# Complie and Execute

```
Q1: gcc A2Q1.c -o a2q1 -lpthread and ./a2q1 30 60 Q3: gcc A2Q3.c -o a2q3 -lpthread and ./a2q3 30 60
```

#### Question 1

#### Measurement

#### Observation

This implementation have a starvation problem that writer have to wait significantly longer than reader.

# Reasoning

- All readers at a time slice should be considered to hold the rw\_mutex lock if one of them actually holds, and therefore blocks all other pending writers
- Readers may give up rw\_mutex lock only after read\_count drops to 0, and a writer could write, or another reader could read, if they obtained the rw\_mutex lock.
- Writer have to wait for readers if there are multiple readers, even if some readers arrives after the writer.
- For instance, if one reader is reading, and while the reader is reading, a writer followed by another n readers came, then the writers will wait for the (at least) n+1 readers to finish their reading (even if n reader came after the writer), since the writer will not give up file mutex lock until read\_count is 0.

# Question 2

Starvation already observerd in Q1

## Question 3

See A2Q3.c

## Question 4

#### Measurement

Since 4.45 ms is not significantly higher than 5.91 ms, there is no starvation occurred.

## **Proof**

```
std_dev_read = range / 4 = 265 / 4 = 66.25 (approx)
std_dev_write = range / 4 = 242 / 4 = 60.5 (approx)
using Unpaired T-test, p value is 0.7022, and even if alpha is 0.1, it is still
considered as not significant.
```

## **END** of this assignment