The scheduling problem:
- Have \( k \) jobs ready to run
- Have \( n \geq 1 \) CPUs that can run them

Which jobs should we assign to which CPU(s)?
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When do we schedule CPU?

Scheduling decisions may take place when a process:

1. Switches from running to waiting state
2. Switches from running to ready state
3. Switches from new/waiting to ready
4. Exits

- Non-preemptive schedules use 1 & 4 only
- Preemptive schedulers run at all four points
Scheduling criteria

- **Why do we care?**
  - What goals should we have for a scheduling algorithm?

  - Throughput – # of processes that complete per unit time
    - Higher is better
  - Turnaround time – time for each process to complete
    - Lower is better
  - Response time – time from request to first response
    - I.e., time between waiting → ready transition and ready → running (e.g., key press to echo, not launch to exit)
    - Lower is better

  - Above criteria are affected by secondary criteria
    - CPU utilization – fraction of time CPU doing productive work
    - Waiting time – time each process waits in ready queue
Scheduling criteria

• Why do we care?
  - What goals should we have for a scheduling algorithm?

• *Throughput* – # of processes that complete per unit time
  - Higher is better

• *Turnaround time* – time for each process to complete
  - Lower is better

• *Response time* – time from request to first response
  - I.e., time between *waiting* → *ready* transition and *ready* → *running* (e.g., key press to echo, not launch to exit)
  - Lower is better

• Above criteria are affected by secondary criteria
  - *CPU utilization* – fraction of time CPU doing productive work
  - *Waiting time* – time each process waits in ready queue
Example: FCFS Scheduling

- Run jobs in order that they arrive
  - Called “First-come first-served” (FCFS)
  - E.g., Say $P_1$ needs 24 sec, while $P_2$ and $P_3$ need 3.
  - Say $P_2$, $P_3$ arrived immediately after $P_1$, get:

  \[
  P_1 \quad P_2 \quad P_3
  \]

  \[
  0 \quad 24 \quad 27 \quad 30
  \]

- Dirt simple to implement—how good is it?
- Throughput: 3 jobs / 30 sec = 0.1 jobs/sec
- Turnaround Time: $P_1 : 24$, $P_2 : 27$, $P_3 : 30$
  - Average TT: $(24 + 27 + 30)/3 = 27$
- Can we do better?
Suppose we scheduled $P_2$, $P_3$, then $P_1$

- Would get:

![Diagram showing $P_2$, $P_3$, and $P_1$]

Throughput: 3 jobs / 30 sec = 0.1 jobs/sec

Turnaround time: $P_1 : 30$, $P_2 : 3$, $P_3 : 6$

- Average TT: $(30 + 3 + 6)/3 = 13$ – much less than 27

Lesson: scheduling algorithm can reduce TT

- Minimizing waiting time can improve RT and TT

Can a scheduling algorithm improve throughput?
Suppose we scheduled $P_2, P_3$, then $P_1$

- Would get:

Throughput: 3 jobs / 30 sec = 0.1 jobs/sec

Turnaround time: $P_1 : 30, P_2 : 3, P_3 : 6$
- Average TT: $(30 + 3 + 6)/3 = 13$ – much less than 27

Lesson: scheduling algorithm can reduce TT
- Minimizing waiting time can improve RT and TT

Can a scheduling algorithm improve throughput?
- Yes, if jobs require both computation and I/O
View CPU and I/O devices the same

- CPU is one of several devices needed by users’ jobs
  - CPU runs compute jobs, Disk drive runs disk jobs, etc.
  - With network, part of job may run on remote CPU

- Scheduling 1-CPU system with $n$ I/O devices like scheduling asymmetric $(n + 1)$-CPU multiprocessor
  - Result: all I/O devices + CPU busy $\Rightarrow (n + 1)$-fold throughput gain!

- Example: disk-bound grep + CPU-bound matrix multiply
  - Overlap them just right? throughput will be almost doubled
Bursts of computation & I/O

- Jobs contain I/O and computation
  - Bursts of computation
  - Then must wait for I/O
- To maximize throughput, maximize both CPU and I/O device utilization
- How to do?
  - Overlap computation from one job with I/O from other jobs
  - Means response time very important for I/O-intensive jobs: I/O device will be idle until job gets small amount of CPU to issue next I/O request
• What does this mean for FCFS?
FCFS Convoy effect

- CPU-bound jobs will hold CPU until exit or I/O (but I/O rare for CPU-bound thread)
  - Long periods where no I/O requests issued, and CPU held
  - Result: poor I/O device utilization

- Example: one CPU-bound job, many I/O bound
  - CPU-bound job runs (I/O devices idle)
  - Eventually, CPU-bound job blocks
  - I/O-bound jobs run, but each quickly blocks on I/O
  - CPU-bound job unblocks, runs again
  - All I/O requests complete, but CPU-bound job still hogs CPU
  - I/O devices sit idle since I/O-bound jobs can’t issue next requests

- Simple hack: run process whose I/O completed
  - What is a potential problem?
FCFS Convoy effect

- CPU-bound jobs will hold CPU until exit or I/O (but I/O rare for CPU-bound thread)
  - Long periods where no I/O requests issued, and CPU held
  - Result: poor I/O device utilization

- Example: one CPU-bound job, many I/O bound
  - CPU-bound job runs (I/O devices idle)
  - Eventually, CPU-bound job blocks
  - I/O-bound jobs run, but each quickly blocks on I/O
  - CPU-bound job unblocks, runs again
  - All I/O requests complete, but CPU-bound job still hogs CPU
  - I/O devices sit idle since I/O-bound jobs can’t issue next requests

- Simple hack: run process whose I/O completed
  - What is a potential problem?
  I/O-bound jobs can starve CPU-bound one
SJF Scheduling

• **Shortest-job first (SJF)** attempts to minimize TT
  - Schedule the job whose next CPU burst is the shortest
  - Misnomer unless “job” = one CPU burst with no I/O

• **Two schemes:**
  - *Non-preemptive* – once CPU given to the process it cannot be preempted until completes its CPU burst
  - *Preemptive* – if a new process arrives with CPU burst length less than remaining time of current executing process, preempt (Known as the Shortest-Remaining-Time-First or SRTF)

• **What does SJF optimize?**
SJF Scheduling

- **Shortest-job first (SJF) attempts to minimize TT**
  - Schedule the job whose next CPU burst is the shortest
  - Misnomer unless “job” = one CPU burst with no I/O

- **Two schemes:**
  - *Non-preemptive* – once CPU given to the process it cannot be preempted until completes its CPU burst
  - *Preemptive* – if a new process arrives with CPU burst length less than remaining time of current executing process, preempt (Known as the Shortest-Remaining-Time-First or SRTF)

- **What does SJF optimize?**
  - Gives minimum average *waiting time* for a given set of processes
Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Arrival Time</th>
<th>Burst Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P_1$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_2$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_3$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_4$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Non-preemptive

- Preemptive

- Drawbacks?
SJF limitations

- Doesn’t always minimize average TT
  - Only minimizes waiting time
  - Example where turnaround time might be suboptimal?

- Can lead to unfairness or starvation

- In practice, can’t actually predict the future

- But can estimate CPU burst length based on past
  - Exponentially weighted average a good idea
  - $t_n$ actual length of process’s $n^{th}$ CPU burst
  - $\tau_{n+1}$ estimated length of proc’s $(n + 1)^{st}$
  - Choose parameter $\alpha$ where $0 < \alpha \leq 1$
  - Let $\tau_{n+1} = \alpha t_n + (1 - \alpha) \tau_n$
SJF limitations

• Doesn’t always minimize average TT
  - Only minimizes waiting time
  - Example where turnaround time might be suboptimal?
  - Overall longer job has shorter bursts

• Can lead to unfairness or starvation

• In practice, can’t actually predict the future

• But can estimate CPU burst length based on past
  - Exponentially weighted average a good idea
  - $t_n$ actual length of process’s $n^{th}$ CPU burst
  - $\tau_{n+1}$ estimated length of proc’s $(n+1)^{st}$
  - Choose parameter $\alpha$ where $0 < \alpha \leq 1$
  - Let $\tau_{n+1} = \alpha t_n + (1 - \alpha) \tau_n$
Exp. weighted average example

CPU burst ($t_i$) | 6  | 4  | 6  | 4  | 13 | 13 | 13 | ...  
"guess" ($\tau_i$) | 10 | 8  | 6  | 6  | 5  | 9  | 11 | 12  | ...
Round robin (RR) scheduling

- Solution to fairness and starvation
  - Preempt job after some time slice or quantum
  - When preempted, move to back of FIFO queue
  - (Most systems do some flavor of this)

- Advantages:
  - Fair allocation of CPU across jobs
  - Low average waiting time when job lengths vary
  - Good for responsiveness if small number of jobs

- Disadvantages?
RR disadvantages

- Varying sized jobs are good … what about same-sized jobs?

- Assume 2 jobs of time=100 each:

```
  P1  P2  P1  P2  P1  P2 ... P1  P2
  0    1   2    3   4    5   6    198  199  200
```

- Even if context switches were free…
  - What would average turnaround time be with RR?
  - How does that compare to FCFS?
RR disadvantages

- Varying sized jobs are good ... what about same-sized jobs?
- Assume 2 jobs of time=100 each:

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 198 199 200
```

- Even if context switches were free...
  - What would average turnaround time be with RR? 199.5
  - How does that compare to FCFS? 150
What is the cost of a context switch?

- Brute CPU time cost in kernel
  - Save and restore registers, etc.
  - Switch address spaces (expensive instructions)
- Indirect costs: cache, buffer cache, & TLB misses
What is the cost of a context switch?

Brute CPU time cost in kernel
- Save and restore registers, etc.
- Switch address spaces (expensive instructions)

Indirect costs: cache, buffer cache, & TLB misses
• What is the cost of a context switch?

• Brute CPU time cost in kernel
  - Save and restore resisters, etc.
  - Switch address spaces (expensive instructions)

• Indirect costs: cache, buffer cache, & TLB misses
Time quantum

How to pick quantum?
- Want much larger than context switch cost
- Majority of bursts should be less than quantum
- But not so large system reverts to FCFS

Typical values: 1–100 msec
Turnaround time vs. quantum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>process</th>
<th>time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P_1$</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_2$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_3$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_4$</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two-level scheduling

- Under memory constraints, may need to *swap* process to disk

- Switching to swapped out process very expensive
  - Swapped out process has most memory pages on disk
  - Will have to fault them all in while running
  - One disk access costs $\sim 10\text{ms}$. On 1GHz machine, 10ms = 10 million cycles!

- **Solution: Context-switch-cost aware scheduling**
  - Run in-core subset for “a while”
  - Then swap some between disk and memory

- **How to pick subset? How to define “a while”?**
  - View as scheduling *memory* before scheduling CPU
  - Swapping in process is cost of memory “context switch”
  - So want “memory quantum” much larger than swapping cost
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Priority scheduling

• Associate a numeric priority with each process
  - E.g., smaller number means higher priority (Unix/BSD)
  - Or smaller number means lower priority (Pintos)
• Give CPU to the process with highest priority
  - Can be done preemptively or non-preemptively
• Note SJF is priority scheduling where priority is the predicted next CPU burst time
• Starvation – low priority processes may never execute
• Solution?
Priority scheduling

• Associate a numeric priority with each process
  - E.g., smaller number means higher priority (Unix/BSD)
  - Or smaller number means lower priority (Pintos)

• Give CPU to the process with highest priority
  - Can be done preemptively or non preemptively

• Note SJF is priority scheduling where priority is the predicted next CPU burst time

• Starvation – low priority processes may never execute

• Solution?
  - Aging: increase a process’s priority as it waits
Multilevel feedback queues (BSD)

- Every runnable process on one of 32 run queues
  - Kernel runs process on highest-priority non-empty queue
    - Round-robin among processes on same queue
- Process priorities dynamically computed
  - Processes moved between queues to reflect priority changes
  - If a process gets higher priority than running process, run it
- Idea: Favor interactive jobs that use less CPU
Process priority

- **$p_{\text{nice}}$** – user-settable weighting factor
- **$p_{\text{estcpu}}$** – per-process estimated CPU usage
  - Incremented whenever timer interrupt found process running
  - Decayed every second while process runnable

\[
p_{\text{estcpu}} \leftarrow \left( \frac{2 \cdot \text{load}}{2 \cdot \text{load} + 1} \right) p_{\text{estcpu}} + p_{\text{nice}}
\]
  - Load is sampled average of length of run queue plus short-term sleep queue over last minute

- **Run queue determined by** $p_{\text{usrpri}}/4$

\[
p_{\text{usrpri}} \leftarrow 50 + \left( \frac{p_{\text{estcpu}}}{4} \right) + 2 \cdot p_{\text{nice}}
\]

(value clipped if over 127)
Sleeping process increases priority

- `p_{estcpu}` **not updated while asleep**
  - Instead `p_{slptime}` keeps count of sleep time
- **When process becomes runnable**
  
  \[ p_{estcpu} \leftarrow \left( \frac{2 \cdot \text{load}}{2 \cdot \text{load} + 1} \right)^{p_{slptime}} \times p_{estcpu} \]
  
  - Approximates decay ignoring nice and past loads
- **Previous description based on [McKusick][1] (The Design and Implementation of the 4.4BSD Operating System)**

---

[1] See [library.stanford.edu](http://library.stanford.edu) for off-campus access
• Same basic idea for second half of project 1
  - But 64 priorities, not 128
  - Higher numbers mean higher priority
  - Okay to have only one run queue if you prefer (less efficient, but we won’t deduct points for it)

• Have to negate priority equation:

\[ \text{priority} = 63 - \left( \frac{\text{recent_cpu}}{4} \right) - 2 \cdot \text{nice} \]
Thread scheduling

• With thread library, have two scheduling decisions:
  - *Local Scheduling* – Thread library decides which user thread to put onto an available kernel thread
  - *Global Scheduling* – Kernel decides which kernel thread to run next

• Can expose to the user
  - E.g., pthread_attr_setscope allows two choices
    - `PTHREAD_SCOPE_SYSTEM` – thread scheduled like a process (effectively one kernel thread bound to user thread – Will return ENOTSUP in user-level pthreads implementation)
    - `PTHREAD_SCOPE_PROCESS` – thread scheduled within the current process (may have multiple user threads multiplexed onto kernel threads)
Thread dependencies

- **Say $H$ at high priority, $L$ at low priority**
  - $L$ acquires lock $\ell$.
  - Scenario 1 ($\ell$ a spinlock): $H$ tries to acquire $\ell$, fails, spins. $L$ never gets to run.
  - Scenario 2 ($\ell$ a mutex): $H$ tries to acquire $\ell$, fails, blocks. $M$ enters system at medium priority. $L$ never gets to run.
  - Both scenes are examples of *priority inversion*

- **Scheduling = deciding who should make progress**
  - A thread’s importance should increase with the importance of those that depend on it
  - Naïve priority schemes violate this
Priority donation

- Say higher number = higher priority (like Pintos)

Example 1: $L$ (prio 2), $M$ (prio 4), $H$ (prio 8)

- $L$ holds lock $\ell$
- $M$ waits on $\ell$, $L$’s priority raised to $L_1 = \max(M, L) = 4$
- Then $H$ waits on $\ell$, $L$’s priority raised to $\max(H, L_1) = 8$

Example 2: Same $L, M, H$ as above

- $L$ holds lock $\ell_1$, $M$ holds lock $\ell_2$
- $M$ waits on $\ell_1$, $L$’s priority now $L_1 = 4$ (as before)
- Then $H$ waits on $\ell_2$. $M$’s priority goes to $M_1 = \max(H, M) = 8$, and $L$’s priority raised to $\max(M_1, L_1) = 8$

Example 3: $L$ (prio 2), $M_1, \ldots, M_{1000}$ (all prio 4)

- $L$ has $\ell$, and $M_1, \ldots, M_{1000}$ all block on $\ell$. $L$’s priority is $\max(L, M_1, \ldots, M_{1000}) = 4$. 
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Multiprocessor scheduling issues

- **Must decide on more than which processes to run**
  - Must decide on which CPU to run which process

- **Moving between CPUs has costs**
  - More cache misses, depending on arch. more TLB misses too

- **Affinity scheduling**—try to keep process/thread on same CPU

  - But also prevent load imbalances
  - Do *cost-benefit* analysis when deciding to migrate… affinity can also be harmful, when tail latency is critical
• Want related processes/threads scheduled together
  - Good if threads access same resources (e.g., cached files)
  - Even more important if threads communicate often, otherwise must context switch to communicate

• **Gang scheduling**—schedule all CPUs synchronously
  - With synchronized quanta, easier to schedule related processes/threads together
Real-time scheduling

- **Two categories:**
  - *Soft real time*—miss deadline and audio playback will sound funny
  - *Hard real time*—miss deadline and plane will crash

- **System must handle periodic and aperiodic events**
  - E.g., processes A, B, C must be scheduled every 100, 200, 500 msec, require 50, 30, 100 msec respectively
  - *Schedulerable* if $\sum \frac{CPU}{period} \leq 1$ (not counting switch time)

- **Variety of scheduling strategies**
  - E.g., first deadline first
    (works if schedulable, otherwise fails spectacularly)
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Many modern schedulers employ notion of *virtual time*
  - Idea: Equalize virtual CPU time consumed by different processes
  - Higher-priority processes consume virtual time more slowly

Forms the basis of the current linux scheduler, **CFS**

Case study: Borrowed Virtual Time (BVT) [Duda]

BVT runs process with lowest *effective virtual time*
  - $A_i$ – *actual virtual time* consumed by process $i$
  - *effective virtual time* $E_i = A_i - (\text{warp}_i ? W_i : 0)$
  - Special warp factor allows borrowing against future CPU time
    …hence name of algorithm
• Each process $i$’s faction of CPU determined by weight $w_i$
  - $i$ should get $w_i / \sum_j w_j$ faction of CPU
  - So $w_i$ is real seconds per virtual second that process $i$ has CPU

• When $i$ consumes $t$ CPU time, track it: $A_i += t/w_i$

• Example: gcc (weight 2), bigsim (weight 1)
  - Assuming no IO, runs: gcc, gcc, bigsim, gcc, gcc, bigsim, …
  - Lots of context switches, not so good for performance

• Add in context switch allowance, $C$
  - Only switch from $i$ to $j$ if $E_j \leq E_i - C/w_i$
  - $C$ is wall-clock time ($\gg$ context switch cost), so must divide by $w_i$
  - Ignore $C$ if $j$ just became runnable… why?
Process weights

- Each process $i$’s faction of CPU determined by weight $w_i$
  - $i$ should get $w_i / \sum j w_j$ faction of CPU
  - So $w_i$ is real seconds per virtual second that process $i$ has CPU
- When $i$ consumes $t$ CPU time, track it: $A_i += t / w_i$
- Example: gcc (weight 2), bigsim (weight 1)
  - Assuming no IO, runs: gcc, gcc, bigsim, gcc, gcc, bigsim, …
  - Lots of context switches, not so good for performance
- Add in context switch allowance, $C$
  - Only switch from $i$ to $j$ if $E_j \leq E_i - C / w_i$
  - $C$ is wall-clock time ($\gg$ context switch cost), so must divide by $w_i$
  - Ignore $C$ if $j$ just became runnable to avoid affecting response time
- gcc has weight 2, bigsim weight 1, $C = 2$, no I/O
  - bigsim consumes virtual time at twice the rate of gcc
  - Processes run for $C$ time after lines cross before context switch
Sleep/wakeup

- Must lower priority (increase $A_i$) after wakeup
  - Otherwise process with very low $A_i$ would starve everyone

- Bound lag with Scheduler Virtual Time (SVT)
  - SVT is minimum $A_j$ for all runnable threads $j$
  - When waking $i$ from voluntary sleep, set $A_i \leftarrow \max(A_i, SVT)$

- Note voluntary/involuntary sleep distinction
  - E.g., Don’t reset $A_j$ to SVT after page fault
  - Faulting thread needs a chance to catch up
  - But do set $A_i \leftarrow \max(A_i, SVT)$ after socket read

- Note: Even with SVT $A_i$ can never decrease
  - After short sleep, might have $A_i > SVT$, so $\max(A_i, SVT) = A_i$
  - $i$ never gets more than its fair share of CPU in long run
• gcc’s $A_i$ gets reset to SVT on wakeup
  - Otherwise, would be at lower (blue) line and starve bigsim
Real-time threads

- Also want to support time-critical tasks
  - E.g., mpeg player must run every 10 clock ticks
- **Recall** $E_i = A_i - (\text{warp}_i \ ? W_i : 0)$
  - $W_i$ is *warp factor* – gives thread precedence
  - Just give mpeg player $i$ large $W_i$ factor
  - Will get CPU whenever it is runnable
  - But long term CPU share won’t exceed $w_i / \sum_j w_j$
- **Note** $W_i$ only matters when warp$_i$ is true
  - Can set warp$_i$ with a syscall, or have it set in signal handler
  - Also gets cleared if $i$ keeps using CPU for $L_i$ time
  - $L_i$ limit gets reset every $U_i$ time
  - $L_i = 0$ means no limit – okay for small $W_i$ value
- mpeg player runs with $-50$ warp value
  - Always gets CPU when needed, never misses a frame
• mpeg goes into tight loop at time 5
• Exceeds $L_i$ at time 10, so $\text{warp}_i \leftarrow \text{false}$
• Common queries 150 times faster than uncommon
  - Have 10-thread pool of threads to handle requests
  - Assign $W_i$ value sufficient to process fast query (say 50)

• Say 1 slow query, small trickle of fast queries
  - Fast queries come in, warped by 50, execute immediately
  - Slow query runs in background
  - Good for turnaround time

• Say 1 slow query, but many fast queries
  - At first, only fast queries run
  - But SVT is bounded by $A_i$ of slow query thread $i$
  - Recall fast query thread $j$ gets $A_j = \max(A_j, SVT) = A_j$; eventually
    $SVT < A_j$ and a bit later $A_j - \text{warp}_j > A_i$.
  - At that point thread $i$ will run again, so no starvation
Case study: SMART

- **Key idea: Separate importance from urgency**
  - Figure out which processes are important enough to run
  - Run whichever of these is most urgent

- **Importance** = \( \langle \text{priority}, \text{BVFT} \rangle \) value tuple
  - **priority** – parameter set by user or administrator (higher is better)
    - Takes absolute priority over BVFT
  - **BVFT** – Biased Virtual Finishing Time (lower is better)
    - virtual time consumed + virtual length of next CPU burst
    - I.e., virtual time at which quantum would end if process scheduled now
    - Bias is like negative warp, see paper for details

- **Urgency** = next deadline (sooner is more urgent)
SMART algorithm

• If most important ready task (ready task with best value tuple) is conventional (not real-time), run it

• Consider all real-time tasks with better value tuples than the best ready conventional task

• For each such real-time task, starting from the best value-tuple
  - Can you run it without missing deadlines of more important tasks?
  - If so, add to schedulable set

• Run task with earliest deadline in schedulable set

• Send signal to tasks that won’t meet their deadlines