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1 Warmup

Which of the following are true about Round Robin Scheduling?

1. The average wait time is less that that of FCFS for the same workload.
2. Is supported by `thread_tick` in Pintos.
3. It requires pre-emption to maintain uniform quanta.
4. If quanta is constantly updated to become the # of cpu ticks since boot, Round Robin becomes FIFO.
5. If all threads in the system have the same priority, Priority Schedulers **must** behave like round robin.
6. Cache performance is likely to improve relative to FCFS.
7. If no new threads are entering the system all threads will get a chance to run in the cpu every $\text{QUANTA} \times \text{SECONDS_PER_TICK} \times \text{NUMTHREADS}$ seconds. (Assuming $\text{QUANTA}$ is in ticks).
8. This is the default scheduler in Pintos
9. It is the fairest scheduler

2,3,4,8

2 Vocabulary

- **Scheduler** - The process scheduler is a part of the operating system that decides which process runs at a certain point in time. It usually has the ability to pause a running process, move it to the back of the running queue and start a new process;
3 Problems

3.1 Simple Priority Scheduler

We are going to implement a new scheduler in Pintos we will call it SPS. We will just split threads into two priorities "high" and "low". High priority threads should always be scheduled before low priority threads. Turns out we can do this without expensive list operations.

For this question make the following assumptions:

- Priority Scheduling is NOT implemented
- High priority threads will have priority 1
- Low priority threads will have priority 0
- The priorities are set correctly and will never be less than 0 or greater than 1
- The priority of the thread can be accessed in the field `int priority` in `struct thread`
- The scheduler treats the ready queue like a FIFO queue
- Don't worry about pre-emption.

Modify `thread_unblock` so SPS works correctly.

You are not allowed to use any non constant time list operations.

```c
void
thread_unblock (struct thread *t)
{
    enum intr_level old_level;

    ASSERT (is_thread (t));

    old_level = intr_disable ();
    ASSERT (t->status == THREAD_BLOCKED);
    if (t->priority == 1) {
        list_push_front (&ready_list, &t->elem);
    } else
        list_push_back (&ready_list, &t->elem);
    t->status = THREAD_READY;
    intr_set_level (old_level);
}
```

3.1.1 Fairness

In order for this scheduler to be "fair" briefly describe when you would make a thread high priority and when you would make a thread low priority.

Downgrade priority when thread uses up its quanta, upgrade priority when it voluntarily yields, or gets blocked.
3.1.2 Better than Priority Scheduler?

If we let the user set the priorities of this scheduler with \texttt{set_priority}, why might this scheduler be preferable to the normal pintos priority scheduler?

\begin{quote}

The insert operations are cheaper, and it provides a good approximation to priority scheduling.
\end{quote}

3.1.3 Tradeoff

How can we trade off between the coarse granularity of SPS and the super fine granularity of normal priority scheduling? (Assuming we still want this fast insert)

\begin{quote}

We can have more than 2 priorities but still a small number of fixed priorities, and have a queue for each priority, and then pop off threads from each queue as necessary.
\end{quote}

3.2 Totally Fair Scheduler

You design a new scheduler, you call it TFS. The idea is relatively simple, in the beginning, we have three values \texttt{BIG_QUANTA}, \texttt{MIN_LATENCY} and \texttt{MIN_QUANTA}. We want to try and schedule all threads every \texttt{MIN_LATENCY} ticks, so they can get at least a little work done, but we also want to make sure they run \texttt{at least MIN_QUANTA} ticks. In addition to this we want to account for priorities. We want a thread's priority to be inversely proportional to its \texttt{vruntime} or the amount of ticks its spent in the CPU in the last \texttt{BIG_QUANTA} ticks.

You may make the following assumptions in this problem:

- Priority scheduling in Pintos is functioning properly,
- Priority donation is not implemented.
- Alarm is not implemented.
- \texttt{thread_set_priority} is never called by the thread
- You may ignore the limited set of priorities enforced by pintos (priority values may span any \texttt{float} value)
- For simplicity assume floating point operations work in the kernel

3.2.1 Per thread quanta

How long will a particular thread run? (use the threads priority value)

\begin{quote}

Every thread $T_k$ will run for 
\[
\max \left( \frac{T_k\text{.priority}}{\sum_{i=0}^{T_i\text{.priority}}} \cdot \text{MIN_LATENCY} \cdot \text{MIN_QUANTA} \right)
\end{quote}
3.2.2 struct thread

Below is the declaration of struct thread. What field(s) would we need to add to make TFS possible? You may not need all the blanks.

```c
struct thread
{
    /* Owned by thread.c. */
    tid_t tid; /* Thread identifier. */
    enum thread_status status; /* Thread state. */
    char name[16]; /* Name (for debugging purposes). */
    uint8_t *stack; /* Saved stack pointer. */
    float priority; /* Priority, as a float. */
    struct list_elem allelem; /* List element for all threads list. */

    /* Shared between thread.c and synch.c. */
    struct list_elem elem; /* List element. */

    #ifdef USERPROG
    /* Owned by userprog/process.c. */
    uint32_t *pagedir; /* Page directory. */
    #endif

    int vruntime;
    int quanta; /* Owned by thread.c. */
    unsigned magic; /* Detects stack overflow. */
};
```

3.2.3 thread tick

What is needed for thread_tick() for TFS to work properly? You may not need all the blanks.

```c
void thread_tick (void)
{
    struct thread *t = thread_current ();

    /* Update statistics. */
    if (t == idle_thread)
        idle_ticks++;
    #ifdef USERPROG
    else if (t->pagedir != NULL)
        user_ticks++;
    #endif
    else
        kernel_ticks++;

    t->vruntime++;
    /* Enforce preemption. */
    if (++thread_ticks >= t->quanta){
        intr_yield_on_return ();
        t->priority = (1.0/t->vruntime);
        float total_priority = 0.0f;
        for (e = list_begin (&all_list); e != list_end (&all_list);
            e = list_next (e)) {
            struct thread *t = list_entry (e, struct thread, allelem);
            total_priority += t->priority;
        }
        t->quanta = max(t->priority/total_priority*MIN_LATENCY, MIN_QUANTA);
    }
}
```

3.2.4 timer interrupt

What is needed for timer_interrupt for TFS to function properly.

```c
static void timer_interrupt (struct intr_frame *args UNUSED)
{
    ticks++;
    if (ticks % BIG_QUANTA == 0) {
        int tc = list_size(all_list);

        for (e = list_begin (&all_list); e != list_end (&all_list);
            e = list_next (e)) {
            struct thread *t = list_entry (e, struct thread, allelem);
            t->vruntime = 0;
            t->priority = 1.0f;
            t->quanta = max((1.0/tc)*MIN_LATENCY, MIN_QUANTA);
        }
    }
```
thread_tick ();
}

3.2.5 thread create
What is needed for thread_create() for TFS to work properly? You may not need all the blanks.

```c
thread_create (const char *name, int priority,
    thread_func *function, void *aux)
```

```c
/* Body of thread_create omitted for brevity */
old_level = intr_disable ();
int total_priority = 0;
for (e = list_begin (&all_list); e != list_end (&all_list);
    e = list_next (e)) {
    struct thread *t = list_entry (e, struct thread, allelem);
    total_priority += t->priority;
}
```

```c
for (e = list_begin (&all_list); e != list_end (&all_list);
    e = list_next (e)) {
    struct thread *t = list_entry (e, struct thread, allelem);
    t->quanta = max((t->priority/total_priority)*(MIN_LATENCY), MIN_QUANTA);
}
```

```c
intr_set_level (old_level);
/* Add to run queue. */
thread_unblock (t);
if (priority > thread_get_priority ())
    thread_yield ();
}
```

3.2.6 Analysis
Explain the high level behavior of this scheduler; what exactly is it trying to do? How is it different/similar from/to the multilevel feedback scheduler from the project?

This scheduler is a "fair" scheduler it tries to treat the cpu as a shared "ideal" cpu that multiplexes fairly between all the processes weighted by their priorities. Both this and multilevel feedback are similar in that they try and give threads who've used the cpu recently lower priority, they are dissimilar in the fact that the per tick operations are faster. And the MFSQ has more memory, it remembers about its cpu time for a longer period of time (well its slightly more complicated).