CS 471 Operating Systems

Yue Cheng

George Mason University Fall 2019

Midterm II

- Thursday, Nov 7, 1:30pm 2:45pm
 - 75 min, closed book, closed note

- Covering topics from lec-3a to lec-4f
 - CPU scheduling:
 - FIFO/SJF/SRTF/RR/Priority/MLFQ
 - Memory management:
 - Paging/PT/TLB/Swapping/Page Replacement

CPU Scheduling Policies

- o FIFO
 - How it works?
 - Its inherent issues (why we need SJF)?
- SJF
 - How it works?
 - Any limitations (why we need SRTF)?
- SRTF (preemptive SJF)
 - How it works? How it solves SJF's limitations?

Various Metrics

- Average waiting time
- Average turnaround time
- How to calculate each metric under a specific schedule (Gantt chart)

CPU Scheduling Policies (cont.)

o RR

- How it works?
- Why it is needed (compared to SJF & SRTF)?
 - The turnaround time vs. response time tradeoff
- Impact of quantum tuning on turnaround time

Priority

- How it works?
- Problems of Priority scheduling and solution?

MLFQ

- How it works?
- Rules that were discussed in lecture. Which rule solves what problem?

Virtual Memory Accesses

- Virtual memory accesses for executing one assembly instruction
 - Fetch instruction at addr XYZ
 - Mem load/store if any
- Segfault vs. page fault
 - Basic concepts of memory segmentation

Paging

- Virtual addresses and physical addresses
 - VPN, PFN, page offset
- Virtual to physical address translation
 - (Basic) linear page table: VPN as index of the array
 - Each PTE contains PFN + other status info
- Page tables' performance and memory issues
 - Performance problem TLB to the rescue
 - Memory consumption problem various solutions

PT's are Too Slow – Translation Lookaside Buffer (TLB)

- Address translation steps
 - Each virtual address access requires two physical memory accesses: one for PTE access, one for data access (assuming a 1-level PT)
 - Too much performance overhead!
- O TLB entry: VPN | PFN | ASID | Valid | Prot | ...
- Having TLB as a hardware cache to accelerate address translation
 - PT access workloads exhibit data locality
 - To save the physical memory access(es) for fetching PTE(s)

PT-related calculation

Assume a linear page table array

- Virtual address: VPN + offset
 - Assume a 32-bit virtual address space
 - 4KB pages: offset has 12 bits
 - How many pages: 2²⁰ pages since VPN has 20 bits
 - How much memory: 4MB assuming each PTE has 4 bytes
 - 2 ^ (32-log(4KB)) * 4 = 4MB

PT's are Too Big

- Approach 1: Linear Inverted Page Table
 - Whole system maintains only one PT
 - Performs a whole-table linear search using pid+VPN to get the index
 - The index corresponds to the PFN: An "Inverted" process compared against the baseline linear page table array
- Approach 2: Hash Inverted Page Table
 - Leverages hashing to reduce the algorithmic time complexity from O(N) to O(1)
- Approach 3: Multi-Level Page Table
 - Uses hierarchy to reduce the overall memory usage

Page Replacement Policies

FIFO

- Why it might work? Maybe the one brought in the longest ago is one we are not using now
- Why it might not work? No real info to tell if it's being used or not
- Suffers "Belady's Anomaly"

Random

- Why it might work? Sometimes non intelligence is better
- Why it might not work? No real info to tell if it's being used or not

o OPT

- Assume we know about the future
- Not practical in real cases: offline policy
- However, can be used as a best case baseline for comparison purpose

LRU

- Intuition: we can't look into the future, but let's look at past experience to make a good guess
- Our "bet" is that pages used recently are ones which will be used again (principle of locality)

Average Memory Access Time

- Metric to quantify the effective memory access performance
 - Assume a more generic two-tier memory (or storage) model
 - AMAT = Hit_rate*T_{T1} + Miss_rate*T_{T2}
 - T_{T1}: Performance cost given existence of Tier 1
 - T_{T2}: Performance cost given absence of Tier 1

Variants

- Simple case: If Tier 1 is memory, then Tier 2 can be disk
- TLB-related AMAT
- Tier 1 can be CPU cache, tier 2 can be memory, and tier 3 can be disk