)	1.54ms (2.17%)	0.00%
		real	69.31ms	4.13ms (5.95%)	1.30ms (1.88%)	-3.77%
myjs4.pas	yes	CPU	67.67ms	3.94 ms (5.82%)	1.25ms (1.84%)	-4.35%
		real	61.85ms	7.01ms (11.34%)	2.22ms (3.59%)	-14.13%
	no BPF	CPU	$60.24 \mathrm{ms}$	6.41 ms (10.65%)	2.03ms (3.37%)	-14.15%
		real	310.64ms	23.84ms (7.67%)	\ /	
	no	CPU	306.25 ms	,	7.54ms (2.43%) 5.44ms (1.78%)	$0.00\% \\ 0.00\%$
			384.98ms	17.21ms (5.62%) 7.94ms (2.06%)	2.51ms (0.65%)	$\frac{0.00\%}{23.93\%}$
myjs5.cpp	yes	real CPU		(/	` ,	23.93% $24.17%$
•			380.27ms	7.79ms (2.05%)	2.46ms (0.65%)	
	no BPF	real	358.36ms	7.67 ms (2.14%)	2.43ms (0.68%)	15.36%
		CPU	351.52ms	4.90ms (1.40%)	1.55ms (0.44%)	14.78%
	no	real	71.69ms	4.21ms (5.88%)	1.33ms (1.86%)	0.00%
		CPU	70.00ms	4.01ms (5.73%)	1.27ms (1.81%)	0.00%
myjs6.pas	yes	real	68.40ms	4.09 ms (5.98%)	1.29ms (1.89%)	-4.58%
myjso.pas		CPU	66.64ms	3.65 ms (5.48%)	1.15ms (1.73%)	-4.81%
	no BPF	real	69.24ms	4.16 ms (6.00%)	1.31ms (1.90%)	-3.41%
	. == *	CPU	66.45ms	3.33 ms (5.02%)	1.05ms (1.59%)	-5.08%
	no	real	2123.70 ms	40.65 ms (1.91%)	12.85ms (0.61%)	0.00%
	110	CPU	2109.31ms	33.11 ms (1.57%)	$10.47 \text{ms} \ (0.50\%)$	0.00%
myjs7.cpp	yes	real	2451.10 ms	$37.92 \text{ms} \ (1.55\%)$	11.99 ms (0.49%)	15.42%
шујот.срр	усь	CPU	2425.73ms	28.52 ms (1.18%)	$9.02 \text{ms} \ (0.37\%)$	15.00%
	no BPF	real	2131.85ms	35.95 ms (1.69%)	11.37 ms (0.53%)	0.38%
	IIO DI I	CPU	2111.61 ms	36.11 ms (1.71%)	11.42 ms (0.54%)	0.11%

	no	real	2013.38ms	150.21ms (7.46%)	47.50ms (2.36%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	1997.83 ms	149.04ms (7.46%)	47.13 ms (2.36%)	0.00%
muia@ ann	yes	real	2411.73ms	33.09 ms (1.37%)	10.46ms (0.43%)	19.79%
myjs8.cpp		CPU	2382.87ms	31.90 ms (1.34%)	$10.09 \text{ms} \ (0.42\%)$	19.27%
	no BPF	real	2070.14 ms	38.98ms (1.88%)	12.33 ms (0.60%)	2.82%
		CPU	2053.40 ms	38.97 ms (1.90%)	$12.32 \text{ms} \ (0.60\%)$	2.78%

Table 5.1: Compilation times of all solution programs of the problem Myjnie (myj) from the finale of XXII Polish Olimpiad in Informatics. For each configuration (Solution program and Sandbox columns) the data was collected from 10 runs. Real and CPU times were collected from the same runs. Slowdown is measured form the times of configuration without sandbox.

Tablice kierunkowe (tab)

Solution program	Sandbox	Time	Mean	Std. dev.	Std. err. on the mean	Slowdown
1 0		real	1502.95ms	25.17ms (1.67%)	7.96ms (0.53%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$1488.30 \mathrm{ms}$	20.63 ms (1.39%)	6.52 ms (0.44%)	0.00%
		real	1634.57ms	18.91ms (1.16%)	5.98ms (0.37%)	8.76%
tab.cpp	yes	CPU	$1609.73 \mathrm{ms}$	19.95ms (1.24%)	6.31 ms (0.39%)	8.16%
	no BPF	real	1402.92ms	105.52ms (7.52%)	33.37 ms (2.38%)	-6.66%
	no BPF	CPU	$1389.83 \mathrm{ms}$	102.23ms (7.36%)	32.33 ms (2.33%)	-6.62%
		real	222.52 ms	79.15ms (35.57%)	25.03ms (11.25%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$192.33 \mathrm{ms}$	14.33ms (7.45%)	4.53 ms (2.36%)	0.00%
4-1-0 -		real	195.05 ms	4.84ms (2.48%)	1.53 ms (0.79%)	-12.34%
tab2.c	yes	CPU	$190.64 \mathrm{ms}$	3.50 ms (1.84%)	$1.11 \text{ms} \ (0.58\%)$	-0.88%
	no BPF	real	196.87 ms	4.45 ms (2.26%)	$1.41 \text{ms} \ (0.72\%)$	-11.53%
	no BPF	CPU	$190.74 \mathrm{ms}$	2.57 ms (1.35%)	$0.81 \text{ms} \ (0.43\%)$	-0.83%
		real	75.84 ms	5.48ms (7.23%)	1.73ms (2.28%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$72.71 \mathrm{ms}$	4.38 ms (6.02%)	1.38 ms (1.90%)	0.00%
tab2 mag	****	real	71.19 ms	3.61 ms (5.07%)	1.14ms (1.60%)	-6.14%
tab3.pas	yes	CPU	$69.66 \mathrm{ms}$	3.18 ms (4.56%)	1.00 ms (1.44%)	-4.20%
	no BPF	real	70.14 ms	5.72ms (8.16%)	1.81ms (2.58%)	-7.53%
		CPU	$67.41 \mathrm{ms}$	4.27 ms (6.34%)	1.35 ms (2.00%)	-7.30%
	no	real	2261.35 ms	39.40ms (1.74%)	12.46 ms (0.55%)	0.00%
		CPU	$2232.11 \mathrm{ms}$	33.15 ms (1.49%)	$10.48 \text{ms} \ (0.47\%)$	0.00%
tab4.cpp	yes	real	2525.38 ms	62.24ms (2.46%)	19.68 ms (0.78%)	11.68%
тар4.срр		CPU	$2503.59 \mathrm{ms}$	61.71ms (2.46%)	19.51 ms (0.78%)	12.16%
	no BPF	real	2182.13 ms	43.47 ms (1.99%)	13.75 ms (0.63%)	-3.50%
		CPU	$2154.98\mathrm{ms}$	35.40 ms (1.64%)	11.19 ms (0.52%)	-3.46%
		real	1631.92 ms	121.04ms (7.42%)	38.28 ms (2.35%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$1615.02\mathrm{ms}$	120.35ms (7.45%)	38.06 ms (2.36%)	0.00%
tabb1.cpp	TTOG	real	1831.19 ms	33.72ms (1.84%)	$10.66 \text{ms} \ (0.58\%)$	12.21%
тавыт.срр	yes	CPU	$1813.79 \mathrm{ms}$	31.32 ms (1.73%)	$9.90 \text{ms} \ (0.55\%)$	12.31%
	no BPF	real	1679.20 ms	23.03 ms (1.37%)	$7.28 \text{ms} \ (0.43\%)$	2.90%
	no bi i	CPU	$1660.51 \mathrm{ms}$	17.82 ms (1.07%)	5.64 ms (0.34%)	2.82%
	200	real	1671.93 ms	25.31ms (1.51%)	$8.00 \text{ms} \ (0.48\%)$	0.00%
	no	CPU	$1662.92 \mathrm{ms}$	24.85 ms (1.49%)	$7.86 \text{ms} \ (0.47\%)$	0.00%
tabb2.cpp	MOG	real	1674.66 ms	161.33ms (9.63%)	51.02ms (3.05%)	0.16%
tabb2.cpp	yes	CPU	$1655.46\mathrm{ms}$	150.66ms (9.10%)	47.64ms (2.88%)	-0.45%
	no BPF	real	1687.88 ms	45.56ms (2.70%)	14.41ms (0.85%)	0.95%
	по ы г	CPU	$1664.14\mathrm{ms}$	39.50 ms (2.37%)	12.49 ms (0.75%)	0.07%

		real	2154.16ms	28.51ms (1.32%)	9.02ms (0.42%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	2134.10ms 2129.23ms	26.30ms (1.24%)	8.32ms (0.39%)	0.00%
		real	2471.52ms	38.72ms (1.57%)	12.24ms (0.50%)	14.73%
tabb3.cpp	yes	CPU	2445.05ms	39.86ms (1.63%)	12.24ms (0.50%) 12.60ms (0.52%)	14.83%
		real	2058.72ms	166.25ms (8.08%)	52.57ms (2.55%)	-4.43%
	no BPF	CPU	2036.72ms 2036.36ms	158.63ms (7.79%)	50.16ms (2.46%)	-4.36%
		real	1613.79ms	134.43ms (8.33%)	42.51ms (2.63%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	1600.23ms	130.74ms (8.17%)	42.31ms (2.03%) 41.34ms (2.58%)	0.00%
		real	1883.39ms	35.67ms (1.89%)	11.28ms (0.60%)	$\frac{0.00\%}{16.71\%}$
tabb4.cpp	yes	CPU	1857.23ms	29.17ms (1.57%)	9.22 ms (0.50%)	16.06%
		real	1702.76ms	28.62ms (1.68%)	9.05ms (0.53%)	5.51%
	no BPF	CPU	1686.87ms	27.15ms (1.61%)	8.59ms (0.51%)	5.41%
		real	1565.51ms	22.63ms (1.45%)	7.16ms (0.46%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	1505.51ms 1557.13ms	22.90ms (1.47%)	7.10ms (0.40%) 7.24ms (0.47%)	0.00%
		real	1604.59ms	143.02ms (8.91%)	45.23ms (2.82%)	$\frac{0.00\%}{2.50\%}$
tabb5.cpp	yes	CPU	1589.50ms	137.02ms (8.62%)	43.33ms (2.73%)	$\frac{2.50\%}{2.08\%}$
		real	1577.05ms	28.41ms (1.80%)	8.98ms (0.57%)	0.74%
	no BPF	CPU	1577.05ms 1558.93ms	24.23ms (1.55%)	7.66ms (0.49%)	0.14% $0.12%$
			2323.59ms	53.25ms (2.29%)	16.84ms (0.72%)	0.12%
	no	real CPU	2323.39ms 2301.03ms	50.99ms (2.22%)	16.13ms (0.72%)	0.00%
			2570.53ms	153.29ms (5.96%)	48.47ms (1.89%)	10.63%
tabs1.cpp	yes	real CPU	2570.55ms 2541.60ms	153.29ms (5.96%) 151.81ms (5.97%)	48.47 ms (1.89%) 48.01 ms (1.89%)	10.05% $10.45%$
		real	2313.52ms	37.31ms (3.97%)	11.80ms (0.51%)	-0.43%
	no BPF	CPU	2313.32IIIS 2289.49ms	37.80ms (1.65%)	11.95ms (0.52%)	-0.43%
			1442.48ms	27.35ms (1.90%)	8.65ms (0.60%)	0.00%
	no	real CPU	1442.48ms 1423.01ms	16.75ms (1.18%)	\ /	0.00%
			1423.01ms 1568.84ms	24.78ms (1.58%)	5.30ms (0.37%) 7.84ms (0.50%)	8.76%
tabs 2.cpp	yes	real CPU	1508.84ms 1547.59ms	/	5.48ms (0.35%)	
		real	1347.39ms 1427.96ms	17.34ms (1.12%) 24.65ms (1.73%)	7.80ms (0.55%)	8.75% -1.01%
	no BPF	CPU	1427.90ms 1413.63ms	24.05ms (1.75%) 20.35ms (1.44%)	6.44ms (0.46%)	-0.66%
		real	1561.91ms	31.81ms (2.04%)	10.06ms (0.64%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	1501.91ms 1549.61ms	31.37ms (2.02%)	9.92ms (0.64%)	0.00%
		real	1695.55ms	33.16ms (1.96%)	10.49ms (0.62%)	8.56%
tabs 3.cpp	yes	CPU	1667.92ms	23.82ms (1.43%)	7.53ms (0.45%)	7.63%
	no BPF	real	1477.71ms	118.16ms (8.00%)	37.37ms (2.53%)	-5.39%
		CPU	1461.29ms	111.89ms (7.66%)	35.38ms (2.42%)	-5.70%
		real	2592.15ms	44.09ms (1.70%)	13.94ms (0.54%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	2573.68ms	38.34ms (1.49%)	12.12ms (0.47%)	0.00%
		real	2822.21ms	175.59ms (6.22%)	55.53ms (1.97%)	8.88%
tabs 4.cpp	yes	CPU	2797.91ms	175.07ms (6.26%)	55.36ms (1.98%)	8.71%
		real	2580.34ms	46.37ms (1.80%)	14.66ms (0.57%)	-0.46%
	no BPF	CPU	2556.68ms	41.86ms (1.64%)	13.24 ms (0.52%)	-0.66%
		real	2631.50ms	47.73ms (1.81%)	15.09ms (0.57%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	2612.73ms	38.40ms (1.47%)	12.14ms (0.46%)	0.00%
		real	2862.74ms	167.67ms (5.86%)	53.02ms (1.85%)	8.79%
tabs 5.cpp	yes	CPU	2829.77ms	167.37ms (5.91%)	52.93ms (1.87%)	8.31%
		real	2628.00ms	43.35ms (1.65%)	13.71ms (0.52%)	-0.13%
	no BPF	CPU	2593.05ms	41.02ms (1.58%)	13.71ms (0.52%) 12.97ms (0.50%)	-0.15%
		real	1914.91ms	40.86ms (2.13%)	12.97 ms (0.50%) 12.92 ms (0.67%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	1895.37ms	34.85ms (1.84%)	11.02ms (0.58%)	0.00%
		real	2106.36ms	34.78ms (1.65%)	11.02ms (0.58%) 11.00ms (0.52%)	10.00%
tabs 6.cpp	yes	CPU	2077.84ms	28.96ms (1.39%)	9.16ms (0.44%)	9.63%
		real	1910.88ms	32.87ms (1.72%)	10.39ms (0.54%)	-0.21%
	no BPF	CPU	1882.19ms	30.43ms (1.62%)	9.62ms (0.51%)	-0.21%
		010	1002.191118	00.401115 (1.02/0)	3.04ms (0.01/0)	-0.70/0

		real	2957.68ms	60.44ms (2.04%)	19.11ms (0.65%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	2931.50 ms	55.50ms (1.89%)	17.55 ms (0.60%)	0.00%
tabs7.cpp	TIOG	real	3282.68 ms	65.61ms (2.00%)	20.75 ms (0.63%)	10.99%
tabsr.cpp	yes	CPU	3248.76 ms	60.39ms (1.86%)	$19.10 \text{ms} \ (0.59\%)$	10.82%
	no BPF	real	2921.55ms	57.01ms (1.95%)	18.03ms (0.62%)	-1.22%
	по Бг	CPU	2898.11ms	50.67ms (1.75%)	$16.02 \text{ms} \ (0.55\%)$	-1.14%
	no	real	1796.60 ms	33.59ms (1.87%)	10.62 ms (0.59%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	1781.45 ms	25.69ms (1.44%)	8.12 ms (0.46%)	0.00%
tabs8.cpp	yes	real	1946.05ms	33.29ms (1.71%)	$10.53 \text{ms} \ (0.54\%)$	8.32%
tabso.cpp		CPU	1927.81ms	31.78ms (1.65%)	$10.05 \text{ms} \ (0.52\%)$	8.22%
	no BPF	real	1786.73ms	29.69ms (1.66%)	9.39ms (0.53%)	-0.55%
		CPU	1770.08 ms	27.25ms (1.54%)	8.62 ms (0.49%)	-0.64%
	no	real	2183.74ms	40.84ms (1.87%)	12.91ms (0.59%)	0.00%
	110	CPU	2165.15 ms	40.55ms (1.87%)	12.82 ms (0.59%)	0.00%
tabs9.cpp	MOG	real	2404.02ms	174.72ms (7.27%)	55.25ms (2.30%)	10.09%
tabsa.cpp	yes	CPU	2381.17ms	167.37ms (7.03%)	52.93ms (2.22%)	9.98%
	no BPF	real	2164.08ms	43.88ms (2.03%)	13.87ms (0.64%)	-0.90%
	IIO DI I	CPU	2141.77ms	39.89ms (1.86%)	12.61 ms (0.59%)	-1.08%

Table 5.2: Compilation times of all solution programs of the problem Tablice kierunkowe (tab) from the finale of XXII Polish Olimpiad in Informatics. For each configuration (Solution program and Sandbox columns) the data was collected from 10 runs. Real and CPU times were collected from the same runs. Slowdown is measured form the times of configuration without sandbox.

Modernizacja autostrady (mod)

Solution program	Sandbox	Time	Mean	Std. dev.	Std. err. on the mean	Slowdown
mod.cpp	no	real	$506.86 \mathrm{ms}$	8.18ms (1.61%)	$2.59 \text{ms} \ (0.51\%)$	0.00%
		CPU	$494.46\mathrm{ms}$	7.64 ms (1.54%)	2.42 ms (0.49%)	0.00%
	yes	real	$545.40 \mathrm{ms}$	7.35 ms (1.35%)	$2.33 \text{ms} \ (0.43\%)$	7.60%
		CPU	$537.60\mathrm{ms}$	6.49 ms (1.21%)	2.05 ms (0.38%)	8.72%
	no BPF	real	$453.21 \mathrm{ms}$	45.80ms (10.11%)	14.48ms (3.20%)	-10.59%
		CPU	$445.80 \mathrm{ms}$	42.17 ms (9.46%)	13.33 ms (2.99%)	-9.84%
mod2.cpp	no	real	$617.70 \mathrm{ms}$	48.98ms (7.93%)	15.49 ms (2.51%)	0.00%
		CPU	$608.57 \mathrm{ms}$	44.07 ms (7.24%)	13.94 ms (2.29%)	0.00%
	yes	real	699.67 ms	15.03ms (2.15%)	4.75 ms (0.68%)	13.27%
		CPU	$688.35 \mathrm{ms}$	11.55ms (1.68%)	3.65 ms (0.53%)	13.11%
	no BPF	real	$633.41 \mathrm{ms}$	14.04 ms (2.22%)	4.44 ms (0.70%)	2.54%
		CPU	$619.64 \mathrm{ms}$	8.23 ms (1.33%)	$2.60 \text{ms} \ (0.42\%)$	1.82%
mod3.cpp	no	real	640.60 ms	9.78ms (1.53%)	3.09 ms (0.48%)	0.00%
		CPU	$634.93 \mathrm{ms}$	9.92 ms (1.56%)	3.14 ms (0.49%)	0.00%
	yes	real	706.43 ms	18.20ms (2.58%)	5.75ms (0.81%)	10.28%
		CPU	$688.07\mathrm{ms}$	6.31 ms (0.92%)	1.99 ms (0.29%)	8.37%
	no BPF	real	641.73 ms	15.47ms (2.41%)	4.89 ms (0.76%)	0.18%
		CPU	$627.42 \mathrm{ms}$	10.60ms (1.69%)	3.35 ms (0.53%)	-1.18%

	I	1	0015 50	05 05 (1.0007)	11.04 (0.5107)	0.0004
	no	real	2215.50ms	35.85ms (1.62%)	11.34ms (0.51%)	0.00%
		CPU	2195.65ms	34.97ms (1.59%)	11.06ms (0.50%)	0.00%
mod4.cpp	yes	real	2420.52ms	147.40ms (6.09%)	46.61ms (1.93%)	9.25%
		CPU	2400.51ms	141.98ms (5.91%)	44.90ms (1.87%)	9.33%
	no BPF	real	2208.39ms	38.47ms (1.74%)	12.17ms (0.55%)	-0.32%
	-	CPU	2182.31ms	32.76ms (1.50%)	10.36ms (0.47%)	-0.61%
	no	real	387.92ms	34.66ms (8.93%)	10.96ms (2.83%)	0.00%
		CPU	384.44ms	31.66ms (8.23%)	10.01ms (2.60%)	0.00%
mod5.cpp	yes	real	478.65ms	21.47ms (4.49%)	6.79ms (1.42%)	23.39%
P P	J	CPU	468.80ms	22.54ms (4.81%)	7.13ms (1.52%)	21.94%
	no BPF	real	446.20ms	7.88ms (1.77%)	2.49ms (0.56%)	15.03%
	no Bi i	CPU	438.35ms	8.13ms (1.86%)	2.57 ms (0.59%)	14.02%
	no	real	645.45 ms	14.49 ms (2.25%)	4.58 ms (0.71%)	0.00%
	110	CPU	639.14 ms	11.80 ms (1.85%)	3.73 ms (0.58%)	0.00%
modb1.cpp	VOC	real	704.78ms	11.64ms (1.65%)	$3.68 \text{ms} \ (0.52\%)$	9.19%
шодыл.срр	yes	CPU	691.52 ms	9.97 ms (1.44%)	3.15 ms (0.46%)	8.19%
	no BPF	real	572.02 ms	58.27ms (10.19%)	18.43ms (3.22%)	-11.38%
	HO DE E	CPU	$566.08 \mathrm{ms}$	55.26ms (9.76%)	17.47ms (3.09%)	-11.43%
		real	649.10 ms	9.53ms (1.47%)	3.01 ms (0.46%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	637.41 ms	4.50ms (0.71%)	1.42ms (0.22%)	0.00%
11.0		real	700.70ms	10.35ms (1.48%)	3.27ms (0.47%)	7.95%
modb2.cpp	yes	CPU	689.42 ms	6.08 ms (0.88%)	1.92 ms (0.28%)	8.16%
	DDE	real	639.07 ms	13.18ms (2.06%)	4.17ms (0.65%)	-1.55%
	no BPF	CPU	$626.76 \mathrm{ms}$	10.97ms (1.75%)	3.47 ms (0.55%)	-1.67%
		real	657.89ms	12.21ms (1.86%)	3.86ms (0.59%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	648.33ms	12.27ms (1.89%)	3.88 ms (0.60%)	0.00%
		real	695.02ms	13.18ms (1.90%)	4.17 ms (0.60%)	5.64%
modb3.cpp	yes	CPU	687.97ms	12.59ms (1.83%)	3.98 ms (0.58%)	6.12%
		real	633.97ms	12.16ms (1.92%)	3.85 ms (0.61%)	-3.64%
	no BPF	CPU	625.14ms	11.16ms (1.78%)	$3.53 \text{ms} \ (0.56\%)$	-3.58%
		real	651.47ms	14.58ms (2.24%)	4.61 ms (0.71%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	639.38ms	8.95ms (1.40%)	2.83ms (0.44%)	0.00%
		real	702.43ms	14.35ms (2.04%)	4.54ms (0.65%)	7.82%
modb4.cpp	yes	CPU	690.45ms	10.40ms (1.51%)	3.29 ms (0.48%)	7.99%
		real	641.23ms	11.85ms (1.85%)	3.75 ms (0.58%)	-1.57%
	no BPF	CPU	628.03ms	8.47ms (1.35%)	2.68ms (0.43%)	-1.77%
		real	648.21ms	9.03ms (1.39%)	2.86ms (0.44%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	638.99ms	9.92ms (1.55%)	3.14ms (0.49%)	0.00%
		real	696.55ms	10.56ms (1.52%)	3.34ms (0.48%)	$\frac{0.00\%}{7.46\%}$
modb5.cpp	yes	CPU	686.65ms	8.27ms (1.20%)	2.62ms (0.38%)	7.46%
				10.46ms (1.66%)	3.31 ms (0.52%)	-2.58%
	no BPF	real CPU	631.47ms	l ' '	` ′	-2.36% -2.45%
			623.31ms	6.18ms (0.99%)	1.95ms (0.31%)	
	no	real	501.15ms	9.42ms (1.88%)	2.98ms (0.59%)	0.00%
		CPU	493.57ms	9.06ms (1.84%)	2.87ms (0.58%)	0.00%
mods1.cpp	yes	real	549.66ms	9.73ms (1.77%)	3.08ms (0.56%)	9.68%
тосы.срр		CPU	537.71ms	8.86ms (1.65%)	2.80ms (0.52%)	8.94%
	no BPF	real	489.43ms	10.50ms (2.14%)	3.32ms (0.68%)	-2.34%
		CPU	480.21ms	7.46ms (1.55%)	2.36ms (0.49%)	-2.71%
	no	real	493.88ms	9.76ms (1.98%)	3.09ms (0.63%)	0.00%
		CPU	484.96ms	6.33ms (1.31%)	2.00ms (0.41%)	0.00%
mods2.cpp	yes	real	542.43ms	8.03ms (1.48%)	2.54ms (0.47%)	9.83%
шочьг.орр	,	CPU	530.13 ms	$5.03 \text{ms} \ (0.95\%)$	$1.59 \text{ms} \ (0.30\%)$	9.31%
	no BPF	real	482.53 ms	7.30ms (1.51%)	$2.31 \text{ms} \ (0.48\%)$	-2.30%
		CPU	469.91 ms	5.84 ms (1.24%)	1.85 ms (0.39%)	-3.10%

	no	real	509.10 ms	10.04ms (1.97%)	$3.17 \text{ms} \ (0.62\%)$	0.00%
		CPU	$497.64 \mathrm{ms}$	5.89 ms (1.18%)	$1.86 \text{ms} \ (0.37\%)$	0.00%
mode2 ann	yes	real	$546.91 \mathrm{ms}$	5.99 ms (1.09%)	1.89 ms (0.35%)	7.43%
mods3.cpp		CPU	$540.42 \mathrm{ms}$	4.48 ms (0.83%)	$1.42 \text{ms} \ (0.26\%)$	8.60%
	no BPF	real	487.78ms	10.08ms (2.07%)	3.19 ms (0.65%)	-4.19%
		CPU	$482.33 \mathrm{ms}$	10.09 ms (2.09%)	$3.19 \text{ms} \ (0.66\%)$	-3.08%

Table 5.3: Compilation times of all solution programs of the problem Modernizacja autostrady (mod) from the finale of XXII Polish Olimpiad in Informatics. For each configuration (Solution program and Sandbox columns) the data was collected from 10 runs. Real and CPU times were collected from the same runs. Slowdown is measured form the times of configuration without sandbox.

Wycieczki (wyc)

Solution program	Sandbox	Time	Mean	Std. dev.	Std. err. on the mean	Slowdown
	no	real	1020.39 ms	96.63ms (9.47%)	30.56ms (2.99%)	0.00%
		CPU	$1010.54\mathrm{ms}$	92.75ms (9.18%)	29.33ms (2.90%)	0.00%
	****	real	1166.98 ms	25.27ms (2.17%)	7.99 ms (0.68%)	14.37%
wyc.cpp	yes	CPU	$1147.29\mathrm{ms}$	23.21 ms (2.02%)	$7.34 \text{ms} \ (0.64\%)$	13.53%
	no BPF	real	1062.37 ms	17.42ms (1.64%)	$5.51 \text{ms} \ (0.52\%)$	4.11%
	повіт	CPU	$1044.65\mathrm{ms}$	$5.48 \text{ms} \ (0.52\%)$	$1.73 \text{ms} \ (0.17\%)$	3.38%
	no	real	$70.80 { m ms}$	3.11ms (4.39%)	$0.98 \text{ms} \ (1.39\%)$	0.00%
	no	CPU	$69.32 \mathrm{ms}$	3.27 ms (4.72%)	1.03 ms (1.49%)	0.00%
wyc0.pas	MOG	real	$68.40 \mathrm{ms}$	4.93ms (7.21%)	1.56 ms (2.28%)	-3.39%
wyco.pas	yes	CPU	$65.60 \mathrm{ms}$	4.60 ms (7.01%)	1.46 ms (2.22%)	-5.36%
	no BPF	real	$66.51 \mathrm{ms}$	3.06ms (4.61%)	0.97 ms (1.46%)	-6.05%
	no BPF	CPU	$64.84 \mathrm{ms}$	3.10 ms (4.79%)	0.98 ms (1.51%)	-6.46%
	no	real	320.31 ms	25.17ms (7.86%)	7.96 ms (2.48%)	0.00%
		CPU	$313.19 \mathrm{ms}$	21.55 ms (6.88%)	6.82 ms (2.18%)	0.00%
wyc2.cpp	yes	real	283.97 ms	18.16ms (6.39%)	5.74 ms (2.02%)	-11.34%
wycz.cpp		CPU	$281.69 \mathrm{ms}$	18.26ms (6.48%)	5.77 ms (2.05%)	-10.06%
	no BPF	real	321.54 ms	9.08ms (2.82%)	2.87 ms (0.89%)	0.39%
		CPU	$311.98 \mathrm{ms}$	6.04 ms (1.94%)	$1.91 \text{ms} \ (0.61\%)$	-0.39%
	no	real	949.95 ms	17.50ms (1.84%)	5.53 ms (0.58%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$941.99 \mathrm{ms}$	12.97 ms (1.38%)	4.10 ms (0.44%)	0.00%
wycb1.cpp	MOG	real	1025.31 ms	18.12ms (1.77%)	$5.73 \text{ms} \ (0.56\%)$	7.93%
wycor.cpp	yes	CPU	$1012.82\mathrm{ms}$	11.24ms (1.11%)	3.55 ms (0.35%)	7.52%
	no BPF	real	942.95 ms	15.54 ms (1.65%)	4.91 ms (0.52%)	-0.74%
	no bi i	CPU	$924.64 \mathrm{ms}$	12.31 ms (1.33%)	3.89 ms (0.42%)	-1.84%
	no	real	1073.49 ms	9.98 ms (0.93%)	3.16 ms (0.29%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$1064.54\mathrm{ms}$	6.97 ms (0.65%)	$2.20 \text{ms} \ (0.21\%)$	0.00%
wycb2.cpp	MOG	real	$1160.66 \mathrm{ms}$	59.32ms (5.11%)	18.76ms (1.62%)	8.12%
wycoz.cpp	yes	CPU	$1145.10\mathrm{ms}$	56.74ms (4.95%)	17.94 ms (1.57%)	7.57%
	no BPF	real	1031.55 ms	102.81ms (9.97%)	32.51ms (3.15%)	-3.91%
	по рі г	CPU	$1019.14\mathrm{ms}$	97.90ms (9.61%)	30.96ms (3.04%)	-4.27%

		real	693.59 ms	9.13ms (1.32%)	2.89 ms (0.42%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$684.05 \mathrm{ms}$	8.69 ms (1.27%)	2.75 ms (0.40%)	0.00%
wycb3.cpp	TOG	real	752.42 ms	8.78ms (1.17%)	$2.78 \text{ms} \ (0.37\%)$	8.48%
wycb3.cpp	yes	CPU	739.72 ms	$6.32 \text{ms} \ (0.85\%)$	$2.00 \text{ms} \ (0.27\%)$	8.14%
	no BPF	real	679.08 ms	11.68ms (1.72%)	3.69 ms (0.54%)	-2.09%
		CPU	$668.80 \mathrm{ms}$	8.52 ms (1.27%)	2.69 ms (0.40%)	-2.23%
	no	real	1097.15 ms	18.26ms (1.66%)	5.77 ms (0.53%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	1085.43 ms	17.18ms (1.58%)	5.43 ms (0.50%)	0.00%
wycb4.cpp	yes	real	1084.24 ms	108.35ms (9.99%)	34.26ms (3.16%)	-1.18%
wycb4.cpp		CPU	1070.69 ms	101.89 ms (9.52%)	32.22ms (3.01%)	-1.36%
	no BPF	real	1074.07 ms	21.18ms (1.97%)	6.70ms (0.62%)	-2.10%
		CPU	1060.03 ms	18.00ms (1.70%)	5.69 ms (0.54%)	-2.34%
	no	real	1014.67 ms	24.17ms (2.38%)	7.64 ms (0.75%)	0.00%
	110	CPU	997.87 ms	11.21ms (1.12%)	3.54 ms (0.36%)	0.00%
nyah5 ann	TOG	real	1111.70ms	19.76ms (1.78%)	6.25 ms (0.56%)	9.56%
wycb5.cpp	yes	CPU	1091.58 ms	14.61 ms (1.34%)	4.62 ms (0.42%)	9.39%
	no BPF	real	996.27ms	14.96ms (1.50%)	4.73 ms (0.47%)	-1.81%
	IIO DI I	CPU	982.35 ms	12.70 ms (1.29%)	4.02 ms (0.41%)	-1.56%

Table 5.4: Compilation times of all solution programs of the problem Wycieczki (wyc) from the finale of XXII Polish Olimpiad in Informatics. For each configuration (Solution program and Sandbox columns) the data was collected from 10 runs. Real and CPU times were collected from the same runs. Slowdown is measured form the times of configuration without sandbox.

5.1.2. Model solutions' run times

Table 5.5 contains the run times of the model solution program of problem Myjnie. Table 5.6 contains the run times of the model solution program of problem Tablice kierunkowe. Table 5.7 contains the run times of the model solution program of problem Modernizacja autostrady. Table 5.8 contains the run times of the model solution program of problem Wycieczki.

From the measurements we see that on large tests (those with high runtime) the slowdown in the sandbox can be as high as 20%. On smaller tests there is often a seed-up but it can be caused by a different method of measuring runtime i.e. perf stat vs. sandbox i.e. real time timer and cgroup cpu.stat file. We could not identify the cause of the speedup on the large tests up to 15%.

Myjnie (myj)

Test case	Sandbox	Time	Mean	Std. dev.	Std. err. on the mean	Slowdown
	no	real	$2.41 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.61 \text{ms} \ (25.26\%)$	0.19 ms (7.99%)	0.00%
myj0	110	CPU	$2.45 \mathrm{ms}$	0.60 ms (24.58%)	0.19 ms (7.77%)	0.00%
Illyjo	yes	real	$2.18 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.44 \text{ms} \ (20.27\%)$	$0.14 \text{ms} \ (6.41\%)$	-9.74%
		CPU	$2.03 \mathrm{ms}$	0.44 ms (21.61%)	0.14 ms (6.83%)	-17.02%
	no	real	$1.95 \mathrm{ms}$	0.35 ms (17.65%)	0.11 ms (5.58%)	0.00%
myj1ocen	no	CPU	$2.00 \mathrm{ms}$	0.35 ms (17.38%)	0.11 ms (5.50%)	0.00%
myjrocen	yes	real	2.14ms	0.75ms (35.07%)	0.24ms (11.09%)	9.63%
		CPU	$1.96 \mathrm{ms}$	0.74 ms (37.70%)	0.23ms (11.92%)	-1.68%

		real	0.91ms	0.04ms (4.71%)	0.01ms (1.49%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$0.98 \mathrm{ms}$	0.05 ms (5.06%)	0.02 ms (1.60%)	0.00%
myj2ocen		real	$0.97 \mathrm{ms}$	0.40ms (40.86%)	0.13ms (12.92%)	6.62%
	yes	CPU	$0.87 \mathrm{ms}$	0.39ms (44.91%)	0.12ms (14.20%)	-11.92%
		real	337.52 ms	7.81ms (2.31%)	2.47 ms (0.73%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$330.51 \mathrm{ms}$	2.65 ms (0.80%)	0.84 ms (0.25%)	0.00%
myj3ocen		real	266.05 ms	10.76ms (4.04%)	3.40ms (1.28%)	-21.17%
	yes	CPU	264.19 ms	7.94 ms (3.01%)	2.51 ms (0.95%)	-20.06%
		real	1.01ms	0.55ms (54.48%)	0.17ms (17.23%)	0.00%
• •	no	CPU	$0.89 \mathrm{ms}$	0.01 ms (1.39%)	0.00 ms (0.44%)	0.00%
myj1a		real	$0.73 \mathrm{ms}$	0.03ms (4.07%)	0.01ms (1.29%)	-27.65%
	yes	CPU	$0.63 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (1.27\%)$	0.00 ms (0.40%)	-29.17%
		real	$0.85 \mathrm{ms}$	0.03ms (3.86%)	0.01ms (1.22%)	0.00%
.41	no	CPU	$0.90 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.02 \text{ms} \ (2.30\%)$	0.01 ms (0.73%)	0.00%
myj1b		real	$0.72 \mathrm{ms}$	0.03ms (4.14%)	0.01ms (1.31%)	-14.44%
	yes	CPU	$0.63 \mathrm{ms}$	0.01 ms (2.28%)	0.00 ms (0.72%)	-30.26%
		real	$0.85 \mathrm{ms}$	0.04ms (5.22%)	0.01ms (1.65%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$0.91 \mathrm{ms}$	0.03 ms (3.39%)	0.01 ms (1.07%)	0.00%
myj1c		real	$0.73 \mathrm{ms}$	0.03ms (3.91%)	0.01ms (1.24%)	-14.10%
	yes	CPU	$0.64 \mathrm{ms}$	0.01 ms (2.09%)	0.00 ms (0.66%)	-29.62%
		real	2.13ms	0.55ms (25.63%)	0.17ms (8.10%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$2.16 \mathrm{ms}$	0.56 ms (25.76%)	0.18ms (8.15%)	0.00%
myj1d		real	$1.69 \mathrm{ms}$	0.06ms (3.62%)	0.02ms (1.14%)	-20.51%
	yes	CPU	$1.55 \mathrm{ms}$	0.05 ms (2.97%)	0.01 ms (0.94%)	-28.28%
		real	1.62ms	0.42ms (26.09%)	0.13ms (8.25%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$1.66 \mathrm{ms}$	0.39 ms (23.43%)	0.12ms (7.41%)	0.00%
myj1e		real	$1.35 \mathrm{ms}$	0.28ms (21.12%)	0.09ms (6.68%)	-16.64%
	yes	CPU	$1.22 \mathrm{ms}$	0.28 ms (22.98%)	0.09 ms (7.27%)	-26.08%
		real	$1.87 \mathrm{ms}$	0.30ms (16.09%)	0.09 ms (5.09%)	0.00%
:16	no	CPU	$1.92 \mathrm{ms}$	0.30 ms (15.41%)	$0.09 \text{ms} \ (4.87\%)$	0.00%
myj1f		real	$1.96 \mathrm{ms}$	0.66ms (33.54%)	$0.21 \text{ms} \ (10.61\%)$	5.06%
	yes	CPU	$1.82 \mathrm{ms}$	0.63 ms (34.83%)	0.20ms (11.01%)	-5.16%
		real	1.78ms	0.05 ms (3.04%)	$0.02 \text{ms} \ (0.96\%)$	0.00%
	no	CPU	$1.82 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.04 \text{ms} \ (2.09\%)$	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.66\%)$	0.00%
myj1g	*****	real	$1.99 \mathrm{ms}$	0.69 ms (34.57%)	0.22ms (10.93%)	11.80%
	yes	CPU	$1.82 \mathrm{ms}$	0.63 ms (34.46%)	0.20 ms (10.90%)	0.14%
	20.0	real	$2.03 \mathrm{ms}$	0.44 ms (21.53%)	0.14ms (6.81%)	0.00%
myj1h	no	CPU	$1.94 \mathrm{ms}$	0.29 ms~(15.12%)	$0.09 \text{ms} \ (4.78\%)$	0.00%
myjin	***00	real	$2.05 \mathrm{ms}$	0.68ms (33.37%)	0.22ms (10.55%)	1.13%
	yes	CPU	$1.72 \mathrm{ms}$	0.38 ms (22.04%)	$0.12 \text{ms} \ (6.97\%)$	-11.76%
	no	real	$2.35 \mathrm{ms}$	0.77ms (32.77%)	0.24ms (10.36%)	0.00%
myj1i	no	CPU	$2.38 \mathrm{ms}$	0.74 ms (30.95%)	0.23 ms (9.79%)	0.00%
myjm	MOG	real	$2.21 \mathrm{ms}$	0.83 ms (37.43%)	0.26ms (11.84%)	-6.06%
	yes	CPU	$2.07 \mathrm{ms}$	0.81 ms (38.93%)	0.26ms (12.31%)	-12.92%
	no	real	$1.59 \mathrm{ms}$	0.60 ms (37.47%)	0.19ms (11.85%)	0.00%
mvi1i	no	CPU	$1.65 \mathrm{ms}$	0.59 ms (35.87%)	0.19ms (11.34%)	0.00%
myj1j	MOG	real	$1.74 \mathrm{ms}$	0.62 ms (35.38%)	0.19ms (11.19%)	9.20%
	yes	CPU	$1.57 \mathrm{ms}$	0.62 ms (39.83%)	0.20ms (12.60%)	-5.07%
	no	real	$2.30 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.07 \text{ms} \ (3.02\%)$	$0.02 \text{ms} \ (0.95\%)$	0.00%
myi2e	no	CPU	$2.32 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.04 \text{ms} \ (1.54\%)$	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.49\%)$	0.00%
myj2a	MOG	real	$2.75 \mathrm{ms}$	0.76ms (27.81%)	0.24ms (8.79%)	19.38%
	yes	CPU	$2.45 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.68 \text{ms} \ (27.72\%)$	0.22ms (8.77%)	5.75%

				()		
	no	real	$2.56 \mathrm{ms}$	0.76 ms (29.56%)	0.24ms (9.35%)	0.00%
myj2b		CPU	2.41ms	0.31 ms (12.68%)	$0.10 \text{ms} \ (4.01\%)$	0.00%
111/1/20	yes	real	$2.34 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.32 \text{ms} \ (13.56\%)$	0.10ms (4.29%)	-8.62%
	, , ,	CPU	2.18ms	0.29 ms (13.38%)	$0.09 \text{ms} \ (4.23\%)$	-9.52%
	no	real	$2.69 \mathrm{ms}$	0.57 ms (21.11%)	0.18ms (6.67%)	0.00%
myj2c	no	CPU	$2.68 \mathrm{ms}$	0.58 ms (21.47%)	$0.18 \text{ms} \ (6.79\%)$	0.00%
myj2c	yes	real	$3.14 \mathrm{ms}$	0.85ms (27.02%)	0.27ms (8.55%)	16.66%
	yes	CPU	$2.94 \mathrm{ms}$	0.84 ms (28.66%)	0.27 ms (9.06%)	9.51%
	no	real	$4.09 \mathrm{ms}$	0.85 ms (20.84%)	0.27 ms (6.59%)	0.00%
myj3a	110	CPU	$4.10 \mathrm{ms}$	0.84 ms (20.59%)	0.27 ms (6.51%)	0.00%
шујза	yes	real	$3.60 \mathrm{ms}$	0.69 ms (19.12%)	$0.22 \text{ms} \ (6.05\%)$	-11.91%
	yes	CPU	$3.43 \mathrm{ms}$	0.64 ms (18.64%)	0.20 ms (5.89%)	-16.18%
	no	real	$3.53 \mathrm{ms}$	0.66 ms (18.58%)	0.21ms (5.88%)	0.00%
myj3b	no	CPU	$3.51 \mathrm{ms}$	0.60 ms (17.00%)	0.19 ms (5.38%)	0.00%
шујзо	TYOU	real	$3.78 \mathrm{ms}$	0.79 ms (21.00%)	0.25ms (6.64%)	7.05%
	yes	CPU	$3.61 \mathrm{ms}$	0.80 ms (22.19%)	0.25 ms (7.02%)	2.83%
		real	$6.04 \mathrm{ms}$	0.94 ms (15.52%)	0.30ms (4.91%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$5.74 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.78 \text{ms} \ (13.65\%)$	0.25 ms (4.32%)	0.00%
myj4a	******	real	$5.68 \mathrm{ms}$	0.69 ms (12.20%)	0.22ms (3.86%)	-5.86%
	yes	CPU	$5.49 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.68 \text{ms} \ (12.35\%)$	0.21 ms (3.90%)	-4.41%
		real	$4.06 \mathrm{ms}$	0.77ms (18.94%)	0.24ms (5.99%)	0.00%
: 41-	no	CPU	$3.77 \mathrm{ms}$	0.43ms (11.34%)	0.14ms (3.59%)	0.00%
myj4b		real	$4.50 \mathrm{ms}$	0.91ms (20.20%)	0.29ms (6.39%)	10.63%
	yes	CPU	$4.14 \mathrm{ms}$	0.83 ms (20.01%)	0.26 ms (6.33%)	9.92%
		real	$5.10 \mathrm{ms}$	0.90ms (17.64%)	0.28ms (5.58%)	0.00%
٠,-	no	CPU	$4.89 \mathrm{ms}$	0.80 ms (16.43%)	0.25 ms (5.20%)	0.00%
myj5		real	$4.57 \mathrm{ms}$	0.98ms (21.43%)	0.31ms (6.78%)	-10.49%
	yes	CPU	$4.31 \mathrm{ms}$	0.86 ms (20.00%)	0.27 ms (6.32%)	-11.88%
		real	$6.87 \mathrm{ms}$	0.94ms (13.71%)	0.30ms (4.33%)	0.00%
:c	no	CPU	$6.63 \mathrm{ms}$	0.75 ms (11.34%)	0.24 ms (3.59%)	0.00%
myj6	*****	real	$6.51 \mathrm{ms}$	1.20ms (18.38%)	0.38ms (5.81%)	-5.22%
	yes	CPU	$6.05 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.88 \text{ms} \ (14.59\%)$	0.28ms (4.61%)	-8.78%
		real	$7.69 \mathrm{ms}$	1.47ms (19.06%)	0.46ms (6.03%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$7.15 \mathrm{ms}$	0.75 ms (10.45%)	0.24 ms (3.30%)	0.00%
myj7		real	$6.87 \mathrm{ms}$	0.90ms (13.11%)	0.29ms (4.15%)	-10.62%
	yes	CPU	$6.60 \mathrm{ms}$	0.86ms (13.06%)	0.27 ms (4.13%)	-7.67%
		real	11.73ms	0.86ms (7.34%)	0.27ms (2.32%)	0.00%
:0	no	CPU	$11.51 \mathrm{ms}$	1.14ms (9.90%)	0.36ms (3.13%)	0.00%
myj8		real	$10.89 \mathrm{ms}$	1.31ms (12.05%)	0.42ms (3.81%)	-7.14%
	yes	CPU	$10.53 \mathrm{ms}$	1.20 ms (11.41%)	0.38 ms (3.61%)	-8.52%
		real	10.82ms	1.34ms (12.36%)	0.42ms (3.91%)	0.00%
••	no	CPU	$10.14 \mathrm{ms}$	0.84 ms (8.32%)	0.27 ms (2.63%)	0.00%
myj9		real	$9.60 \mathrm{ms}$	1.15ms (11.96%)	0.36ms (3.78%)	-11.21%
	yes	CPU	$9.39 \mathrm{ms}$	1.17 ms (12.42%)	0.37 ms (3.93%)	-7.43%
		real	18.74ms	1.59ms (8.48%)	0.50ms (2.68%)	0.00%
• • •	no	CPU	$17.82 \mathrm{ms}$	1.28 ms (7.18%)	0.40 ms (2.27%)	0.00%
myj10		real	17.20ms	1.65ms (9.57%)	0.52 ms (3.03%)	-8.23%
	yes	CPU	$16.94 \mathrm{ms}$	1.64 ms (9.67%)	0.52 ms (3.06%)	-4.94%
		real	10.95ms	1.25ms (11.45%)	0.40 ms (3.62%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$10.72 \mathrm{ms}$	0.78 ms (7.25%)	0.25 ms (2.29%)	0.00%
myj11a		real	10.72ms	0.20ms (1.94%)	0.06ms (0.61%)	-6.71%
	yes	CPU	$9.97 \mathrm{ms}$	0.19 ms (1.94%)	0.06ms (0.60%)	-6.97%
		CPU	9.97 ms	0.19ms (1.91%)	0.00ms (0.00%)	-0.97%

		real	10.68ms	0.44ms (4.14%)	0.14ms (1.31%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$10.45 \mathrm{ms}$	0.19ms (1.86%)	0.06 ms (0.59%)	0.00%
myj11b		real	10.29ms	0.24ms (2.34%)	0.08ms (0.74%)	-3.67%
	yes	CPU	$10.05 \mathrm{ms}$	0.19ms (1.91%)	0.06ms (0.60%)	-3.89%
		real	10.27ms	0.43ms (4.24%)	0.14ms (1.34%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$10.02 \mathrm{ms}$	0.43ms (4.24%) 0.23ms (2.31%)	0.07 ms (0.73%)	0.00%
myj11c		real	9.78ms	0.13ms (1.36%)	0.04ms (0.43%)	-4.72%
	yes	CPU	$9.53 \mathrm{ms}$	0.15ms (1.55%)	0.05 ms (0.49%)	-4.95%
		real	19.54ms	0.45ms (2.33%)	0.14ms (0.74%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$19.28 \mathrm{ms}$	0.18ms (0.93%)	0.06 ms (0.30%)	0.00%
myj12a		real	18.90ms	0.13ms (0.70%)	0.04 ms (0.22%)	-3.24%
	yes	CPU	$18.63 \mathrm{ms}$	0.14ms (0.74%)	0.04ms (0.23%)	-3.36%
		real	19.46ms	0.65ms (3.33%)	0.20ms (1.05%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	19.19ms	0.52 ms (2.69%)	0.16ms (0.85%)	0.00%
myj12b		real	18.92ms	0.15ms (0.78%)	0.05 ms (0.25%)	-2.76%
	yes	CPU	$18.63 \mathrm{ms}$	0.15ms (0.76%) 0.15ms (0.80%)	0.05 ms (0.25%) $0.05 ms (0.25%)$	-2.90%
		real	19.62ms	0.43ms (2.20%)	0.14ms (0.69%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$19.02 \mathrm{ms}$ $19.36 \mathrm{ms}$	0.43ms (2.20%) 0.33ms (1.69%)	0.14ms (0.09%) 0.10ms (0.53%)	0.00%
myj12c		real	22.64ms	2.75ms (12.13%)	0.10ms (0.93%) 0.87ms (3.84%)	15.35%
	yes	CPU	22.04 ms $22.08 ms$	2.87ms (13.02%)	0.91ms (4.12%)	14.03%
		real	22.57ms	1.70ms (7.52%)	0.54ms (2.38%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$21.98 \mathrm{ms}$	1.70ms (7.52%) 1.87ms (8.53%)	0.54ms (2.38%) 0.59ms (2.70%)	0.00%
myj12d		real	21.96ms 22.75ms	2.47ms (10.86%)	0.78ms (3.43%)	0.78%
	yes	CPU	22.75 ms $22.17 ms$	2.23ms (10.08%)	0.71ms (3.19%)	0.78% $0.82%$
		real	22.17ms 22.06ms	2.24ms (10.16%)	0.71ms (3.13%) 0.71ms (3.21%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	21.17 ms	1.68ms (7.91%)	$0.71 \text{ms} (3.21\%) \\ 0.53 \text{ms} (2.50\%)$	0.00%
myj13		real	22.28ms	3.41ms (15.31%)	1.08ms (4.84%)	0.98%
	yes	CPU	$21.05 \mathrm{ms}$	2.43ms (11.53%)	0.77ms (3.65%)	-0.55%
		real	110.00ms	6.34ms (5.76%)	2.01ms (1.82%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	107.97 ms	4.62ms (4.27%)	1.46ms (1.35%)	0.00%
myj14		real	107.37ms 108.22ms	6.18ms (5.71%)	1.95ms (1.81%)	-1.62%
	yes	CPU	107.58ms	6.15ms (5.72%)	1.94ms (1.81%)	-0.36%
		real	40.84ms	4.07ms (9.96%)	1.29ms (3.15%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$39.52 \mathrm{ms}$	3.42ms (8.65%)	1.08ms (2.73%)	0.00%
myj15a		real	$\frac{35.52 \text{ms}}{40.53 \text{ms}}$	2.82ms (6.97%)	0.89ms (2.20%)	-0.75%
	yes	CPU	39.79 ms	2.46ms (6.18%)	0.78ms (1.96%)	0.69%
		real	40.66ms	4.27ms (10.51%)	1.35ms (3.32%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	39.79 ms	3.76ms (9.45%)	1.19ms (2.99%)	0.00%
myj15b		real	39.83ms	3.40ms (8.52%)	1.07ms (2.70%)	-2.04%
	yes	CPU	$38.65 \mathrm{ms}$	3.40ms (8.92%) 3.08ms (7.96%)	0.97ms (2.52%)	-2.86%
		real	40.38ms	3.03ms (7.51%)	0.96ms (2.37%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$39.78 \mathrm{ms}$	2.86ms (7.20%)	0.91ms (2.28%)	0.00%
myj15c		real	40.14ms	2.51ms (6.25%)	0.79ms (1.98%)	-0.60%
	yes	CPU	$39.54 \mathrm{ms}$	2.36ms (5.97%)	0.75ms (1.89%)	-0.60%
			$\frac{39.54 \text{ms}}{420.55 \text{ms}}$	8.64ms (2.05%)	2.73ms (0.65%)	0.00%
	no	real CPU	420.55 ms $412.12 ms$	3.04ms (2.05%) 3.04ms (0.74%)	0.96ms (0.23%)	0.00%
myj16a			367.88ms	38.53ms (10.47%)	12.19ms (3.31%)	-12.52%
	yes	real CPU	365.03ms	36.65ms (10.04%)	12.19ms (3.31%) 11.59ms (3.18%)	-12.52%
			389.42ms	40.58ms (10.42%)	11.59ms (5.18%) 12.83ms (3.30%)	0.00%
	no	real CPU	389.42ms 381.49ms	l ' '	\ /	
myj16b			411.51ms	35.42ms (9.29%) 2.41ms (0.59%)	11.20ms (2.94%) 0.76ms (0.19%)	$\frac{0.00\%}{5.67\%}$
	yes	real CPU	411.51 ms 409.79 ms	l ' '		
		OPU	409.79IIIS	2.41 ms (0.59%)	0.76 ms (0.19%)	7.42%

		real	381.73ms	6.34ms (1.66%)	2.00ms (0.52%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	376.18ms	1.92ms (0.51%)	0.61ms (0.16%)	0.00%
myj16c		real	386.79ms	7.18ms (1.86%)	2.27 ms (0.59%)	1.33%
	yes	CPU	378.28ms	5.92ms (1.57%)	1.87ms (0.49%)	0.56%
		real	77.59ms	5.07ms (6.53%)	1.60ms (2.06%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	77.16ms	4.84ms (6.27%)	1.53ms (1.98%)	0.00%
myj17a		real	77.15ms	4.62ms (5.99%)	1.46ms (1.89%)	-0.56%
	yes	CPU	76.61ms	4.63ms (6.04%)	1.46ms (1.91%)	-0.72%
		real	78.77ms	5.20ms (6.60%)	1.64ms (2.09%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	76.09ms	4.07ms (5.35%)	1.29ms (1.69%)	0.00%
myj17b		real	78.29ms	4.46ms (5.69%)	1.41ms (1.80%)	-0.61%
	yes	CPU	76.57ms	4.43ms (5.78%)	1.40ms (1.83%)	0.64%
		real	79.24ms	6.06ms (7.65%)	1.92ms (2.42%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	77.95ms	5.76ms (7.39%)	1.82ms (2.34%)	0.00%
myj17c		real	78.64ms	5.14ms (6.54%)	1.63ms (2.07%)	-0.75%
	yes	CPU	77.20ms	3.70ms (4.79%)	1.17ms (1.51%)	-0.95%
		real	43.72ms	3.24ms (7.42%)	1.03ms (2.35%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	42.78ms	2.76ms (6.44%)	0.87ms (2.04%)	0.00%
myj18a		real	42.89ms	4.46ms (10.39%)	1.41ms (3.29%)	-1.91%
	yes	CPU	41.88ms	3.99 ms (9.53%)	1.26ms (3.01%)	-2.12%
		real	45.58ms	3.73ms (8.19%)	1.18ms (2.59%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	43.68ms	3.15ms (7.22%)	1.00ms (2.28%)	0.00%
myj18b		real	43.86ms	3.62ms (8.25%)	1.14ms (2.61%)	-3.76%
	yes	CPU	43.42ms	3.62 ms (8.33%)	1.14ms (2.63%)	-0.61%
		real	42.52ms	4.86ms (11.42%)	1.54ms (3.61%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	39.70ms	2.63ms (6.64%)	0.83ms (2.10%)	0.00%
myj18c		real	42.83ms	4.52ms (10.56%)	1.43ms (3.34%)	0.73%
	yes	CPU	41.58ms	4.36ms (10.48%)	1.38ms (3.31%)	4.74%
		real	1353.52ms	16.71ms (1.23%)	5.28ms (0.39%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	1346.57ms	11.16ms (0.83%)	3.53 ms (0.26%)	0.00%
myj19a		real	1269.57ms	119.68ms (9.43%)	37.85ms (2.98%)	-6.20%
	yes	CPU	1258.78ms	116.01ms (9.22%)	36.69ms (2.91%)	-6.52%
		real	1350.30ms	14.62ms (1.08%)	4.62ms (0.34%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	1342.81ms	11.45ms (0.85%)	3.62 ms (0.27%)	0.00%
myj19b		real	1376.87ms	17.28ms (1.26%)	5.47ms (0.40%)	1.97%
	yes	CPU	1361.73ms	8.43ms (0.62%)	2.67 ms (0.20%)	1.41%
		real	1283.10ms	113.29ms (8.83%)	35.83ms (2.79%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	1277.37ms	110.65ms (8.66%)	34.99ms (2.74%)	0.00%
myj20a		real	1278.21ms	120.55ms (9.43%)	38.12ms (2.98%)	-0.38%
	yes	CPU	1269.97ms	123.81ms (9.75%)	39.15ms (3.08%)	-0.58%
		real	1211.57ms	111.11ms (9.17%)	35.14ms (2.90%)	0.00%
:001	no	CPU	1203.19ms	107.88ms (8.97%)	34.11ms (2.84%)	0.00%
myj20b		real	1366.10ms	18.91ms (1.38%)	5.98ms (0.44%)	12.75%
	yes	CPU	1350.41ms	13.59ms (1.01%)	4.30ms (0.32%)	12.24%
		real	1354.07ms	15.61ms (1.15%)	4.94ms (0.36%)	0.00%
100	no	CPU	1349.44ms	13.83ms (1.02%)	4.37 ms (0.32%)	0.00%
myj20c		real	1352.38ms	20.36ms (1.51%)	6.44ms (0.48%)	-0.12%
	yes	CPU	1341.98ms	13.65ms (1.02%)	4.32 ms (0.32%)	-0.55%
		real	1106.04ms	18.56ms (1.68%)	5.87ms (0.53%)	0.00%
100.1	no	CPU	1100.80ms	12.40ms (1.13%)	3.92 ms (0.36%)	0.00%
myj20d		real	1320.44ms	77.02ms (5.83%)	24.36ms (1.84%)	19.38%
	yes	CPU	1313.12ms	77.91ms (5.93%)	24.64ms (1.88%)	19.29%
		1 22 0		(3.0070)	(2.00/0)	20.20/0

		real	1269.13 ms	115.99ms (9.14%)	36.68ms (2.89%)	0.00%
myj20e	no	CPU	1263.02 ms	115.20ms (9.12%)	36.43ms (2.88%)	0.00%
myjzoe		real	1364.85 ms	19.99ms (1.46%)	$6.32 \text{ms} \ (0.46\%)$	7.54%
	yes	CPU	1357.45ms	16.52ms (1.22%)	5.22 ms (0.38%)	7.48%

Table 5.5: Run times of the model solution program of the problem Myjnie (myj) from the finale of XXII Polish Olimpiad in Informatics. For each configuration (Test case and Sandbox columns) the data was collected from 10 runs. Real and CPU times were collected from the same runs. Slowdown is measured form the times of configuration without sandbox.

Tablice kierunkowe (tab)

Test	Sandbox	Time	Mean	Std. dev.	Std. err. on the mean	Slowdown
		real	1.26ms	0.33ms (25.85%)	0.10ms (8.17%)	0.00%
1.0	no	CPU	$1.26 \mathrm{ms}$	0.21 ms (16.87%)	0.07 ms (5.34%)	0.00%
tab0		real	$0.72 \mathrm{ms}$	0.04ms (5.35%)	0.01ms (1.69%)	-43.24%
	yes	CPU	$0.64 \mathrm{ms}$	0.02 ms (2.85%)	0.01 ms (0.90%)	-49.35%
		real	$1.69 \mathrm{ms}$	0.77ms (45.56%)	0.24ms (14.41%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$1.55 \mathrm{ms}$	0.58 ms (37.26%)	0.18ms (11.78%)	0.00%
tab1ocen		real	$0.70 \mathrm{ms}$	0.01ms (1.61%)	0.00ms (0.51%)	-58.46%
	yes	CPU	$0.63 \mathrm{ms}$	0.01 ms (1.90%)	0.00 ms (0.60%)	-59.42%
		real	$1.52 \mathrm{ms}$	0.64ms (42.36%)	0.20ms (13.39%)	0.00%
. 10	no	CPU	$1.46 \mathrm{ms}$	0.39 ms (26.83%)	0.12 ms (8.49%)	0.00%
tab2ocen		real	$0.81 \mathrm{ms}$	0.32ms (39.39%)	0.10ms (12.46%)	-46.34%
	yes	CPU	$0.73 \mathrm{ms}$	0.31 ms (42.13%)	0.10ms (13.32%)	-50.25%
		real	55.10ms	3.93ms (7.13%)	1.24ms (2.25%)	0.00%
. 10	no	CPU	$54.22 \mathrm{ms}$	2.05 ms (3.79%)	0.65 ms (1.20%)	0.00%
tab3ocen		real	49.45 ms	0.40ms (0.82%)	0.13ms (0.26%)	-10.26%
	yes	CPU	$49.16 \mathrm{ms}$	0.41 ms (0.84%)	0.13 ms (0.27%)	-9.32%
		real	$1.95 \mathrm{ms}$	0.02ms (1.26%)	0.01ms (0.40%)	0.00%
4-1-1-	no	CPU	$2.01 \mathrm{ms}$	0.02 ms (0.87%)	0.01 ms (0.27%)	0.00%
tab1a		real	$1.22 \mathrm{ms}$	0.02ms (1.96%)	0.01ms (0.62%)	-37.68%
	yes	CPU	$1.13 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.02 \text{ms} \ (1.40\%)$	$0.00 \text{ms} \ (0.44\%)$	-43.91%
		real	$1.56 \mathrm{ms}$	0.02ms (1.17%)	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.37\%)$	0.00%
tab1b	no	CPU	$1.62 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.91\%)$	$0.00 \text{ms} \ (0.29\%)$	0.00%
tabib	******	real	$0.92 \mathrm{ms}$	0.04ms (4.18%)	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (1.32\%)$	-41.12%
	yes	CPU	$0.83 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.03 \text{ms} \ (3.14\%)$	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.99\%)$	-48.75%
	70.0	real	$1.78 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.11 \text{ms} \ (6.37\%)$	0.04 ms (2.01%)	0.00%
tab1c	no	CPU	$1.83 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.13 \text{ms} \ (6.93\%)$	0.04 ms (2.19%)	0.00%
tabic	******	real	$1.09 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.02 \text{ms} \ (1.67\%)$	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.53\%)$	-39.01%
	yes	CPU	$1.00 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.99\%)$	$0.00 \text{ms} \ (0.31\%)$	-45.67%
	70.0	real	$1.62 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.57\%)$	$0.00 \text{ms} \ (0.18\%)$	0.00%
tab1d	no	CPU	$1.68 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.39\%)$	$0.00 \text{ms} \ (0.12\%)$	0.00%
tabiu	MOG	real	$0.93 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.02 \text{ms} \ (2.23\%)$	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.70\%)$	-42.46%
	yes	CPU	$0.85 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (1.34\%)$	$0.00 \text{ms} \ (0.42\%)$	-49.35%
	no	real	1.71ms	0.05 ms (3.16%)	0.02 ms (1.00%)	0.00%
tab1e	110	CPU	$1.78 \mathrm{ms}$	0.05 ms (3.01%)	$0.02 \text{ms} \ (0.95\%)$	0.00%
anie	yes	real	$1.07 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.02 \text{ms} \ (2.28\%)$	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.72\%)$	-37.30%
	yes	CPU	$0.98 \mathrm{ms}$	0.01 ms (1.02%)	$0.00 \text{ms} \ (0.32\%)$	-44.79%

		real	1.87ms	0.05ms (2.82%)	0.02ms (0.89%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$1.94 \mathrm{ms}$	0.06 ms (2.82%)	0.02 ms (0.03%) $0.02 ms (0.91%)$	0.00%
tab1f		real	1.17ms	0.03 ms (2.46%)	0.01 ms (0.78%)	-37.60%
	yes	CPU	$1.07 \mathrm{ms}$	0.02 ms (1.74%)	0.01 ms (0.55%)	-44.57%
		real	1.09ms	0.01ms (0.61%)	0.00ms (0.19%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$1.16 \mathrm{ms}$	0.01 ms (0.01%) $0.01 ms (1.10%)$	0.00 ms (0.15%)	0.00%
tab1g		real	0.71ms	0.02 ms (3.03%)	0.01 ms (0.96%)	-34.87%
	yes	CPU	$0.62 \mathrm{ms}$	0.02 ms (3.03%) $0.02 ms (2.83%)$	0.01 ms (0.30%) $0.01 ms (0.89%)$	-46.27%
		real	1.11ms	0.01ms (1.03%)	0.00ms (0.33%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	1.11ms 1.18ms	0.01 ms (1.05%) 0.01 ms (0.85%)	0.00 ms (0.35%) $0.00 ms (0.27%)$	0.00%
tab1h		real	0.85ms	0.34 ms (40.25%)	0.11ms (12.73%)	-23.74%
	yes	CPU	$0.75 \mathrm{ms}$	0.34 ms (40.25%) $0.31 ms (41.76%)$	0.11ms (12.75%) 0.10ms (13.21%)	-36.45%
		real	1.38ms	0.31ms (41.70%) 0.31ms (22.40%)	0.10ms (7.08%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	1.40ms	0.31 ms (22.40%) $0.30 ms (21.20%)$	0.10ms (7.00%) 0.09ms (6.70%)	0.00%
tab1i		real	0.90ms	0.35ms (39.25%)	0.11ms (12.41%)	-34.89%
	yes	CPU	$0.69 \mathrm{ms}$	0.05 ms (6.66%)	0.11ms (12.41%) 0.01ms (2.11%)	-54.69%
		real	1.27ms	0.34ms (27.09%)	0.01ms (2.11%) 0.11ms (8.57%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$1.27 \mathrm{ms}$ $1.31 \mathrm{ms}$	0.34ms (27.09%) 0.30ms (23.05%)	0.11ms (8.57%) 0.10ms (7.29%)	0.00%
tab1j		real	0.99ms	0.62ms (62.62%)	0.10ms (7.29%) 0.20ms (19.80%)	-21.98%
	yes	CPU	$0.99 \mathrm{ms}$ $0.91 \mathrm{ms}$	0.61ms (67.17%)	0.20ms (19.80%) 0.19ms (21.24%)	-21.98% -30.55%
			1.64ms	0.68ms (41.38%)	0.19ffs (21.24%) 0.21ms (13.08%)	0.00%
	no	real CPU	$1.62 \mathrm{ms}$	0.59ms (36.24%)	0.21flis (13.08%) 0.19ms (11.46%)	0.00%
tab1k		real	0.93ms	0.37ms (39.39%)	0.19ms (11.46%) 0.12ms (12.46%)	-43.03%
	yes	CPU	$0.95 \mathrm{ms}$ $0.84 \mathrm{ms}$	0.37ms (39.59%) 0.37ms (43.61%)	0.12ms (12.40%) 0.12ms (13.79%)	-43.03% -48.02%
				0.78ms (20.80%)	\ /	0.00%
	no	real CPU	$3.77 \mathrm{ms}$ $3.44 \mathrm{ms}$	0.78 ms (20.80%) 0.04 ms (1.29%)	0.25ms (6.58%) 0.01ms (0.41%)	0.00%
tab2a		real	2.95ms	0.83ms (28.22%)	0.26ms (8.92%)	-21.55%
	yes	CPU	$2.95 \mathrm{ms}$ $2.83 \mathrm{ms}$	0.85 ms (28.22%) 0.79 ms (28.02%)	0.25ms (8.86%)	-21.33% -17.84%
			3.47ms	0.90ms (25.81%)	0.28ms (8.16%)	0.00%
	no	real CPU		(/	0.28ms (8.10%) 0.16ms (4.91%)	
tab2b			3.20ms 1.61ms	0.50ms (15.52%) 0.32ms (20.09%)	0.10ms (4.91%) 0.10ms (6.35%)	0.00% -53.77%
	yes	real CPU	$1.51 \mathrm{ms}$ $1.51 \mathrm{ms}$	0.32ms (20.09%) 0.31ms (20.80%)	0.10ms (6.58%)	-53.77% -52.82%
			$\frac{1.51 \mathrm{ms}}{2.07 \mathrm{ms}}$	0.03ms (20.80%)	0.10ms (0.55%) 0.01ms (0.51%)	0.00%
	no	real CPU	$2.07 \mathrm{ms}$ $2.12 \mathrm{ms}$	0.03 ms (1.01%) 0.03 ms (1.49%)	0.01ms (0.51%) 0.01ms (0.47%)	0.00%
tab2c			2.12ms 2.18ms	0.95ms (43.55%)	0.30ms (13.77%)	5.44%
	yes	real CPU	$1.62 \mathrm{ms}$	0.45ms (27.74%)	0.14ms (8.77%)	-23.78%
				. ,	,	
	no	real	3.24ms	0.59ms (18.24%)	0.19ms (5.77%)	0.00%
tab2d		CPU	3.32ms	0.61ms (18.32%)	0.19ms (5.79%)	0.00%
	yes	real	1.49ms	0.04 ms (2.73%)	0.01ms (0.86%)	-53.80%
		CPU	1.41ms	0.03 ms (2.00%)	0.01ms (0.63%)	-57.53%
	no	real	4.81ms	0.57 ms (11.84%)	0.18ms (3.74%)	0.00%
tab2e		CPU	4.75ms	0.42ms (8.86%)	0.13ms (2.80%)	0.00%
	yes	real	3.49ms	0.83 ms (23.68%)	0.26ms (7.49%)	-27.49%
		CPU	3.37ms	0.82ms (24.39%)	0.26ms (7.71%)	-29.04%
	no	real	3.33ms	0.51 ms (15.23%)	0.16ms (4.82%)	0.00%
tab2f		CPU	3.37ms	0.51ms (14.99%)	0.16ms (4.74%)	0.00%
	yes	real	2.85ms	0.89 ms (31.07%)	0.28ms (9.83%)	-14.44%
		CPU	2.33ms	0.66ms (28.39%)	0.21ms (8.98%)	-30.83%
	no	real	5.03ms	0.75ms (14.87%)	0.24ms (4.70%)	0.00%
tab3a		CPU	5.15ms	0.75ms (14.52%)	0.24ms (4.59%)	0.00%
	yes	real	4.04ms	0.80 ms (19.77%)	0.25ms (6.25%)	-19.71%
yes		CPU	$3.92 \mathrm{ms}$	0.77 ms (19.70%)	0.24 ms (6.23%)	-23.91%

	1	1 1	4.00	0.00 (00.100/)	0.00 (0.007)	0.0004
	no	real	4.08ms	0.82ms (20.12%)	0.26ms (6.36%)	0.00%
tab3b		CPU	3.90ms	0.73ms (18.64%)	0.23ms (5.89%)	0.00%
	yes	real	2.18ms	0.52ms (23.95%)	0.17ms (7.57%)	-46.64%
	J	CPU	$2.08 \mathrm{ms}$	0.50ms (24.12%)	0.16ms (7.63%)	-46.65%
	no	real	$5.48 \mathrm{ms}$	0.97 ms (17.75%)	0.31 ms (5.61%)	0.00%
tab3c		CPU	$5.26 \mathrm{ms}$	0.66 ms (12.52%)	0.21 ms (3.96%)	0.00%
tabec	yes	real	$3.55 \mathrm{ms}$	0.79 ms (22.30%)	0.25 ms (7.05%)	-35.10%
	yes	CPU	$3.41 \mathrm{ms}$	0.80 ms (23.45%)	0.25 ms (7.42%)	-35.24%
	no	real	$4.13 \mathrm{ms}$	0.92 ms (22.21%)	0.29 ms (7.02%)	0.00%
tab3d	110	CPU	$3.84 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.47 \text{ms} \ (12.35\%)$	0.15 ms (3.91%)	0.00%
tabou	******	real	$2.54 \mathrm{ms}$	0.96 ms (37.97%)	0.30 ms (12.01%)	-38.58%
	yes	CPU	$2.42 \mathrm{ms}$	0.91 ms (37.71%)	0.29ms (11.93%)	-36.93%
		real	$6.99 \mathrm{ms}$	0.78ms (11.13%)	0.25ms (3.52%)	0.00%
. 10	no	CPU	$6.94 \mathrm{ms}$	0.68 ms (9.85%)	0.22 ms (3.11%)	0.00%
tab3e		real	$5.36 \mathrm{ms}$	0.79ms (14.74%)	0.25ms (4.66%)	-23.25%
	yes	CPU	$5.21 \mathrm{ms}$	0.77ms (14.84%)	0.24 ms (4.69%)	-25.00%
		real	3.84ms	0.51ms (13.17%)	0.16ms (4.16%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$3.88 \mathrm{ms}$	0.50 ms (12.92%)	0.16ms (4.09%)	0.00%
tab3f		real	2.13ms	0.42ms (19.71%)	0.13ms (6.23%)	-44.55%
	yes	CPU	$2.01 \mathrm{ms}$	0.39ms (19.48%)	0.12ms (6.16%)	-48.34%
	+	real	$30.95 \mathrm{ms}$	1.77ms (5.73%)	0.56ms (1.81%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$30.95 \mathrm{ms}$	1.85 ms (6.15%)	0.58ms (1.94%)	0.00%
tab4a		real	27.12ms	2.29ms (8.46%)	0.73ms (2.68%)	-12.39%
	yes	CPU	26.87ms	2.29ms (8.40%) 2.28ms (8.47%)	0.73ms (2.68%)	
				()	,	-10.60%
	no	real	10.63ms	1.54ms (14.45%)	0.49ms (4.57%)	0.00%
tab4b		CPU	10.43ms	1.60ms (15.36%)	0.51ms (4.86%)	0.00%
	yes	real	$6.00 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.05 \text{ms} \ (0.76\%)$	0.01ms (0.24%)	-43.53%
		CPU	5.87ms	$0.02 \text{ms} \ (0.36\%)$	0.01ms (0.11%)	-43.74%
	no	real	14.81ms	$0.57 \text{ms} \ (3.87\%)$	0.18ms (1.23%)	0.00%
tab4c		CPU	$14.80 \mathrm{ms}$	0.57ms (3.86%)	0.18ms (1.22%)	0.00%
000 10	yes	real	$10.46 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.30 \text{ms} \ (2.87\%)$	$0.09 \text{ms} \ (0.91\%)$	-29.39%
	, , , ,	CPU	$10.29 \mathrm{ms}$	0.32 ms (3.06%)	$0.10 \text{ms} \ (0.97\%)$	-30.45%
	no	real	$11.03 \mathrm{ms}$	0.36 ms (3.28%)	0.11ms (1.04%)	0.00%
tab4d	110	CPU	$11.03 \mathrm{ms}$	0.36 ms (3.25%)	0.11 ms (1.03%)	0.00%
uabaa	TOG	real	$6.19 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.04 \text{ms} \ (0.70\%)$	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.22\%)$	-43.84%
	yes	CPU	$6.05 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.02 \text{ms} \ (0.30\%)$	$0.01 \mathrm{ms} \ (0.10\%)$	-45.14%
	no	real	$23.59 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.46 \text{ms} \ (1.93\%)$	$0.14 \text{ms} \ (0.61\%)$	0.00%
+ a la 4 a	no	CPU	$23.56 \mathrm{ms}$	0.45 ms (1.93%)	$0.14 \text{ms} \ (0.61\%)$	0.00%
tab4e		real	$19.39 \mathrm{ms}$	0.69 ms (3.58%)	0.22ms (1.13%)	-17.81%
	yes	CPU	$19.18 \mathrm{ms}$	0.69 ms (3.60%)	0.22ms (1.14%)	-18.60%
		real	10.19 ms	1.16ms (11.37%)	0.37 ms (3.60%)	0.00%
1.46	no	CPU	$10.20 \mathrm{ms}$	1.15ms (11.29%)	0.36 ms (3.57%)	0.00%
tab4f		real	$5.64 \mathrm{ms}$	0.05ms (0.89%)	0.02 ms (0.28%)	-44.67%
	yes	CPU	$5.49 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.02 \text{ms} \ (0.41\%)$	0.01 ms (0.13%)	-46.11%
	+	real	61.04ms	2.46ms (4.02%)	0.78ms (1.27%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$60.49 \mathrm{ms}$	2.72 ms (4.49%)	0.86ms (1.42%)	0.00%
tab5a		real	56.89ms	1.85ms (3.25%)	0.59ms (1.03%)	-6.79%
	yes	CPU	$56.34 \mathrm{ms}$	1.90 ms (3.37%)	0.60ms (1.07%)	-6.85%
		_	17.09ms	1.29ms (7.57%)	0.41ms (2.39%)	0.00%
	no	real CPU	17.09ms 16.72ms	,		
tab5b				$\frac{1.30 \text{ms} (7.76\%)}{1.02 \text{mg} (8.84\%)}$	0.41ms (2.45%)	0.00%
	yes	real	11.54ms	1.02 ms (8.84%)	0.32ms (2.79%)	-32.47%
		CPU	$11.38 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.99 \text{ms} \ (8.66\%)$	0.31 ms (2.74%)	-31.91%

		real	22.88ms	0.74ms (3.25%)	0.23ms (1.03%)	0.00%
. 1 -	no	CPU	22.23ms	1.25 ms (5.62%)	0.40ms (1.78%)	0.00%
tab5c		real	18.70ms	1.88ms (10.06%)	0.59ms (3.18%)	-18.28%
	yes	CPU	18.38ms	1.83ms (9.96%)	0.58ms (3.15%)	-17.35%
		real	11.20ms	0.56ms (5.01%)	0.18ms (1.58%)	0.00%
. 1 - 1	no	CPU	$11.03 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.47 \text{ms} \ (4.25\%)$	0.15ms (1.34%)	0.00%
tab5d		real	8.02ms	0.91ms (11.32%)	0.29ms (3.58%)	-28.43%
	yes	CPU	$7.86 \mathrm{ms}$	0.90ms (11.40%)	0.28 ms (3.60%)	-28.77%
		real	$35.26 \mathrm{ms}$	2.70ms (7.65%)	0.85ms (2.42%)	0.00%
. 1 5	no	CPU	$34.22 \mathrm{ms}$	2.07 ms (6.04%)	0.65 ms (1.91%)	0.00%
tab5e		real	$30.23 \mathrm{ms}$	2.51ms (8.31%)	0.79ms (2.63%)	-14.26%
	yes	CPU	$29.48 \mathrm{ms}$	2.23ms (7.55%)	$0.70 \text{ms} \ (2.39\%)$	-13.86%
		real	18.42ms	1.52ms (8.28%)	0.48ms (2.62%)	0.00%
. 1 5 6	no	CPU	18.40ms	1.53ms (8.30%)	0.48 ms (2.62%)	0.00%
tab5f		real	14.21ms	1.26ms (8.88%)	0.40ms (2.81%)	-22.82%
	yes	CPU	14.01ms	1.24ms (8.88%)	$0.39 \text{ms} \ (2.81\%)$	-23.89%
		real	195.18ms	6.07ms (3.11%)	1.92ms (0.98%)	0.00%
4 - 1- C -	no	CPU	192.32ms	1.88ms (0.98%)	0.59 ms (0.31%)	0.00%
tab6a	*****	real	$188.46 \mathrm{ms}$	2.33ms (1.24%)	0.74 ms (0.39%)	-3.44%
	yes	CPU	187.72ms	2.30 ms (1.23%)	$0.73 \text{ms} \ (0.39\%)$	-2.39%
		real	$32.69 \mathrm{ms}$	1.70ms (5.21%)	0.54 ms (1.65%)	0.00%
tab6b	no	CPU	$32.34 \mathrm{ms}$	1.65 ms (5.09%)	$0.52 \text{ms} \ (1.61\%)$	0.00%
tabob	******	real	$28.20 \mathrm{ms}$	2.56ms (9.09%)	0.81ms (2.87%)	-13.74%
	yes	CPU	$27.29 \mathrm{ms}$	1.83 ms (6.69%)	$0.58 \text{ms} \ (2.12\%)$	-15.62%
	no	real	$58.83 \mathrm{ms}$	4.40ms (7.48%)	1.39ms (2.36%)	0.00%
tab6c	no	CPU	$58.71 \mathrm{ms}$	4.38ms (7.46%)	1.39 ms (2.36%)	0.00%
tabuc	TOG	real	$51.30 \mathrm{ms}$	1.94ms (3.78%)	0.61ms (1.20%)	-12.80%
	yes	CPU	$50.79 \mathrm{ms}$	2.04 ms (4.02%)	0.65 ms (1.27%)	-13.48%
	no	real	$33.46 \mathrm{ms}$	2.31ms (6.90%)	0.73 ms (2.18%)	0.00%
tab6d	110	CPU	$33.20 \mathrm{ms}$	2.18 ms (6.58%)	0.69 ms (2.08%)	0.00%
taboa	yes	real	$31.06 \mathrm{ms}$	4.20ms (13.51%)	1.33ms (4.27%)	-7.17%
	yes	CPU	$30.31 \mathrm{ms}$	4.30ms (14.20%)	1.36 ms (4.49%)	-8.68%
	no	real	$97.21 \mathrm{ms}$	6.29 ms (6.47%)	1.99ms (2.04%)	0.00%
tab6e	110	CPU	96.36ms	4.92ms (5.11%)	1.56 ms (1.62%)	0.00%
taboc	yes	real	87.90ms	1.88ms (2.14%)	$0.59 \text{ms} \ (0.68\%)$	-9.58%
	yes	CPU	86.31ms	2.95 ms (3.42%)	0.93 ms (1.08%)	-10.42%
	no	real	$34.28 \mathrm{ms}$	2.56 ms (7.47%)	$0.81 \text{ms} \ (2.36\%)$	0.00%
tab6f		CPU	$33.51 \mathrm{ms}$	$2.13 \text{ms} \ (6.36\%)$	$0.67 \text{ms} \ (2.01\%)$	0.00%
00001	yes	real	32.34ms	1.84 ms (5.68%)	0.58ms (1.80%)	-5.65%
	J ==	CPU	31.36ms	1.88ms (5.99%)	0.59 ms (1.89%)	-6.42%
	no	real	309.97ms	4.60ms (1.48%)	$1.45 \text{ms} \ (0.47\%)$	0.00%
tab7a		CPU	307.75ms	3.91ms (1.27%)	$1.24 \text{ms} \ (0.40\%)$	0.00%
	yes	real	324.18ms	14.65ms (4.52%)	4.63ms (1.43%)	4.58%
	,	CPU	323.04ms	14.59ms (4.52%)	4.61ms (1.43%)	4.97%
	no	real	82.62ms	4.54ms (5.50%)	1.44ms (1.74%)	0.00%
tab7b		CPU	80.67ms	3.72ms (4.61%)	1.18ms (1.46%)	0.00%
-	yes	real	81.98ms	8.55ms (10.42%)	2.70ms (3.30%)	-0.78%
		CPU	80.71ms	6.99ms (8.66%)	2.21ms (2.74%)	0.04%
	no	real	127.31ms	5.69ms (4.47%)	1.80ms (1.41%)	0.00%
tab7c		CPU	125.41ms	4.70ms (3.75%)	1.49ms (1.19%)	0.00%
	yes	real	125.31ms	17.40ms (13.89%)	5.50ms (4.39%)	-1.58%
		CPU	123.55ms	17.06ms (13.81%)	5.40 ms (4.37%)	-1.49%

		real	70.50ms	0.91ms (1.30%)	0.29ms (0.41%)	0.00%
4-1-7-1	no	CPU	70.37 ms	0.92 ms (1.31%)	0.29 ms (0.42%)	0.00%
tab7d		real	$65.89 \mathrm{ms}$	0.54 ms (0.82%)	0.17ms (0.26%)	-6.54%
	yes	CPU	$65.55 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.56 \text{ms} \ (0.85\%)$	$0.18 \text{ms} \ (0.27\%)$	-6.85%
	*0.0	real	178.91ms	11.68ms (6.53%)	3.69ms (2.06%)	0.00%
tab7e	no	CPU	176.95 ms	9.93ms (5.61%)	3.14ms (1.78%)	0.00%
tabre	Mod	real	201.53 ms	6.38ms (3.17%)	2.02ms (1.00%)	12.65%
	yes	CPU	200.53 ms	6.25ms (3.11%)	1.98ms (0.98%)	13.32%
	no	real	86.81ms	5.73ms (6.60%)	1.81ms (2.09%)	0.00%
tab7f	110	CPU	$83.92 \mathrm{ms}$	3.80ms (4.53%)	1.20ms (1.43%)	0.00%
tabii	yes	real	$80.86 \mathrm{ms}$	4.11ms (5.08%)	1.30ms (1.61%)	-6.86%
	yes	CPU	80.34 ms	4.18ms (5.20%)	1.32 ms (1.65%)	-4.26%
	no	real	278.40ms	14.96ms (5.37%)	4.73ms (1.70%)	0.00%
tab8a	110	CPU	276.35ms	12.58ms (4.55%)	3.98ms (1.44%)	0.00%
laboa	yes	real	310.06 ms	15.88ms (5.12%)	5.02ms (1.62%)	11.37%
	yes	CPU	$308.60 \mathrm{ms}$	15.78ms (5.11%)	4.99ms (1.62%)	11.67%
	no	real	82.01ms	6.10ms (7.44%)	1.93ms (2.35%)	0.00%
tab8b	110	CPU	$79.57 \mathrm{ms}$	5.88ms (7.39%)	1.86ms (2.34%)	0.00%
tabob	yes	real	65.42ms	0.91 ms (1.39%)	0.29ms (0.44%)	-20.23%
	yes	CPU	$65.10 \mathrm{ms}$	0.91 ms (1.40%)	0.29 ms (0.44%)	-18.18%
	no	real	109.99 ms	3.35 ms (3.05%)	1.06ms (0.96%)	0.00%
tab8c	110	CPU	109.78 ms	3.31ms (3.02%)	1.05 ms (0.95%)	0.00%
taboc	yes	real	115.78ms	17.52ms (15.13%)	5.54ms (4.79%)	5.26%
	yes	CPU	$115.35 \mathrm{ms}$	17.44ms (15.12%)	5.51ms (4.78%)	5.07%
	no	real	83.83ms	3.81ms (4.55%)	1.21ms (1.44%)	0.00%
tab8d	110	CPU	80.59 ms	4.53 ms (5.62%)	1.43ms (1.78%)	0.00%
tabod	yes	real	$71.69 \mathrm{ms}$	5.03ms (7.01%)	1.59ms (2.22%)	-14.48%
	yes	CPU	$70.22 \mathrm{ms}$	4.41ms (6.28%)	1.40ms (1.99%)	-12.87%
	no	real	$97.93 \mathrm{ms}$	4.73ms (4.83%)	1.49ms (1.53%)	0.00%
tab8e	110	CPU	$97.73 \mathrm{ms}$	4.73ms (4.84%)	1.50ms (1.53%)	0.00%
taboc	yes	real	91.30 ms	3.51 ms (3.85%)	1.11ms (1.22%)	-6.77%
	yes	CPU	90.93 ms	3.51ms (3.86%)	1.11ms (1.22%)	-6.97%
	no	real	98.01ms	7.73ms (7.89%)	2.44ms (2.49%)	0.00%
tab8f	110	CPU	$96.56 \mathrm{ms}$	4.94ms (5.12%)	1.56ms (1.62%)	0.00%
uanoi	yes	real	$106.16 \mathrm{ms}$	7.82ms (7.37%)	2.47ms (2.33%)	8.32%
	yes	CPU	$105.38 \mathrm{ms}$	7.30ms (6.93%)	2.31 ms (2.19%)	9.14%

Table 5.6: Run times of the model solution program of the problem Tablice kierunkowe (tab) from the finale of XXII Polish Olimpiad in Informatics. For each configuration (Test case and Sandbox columns) the data was collected from 10 runs. Real and CPU times were collected from the same runs. Slowdown is measured form the times of configuration without sandbox.

Modernizacja autostrady (mod)

$\operatorname*{Test}$ $\operatorname*{case}$	Sandbox	Time	Mean	Std. dev.	Std. err. on the mean	Slowdown
mod0	no	real CPU	5.23ms 5.20ms	0.37ms (7.14%) 0.28ms (5.44%)	0.12ms (2.26%) 0.09ms (1.72%)	0.00% 0.00%
modo	yes	real CPU	5.22ms 4.94ms	0.53ms (10.20%) 0.44ms (8.92%)	0.17ms (3.23%) 0.14ms (2.82%)	-0.33% -5.06%

		real	5.16ms	0.32ms (6.14%)	0.10ms (1.94%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$5.07 \mathrm{ms}$	0.20ms (3.93%)	0.06ms (1.24%)	0.00%
mod1ocen		real	5.14ms	0.31ms (6.01%)	0.10ms (1.90%)	-0.42%
	yes	CPU	$4.97 \mathrm{ms}$	0.29ms (5.75%)	0.10ms (1.30%) 0.09ms (1.82%)	-2.02%
		real	5.65ms	0.62ms (10.90%)	0.19ms (3.45%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$5.42 \mathrm{ms}$	0.02 ms (10.90%) $0.22 ms (4.05%)$	0.19ms (3.45%) 0.07ms (1.28%)	0.00%
mod2ocen		real	5.42ms 5.49ms	0.34ms (6.15%)	0.07 ms (1.28%) 0.11 ms (1.95%)	-2.73%
	yes	CPU	$5.49 \mathrm{ms}$ $5.30 \mathrm{ms}$	0.34 ms (0.15%) = 0.35 ms (6.65%)	0.11ms (1.95%) 0.11ms (2.10%)	-2.75%
		real	84.92ms	2.76ms (3.25%)	0.11ms (2.10%) 0.87ms (1.03%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	83.99 ms	2.70ms (3.25%) 2.60ms (3.09%)	0.82ms (0.98%)	0.00%
mod3ocen			80.79ms	0.59ms (0.73%)	0.02 H/s (0.98%) $0.19 ms (0.23%)$	-4.87%
	yes	real CPU	80.79ms		\ /	
				0.60ms (0.74%)	0.19ms (0.24%)	-4.28%
	no	real	5.00ms	0.55ms (10.97%)	0.17ms (3.47%)	0.00%
mod1a		CPU	4.84ms	0.06ms (1.19%)	0.02ms (0.38%)	0.00%
	yes	real	4.80ms	0.18ms (3.83%)	0.06ms (1.21%)	-4.02%
		CPU	4.63ms	0.18ms (3.90%)	0.06ms (1.23%)	-4.33%
	no	real	4.84ms	0.06ms (1.19%)	0.02 ms (0.38%)	0.00%
mod1b		CPU	4.87ms	0.06ms (1.21%)	0.02ms (0.38%)	0.00%
	yes	real	5.01ms	0.29ms (5.71%)	0.09ms (1.81%)	3.52%
		CPU	4.82ms	0.27ms (5.54%)	0.08ms (1.75%)	-1.02%
	no	real	4.82ms	0.10ms (2.14%)	0.03ms (0.68%)	0.00%
$\mod 1c$		CPU	4.83ms	0.06ms (1.14%)	0.02ms (0.36%)	0.00%
	yes	real	$5.29 \mathrm{ms}$	0.30ms (5.63%)	0.09ms (1.78%)	9.70%
		CPU	5.02ms	0.22ms (4.47%)	0.07ms (1.41%)	3.82%
	no	real	$5.19 \mathrm{ms}$	0.27ms (5.20%)	0.09ms (1.64%)	0.00%
mod1d		CPU	5.11ms	0.24ms (4.75%)	0.08ms (1.50%)	0.00%
	yes	real	$5.40 \mathrm{ms}$	0.38ms (7.08%)	0.12ms (2.24%)	3.99%
	J	CPU	$5.06 \mathrm{ms}$	0.27ms (5.26%)	0.08ms (1.66%)	-0.92%
	no	real	$5.27 \mathrm{ms}$	0.52ms (9.86%)	0.16ms (3.12%)	0.00%
mod1e		CPU	$5.09 \mathrm{ms}$	0.23ms (4.56%)	0.07ms (1.44%)	0.00%
	yes	real	$5.24 \mathrm{ms}$	0.38ms (7.31%)	0.12ms (2.31%)	-0.57%
	<i>J</i> 65	CPU	$4.97 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.33 \text{ms} \ (6.63\%)$	$0.10 \mathrm{ms} \ (2.10\%)$	-2.33%
	no	real	$5.01 \mathrm{ms}$	0.27 ms (5.48%)	0.09 ms (1.73%)	0.00%
mod1f	110	CPU	$5.00 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.23 \text{ms} \ (4.64\%)$	0.07 ms (1.47%)	0.00%
modii	yes	real	$5.02 \mathrm{ms}$	0.42ms (8.32%)	0.13ms (2.63%)	0.23%
	yes	CPU	$4.83 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.42 \text{ms} \ (8.73\%)$	$0.13 \text{ms} \ (2.76\%)$	-3.30%
	no	real	$5.08 \mathrm{ms}$	0.22ms (4.37%)	0.07 ms (1.38%)	0.00%
mod2a	110	CPU	$5.05 \mathrm{ms}$	0.21 ms (4.17%)	0.07 ms (1.32%)	0.00%
modza	yes	real	$5.09 \mathrm{ms}$	0.38 ms (7.55%)	$0.12 \text{ms} \ (2.39\%)$	0.21%
	ycs	CPU	$4.92 \mathrm{ms}$	0.36ms (7.38%)	$0.11 \text{ms} \ (2.33\%)$	-2.54%
	no	real	$5.34 \mathrm{ms}$	0.51ms (9.64%)	0.16 ms (3.05%)	0.00%
mod2b	no	CPU	$5.18 \mathrm{ms}$	0.36ms (6.90%)	0.11 ms (2.18%)	0.00%
modzb	TIOS	real	$5.03 \mathrm{ms}$	0.33ms (6.59%)	0.10ms (2.09%)	-5.83%
	yes	CPU	$4.86 \mathrm{ms}$	0.32 ms (6.59%)	$0.10 \mathrm{ms} \ (2.08\%)$	-6.08%
	20.0	real	$5.13 \mathrm{ms}$	0.23ms (4.42%)	0.07ms (1.40%)	0.00%
mode	no	CPU	$5.13 \mathrm{ms}$	0.20ms (3.86%)	0.06ms (1.22%)	0.00%
mod2c	1100	real	$5.13 \mathrm{ms}$	0.37ms (7.26%)	0.12ms (2.30%)	-0.04%
	yes	CPU	$4.92 \mathrm{ms}$	0.36 ms (7.30%)	$0.11 \text{ms} \ (2.31\%)$	-4.00%
	*0.0	real	$5.15 \mathrm{ms}$	0.26ms (4.98%)	0.08ms (1.57%)	0.00%
*** o d0 d	no	CPU	$5.11 \mathrm{ms}$	0.23 ms (4.43%)	0.07 ms (1.40%)	0.00%
mod2d		real	5.26ms	0.45ms (8.60%)	0.14ms (2.72%)	2.12%
	yes	CPU	$4.94 \mathrm{ms}$	0.28 ms (5.72%)	0.09 ms (1.81%)	-3.28%
		-		(- : , 0)	(0)	0

		real	5.15ms	0.19ms (3.66%)	0.06ms (1.16%)	0.00%
,,	no	CPU	$5.10 \mathrm{ms}$	0.19 ms (3.67%)	0.06 ms (1.16%)	0.00%
mod2e		real	5.47ms	0.67ms (12.33%)	0.21 ms (3.90%)	6.31%
	yes	CPU	$5.05 \mathrm{ms}$	0.31 ms (6.14%)	0.10ms (1.94%)	-0.93%
		real	5.31ms	0.21 ms (3.98%)	0.07 ms (1.26%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	5.15ms	0.24 ms (4.67%)	0.08ms (1.48%)	0.00%
mod2f		real	5.18ms	0.41ms (7.87%)	0.13ms (2.49%)	-2.43%
	yes	CPU	$4.85 \mathrm{ms}$	0.28ms (5.71%)	0.09ms (1.81%)	-5.83%
		real	5.62ms	0.38ms (6.84%)	0.12 ms (2.16%)	0.00%
_	no	CPU	5.41ms	0.24ms (4.51%)	0.08 ms (1.42%)	0.00%
mod3a		real	5.52ms	0.25ms (4.53%)	0.08ms (1.43%)	-1.70%
	yes	CPU	$5.30 \mathrm{ms}$	0.25 ms (4.70%)	0.08ms (1.48%)	-2.02%
		real	5.47ms	0.29ms (5.23%)	0.09ms (1.65%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$5.40 \mathrm{ms}$	0.29ms (5.44%)	0.09 ms (1.72%)	0.00%
mod3b		real	5.65ms	0.43ms (7.68%)	0.14 ms (2.43%)	3.26%
	yes	CPU	$5.25 \mathrm{ms}$	0.32 ms (6.03%)	0.10ms (1.91%)	-2.81%
		real	5.73ms	0.47ms (8.27%)	0.15ms (2.62%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$5.43 \mathrm{ms}$	0.24 ms (3.27%) = 0.24 ms (4.46%)	0.18ms (2.02%) 0.08ms (1.41%)	0.00%
mod3c		real	5.49ms 5.50ms	0.58ms (10.58%)	0.18ms (3.35%)	-3.99%
	yes	CPU	5.10ms	0.33 ms (6.47%)	0.10 ms (3.99%) $0.10 ms (2.04%)$	-6.04%
		real	5.67ms	0.46ms (8.09%)	0.14 ms (2.56%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$5.58 \mathrm{ms}$	0.29ms (5.11%)	0.14ms (2.50%) 0.09ms (1.62%)	0.00%
mod3d		real	5.40ms	0.30 ms (5.55%)	0.09ms (1.76%)	-4.76%
	yes	CPU	5.18ms	0.29 ms (5.54%)	0.09ms (1.75%)	-7.14%
		real	5.54ms	0.29ms (5.24%)	0.09ms (1.66%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$5.54 \mathrm{ms}$	0.30ms (5.36%)	0.09ms (1.69%)	0.00%
mod3e		real	5.63ms	0.53ms (9.47%)	0.17 ms (2.99%)	1.61%
	yes	CPU	$5.31 \mathrm{ms}$	0.36ms (6.77%)	0.11 ms (2.14%)	-4.14%
		real	5.67ms	0.38ms (6.71%)	0.12ms (2.12%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$5.64 \mathrm{ms}$	0.34 ms (6.05%)	0.11ms (1.91%)	0.00%
mod3f		real	5.63ms	0.64ms (11.31%)	0.20 ms (3.58%)	-0.61%
	yes	CPU	$5.20 \mathrm{ms}$	0.37 ms (7.08%)	0.12 ms (2.24%)	-7.83%
		real	$5.69 \mathrm{ms}$	0.33 ms (5.73%)	0.10ms (1.81%)	0.00%
_	no	CPU	$5.57 \mathrm{ms}$	0.21 ms (3.80%)	0.07ms (1.20%)	0.00%
mod3g		real	5.51ms	0.35 ms (6.28%)	0.11ms (1.99%)	-3.06%
	yes	CPU	$5.31 \mathrm{ms}$	0.35 ms (6.63%)	0.11 ms (2.10%)	-4.52%
		real	18.07ms	1.03ms (5.70%)	0.33 ms (1.80%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$17.61 \mathrm{ms}$	0.53 ms (2.99%)	0.17 ms (0.94%)	0.00%
mod4a		real	17.97ms	0.74ms (4.10%)	0.23 ms (1.30%)	-0.55%
	yes	CPU	$17.54 \mathrm{ms}$	0.61 ms (3.47%)	0.19ms (1.10%)	-0.42%
		real	14.61ms	1.01ms (6.89%)	0.32 ms (2.18%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$14.09 \mathrm{ms}$	0.80ms (5.70%)	0.25ms (1.80%)	0.00%
mod4b		real	13.69ms	0.82 ms (6.00%)	0.26ms (1.90%)	-6.26%
	yes	CPU	$13.07 \mathrm{ms}$	0.42 ms (3.21%)	0.13ms (1.01%)	-7.23%
		real	19.38ms	1.10ms (5.70%)	0.35 ms (1.80%)	0.00%
_	no	CPU	18.96ms	0.76ms (4.02%)	0.24ms (1.27%)	0.00%
mod4c		real	19.63ms	1.21ms (6.18%)	0.38ms (1.95%)	1.28%
	yes	CPU	18.99ms	0.94ms (4.94%)	0.30ms (1.56%)	0.13%
		real	18.79ms	1.31ms (6.95%)	0.41ms (2.20%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	18.05ms	0.61 ms (3.39%)	0.41ms (2.20%) 0.19ms (1.07%)	0.00%
mod4d		real	18.49ms	0.96 ms (5.22%)	0.30ms (1.65%)	-1.61%
	yes	CPU	18.22ms	0.94ms (5.15%)	0.30 ms (1.63%) 0.30ms (1.63%)	0.98%
		010	10.221115	0.041119 (0.1070)	0.001112 (1.00/0)	0.9070

		real	17.26ms	0.75ms (4.33%)	0.24ms (1.37%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	16.66ms	0.65 ms (3.92%)	0.21 ms (1.34%) $0.21 ms (1.24%)$	0.00%
mod4e		real	16.96ms	0.70ms (4.13%)	0.22ms (1.31%)	-1.75%
	yes	CPU	16.61ms	0.58ms (3.49%)	0.18 ms (1.10%)	-0.26%
		real	17.29ms	0.56ms (3.24%)	0.18ms (1.02%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	16.88ms	0.45 ms (2.67%)	0.14 ms (0.85%)	0.00%
mod4f		real	16.97ms	0.94ms (5.56%)	0.30ms (1.76%)	-1.84%
	yes	CPU	$16.34 \mathrm{ms}$	0.60 ms (3.65%)	0.19 ms (1.15%)	-3.17%
		real	47.76ms	3.49ms (7.30%)	1.10ms (2.31%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	46.49ms	2.25ms (4.84%)	0.71 ms (1.53%)	0.00%
mod5a		real	47.47ms	2.41ms (5.07%)	0.76 ms (1.60%)	-0.60%
	yes	CPU	45.91ms	1.61ms (3.51%)	0.51 ms (1.11%)	-1.25%
		real	36.91ms	1.45ms (3.92%)	0.46ms (1.24%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$36.60 \mathrm{ms}$	1.70ms (4.66%)	0.54 ms (1.47%)	0.00%
mod5b		real	40.61ms	4.71ms (11.59%)	1.49 ms (3.67%)	10.01%
	yes	CPU	38.87ms	2.61ms (6.71%)	0.82 ms (2.12%)	6.21%
		real	46.00ms	2.01ms (4.38%)	0.64ms (1.38%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	45.47ms	2.04ms (4.50%)	0.65 ms (1.42%)	0.00%
mod5c		real	48.42ms	2.99ms (6.17%)	0.95 ms (1.42%)	5.26%
	yes	CPU	47.85ms	2.88ms (6.02%)	0.91 ms (1.90%)	5.23%
		real	48.50ms	1.95ms (4.02%)	0.62 ms (1.27%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	47.81ms	1.67ms (3.50%)	0.53ms (1.11%)	0.00%
mod5d		real	49.03ms	2.97 ms (6.05%)	0.94ms (1.91%)	1.10%
	yes	CPU	$46.35 \mathrm{ms}$	1.69ms (3.65%)	0.53 ms (1.15%)	-3.07%
		real	42.90ms	0.52ms (1.21%)	0.16 ms (0.38%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	42.57 ms	0.50ms (1.17%)	0.16 ms (0.37%)	0.00%
mod5e		real	42.55ms	0.98 ms (2.30%)	0.31 ms (0.73%)	-0.82%
	yes	CPU	42.25ms	0.99 ms (2.35%)	0.31 ms (0.74%)	-0.75%
		real	41.63ms	0.69 ms (1.65%)	$0.22 \text{ms} \ (0.52\%)$	0.00%
1=0	no	CPU	$41.33 \mathrm{ms}$	0.29 ms (0.69%)	$0.09 \text{ms} \ (0.22\%)$	0.00%
mod5f		real	42.25ms	1.29ms (3.05%)	0.41 ms (0.96%)	1.49%
	yes	CPU	$41.71 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.69 \text{ms} \ (1.66\%)$	$0.22 \text{ms} \ (0.53\%)$	0.90%
		real	47.79ms	2.75ms (5.75%)	0.87 ms (1.82%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$46.26 \mathrm{ms}$	1.46ms (3.15%)	0.46 ms (1.00%)	0.00%
mod5g		real	48.65ms	2.94ms (6.04%)	0.93ms (1.91%)	1.81%
	yes	CPU	$45.95 \mathrm{ms}$	1.92ms (4.18%)	$0.61 \text{ms} \ (1.32\%)$	-0.66%
		real	84.97ms	3.24ms (3.81%)	1.03ms (1.21%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	83.63ms	2.82 ms (3.38%)	0.89 ms (1.07%)	0.00%
mod6a		real	77.73ms	2.91ms (3.74%)	0.92ms (1.18%)	-8.52%
	yes	CPU	$76.94 \mathrm{ms}$	2.52 ms (3.28%)	0.80 ms (1.04%)	-8.00%
		real	58.88ms	0.62 ms (1.05%)	$0.20 \text{ms} \ (0.33\%)$	0.00%
1.01	no	CPU	$58.47 \mathrm{ms}$	0.34 ms (0.58%)	$0.11 \text{ms} \ (0.18\%)$	0.00%
mod6b		real	64.92ms	5.16ms (7.95%)	$1.63 \text{ms} \ (2.51\%)$	10.26%
	yes	CPU	61.48ms	2.47 ms (4.02%)	$0.78 \text{ms} \ (1.27\%)$	5.16%
		real	82.99ms	3.87 ms (4.67%)	1.23ms (1.48%)	0.00%
16	no	CPU	81.27ms	3.42 ms (4.21%)	1.08 ms (1.33%)	0.00%
mod6c		real	81.73ms	4.41ms (5.40%)	1.40ms (1.71%)	-1.52%
	yes	CPU	$80.23 \mathrm{ms}$	2.32 ms (2.89%)	$0.73 \text{ms} \ (0.91\%)$	-1.29%
		real	91.40ms	3.39ms (3.71%)	1.07ms (1.17%)	0.00%
16.1	no	CPU	89.29ms	2.80ms (3.14%)	0.89 ms (0.99%)	0.00%
mod6d		real	92.28ms	3.39 ms (3.68%)	1.07ms (1.16%)	0.96%
	yes	CPU	88.44ms	2.28 ms (2.57%)	0.72 ms (0.81%)	-0.96%
	1	1		(=:=::=::(=:::,0)	(0.02,0)	2.0070

		real	95.71ms	3.64ms (3.80%)	1.15ms (1.20%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	94.29ms	3.19ms (3.38%)	1.01ms (1.07%)	0.00%
mod6e		real	88.47ms	3.05ms (3.45%)	0.96ms (1.09%)	-7.57%
	yes	CPU	87.98ms	3.03ms (3.45%)	0.96ms (1.09%)	-6.69%
		real	72.95ms	0.90ms (1.23%)	0.28ms (0.39%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	72.55ms	0.58ms (0.80%)	0.18 ms (0.25%)	0.00%
mod6f		real	77.42ms	4.42ms (5.71%)	1.40ms (1.81%)	6.13%
	yes	CPU	75.77ms	3.84ms (5.07%)	1.21ms (1.60%)	4.45%
		real	77.06ms	5.44ms (7.06%)	1.72ms (2.23%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$75.39 \mathrm{ms}$	3.80ms (5.03%)	1.20ms (1.59%)	0.00%
mod6g		real	70.94ms	0.71 ms (1.00%)	0.22 ms (0.32%)	-7.95%
	yes	CPU	$70.49 \mathrm{ms}$	0.71ms (1.01%)	$0.22 \text{ms} \ (0.32\%)$	-6.50%
		real	143.37ms	5.21ms (3.63%)	1.65ms (1.15%)	0.00%
_	no	CPU	142.65ms	5.22ms (3.66%)	1.65ms (1.16%)	0.00%
mod7a		real	154.70ms	3.71 ms (2.40%)	1.17 ms (0.76%)	7.91%
	yes	CPU	152.51ms	1.71ms (1.12%)	0.54 ms (0.36%)	6.91%
		real	109.98ms	3.10ms (2.82%)	0.98ms (0.89%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	108.58ms	2.19ms (2.02%)	0.69 ms (0.64%)	0.00%
mod7b		real	109.62ms	2.86ms (2.61%)	0.90ms (0.82%)	-0.33%
	yes	CPU	108.69ms	2.80ms (2.57%)	$0.88 \text{ms} \ (0.81\%)$	0.10%
		real	113.99ms	2.30ms (2.02%)	0.73ms (0.64%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	113.21ms	2.00ms (1.76%)	$0.63 \text{ms} \ (0.56\%)$	0.00%
mod7c		real	115.04ms	1.55ms (1.35%)	0.49ms (0.43%)	0.93%
	yes	CPU	$114.31 \mathrm{ms}$	1.54ms (1.35%)	0.49 ms (0.43%)	0.97%
		real	147.84ms	7.48ms (5.06%)	2.36ms (1.60%)	0.00%
1- 1	no	CPU	145.09 ms	5.84ms (4.03%)	1.85ms (1.27%)	0.00%
mod7d		real	137.64 ms	0.90ms (0.66%)	0.29ms (0.21%)	-6.90%
	yes	CPU	$136.81 \mathrm{ms}$	0.94 ms (0.69%)	$0.30 \text{ms} \ (0.22 \%)$	-5.71%
		real	156.91 ms	3.85ms (2.45%)	1.22ms (0.78%)	0.00%
17-	no	CPU	$155.96 \mathrm{ms}$	4.45ms (2.85%)	1.41 ms (0.90%)	0.00%
mod7e		real	160.70 ms	3.76ms (2.34%)	1.19ms (0.74%)	2.41%
	yes	CPU	$158.09 \mathrm{ms}$	2.22ms (1.40%)	$0.70 \text{ms} \ (0.44\%)$	1.37%
		real	159.59 ms	3.35ms (2.10%)	1.06ms (0.66%)	0.00%
o d7f	no	CPU	$156.29 \mathrm{ms}$	2.94ms (1.88%)	$0.93 \text{ms} \ (0.60\%)$	0.00%
mod7f	*****	real	148.48ms	6.94ms (4.67%)	2.19ms (1.48%)	-6.96%
	yes	CPU	$146.50 \mathrm{ms}$	3.49 ms (2.38%)	$1.10 \text{ms} \ (0.75\%)$	-6.27%
	no	real	$304.65 \mathrm{ms}$	5.46ms (1.79%)	$1.73 \text{ms} \ (0.57\%)$	0.00%
modes	no	CPU	$301.59 \mathrm{ms}$	2.08ms (0.69%)	$0.66 \text{ms} \ (0.22\%)$	0.00%
mod8a	TIOS	real	289.97 ms	13.63ms (4.70%)	4.31ms (1.49%)	-4.82%
	yes	CPU	$288.48 \mathrm{ms}$	13.57ms (4.70%)	4.29ms (1.49%)	-4.35%
	no	real	236.16ms	7.83ms (3.32%)	2.48ms (1.05%)	0.00%
mod8b	no	CPU	$233.15 \mathrm{ms}$	6.83ms (2.93%)	2.16 ms (0.93%)	0.00%
modob	yes	real	230.26 ms	11.56ms (5.02%)	3.66ms (1.59%)	-2.50%
	yes	CPU	$228.55 \mathrm{ms}$	11.53ms (5.05%)	3.65 ms (1.60%)	-1.97%
	no	real	225.84 ms	5.98ms (2.65%)	1.89ms (0.84%)	0.00%
mod8c	no	CPU	224.34ms	5.50ms (2.45%)	1.74 ms (0.78%)	0.00%
modoc	VAC	real	242.43ms	10.08ms (4.16%)	3.19ms (1.32%)	7.35%
	yes	CPU	241.09ms	10.05ms (4.17%)	3.18ms (1.32%)	7.47%
<u> </u>	no	real	314.94ms	2.72ms (0.86%)	0.86ms (0.27%)	0.00%
mod8d	110	CPU	313.13ms	2.33 ms (0.74%)	$0.74 \text{ms} \ (0.24\%)$	0.00%
mouou	yes	real	317.00ms	6.24ms (1.97%)	$1.97 \text{ms} \ (0.62\%)$	0.65%
	yes	CPU	$315.12 \mathrm{ms}$	6.34 ms (2.01%)	2.00 ms (0.64%)	0.64%

		real	358.78ms	19.81ms (5.52%)	6.26ms (1.75%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	357.30ms	19.82ms (5.55%)	6.27ms (1.75%)	0.00%
mod8e		real	353.70ms	38.76ms (10.96%)	12.26ms (3.47%)	-1.42%
	yes	CPU	350.86ms	37.16ms (10.59%)	11.75ms (3.35%)	-1.80%
		real	326.37ms	7.80ms (2.39%)	2.47ms (0.76%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	322.44ms	4.22ms (1.31%)	1.33ms (0.41%)	0.00%
mod8f		real	327.56ms	5.16ms (1.58%)	1.63ms (0.50%)	0.36%
	yes	CPU	325.80ms	5.12ms (1.57%)	1.62ms (0.50%)	1.04%
		real	325.61ms	8.25ms (2.53%)	2.61ms (0.80%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	318.04ms	4.06ms (1.28%)	1.28ms (0.40%)	0.00%
mod8g		real	330.21ms	11.28ms (3.42%)	3.57ms (1.08%)	1.41%
	yes	CPU	328.40ms	11.27ms (3.43%)	3.56ms (1.09%)	3.26%
		real	490.02ms	8.21ms (1.68%)	2.60ms (0.53%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	482.27ms	6.26ms (1.30%)	1.98ms (0.41%)	0.00%
mod9a		real	485.52ms	5.65ms (1.16%)	1.79ms (0.37%)	-0.92%
	yes	CPU	482.72ms	5.62ms (1.16%)	1.78ms (0.37%)	0.09%
		real	349.57ms	28.07ms (8.03%)	8.88ms (2.54%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	345.96ms	29.18ms (8.43%)	9.23ms (2.67%)	0.00%
mod9b		real	344.45ms	38.38ms (11.14%)	12.14ms (3.52%)	-1.46%
	yes	CPU	342.58ms	38.09ms (11.12%)	12.14ms (3.52%) 12.05ms (3.52%)	-0.98%
		real	435.37ms	8.38ms (1.92%)	2.65ms (0.61%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	435.57 ms 431.75 ms	5.03ms (1.16%)	1.59ms (0.37%)	0.00%
mod9c			406.78ms	49.95ms (12.28%)	15.80ms (3.88%)	-6.57%
	yes	real CPU	400.78ms 404.56ms	49.95ms (12.28%) 49.75ms (12.30%)	15.73ms (3.89%)	-6.30%
					, ,	
	no	real	450.48ms	49.69ms (11.03%)	15.71ms (3.49%)	0.00%
mod9d		CPU	446.09ms	45.83ms (10.27%)	14.49ms (3.25%)	0.00%
	yes	real	516.08ms	10.35ms (2.01%)	3.27ms (0.63%)	14.56%
	-	CPU	508.79ms	13.24ms (2.60%)	4.19ms (0.82%)	14.05%
	no	real	509.04ms	8.47ms (1.66%)	2.68ms (0.53%)	0.00%
mod9e		CPU	505.00ms	4.30ms (0.85%)	1.36ms (0.27%)	0.00%
	yes	real	479.69ms	41.40ms (8.63%)	13.09ms (2.73%)	-5.77%
	-	CPU	475.50ms	41.49ms (8.73%)	13.12ms (2.76%)	-5.84%
	no	real	382.76ms	36.53ms (9.54%)	11.55ms (3.02%)	0.00%
mod9f		CPU	379.94ms	33.86ms (8.91%)	10.71ms (2.82%)	0.00%
	yes	real	442.34ms	28.82ms (6.51%)	9.11ms (2.06%)	15.57%
		CPU	437.64ms	26.43ms (6.04%)	8.36ms (1.91%)	15.19%
	no	real	546.64ms	41.89ms (7.66%)	13.25ms (2.42%)	0.00%
mod10a		CPU	541.98ms	40.12ms (7.40%)	12.69ms (2.34%)	0.00%
	yes	real	553.07ms	46.09ms (8.33%)	14.57ms (2.64%)	1.17%
		CPU	545.55ms	43.08ms (7.90%)	13.62ms (2.50%)	0.66%
	no	real	420.02ms	9.52ms (2.27%)	3.01ms (0.72%)	0.00%
mod10b		CPU	413.88ms	7.03ms (1.70%)	2.22ms (0.54%)	0.00%
	yes	real	419.49ms	11.06ms (2.64%)	3.50 ms (0.83%)	-0.12%
	J	CPU	416.90ms	10.99ms (2.64%)	3.48ms (0.83%)	0.73%
	no	real	488.18ms	10.60ms (2.17%)	3.35ms (0.69%)	0.00%
mod10c		CPU	482.89ms	10.71ms (2.22%)	3.39ms (0.70%)	0.00%
	yes	real	482.24ms	4.57ms (0.95%)	1.44ms (0.30%)	-1.22%
	, 55	CPU	478.63ms	4.50ms (0.94%)	$1.42 \text{ms} \ (0.30\%)$	-0.88%
	no	real	536.97ms	5.33ms (0.99%)	1.69ms (0.31%)	0.00%
mod10d	110	CPU	533.12ms	4.19ms (0.79%)	$1.33 \text{ms} \ (0.25\%)$	0.00%
111001100	yes	real	520.43 ms	38.75ms (7.45%)	12.25ms (2.35%)	-3.08%
	, , ,	CPU	517.93 ms	38.47 ms (7.43%)	12.17ms (2.35%)	-2.85%

	no	real	526.14ms	43.07ms (8.19%)	13.62ms (2.59%)	0.00%
$\mod 10e$	110	CPU	$519.83 \mathrm{ms}$	40.43 ms (7.78%)	12.78ms (2.46%)	0.00%
modite	TOG	real	544.12ms	6.10ms (1.12%)	$1.93 \text{ms} \ (0.35\%)$	3.42%
	yes	CPU	$541.52 \mathrm{ms}$	6.05 ms (1.12%)	1.91 ms (0.35%)	4.17%
	no	real	$554.25 \mathrm{ms}$	8.12ms (1.47%)	2.57 ms (0.46%)	0.00%
mod10f		CPU	$546.83 \mathrm{ms}$	4.93 ms (0.90%)	1.56ms (0.29%)	0.00%
modioi	yes	real	549.90ms	2.12 ms (0.39%)	$0.67 \text{ms} \ (0.12\%)$	-0.79%
		CPU	547.10 ms	2.06 ms (0.38%)	0.65 ms (0.12%)	0.05%
	no	real	523.16ms	7.04 ms (1.35%)	$2.23 \text{ms} \ (0.43\%)$	0.00%
mod10g	no	CPU	$520.59 \mathrm{ms}$	7.07 ms (1.36%)	2.24 ms (0.43%)	0.00%
	TOG	real	515.51ms	6.05 ms (1.17%)	1.91ms (0.37%)	-1.46%
	yes	CPU	512.87ms	$6.00 \mathrm{ms} \ (1.17\%)$	1.90 ms (0.37%)	-1.48%

Table 5.7: Run times of the model solution program of the problem Modernizacja autostrady (mod) from the finale of XXII Polish Olimpiad in Informatics. For each configuration (Test case and Sandbox columns) the data was collected from 10 runs. Real and CPU times were collected from the same runs. Slowdown is measured form the times of configuration without sandbox.

Wycieczki (wyc)

Test case	Sandbox	Time	Mean	Std. dev.	Std. err. on the mean	Slowdown
Case		real	1.28ms	0.03ms (2.27%)	0.01 ms (0.72%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$1.35 \mathrm{ms}$	0.04ms (2.73%)	0.01 ms (0.72%) 0.01 ms (0.86%)	0.00%
wyc0		real	0.99ms	0.31ms (31.77%)	0.10ms (10.05%)	-23.23%
	yes	CPU	$0.89 \mathrm{ms}$	0.27ms (30.10%)	0.08 ms (9.52%)	-34.24%
		real	1.96ms	0.59ms (30.03%)	0.19 ms (9.50%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$1.95 \mathrm{ms}$	0.60 ms (30.99%)	0.19 ms (9.80%)	0.00%
wyc1ocen		real	1.48ms	0.64ms (42.91%)	0.20ms (13.57%)	-24.48%
	yes	CPU	$1.38 \mathrm{ms}$	0.61ms (44.11%)	0.19ms (13.95%)	-29.03%
		real	7.88ms	0.57ms (7.21%)	0.18ms (2.28%)	0.00%
0	no	CPU	$7.97 \mathrm{ms}$	0.67 ms (8.44%)	0.21 ms (2.67%)	0.00%
wyc2ocen		real	7.42ms	1.13ms (15.29%)	0.36ms (4.84%)	-5.95%
	yes	CPU	$6.88 \mathrm{ms}$	0.78ms (11.28%)	0.25 ms (3.57%)	-13.68%
	no	real	$1.64 \mathrm{ms}$	0.56ms (33.78%)	0.18ms (10.68%)	0.00%
1-		CPU	$1.71 \mathrm{ms}$	0.55ms (32.21%)	0.17ms (10.19%)	0.00%
wyc1a	yes	real	$1.35 \mathrm{ms}$	0.60ms (44.76%)	0.19ms (14.16%)	-17.86%
		CPU	$1.15 \mathrm{ms}$	0.42ms (36.29%)	0.13ms (11.48%)	-32.39%
		real	$1.41 \mathrm{ms}$	0.47ms (33.20%)	0.15ms (10.50%)	0.00%
wyc1b	no	CPU	$1.46 \mathrm{ms}$	0.45 ms (30.44%)	0.14 ms (9.63%)	0.00%
wycib	******	real	$1.26 \mathrm{ms}$	0.68ms (54.41%)	0.22ms (17.20%)	-10.61%
	yes	CPU	$1.16 \mathrm{ms}$	0.64 ms (55.05%)	0.20ms (17.41%)	-20.86%
	no	real	$1.45 \mathrm{ms}$	0.03 ms (2.09%)	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.66\%)$	0.00%
,,,,,,1°	no	CPU	$1.51 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.03 \text{ms} \ (2.27\%)$	$0.01 \mathrm{ms} \ (0.72\%)$	0.00%
wyc1c	******	real	$1.16 \mathrm{ms}$	0.34 ms (29.76%)	0.11ms (9.41%)	-19.89%
	yes	CPU	$1.04 \mathrm{ms}$	0.29 ms (27.41%)	$0.09 \text{ms} \ (8.67\%)$	-31.16%
	no	real	$1.56 \mathrm{ms}$	0.26ms (16.44%)	0.08 ms (5.20%)	0.00%
wyc1d	no	CPU	$1.69 \mathrm{ms}$	0.34 ms (20.26%)	0.11ms (6.41%)	0.00%
wyciu	VOC	real	1.18ms	0.31ms (25.81%)	0.10ms (8.16%)	-24.15%
	yes	CPU	$1.07 \mathrm{ms}$	0.30ms (28.12%)	0.10ms (8.89%)	-36.72%

		real	1.75ms	0.64ms (36.47%)	0.20ms (11.53%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$1.70 \mathrm{ms}$	0.30ms (17.57%)	0.09 ms (5.56%)	0.00%
wyc1e		real	1.25ms	0.41ms (32.44%)	0.13ms (10.26%)	-28.34%
	yes	CPU	$1.06 \mathrm{ms}$	0.31ms (29.46%)	0.10 ms (9.32%)	-37.49%
		real	2.44ms	0.60ms (24.49%)	0.19ms (7.74%)	0.00%
_	no	CPU	$2.49 \mathrm{ms}$	0.58 ms (23.27%)	0.18 ms (7.36%)	0.00%
wyc2a		real	2.29ms	0.79ms (34.33%)	0.25ms (10.86%)	-5.99%
	yes	CPU	$1.84 \mathrm{ms}$	0.55ms (29.91%)	0.17 ms (9.46%)	-26.01%
		real	$3.09 \mathrm{ms}$	0.63ms (20.45%)	0.20ms (6.47%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$3.22 \mathrm{ms}$	0.62 ms (19.20%)	0.20 ms (6.07%)	0.00%
wyc2b		real	2.64ms	0.62ms (23.47%)	0.20ms (7.42%)	-14.55%
	yes	CPU	$2.40 \mathrm{ms}$	0.60ms (25.20%)	0.19 ms (7.97%)	-25.43%
		real	3.82ms	0.81ms (21.18%)	0.26ms (6.70%)	0.00%
_	no	CPU	$3.83 \mathrm{ms}$	0.70ms (18.19%)	0.22 ms (5.75%)	0.00%
wyc2c		real	3.45ms	0.80ms (23.22%)	0.25ms (7.34%)	-9.58%
	yes	CPU	$3.32 \mathrm{ms}$	0.77ms (23.25%)	0.24 ms (7.35%)	-13.27%
		real	2.92ms	0.49ms (16.83%)	0.16ms (5.32%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$2.92 \mathrm{ms}$	0.36ms (12.49%)	0.12 ms (3.95%)	0.00%
wyc2d		real	2.38ms	0.41ms (17.05%)	0.13 ms (5.39%)	-18.52%
	yes	CPU	$2.26 \mathrm{ms}$	0.36ms (16.03%)	0.11 ms (5.07%)	-22.69%
		real	$3.27 \mathrm{ms}$	0.50ms (15.35%)	0.16ms (4.85%)	0.00%
_	no	CPU	$3.28 \mathrm{ms}$	0.50ms (15.26%)	0.16 ms (4.83%)	0.00%
wyc2e		real	2.95ms	0.60ms (20.40%)	0.19 ms (6.45%)	-9.94%
	yes	CPU	$2.81 \mathrm{ms}$	0.60 ms (21.42%)	0.19 ms (6.77%)	-14.11%
		real	4.48ms	0.82ms (18.37%)	0.26ms (5.81%)	0.00%
_	no	CPU	$4.53 \mathrm{ms}$	0.79ms (17.47%)	0.25 ms (5.52%)	0.00%
wyc3a		real	4.08ms	0.92ms (22.52%)	0.29ms (7.12%)	-9.07%
	yes	CPU	$3.84 \mathrm{ms}$	0.84ms (21.80%)	0.26 ms (6.89%)	-15.27%
		real	2.00ms	0.64ms (32.28%)	0.20ms (10.21%)	0.00%
0.1	no	CPU	$2.06 \mathrm{ms}$	0.63ms (30.54%)	0.20 ms (9.66%)	0.00%
wyc3b		real	$1.26 \mathrm{ms}$	0.05 ms (3.84%)	0.02ms (1.21%)	-37.08%
	yes	CPU	$1.15 \mathrm{ms}$	0.02 ms (2.07%)	0.01 ms (0.66%)	-44.41%
		real	$9.61 \mathrm{ms}$	0.88ms (9.13%)	0.28ms (2.89%)	0.00%
2	no	CPU	$9.50 \mathrm{ms}$	0.89 ms (9.34%)	0.28 ms (2.95%)	0.00%
wyc3c		real	8.70ms	1.34ms (15.38%)	0.42 ms (4.86%)	-9.41%
	yes	CPU	$8.27 \mathrm{ms}$	0.90ms (10.85%)	0.28 ms (3.43%)	-12.89%
		real	7.42ms	0.99ms (13.40%)	0.31ms (4.24%)	0.00%
0.1	no	CPU	$7.33 \mathrm{ms}$	0.83ms (11.37%)	0.26 ms (3.60%)	0.00%
wyc3d		real	6.87ms	0.89ms (12.96%)	0.28ms (4.10%)	-7.47%
	yes	CPU	$6.67 \mathrm{ms}$	0.84ms (12.63%)	0.27 ms (3.99%)	-9.01%
		real	$6.95 \mathrm{ms}$	0.90ms (12.99%)	0.29ms (4.11%)	0.00%
9	no	CPU	$6.97 \mathrm{ms}$	0.90ms (12.92%)	0.28 ms (4.09%)	0.00%
wyc3e		real	$6.49 \mathrm{ms}$	0.78ms (12.01%)	0.25 ms (3.80%)	-6.68%
	yes	CPU	$6.34 \mathrm{ms}$	0.77ms (12.18%)	0.24 ms (3.85%)	-8.93%
		real	$3.50 \mathrm{ms}$	0.57ms (16.30%)	0.18ms (5.16%)	0.00%
,	no	CPU	$3.55 \mathrm{ms}$	0.56ms (15.74%)	0.18 ms (4.98%)	0.00%
wyc4a		real	$3.62 \mathrm{ms}$	0.91ms (25.19%)	0.29ms (7.97%)	3.46%
	yes	CPU	$3.47 \mathrm{ms}$	0.88ms (25.46%)	$0.28 \text{ms} \ (8.05\%)$	-2.34%
		real	1.55ms	0.39ms (25.51%)	0.12ms (8.07%)	0.00%
41	no	CPU	$1.60 \mathrm{ms}$	0.39ms (24.22%)	0.12ms (7.66%)	0.00%
wyc4b		real	1.35ms	0.64ms (47.20%)	0.20ms (14.93%)	-12.90%
	yes	CPU	$1.21 \mathrm{ms}$	0.63ms (51.86%)	0.20ms (16.40%)	-24.27%
				(02.00/0)	(10.1070)	-2170

		real	7.97ms	0.82ms (10.28%)	0.26ms (3.25%)	0.00%
wyc4c	no	CPU	$7.69 \mathrm{ms}$	0.67 ms (8.69%)	0.21 ms (2.75%)	0.00%
		real	6.99ms	1.01ms (14.43%)	0.32 ms (4.56%)	-12.23%
	yes	CPU	$6.74 \mathrm{ms}$	0.98ms (14.53%)	$0.31 \text{ms} \ (4.60\%)$	-12.27%
		real	9.32ms	0.72ms (7.76%)	0.23 ms (2.45%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	9.21ms	0.66ms (7.15%)	0.21 ms (2.26%)	0.00%
wyc4d		real	8.69ms	0.97ms (11.18%)	0.31 ms (3.54%)	-6.82%
	yes	CPU	$8.42 \mathrm{ms}$	0.82 ms (9.78%)	0.26 ms (3.09%)	-8.49%
		real	6.77ms	0.79ms (11.62%)	0.25 ms (3.67%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$6.65 \mathrm{ms}$	0.72 ms (10.86%)	0.23 ms (3.43%)	0.00%
wyc4e		real	5.83ms	0.81ms (13.98%)	0.26 ms (4.42%)	-13.92%
	yes	CPU	$5.49 \mathrm{ms}$	0.63ms (11.48%)	0.20 ms (3.63%)	-17.37%
		real	4.09ms	0.95ms (23.33%)	0.30ms (7.38%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$3.96 \mathrm{ms}$	0.71ms (17.88%)	0.22 ms (5.65%)	0.00%
wyc5a		real	$3.24 \mathrm{ms}$	0.38ms (11.58%)	0.12 ms (3.66%)	-20.70%
	yes	CPU	$3.10 \mathrm{ms}$	0.38ms (12.21%)	0.12 ms (3.86%)	-21.78%
		real	6.28ms	0.77ms (12.33%)	0.12ms (3.90%) 0.24ms (3.90%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$6.28 \mathrm{ms}$	0.77ms (12.33%) 0.77ms (12.22%)	0.24 ms (3.87%) $0.24 ms (3.87%)$	0.00%
wyc5b		real	$5.62 \mathrm{ms}$	0.64ms (11.45%)	0.24ms (3.67%) 0.20ms (3.62%)	-10.40%
	yes	CPU	$5.47 \mathrm{ms}$	0.64ms (11.45%)	0.20 ms (3.68%)	-12.89%
		real	14.23ms	1.15ms (8.10%)	0.36 ms (2.56%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$13.85 \mathrm{ms}$	1.11ms (8.02%)	0.35 ms (2.53%)	0.00%
wyc5c		real	13.46ms	1.35ms (10.00%)	0.43ms (3.16%)	-5.41%
	yes	CPU	$13.24 \mathrm{ms}$	1.31ms (9.88%)	0.41 ms (3.10%) $0.41 ms (3.12%)$	-4.39%
		real	14.06ms	1.52ms (10.81%)	0.48ms (3.42%)	0.00%
	no yes	CPU	$13.60 \mathrm{ms}$	1.24ms (9.11%)	0.48 ms (3.42%) $0.39 ms (2.88%)$	0.00%
wyc5d		real	13.50ms	1.32ms (9.78%)	0.42 ms (3.09%)	-3.95%
		CPU	$13.24 \mathrm{ms}$	1.22ms (9.19%)	0.38 ms (2.91%)	-2.63%
		real	10.82ms	1.01ms (9.37%)	0.32 ms (2.96%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$10.62 \mathrm{ms}$	0.96ms (9.02%)	0.32 ms (2.85%) $0.30 ms (2.85%)$	0.00%
wyc5e	yes	real	$10.53 \mathrm{ms}$	1.47ms (13.99%)	0.47ms (4.42%)	-2.71%
		CPU	$10.32 \mathrm{ms}$	1.40ms (13.60%)	$0.44 \mathrm{ms} \; (4.42 \%)$ $0.44 \mathrm{ms} \; (4.30 \%)$	-2.65%
		real	5.70ms	0.86ms (15.06%)	0.27ms (4.76%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$5.70 \mathrm{ms}$ $5.31 \mathrm{ms}$	0.54ms (10.12%)	0.27 ms (4.70%) 0.17 ms (3.20%)	0.00%
wyc6a		real	4.41ms	0.03ms (0.71%)	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.22\%)$	-22.70%
	yes	CPU	4.41ms 4.27 ms	$0.03 \text{ms} \ (0.71\%)$ $0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.29\%)$	0.00 ms (0.22%) $0.00 ms (0.09%)$	-19.49%
		real	3.14ms	0.01 ms (0.23%) $0.01 ms (0.32%)$	0.00ms (0.10%)	0.00%
	no yes	CPU	$3.14 \mathrm{ms}$ $3.20 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.32\%)$ $0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.31\%)$	0.00 ms (0.10%) $0.00 ms (0.10%)$	0.00%
wyc6b		real	2.74ms	0.01ms (0.31%) 0.06ms (2.19%)	0.02 ms (0.69%)	-12.95%
		CPU	$2.74 \mathrm{ms}$ $2.63 \mathrm{ms}$	0.06 ms (2.19%) $0.06 ms (2.22%)$	0.02 ms (0.09%) $0.02 ms (0.70%)$	-17.63%
			13.34ms	0.06ms (0.45%)	0.02ms (0.14%)	0.00%
	no	real CPU	13.34 ms $13.33 ms$	0.06ms (0.48%)	0.02 ms (0.14%) 0.02 ms (0.15%)	0.00%
wyc6c		real	12.97 ms	0.05ms (0.39%)	0.02 ms (0.13%) $0.02 ms (0.12%)$	-2.76%
	yes	CPU	$12.76 \mathrm{ms}$	0.03 ms (0.35%) $0.02 ms (0.15%)$	0.02 ms (0.12%) $0.01 ms (0.05%)$	-4.27%
			15.40ms	0.02ms (0.15%) 0.01ms (0.10%)	0.00 ms (0.03%)	0.00%
	no	real CPU	$15.40 \mathrm{ms}$ $15.39 \mathrm{ms}$	0.01ms (0.10%) 0.01ms (0.09%)	0.00 ms (0.03%) $0.00 ms (0.03%)$	0.00%
wyc6d			15.39ms 15.00ms	0.01ms (0.09%) 0.05ms (0.34%)	0.00ms (0.05%) 0.02ms (0.11%)	-2.62%
v	yes	real	$15.00 \mathrm{ms}$ $14.82 \mathrm{ms}$	` '	` ′	
		CPU		0.02 ms (0.15%)	0.01 ms (0.05%)	-3.71%
	no	real	11.31ms	0.04 ms (0.34%)	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.11\%)$	0.00%
wyc6e		CPU	11.31ms	0.09 ms (0.76%)	$0.03 \text{ms} \ (0.24\%)$	0.00%
	yes	real	10.89ms	$0.03 \text{ms} \ (0.26\%)$	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.08\%)$	-3.75%
		CPU	10.73 ms	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.08\%)$	$0.00 \text{ms} \ (0.03\%)$	-5.16%

		real	$2.05 \mathrm{ms}$	0.01ms (0.59%)	0.00ms (0.19%)	0.00%
wyc7a	no	CPU	2.11ms	0.01 ms (0.39%)	0.00 ms (0.13%) $0.00 ms (0.12%)$	
		real	1.62ms	0.02 ms (0.35%)	0.01ms (0.43%)	
	yes	CPU	$1.53 \mathrm{ms}$	0.02ms (1.95%) 0.01ms (0.88%)	0.01 ms (0.43%) $0.00 ms (0.28%)$	
		real	1.31ms	0.01 ms (0.65%)	0.00ms (0.25%)	
	no	CPU	$1.31 \mathrm{ms}$ $1.35 \mathrm{ms}$	0.01ms (0.05%) 0.05ms (3.37%)	0.00ms (0.21%) 0.01ms (1.07%)	
wyc7b			0.91ms	0.03ms (3.37%) 0.04ms (4.64%)	0.01ms (1.07%) 0.01ms (1.47%)	
	yes	real CPU		` '	$0.01 \text{ms} (1.47\%) \\ 0.01 \text{ms} (1.62\%)$	
			0.82ms	0.04ms (5.12%)	` ′	
	no	real	2.93ms	0.01ms (0.41%)	0.00ms (0.13%)	
wyc7c		CPU	2.99ms	0.01ms (0.27%)	0.00ms (0.08%)	0.00% 0.00% -20.60% -27.33% 0.00% 0.00% -31.04% -39.27% 0.00% 0.00% -17.56% -22.98% 0.00% 0.00% -12.58% -16.30% 0.00% 0.00% -19.23% -25.14% 0.00% 0.00% -19.23% -25.14% 0.00% 0.00% -14.04% -9.62% 0.00% -14.04% -9.62% 0.00% -14.98% -14.96% 0.00% -7.24% -7.49% 0.00% -7.24% -7.49% 0.00% -7.24% -7.49% 0.00% -7.24% -7.49% 0.00% -7.24% -7.49% 0.00% -19.35% -26.02% 0.00% -19.35% -26.02% 0.00% -19.35% -26.02% 0.00% -19.35% -26.02% 0.00% -3.07%
•	yes	real	2.41ms	0.06ms (2.46%)	0.02ms (0.78%)	
		CPU	2.30ms	0.02ms (0.71%)	0.01ms (0.22%)	
	no	real	4.15ms	0.53ms (12.73%)	0.17ms (4.03%)	
wyc7d		CPU	4.19ms	0.52ms (12.30%)	0.16ms (3.89%)	
J	yes	real	$3.63 \mathrm{ms}$	0.40ms (10.99%)	0.13ms (3.48%)	
		CPU	3.51ms	0.39ms (11.22%)	0.12ms (3.55%)	
	no	real	3.46ms	0.69ms (19.79%)	0.22ms (6.26%)	
wyc7e		CPU	3.42ms	0.68ms (19.88%)	0.21ms (6.29%)	
J	yes	real	3.60ms	0.88ms (24.55%)	0.28ms (7.76%)	
	,	CPU	3.24ms	0.81ms (24.91%)	0.26ms (7.88%)	
	no	real	$4.37 \mathrm{ms}$	0.85ms (19.37%)	0.27ms (6.13%)	
wyc8a		CPU	4.41ms	0.83ms (18.81%)	0.26ms (5.95%)	
J	yes	real	$3.53 \mathrm{ms}$	0.64ms (18.25%)	0.20ms (5.77%)	
	J	CPU	$3.30 \mathrm{ms}$	0.56ms (17.05%)	0.18ms (5.39%)	
	no	real	4.16ms	0.69ms (16.56%)	0.22 ms (5.24%)	
wyc8b		CPU	4.06ms	0.47ms (11.53%)	0.15 ms (3.65%)	
,	yes	real	$3.42 \mathrm{ms}$	0.61 ms (17.77%)	$0.19 \text{ms} \ (5.62\%)$	
		CPU	$3.31 \mathrm{ms}$	0.59ms (17.75%)	0.19 ms (5.61%)	
	no	real	$8.76 \mathrm{ms}$	0.91ms (10.43%)	0.29 ms (3.30%)	
wyc8c	yes	CPU	8.08ms	0.61 ms (7.60%)	$0.19 \text{ms} \ (2.40\%)$	
,		real	$7.53 \mathrm{ms}$	0.84ms (11.20%)	$0.27 \text{ms} \ (3.54\%)$	
	3 00	CPU	$7.31 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.71 \text{ms} \ (9.70\%)$	0.22 ms (3.07%)	
	no	real	$5.72 \mathrm{ms}$	0.97ms (16.92%)	0.31 ms (5.35%)	
wyc8d		CPU	$5.47 \mathrm{ms}$	0.83ms (15.12%)	$0.26 \text{ms} \ (4.78\%)$	
wycod	yes	real	$5.59 \mathrm{ms}$	0.69ms (12.32%)	0.22 ms (3.90%)	
	yes	CPU	$5.46 \mathrm{ms}$	0.70ms (12.74%)	$0.22 \text{ms} \ (4.03\%)$	
	no	real	$6.55 \mathrm{ms}$	1.15ms (17.63%)	0.37 ms (5.57%)	
wyc8e		CPU	$6.26 \mathrm{ms}$	0.87 ms (13.83%)	$0.27 \text{ms} \ (4.37\%)$	
wycoc		real	$5.57 \mathrm{ms}$	0.77 ms (13.74%)	$0.24 \text{ms} \ (4.34\%)$	
		CPU	$5.33 \mathrm{ms}$	0.73 ms (13.80%)	$0.23 \text{ms} \ (4.36\%)$	
	no	real	$10.58 \mathrm{ms}$	0.74 ms (7.01%)	$0.23 \text{ms} \ (2.22\%)$	
wyc9a	110	CPU	$10.37 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.66 \text{ms} \ (6.41\%)$	$0.21 \text{ms} \ (2.03\%)$	
wycsa	VOC	real	$9.81 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.84 \text{ms} \ (8.61\%)$	$0.27 \text{ms} \ (2.72\%)$	-7.24%
	yes	CPU	$9.60 \mathrm{ms}$	$0.83 \text{ms} \ (8.65\%)$	$0.26 \text{ms} \ (2.74\%)$	
www.a0b	no	real	$2.42 \mathrm{ms}$	0.58 ms (24.13%)	$0.18 \text{ms} \ (7.63\%)$	0.00%
	no	CPU	$2.46 \mathrm{ms}$	0.59 ms (24.08%)	0.19 ms (7.61%)	0.00%
wyc9b	VOC	real	$1.95 \mathrm{ms}$	0.40ms (20.34%)	$0.13 \text{ms} \ (6.43\%)$	-19.35%
	yes	CPU	$1.82 \mathrm{ms}$	0.36ms (19.79%)	0.11 ms (6.26%)	-26.02%
	no	real	$20.95 \mathrm{ms}$	1.85ms (8.83%)	$0.58 \text{ms} \ (2.79\%)$	0.00%
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	no	CPU	$20.31 \mathrm{ms}$	1.77ms (8.73%)	$0.56 \text{ms} \ (2.76\%)$	0.00%
wyc9c	***0.0	real	$19.92 \mathrm{ms}$	1.10ms (5.54%)	0.35ms (1.75%)	-4.91%
	yes	CPU	$19.68 \mathrm{ms}$	1.11ms (5.62%)	0.35 ms (1.78%)	-3.07%

		real	7.17ms	0.50ms (7.00%)	0.16ms (2.21%)	0.00%
wyc9d	no	CPU	7.20ms	0.49ms (6.84%)	0.16 ms (2.16%)	0.00%
		real	7.59ms	0.83ms (10.92%)	0.26ms (3.45%)	5.88%
	yes	CPU	7.42ms	0.80ms (10.84%)	0.25ms (3.43%)	3.10%
		real	18.75ms	2.14ms (11.43%)	0.68ms (3.62%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	17.90ms	1.39ms (7.79%)	0.44 ms (2.46%)	0.00%
wyc9e		real	16.00ms	0.05 ms (0.29%)	0.01 ms (0.09%)	-14.67%
	yes	CPU	15.80ms	0.02 ms (0.23%)	0.01 ms (0.03%) $0.01 ms (0.03%)$	-11.71%
		real	14.04ms	0.67ms (4.76%)	0.21ms (1.51%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	14.04ms	0.66ms (4.73%)	0.21 ms (1.51%) = 0.21 ms (1.50%)	0.00%
wyc9f		real	13.40ms	0.04ms (0.30%)	0.01ms (0.10%)	-4.60%
	yes	CPU	13.40ms	0.04 ms (0.30%) 0.02 ms (0.12%)	0.00 ms (0.10%) $0.00 ms (0.04%)$	-5.99%
		real	56.45ms	0.02ms (0.12%) 0.07ms (0.12%)	0.02ms (0.04%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	56.36ms	0.06ms (0.11%)	0.02 ms (0.04%) $0.02 ms (0.03%)$	0.00%
wyc10a		real	56.33ms	0.06ms (0.11%)	0.02 ms (0.03%) $0.02 ms (0.03%)$	-0.20%
	yes	CPU	$56.05 \mathrm{ms}$	0.05 ms (0.10%) 0.05 ms (0.09%)	0.02 ms (0.03%) $0.02 ms (0.03%)$	-0.20%
			4.48ms	0.07ms (1.67%)	0.02 ms (0.03%) $0.02 ms (0.53%)$	0.00%
	no	real CPU	$4.48 \mathrm{ms}$ $4.53 \mathrm{ms}$	0.07ms (1.57%) 0.07ms (1.59%)	0.02 ms (0.53%) = 0.02 ms (0.50%)	0.00%
wyc10b		real	4.08ms	0.07ms (1.39%) 0.02ms (0.47%)	0.02ms (0.30%) 0.01ms (0.15%)	-8.97%
	yes	CPU	3.96ms	0.02ms (0.41%) 0.02ms (0.49%)	$0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.15\%)$ $0.01 \text{ms} \ (0.15\%)$	-12.52%
		real	141.29ms	5.77ms (4.08%)	1.82ms (1.29%)	0.00%
	no yes	CPU	139.76ms	2.69ms (1.93%)	0.85ms (0.61%)	0.00%
wyc10c		real	139.76ms 139.08ms	0.20ms (0.15%)	0.06ms (0.05%)	-1.56%
		CPU	138.57ms	0.20ms (0.13%) 0.20ms (0.14%)	0.06ms (0.04%)	-0.86%
		real	162.04ms	13.65ms (8.42%)	4.32ms (2.66%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	158.48ms	11.28ms (7.12%)	3.57 ms (2.25%)	0.00%
wyc10d		real	171.33ms	3.61ms (2.11%)	1.14ms (0.67%)	$\frac{0.00\%}{5.73\%}$
	yes	CPU	168.48ms	1.68ms (1.00%)	0.53 ms (0.32%)	6.31%
		real	121.74ms	7.23ms (5.94%)	2.29ms (1.88%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	118.23ms	6.55ms (5.54%)	2.07ms (1.75%)	0.00%
wyc10e		real	105.10ms	0.56ms (0.54%)	0.18ms (0.17%)	-13.67%
	yes	CPU	104.67ms	0.57 ms (0.54%)	0.18ms (0.17%) 0.18ms (0.17%)	-11.47%
		real	95.76ms	0.08ms (0.09%)	0.10ms (0.1770) 0.03ms (0.03%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	95.70ms 95.61ms	0.03 ms (0.03%) $0.07 ms (0.08%)$	0.03 ms (0.03%) $0.02 ms (0.02%)$	0.00%
wyc11a		real	95.17ms	0.10ms (0.11%)	0.02ms (0.02%) 0.03ms (0.03%)	-0.62%
	yes	CPU	94.80ms	0.10ms (0.1176) 0.09ms (0.09%)	0.03 ms (0.03%) $0.03 ms (0.03%)$	-0.86%
		real	129.05ms	10.32ms (8.00%)	3.26ms (2.53%)	0.00%
	yes	CPU	126.86ms	8.86ms (6.99%)	2.80ms (2.21%)	0.00%
wyc11b		real	133.16ms	3.21ms (2.41%)	1.02ms (0.76%)	3.19%
		CPU	131.28ms	2.79ms (2.13%)	0.88ms (0.67%)	3.49%
		real	232.34ms	17.40ms (7.49%)	5.50ms (2.37%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	232.34ms 230.35ms	15.38ms (6.67%)	4.86ms (2.11%)	0.00%
wyc11c		real	230.02ms	15.13ms (6.58%)	4.78ms (2.08%)	-1.00%
	yes	CPU	229.20ms	15.13ms (0.55%) 15.02ms (6.55%)	4.75ms (2.07%)	-0.50%
		real	298.05ms	6.90ms (2.32%)	2.18ms (0.73%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	295.03ms 295.28ms	3.71ms (1.26%)	1.17ms (0.40%)	0.00%
wyc11d		real	297.98ms	5.52ms (1.85%)	1.74ms (0.40%) 1.74ms (0.59%)	-0.02%
•	yes	CPU	297.98ms 295.75ms	3.38ms (1.14%)	1.07ms (0.36%)	0.16%
			246.66ms	17.21ms (6.98%)	5.44ms (2.21%)	0.10%
	no	real CPU	246.24ms	17.21ms (6.98%) 17.21ms (6.99%)	5.44ms (2.21%) 5.44ms (2.21%)	0.00%
wyc11e			240.24ms 232.43ms	17.21ms (0.99%) 17.78ms (7.65%)	5.62ms (2.42%)	-5.77%
	yes	real CPU	232.43ms 229.53ms	` ,	` '	
		UPU	229.33HIS	11.28ms (4.91%)	3.57 ms (1.55%)	-6.79%

wyc12a		real	167.16ms	5.64ms (3.38%)	1.78ms (1.07%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$162.40 \mathrm{ms}$	1.48ms (0.91%)	$0.47 \text{ms} \ (0.29\%)$	0.00%
		real	$162.51 \mathrm{ms}$	1.71ms (1.05%)	$0.54 \text{ms} \ (0.33\%)$	-2.78%
	yes	CPU	$161.87 \mathrm{ms}$	1.70ms (1.05%)	$0.54 \text{ms} \ (0.33\%)$	-0.32%
		real	$49.68 \mathrm{ms}$	4.88ms (9.82%)	1.54 ms (3.10%)	0.00%
wyc12b	no	CPU	$47.40 \mathrm{ms}$	2.65 ms (5.59%)	0.84 ms (1.77%)	0.00%
wyC12b	*****	real	$48.67 \mathrm{ms}$	3.08ms (6.33%)	0.97 ms (2.00%)	-2.03%
	yes	CPU	47.87ms	2.60 ms (5.43%)	0.82 ms (1.72%)	1.00%
	no	real	$365.87 \mathrm{ms}$	27.67ms (7.56%)	8.75ms (2.39%)	0.00%
wyc12c	no	CPU	$363.64 \mathrm{ms}$	26.97ms (7.42%)	8.53 ms (2.35%)	0.00%
wyc12c	yes	real	$389.56 \mathrm{ms}$	26.92ms (6.91%)	8.51ms (2.19%)	6.48%
		CPU	385.19 ms	22.96ms (5.96%)	7.26ms (1.89%)	5.93%
		real	$368.08 \mathrm{ms}$	15.34ms (4.17%)	4.85ms (1.32%)	0.00%
wyc12d	no	CPU	$366.39 \mathrm{ms}$	12.87ms (3.51%)	4.07ms (1.11%)	0.00%
wyc12d	Mod	real	422.77ms	9.76ms (2.31%)	3.09 ms (0.73%)	14.86%
	yes	CPU	415.08ms	4.78ms (1.15%)	1.51 ms (0.36%)	13.29%
		real	$395.75 \mathrm{ms}$	30.44ms (7.69%)	9.63ms (2.43%)	0.00%
ww.a12a	no	CPU	389.24 ms	25.85ms (6.64%)	8.17 ms (2.10%)	-2.03% 1.00% 0.00% 0.00% 6.48% 5.93% 0.00% 0.00% 14.86% 13.29%
wyc12e	****	real	$361.03 \mathrm{ms}$	13.54ms (3.75%)	4.28ms (1.19%)	-8.77%
	yes	CPU	$357.38 \mathrm{ms}$	8.59 ms (2.40%)	2.72 ms (0.76%)	-8.18%
wyc12f	no	real	$321.16 \mathrm{ms}$	26.00ms (8.09%)	8.22ms (2.56%)	0.00%
	no	CPU	$316.60 \mathrm{ms}$	22.61ms (7.14%)	7.15 ms (2.26%)	0.00%
wyC121	MOG	real	344.04ms	$1.45 \text{ms} \ (0.42\%)$	$0.46 \text{ms} \ (0.13\%)$	7.12%
	yes	CPU	342.77ms	1.42 ms (0.42%)	0.45 ms (0.13%)	8.27%

Table 5.8: Run times of the model solution program of the problem Wycieczki (wyc) from the finale of XXII Polish Olimpiad in Informatics. For each configuration (Test case and Sandbox columns) the data was collected from 10 runs. Real and CPU times were collected from the same runs. Slowdown is measured form the times of configuration without sandbox.

5.2. Short-running programs and comparison with nsjail

An example of a short-running program is /bin/true — we will use it in the benchmark. The metric we will use is the round-trip time of the request to sandbox a program. The Table 5.9 contains the measurements of the time to handle request to run the /bin/true program, without the sandbox, with sandbox and using nsjail. From the data we see that the nsjail is more than 4 times slower, while at the same time it does not spawn a separate PID 1 process and does not provide the runtime statistics. Our sandbox, while 2.39 times slower, still allows for hundreds requests per second — and that was the goal of the thesis.

Sandbox	Mean time	Std. dev.	Std. err. on the mean	Slowdown
no sandbox	$0.893 \mathrm{ms}$	0.409 ms (45.80%)	0.013 ms (1.45%)	1x
sandbox	$2.348 \mathrm{ms}$	0.768 ms (32.71%)	0.024 ms (1.03%)	2.39x
nsjail	$10.393 { m ms}$	1.327ms (12.77%)	0.042 ms (0.40%)	10.57x

Table 5.9: Statistics for each row were collected from 1000 runs. Each row contains real time it took to handle request to sandbox the /bin/true program. While the slowdown of the sandbox is huge (more than twofold), it still allows for hundreds of runs per second and that was the goal of this thesis, whereas nsjail is more than 4 times slower than our sandbox.

5.2.1. Comparison with nsjail

nsjail does not provide any means to handle more than one program in one execution. This means that one execution of the nsjail program equals one execution of the sandboxed program. This way, the nsjail program cannot share resources e.g. namespaces between the runs and therefore should be slower than our solution. Our solution executes the server program once and it can handle more than one request for secure execution of a program therefore it can and shares the resources. This way, our solution has lower overhead per one execution of the sandboxed program. Therefore the request handle time is drastically lower than for our sandbox. This is presented in Table 5.9. The nsjail can handle around 4.4 times less requests than our solution in a given time. Moreover, our sandbox allows easy collection of the runtime statistics that nsjail is incapable of doing. Command used for benchmarking the nsjail: /usr/bin/nsjail -q -Mo --chroot / --use_cgroupv2 -- /bin/true.

5.3. Impact of some optimizations

From the Table 5.10 it is clear that unsharing namespaces once instead of for every request has positive impact on the performance. The most meaningful was the network namespace that if unshared for every request resulted in 26% performance degradation.

Benchmark	Mean request time	Std. dev.	Std. err. on the mean	Slowdown
Baseline	2.348ms	0.768ms (32.71%)	0.024 ms (1.03%)	0.00%
New network namespace for each request	2.970ms	0.856ms (28.83%)	0.027ms (0.91%)	26.49%
New IPC namespace for each request	2.522ms	0.782ms (31.02%)	$0.025 \text{ms} \ (0.98\%)$	7.41%
New UTS namespace for each request	2.478ms	0.771ms (31.14%)	0.024 ms (0.98%)	5.54%

Table 5.10: Statistics for each row were collected from 1000 runs. Each row contains real time it took to handle request to sandbox the /bin/true program.

5.4. Conclusion

Although the slowdown of the compilation of around 24% and run time of the solution program of around 20%, it is acceptable. More importantly, the overhead of running the tested program is more often negligible than not. Experiments showed that most of the compilation overhead is caused by BPF filters. The sandbox allows handling hundreds of requests per second. The concurrent solution — nsjail is 4.4 times slower than ours. All in all, the goal of the thesis was achieved.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

The sandbox was successfully designed, implemented and integrated with the online judge platform. A new language suites — for Python and Rust were implemented using it.

The new sandbox is optimized for running short-running programs and the overhead of running one in below 3 ms. That is 4 times lower than the closest solution — nsjail. The sandbox is versatile enough to sandbox simple user programs as well as the full compilation. The overhead of running the program in the sandbox is below 24% and often it is even lower than 0%.

The sandbox allows limiting resources and collects the run-time statistics of the executed program. This is a very unique feature of our solution.

Furthermore, our sandbox does not require any privileges — it can be used by any unprivileged user.

All in all, the goal of the thesis was achieved although with higher overheads than anticipated. However, the overhead is within the acceptable margin.

6.1. Future work

There are several aspects that can be worked upon. Each of a different degree of difficulty.

6.1.1. CPU affinity

Now, there is no support for setting CPU affinity mask for the request. Such support should be straightforward to add. It could reduce time variability of subsequent runs of the tested program [23].

6.1.2. Adding support for networking

Although disabling the networking altogether is secure, adding a loopback device can be beneficial for some applications. Adding other devices requires superuser privileges and is out-of-scope for the current solution, but can be done with a **setuid** helper binary like in Firejail [25].

6.1.3. Rust frontend

Implementing the client side (a frontend) in Rust language should ease the adoption of the sandbox. Rust is an efficient and secure programming language. In Rust a simple cargo

package with the frontend could be implemented and published to the world. Such a package would be easy to use and allow easy and quick experimenting with the sandbox.

6.1.4. Further experimentation

Investigating from where the speedups come from and why there are such big slowdowns despite BPF being disabled are what can be improved upon. Such knowledge would provide valuable insight into the situation.

6.2. Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Janina Minter-Daszkiewicz for relentless and valuable insight during the writing of the thesis.

Bibliography

- [1] David Beserra et al. "Performance Analysis of LXC for HPC Environments." In: CISIS. IEEE Computer Society, 2015, pp. 358–363. ISBN: 978-1-4799-8870-9. URL: http://dblp.uni-trier.de/db/conf/cisis/cisis2015.html#BeserraMEBSF15.
- [2] Sander van der Burg and Eelco Dolstra. "Automating System Tests Using Declarative Virtual Machines". In: 2010 IEEE 21st International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering. 2010, pp. 181–190. DOI: 10.1109/ISSRE.2010.34.
- [3] Henrique Zanela Cochak et al. "RunC and Kata runtime using Docker: a network perspective comparison". In: 2021 IEEE Latin-American Conference on Communications (LATINCOM). IEEE. 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [4] CVE-2017-5226 Bubblewrap escape. URL: https://security-tracker.debian.org/tracker/CVE-2017-5226 (visited on 2023-10-22).
- [5] CWE-367: Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition. URL: https://cwe.mitre.org/data/definitions/367.html (visited on 2023-10-19).
- [6] Flatpak. Flatpak the future of application distribution. URL: https://flatpak.org/(visited on 2023-10-17).
- [7] T Garfinkel. "Janus: A practical tool for application sandboxing". In: http://www. cs. berkeley. edu/daw/janus (2004).
- [8] Tal Garfinkel, Ben Pfaff, Mendel Rosenblum, et al. "Ostia: A Delegating Architecture for Secure System Call Interposition." In: *NDSS*. 2004.
- [9] Google. A light-weight process isolation tool, making use of Linux namespaces and seccomp-bpf syscall filters. URL: https://github.com/google/nsjail (visited on 2023-10-17).
- [10] Suman Jana, Donald E Porter, and Vitaly Shmatikov. "TxBox: Building secure, efficient sandboxes with system transactions". In: 2011 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy. IEEE. 2011, pp. 329–344.
- [11] Taesoo Kim and Nickolai Zeldovich. "Practical and effective sandboxing for non-root users". In: 2013 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 13). 2013, pp. 139– 144.
- [12] Rob Kolstad. "Infrastructure for contest task development". In: Olympiads in Informatics 3 (2009), pp. 38–59.
- [13] Yanlin Li et al. "{MiniBox}: A {Two-Way} Sandbox for x86 Native Code". In: 2014 USENIX annual technical conference (USENIX ATC 14). 2014, pp. 409–420.
- [14] Low-level unprivileged sandboxing tool used by Flatpak and similar projects. URL: https://github.com/containers/bubblewrap (visited on 2023-10-19).

- [15] Redis Ltd. Diagnosing latency issues: Latency generated by fork. 2011-09-08. URL: https://redis.io/docs/reference/optimization/latency/#latency-generated-by-fork (visited on 2022-09-08).
- [16] Krzysztof Małysa. Sim project. URL: https://github.com/varqox/sim (visited on 2023-03-15).
- [17] Krzysztof Małysa. Sip a tool for preparing problem packages for the Sim platform. URL: https://github.com/varqox/sip (visited on 2023-03-15).
- [18] Martin Mareš. "Fairness of Time Constraints." In: Olympiads in Informatics 5 (2011), pp. 92–102.
- [19] Martin Mareš. "Perspectives on grading systems". In: Olympiads in Informatics (2007), pp. 124–130.
- [20] Martin Mareš and Bernard Blackham. "A New Contest Sandbox." In: Olympiads in Informatics 6 (2012), pp. 100–109. URL: https://ioi.te.lv/oi/pdf/INFOL094.pdf.
- [21] Jonathan M McCune et al. "TrustVisor: Efficient TCB reduction and attestation". In: 2010 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy. IEEE. 2010, pp. 143–158.
- [22] Dirk Merkel. "Docker: Lightweight Linux Containers for Consistent Development and Deployment". In: Linux J. 2014.239 (2014-03). ISSN: 1075-3583. URL: http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2600239.2600241.
- [23] Bruce Merry. "Performance analysis of sandboxes for reactive tasks". In: Olympiads in Informatics 4 (2010), pp. 87–94.
- [24] Bruce Merry. "Using a Linux security module for contest security". In: Olympiads in Informatics 3 (2009), pp. 67–73.
- [25] netblue30/firejail. Linux namespaces and seccomp-bpf sandbox. URL: https://github.com/netblue30/firejail (visited on 2023-10-17).
- [26] Official website of Kernel Virtual Machine. URL: https://www.linux-kvm.org/ (visited on 2022-11-23).
- [27] Official website of QEMU A generic and open source machine emulator and virtualizer. URL: https://www.qemu.org/ (visited on 2022-11-23).
- [28] Oracle. Official website of VirtualBox. URL: https://www.virtualbox.org/ (visited on 2022-11-23).
- [29] Vassilis Prevelakis and Diomidis Spinellis. "Sandboxing Applications." In: *Usenix annual technical conference, freenix track.* Citeseer. 2001, pp. 119–126.
- [30] man-pages project. execveat execute program relative to a directory file descriptor. URL: https://man7.org/linux/man-pages/man2/execveat.2.html (visited on 2023-10-20).
- [31] man-pages project. getrlimit, setrlimit, prlimit get/set resource limits. URL: https://man7.org/linux/man-pages/man2/prlimit.2.html (visited on 2023-10-18).
- [32] man-pages project. mount_namespaces overview of Linux mount namespaces. URL: https://man7.org/linux/man-pages/man7/mount_namespaces.7.html (visited on 2023-10-20).
- [33] man-pages project. pid_namespaces overview of Linux PID namespaces. URL: https://man7.org/linux/man-pages/man7/pid_namespaces.7.html (visited on 2022-11-13).
- [34] man-pages project. setuid set user identity. URL: https://man7.org/linux/man-pages/man2/setuid.2.html (visited on 2023-10-18).

- [35] man-pages project. unix sockets for local interprocess communication. URL: https://man7.org/linux/man-pages/man7/unix.7.html (visited on 2023-10-20).
- [36] Niels Provos. "Improving Host Security with System Call Policies." In: *USENIX Security Symposium*. 2003, pp. 257–272.
- [37] Inge Alexander Raknes, Bjørn Fjukstad, and Lars Ailo Bongo. "nsroot: Minimalist process isolation tool implemented with linux namespaces". In: arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.03750 (2016).
- [38] rootlesscontaine.rs. Rootless Containers. URL: https://rootlesscontaine.rs (visited on 2022-11-28).
- [39] Giuseppe Scrivano. Rootless containers with Podman and fuse-overlayfs. 2019-06-04. URL: https://indico.cern.ch/event/757415/contributions/3421994/attachments/1855302/3047064/Podman_Rootless_Containers.pdf (visited on 2022-11-28).
- [40] František Špaček, Radomír Sohlich, and Tomáš Dulík. "Docker as Platform for Assignments Evaluation". In: *Procedia Engineering* 100 (2015). 25th DAAAM International Symposium on Intelligent Manufacturing and Automation, 2014, pp. 1665–1671. ISSN: 1877-7058. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2015.01.541. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877705815005688.
- [41] strace trace system calls and signals. URL: https://man7.org/linux/man-pages/man1/strace.1.html (visited on 2023-10-20).
- [42] systemd. systemd-nspawn Spawn a command or OS in a light-weight container. URL: https://www.freedesktop.org/software/systemd/man/systemd-nspawn.html (visited on 2022-11-28).
- [43] Tocho Tochev and Tsvetan Bogdanov. "Validating the Security and Stability of the Grader for a Programming Contest System." In: *Olympiads in Informatics* 4 (2010), pp. 113–119.
- [44] VMWare. Official website of VMWare Workstation. URL: https://www.vmware.com/products/workstation/ (visited on 2022-11-23).
- [45] Bennet Yee et al. "Native client: A sandbox for portable, untrusted x86 native code". In: Communications of the ACM 53.1 (2010), pp. 91–99.