CPU Scheduling

CS 532 Winter 2020 © 2020 Karavanic



Process State Model





Key Concept: Separate Mechanism from Policy

Mechanisms: process, process switch Policy: process scheduling. Which process should run next?

Separating policy from mechanism allows us to make the mechanism solid while allowing varying policy choices. (modularity)



CPU Scheduling Criteria

CPU Utilization

- how busy is the CPU?

Throughput

- how many jobs finished/unit time?

Turnaround Time

how long from job submission to job termination?
Response Time

– how long does it take to get a response

Missed deadlines



Broad Classes of Scheduler

Priority-based?

- Processes have priorities
- Priorities can be assigned statically or dynamically

Preemptive?

- Processes can be switched at any time



Example Scheduling Policies

First-Come, First Served (FIFO) Shortest Job First (non-preemptive) Shortest Job First (with preemption) Round-Robin Scheduling Priority Scheduling Real-Time Scheduling

How can we evaluate Scheduling Algorithms?

• Analytic Models

- Parameters: information about the typical workload such as distribution of job length, interarrival interval
- Determine: throughput, average queue length, average wait time, etc.
- Benefits: Can explore different workloads
- Simulation
 - Given a file with a specific workload (captured from a real system, or created)
 - Determine throughput, average queue length, average wait time, etc.
 - Benefits: Fast (see homework 2)



Start jobs in the order they arrive (FIFO queue) Run each job until completion



	Arrival	Processing
Process	Time	Time
1	0	3
2	2	6
3	4	4
4	6	5
5	8	2



	Arrival	Processing		Turnaround
Process	Time	Time	Delay	Time
1	0	3		
2	2	6		
3	4	4		
4	6	5		
5	8	2		













Select the job with the shortest (expected) running time
Non-Preemptive























Preemptive version of SJF

































































<u>Goal</u>: Enable interactivity

Limit the amount of CPU that a thread can have at one time.

<u>Time quantum</u>

Amount of time the OS gives a thread before intervention
Sometimes called the "time slice"
Typically: 1 to 100ms
Not necessarily the same as the timer interrupt frequency!





60




































































































85







				Arrival			Processing					Turnaround			
_	Proc		Time			Time			De	lay		Time	<u>e</u>		
		1		0				3			1		4		
		2		2			6			1	0		16		
		3		4			4				9		13		
		4		6				5			9		14		
		5		8				2			5		7		
					1			-							
)		5		10)		15		2	0					

87



Effectiveness of round-robin depends on

- The number of threads, and
- The size of the time quantum.

Large # of threads means that the time between scheduling of a single thread increases

- Slow responses

Larger time quantum means that the time between the scheduling of a single thread also increases

- Slow responses

Smaller time quantum means higher processing rates but also more overhead!



General Purpose Schedulers



Priority Scheduling

Assign a priority (number) to each thread Schedule threads based on their priority Higher priority threads get more CPU time Starvation is possible!

Managing priorities

Can use "nice" to voluntarily reduce your priority Scheduler can periodically adjust a process' priority

- Prevents starvation of a lower priority process
- Can improve performance of I/O-bound processes by basing priority on fraction of last quantum used



Multi-Level Queue Scheduling

Multiple queues, each with its own priority Equivalently: each priority level has its own ready queue Round-robin scheduling is used within each queue Simplest approach uses statically assigned priorities





Multi-Level Feedback Scheduling

Problem: with fixed priorities I/O-bound processes are disadvantaged

Can we fix this with dynamic priorities?



Multi-Level Feedback Scheduling

Solution: Let the amount of CPU that a thread used in the last quantum determine its scheduling priority for the next

Expired time quantum \rightarrow decrease priority

Unexpired time quantum \rightarrow increase priority

Rationale: if a thread didn't use all of its time (because it blocked for I/O) the system owes it some more CPU time

Also, if a thread is compute-bound, raising its priority risks it starving the other threads



Multi-Level Feedback Scheduling

N priority levels, round-robin scheduling within a level Should *Quanta* increase as priority decreases? Are high priority threads more likely to be interactive? What stops starvation?





Proportional Share Scheduling

The amount of CPU a thread gets is a separate concern from how urgently it must run

Latency and throughput are distinct scheduling concerns



Lottery Scheduling

A kind of proportional share scheduling by chance Scheduler gives each thread some lottery tickets To select the next process to run...

- The scheduler randomly selects a lottery number
- The winning process gets to run

ExampleThread A gets 50 ticketsThread B gets 15 ticketsThread C gets 35 ticketsThere are 100 tickets outstanding



Lottery Scheduling

A kind of proportional share scheduling Scheduler gives each thread some lottery tickets. To select the next process to run...

- The scheduler randomly selects a lottery number
- The winning process gets to run

<u>Example</u>

Thread A gets 50 tickets → 50% of CPU Thread B gets 15 tickets → 15% of CPU Thread C gets 35 tickets → 35% of CPU There are 100 tickets outstanding



Proportion-Period Scheduling

No need for randomization

- Threads should be able to get throughput and latency guarantees
- Necessary in time-sensitive applications