Operating Systems (234123) – Spring 2013

Scheduling

Dan Tsafrir (18/3/2013, 8/4/2013)
What is it?

BATCH (NON-PREEMPTIVE) SCHEDULERS
Consider a different context...

- In this course, we typically consider the OS of our own computers
- Need to change the mind set for some of the topics in today’s lecture
  - So that they would make sense and have meaning
- New context:
  - “batch scheduling” on “supercomputers”
  - We will explain both of these terms next
Supercomputers

• Comprised of 100s to 100,000s of cores
  – Many multicores connected with a high-speed network

• Used by 100s of scientific users
  – (physicists, chemists...)

• Users submit “jobs” (=programs)
  – Jobs can be serial (one core) or parallel (many cores)
  – A parallel job simultaneously uses N cores to solve a single scientific problem quickly (ideally N times faster)
  – N is the “size” of the job (determined by the submitting user)
  – While the program is running, cores communicate with each other and exchange information
  – Jobs can run from a few seconds to 10s of hours
  – Jobs can have many sizes (often a power of 2)
Think of jobs as rectangles in core X time plane

- Jobs can be “wide” or “narrow” (size)
- Jobs can be “short” or “long” (runtime)
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This is how a schedule might look like
Batch scheduling

• It is important that all the processes of a job run together (as they repeatedly communicate)
  – Each process runs on a different core

• Jobs are often tailored to use the entire physical memory on each individual multicore
  – They cannot really share cores with other jobs via multiprogramming

• Thus, supercomputers use “batch scheduling”
  – When a job is scheduled to run, it gets its own cores
  – Cores are dedicated (not shared)
  – Each job runs to completion (until it terminates)
  – Only after, the cores are allocated to other waiting jobs
  – “Non-preemptive” (see later on)
METRICS TO EVALUATE PERFORMANCE OF BATCH SCHEDULERS

Wait time, response time, slowdown, utilization, throughput
Average wait time & response time

• Average wait time
  – The “wait time” of a job is the interval between the time the job is submitted to the time the job starts to run
    • waitTime = startTime - submitTime
  – The shorter the average wait time, the better the performance

• Average response time
  – The “response time” of a job is the interval between the time the job is submitted to the time the job terminated
    • responseTime = terminationTime – submitTime
    • responseTime = waitTime + runTime
  – The shorter the average response time, the better the performance

• Wait vs. response
  – Users typically care more about response time (wait for their job to end)
  – But schedulers can only affect wait time
Connection between average wait & response

• Claim
  – For batch schedulers, difference between average wait time and average response time is a constant
  – The constant is the average runtime of all jobs
• Proof
  – For each job $i$ ($i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots N$)
    • Let $W_i$ be the wait time of job $i$
    • Let $R_i$ be the runtime of job $i$
    • Let $T_i$ be the response time of job $i$ ($T_i = W_i + R_i$)
  – With this notation we have
    \[
    \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1}^{N} T_i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1}^{N} (W_i + R_i) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1}^{N} W_i + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1}^{N} R_i
    \]
  – The average runtime is a given; it stays the same regardless of the scheduler!
Average slowdown (expansion factor)

• The “slowdown” of a job is
  – The ratio between its response time & its runtime
  – slowdown = responseTime / runTime = Ti/Ri
  – slowdown = (waitTime + runTime) / runTime = (Wi+Ri) / Ri

• Like wait & response, we aspire to minimize the average slowdown
  – slowdown = 1 ⇔ job was immediately scheduled
  – The greater the slowdown, the longer the job is delayed

• Examples
  – If Ri = 1 minute, and Wi = 1 minute
    • Job has a slowdown of (Wi+Ri)/Ri = (1+1)/1 = 2
    • Namely, job was slowed by a factor of 2 relative to its runtime
  – If Ri = 1 hour, and Wi = 1 minute, then the slowdown is much smaller
    • (Wi+Ri)/Ri = (60+1)/60 ≈ 1.02
    • The delay was insignificant relative to the job’s runtime

• The slowdown metric is also called
  – “Expansion factor”
Utilization & throughput

- **Utilization (aspire to maximize)**
  - Percentage of time the resource (CPU in our case) is busy
  - In this example, the utilization is:
    \[
    100 \times \frac{(3 \times 7 - 6)}{3 \times 7} = 71\%
    \]

- **Throughput (aspire to maximize)**
  - How much work is done in one time unit
  - Examples
    - Typical hard disk throughput: 50 MB/second (sequential access)
    - Database server throughput: transactions per second
    - Supercomputer throughput: job completions per second

- **Depends on your point of view**
  - Users typically care about wait time, response time, slowdown
  - The owners of the system typically care about utilization & throughput
FCFS, EASY, backfilling, RR, SJF

BATCH SCHEDULING EXAMPLES
**FCFS (First-Come First-Served) scheduling**

- **Jobs are scheduled by their arrival time**
  - Jobs are scheduled by their arrival order
  - If there are enough free cores, a newly arriving job starts to run immediately
  - Otherwise it waits until enough cores are freed

- **Pros:**
  - Easy to implement (FIFO wait queue)
  - Perceived as most fair

- **Cons:**
  - Creates fragmentation (unutilized cores)
  - Small/short jobs might wait for a long, long while..

(Numbers indicate arrival order)
EASY (= FCFS + backfilling) scheduling

• The “backfilling” optimization
  – A short waiting job can jump over head of queue
  – Provided it doesn’t delay the execution of head of queue

• EASY algorithm: whenever a job arrives or terminates:
  1. Try to start the job @ head of wait queue (FCFS)
  2. Then, iterate over the rest of the waiting jobs (in FCFS order) and try to backfill them

FCFS + Backfilling = “EASY”
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EASY (= FCFS + backfilling) scheduling

• Pros
  – Better utilization (less fragmentation)
  – Narrow/short jobs have better chance to run quicker

• Con:
  – Must know runtimes in advance
    • To know width of holes
    • To know if backfill candidates are short enough to fit holes
EASY (= FCFS + backfilling) scheduling

• Backfilling mandates users to estimate how long their job will run
  • Upon job submission

• If a job tries to overrun its estimate
  – It is killed by the system
  – Provides incentive to supply accurate estimates
    • Short estimate => better chance to backfill
    • Too short => jobs will be killed

• EASY (or FCFS) are very popular
  – Most supercomputer schedulers use them by default

• EASY stands for
  – Extensible Argonne Scheduling sYstem
  – Developed @ Argonne National Laboratory (USA) circa 1995
SJF (Shortest-Job First) scheduling

• Instead of
  – Ordering jobs (or processes) by their arrival time (FCFS)

• Order them by
  – Their (typically estimated) runtime

• Not fair
  – Might cause “starvation” (whereby some job waits forever)

• But “optimal” for performance
  – As we will see later on, using some theoretical computations

• NOTE: limit of job-scheduling theoretical computations (called “queuing theory”)
  – Hard (impossible?) to do them for arbitrary parallel workloads
  – Therefore, for theoretical computations
    • We will assume jobs are serial (job=process)
  – The intuition of ‘serial’ still typically applies to ‘parallel’
Average wait time example: FCFS vs. SJF

- **Assume**
  - Processes P1, P2, P3 arrive together in the very same second
  - Assume their runtimes are 24, 3, and 3, respectively
  - Assume FCFS orders them by their index: P1, P2, P3
  - Whereas SJF orders them by their runtime: P2, P3, P1

- **Then**
  - The average wait time under FCFS is
    - \( \frac{(0+24+27)}{3} = 17 \)
  - The average wait time under SJF is
    - \( \frac{(0+3+6)}{3} = 3 \)

- **SJF seems better than FCFS**
  - In terms of optimizing the average wait time metric
“Convoy effect”

• Slowing down of all (possibly very short) processes on account of the system currently servicing a very long process
  – As we’ve seen in the previous slide

• Does EASY suffer from convoy effect?
  – It might, but certainly less than FCFS
  – There are often holes in which short/narrow jobs can fit and many of them indeed manage to start immediately

• Does SJF suffer from convoy effect?
  – It might (when?), but certainly less than FCFS
Optimality of SJF for average wait time

• Claim
  – Given a 1-core system whereby all jobs are serial (= processes)
  – If all processes arrive together and their runtimes are known
  – Then the average wait time of SJF is equal to or smaller than the average wait time of any other batch scheduler S

• Proof outline
  – Assume the scheduling order under S is: P(1), P(2), ..., P(n)
  – If S is different than SJF, then there exist two processes P(i), P(i+1) such that R(i) = P(i).runtime > P(i+1).runtime = R(i+1)
  – If we swap the scheduling order of P(i) and P(i+1) under S, then we’ve increased the wait time of P(i) by R(i+1), we’ve decreased the wait time of P(i+1) by R(i) and this sums up all the changes that we’ve introduced
  – And since R(i) > R(i+1), the overall average is reduced
  – We do the above repeatedly until we reach SJF
Fairer variants of SJF

• Motivation: we don’t want to starve jobs

• SJBF (Shortest-job Backfilled First)
  – Exactly like EASY in terms of servicing the head of the wait queue in FCFS order (and not allowing anyone to delay it)
  – However, the backfilling traversal is done in SJF order

• LXF (Largest eXpansion Factor)
  – Recall that the “slowdown” or “expansion factor” metric for a job is defined to be:
    • slowdown = (waitTime + runtime) / runtime
  – LXF is identical to EASY, but instead of ordering the wait queue in FCFS, it orders jobs based on their current slowdown (greater slowdown means higher priority)
  – The backfilling activity is done “against” the job with the largest current slowdown (= the head of the LXF wait queue)
  – Note that every scheduling decision (when jobs arrive/finish) requires a re-computation of slowdowns (because wait time has changed)
PREEMPTIVE SCHEDULERS

RR, selfish RR, negative feedback, multi-level priority queue
Reminder

• In the previous lecture
  – We’ve talked about several processes states

• In this lecture
  – We only focus on two:
    • Ready & running

• Namely, we assume that
  – Processes only consume CPU
  – They never do I/O
  – They are always either
    • Running, or
    • Ready to run
Preemption

• The act of suspending one job (process) in favor of another
  – Even though it is not finished yet

• Exercise
  – Assume a one-core system
  – Assume two processes, each requiring 10 hours of CPU time
  – Does it make sense to do preemption (say, every few milliseconds)?

• When would we want a scheduler to be preemptive?
  – When responsiveness to user matters (they actively wait for the output of the program), and
  – When some jobs/processes are much shorter than others

• Examples
  – Two processes, one needs 10 hours of CPU time, the other needs 10 seconds (and a user is waiting for it to complete)
  – Two processes, one needs 10 hours of CPU time, the other is a word processor (like MS Word or Emacs) that has just been awakened because the user clicked on a keyboard key
Quantum

• The maximal amount of time a process is allowed to run before it is preempted
  – 10s to 100s of milliseconds in general-purpose OSes (like Linux or Windows)

• Quantum is oftentimes set per-process
  – Processes that behave differently get different quanta, e.g., in Solaris
    • A CPU-bound process gets long quanta but with low priority
    • Whereas an I/O-bound process gets short quanta with hi priority
  – In Linux, the process “nice” value affects the quantum duration
    • “Nice” is a system call and a shell utility (see man)
Performance metrics for preemptive schedulers

• **Wait time (aspire to minimize)**
  – Same as in batch (non-preemptive) systems

• **Response time (or “turnaround time”; aspire to minimize)**
  – Like batch systems, stands for
    • Time from process submission to process completion
  – But unlike batch systems
    • responseTime ≠ waitTime + runTime
  – Instead,
    • responseTime ≥ waitTime + runTime
  – Because
    • Processes can be preempted, and context switches have a price

• **Overhead (aspire to minimize); comprised of**
  – How long a context switch takes, and how often a context switch occurs

• **Utilization & throughput (aspire to maximize)**
  – Same as in batch (non-preemptive) systems
RR (Round-Robin) scheduling

• **Processes are arranged in a cyclic ready-queue**
  – The head process runs, until its quantum is exhausted
  – The head process is then preempted (suspended)
  – The scheduler resumes the next process in the circular list
  – When we’ve cycled through all processes in the run-list (and we reach the head process again), we say that the current “epoch” is over, and the next epoch begins

• **Requires a timer interrupt**
  – Typically, it’s a periodic interrupt (fires every few millisecond)
  – Upon receiving the interrupt, the OS checks if it’s time to preempt

• **Features**
  – For small enough quantum, it’s like everyone of the N processes advances in $1/N$ of the speed of the core
  – With a huge quantum (infinity), RR resembles FCFS
RR in a parallel system?

• Called “gang scheduling”
  – Time is divided to slots (seconds or preferably minutes)
  – Every job has a native time slot
  – Algorithm attempts to fill holes in time slots by assigning to them jobs from other native slots (called “alternative slots”)
    • Challenge: to keep contiguous chunks of free cores
    • Uses a “buddy system” algorithm
  – Why might gang scheduling be useful?
  – Supported by most commercial supercomputer schedulers
    • But is rarely used
    • Since memory often has to be “swapped out” upon context switches, which might take a very, very long time
Price of preemption: example

• Assume
  – One core, 1 second quantum
  – 10 processes, each requires 100 seconds of CPU time

• Assuming no context switch overhead (takes zero time)
  – Then the “makespan” (time to completion of all processes) is
    • $10 \times 100 = 1000$ seconds
  – Both for FCFS and for RR

• Assume context switch takes 1 second
  – The makespan of FCFS is
    • $10 \text{ (proc)} \times 100 \text{ (sec)} + 9 \text{ (ctx-sw)} \times 1 \text{ (sec)} = 1009$
  – Whereas the makespan of RR is
    • $10 \text{ (proc)} \times 100 \text{ (sec)} + 100 \text{ (proc)} \times 100 \text{ (ctx-se)} - 1 = 10,999$

• The shorter the quantum
  – The higher the overhead price
Given preemptive, can find a better batch

• Claim
  – Let $\text{avgResp}(X)$ be the average response time under algorithm X
  – Assume a single core system, and that all processes arrive together
  – Assume X is a preemptive algorithm with context switch price = 0
  – Then there exists a non-preemptive algorithm Y such that $\text{avgResp}(Y) \leq \text{avgResp}(X)$

• Proof outline
  1. Let $P_k$ be the last preempted process to finish computing

     \[ P_k \quad P_r \quad P_k \quad P_k \]

  2. Compress all of $P_k$’s quanta to the “right” (assume time progresses left to right), such that the last quantum remains where it is and all the rest of the quanta move to the right towards it

     \[ P_r \quad P_r \quad P_r \quad P_k \]

     (Pk’s response time didn’t change, and the response time of the other processes didn’t become longer)

  3. Go to 1 (until no preempted processes are found)
Corollary

• Based on (1) the previous slide and (2) the proof about SJF optimality from a few slides ago
  – SJF is also optimal relative to preemptive schedulers (that meet our assumptions that all processes arrive together)
Connection between RR and SJF

• Claim
  – Assume:
    • 1-core system
    • All processes arrive together (and only use CPU, no I/O)
    • Quantum is identical to all processes
  – Then
    • \( \text{avgResponse}(RR) \leq 2 \times \text{avgResponse}(SJF) \)

• Notation
  – Process \( P_1, P_2, ..., P_N \)
  – \( R_i \) = runtime of \( P_i \)
  – \( W_i \) = wait time of \( P_i \)
  – \( T_i = W_i + R_i \) = response time of \( P_i \)
  – \( \text{delay}(i,k) \) = the delay \( P_i \) caused \( P_k \) under RR
  – \( \text{delay}(i,i) = R_i \)
  – Note that \( T_k = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \text{delay}(i,k) \)
Connection between RR and SJF

• Proof outline
  – For any scheduling algorithm A, $N^*avgResponse(A)$ is always
    
    \[
    = \sum_{k=1}^{N} T_k = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} delay_A(i, j)
    \]
    
    \[
    = \sum_{i=1}^{N} R_i + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} [delay_A(i, j) + delay_A(j, i)]
    \]
  – For $A=\text{SJF}$, we have
    
    \[
    = \sum_{i=1}^{N} R_i + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \min(R_i, R_j)
    \]
    
    (because, given two processes, the shorter delays the longer)
  – And for $A=\text{RR}$, we have
    
    \[
    = \sum_{i=1}^{N} R_i + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} 2 \cdot \min(R_i, R_j)
    \]
    
    (assume $Pi$ is the shorter, then $Pi$ delays $Pj$ by $Ri$, and since it’s a perfect RR, $Pj$ also delays $Pi$ by $Ri$)
SRTF (Shortest-Remaining-Time First)

• Assume different jobs may arrive at different times
• SJF is not optimal
  – As it is not preemptive
  – And a short job might arrive while a very long job is running
• SRTF is just like SJF
  – But is allowed to use preemption,
  – Hence it is optimal (assuming a zero context-switch price)
• Whenever a new job arrives or an old job terminates
  – SRTF schedules the job with the shortest remaining time
  – Thereby making an optimal decision
Selfish RR

• New processes wait in a FIFO queue
  – Not yet scheduled

• Older processes scheduled using RR

• New processes are scheduled when
  1. No ready-to-run “old” processes exist
  2. “Aging” is being applied to new processes (some per-process counter is increased over time); when the counter passes a certain threshold, the “new” process becomes “old” and is transferred to the RR queue

• Fast aging
  – Algorithm resembles RR

• Slow aging
  – Algorithm resembles FCFS
Scheduling using priorities

• Every process is assigned a priority
  – That reflects how “important” it is
  – Can change over time

• Processes with higher priority are favored
  – Scheduled before processes with lower priorities

• For example, in SJF
  – The priority is the runtime (smaller => better)
Negative feedback principle

• All general-purpose OSes (Linux, Windows, ...) embody a negative feedback policy in their scheduler
  – Running reduces priority to run more
  – Not running increases priority to run

• I/O-bound vs. CPU-bound
  – I/O-bound processes (that seldom use the CPU) get higher priority
  – This is why editors are responsive even if they run in the presence of CPU-bound processes like
    ```c
    while(1) {
        sqrt( time() );
    }
    ```

• How about a video with high-frame rate? Or a 3D game?
  – Negative feedback doesn’t help them (they consume lots of CPU)
  – Need other ways to identify/prioritize them (very hard to do securely)
Multi-level priority queue

• Several RR queues
  – Each is associated with a priority
  – Higher-priority queues are at the “top”
  – Lower-priority queues are at the “bottom”

• Processes migrate between queues = have a dynamic priority
  – “Important” processes (e.g., I/O-bound) move up
  – “Unimportant” processes (e.g., CPU-bound) move down

• Variants of multi-level priority queue are used by all general-purpose OSes
  – Priority is greatly affected by how much CPU is consumed by processes
    • I/O bound ↔ move up; CPU-bound ↔ move down
  – Some OSes allocate short quanta to the higher priority queues
  – Some don’t
  – Some do the opposite
Summary can be found in Chapter #6 of:

THE LINUX <= 2.4 SCHEDULER
A COMPREHENSIVE EXAMPLE
The $\leq 2.4$ scheduler maintenance period

from here

O(1)

CFS

until here
Prologue

• **For the reminder of this presentations**
  – All definitions relate to the <=2.4 scheduler...
  – Not necessarily to other schedulers

• **Ignoring...**
  – The description ignores the so called “real time” tasks
    • SCHED_RR, SCHED_FIFO (scheduling policies defined by POSIX)
    • Have different scheduling semantics then those outlines later

• **Focusing...**
  – Instead, we focus on the default scheduling policy
    • SCHED_OTHER
    • (Will never run if there exists a runnable SCHED_RR or SCHED_FIFO task)
Definitions: task

• **Within the Linux kernel**
  – Every process is called a “task”
  – Every thread (to be defined later on) is also called a “task”
Definitions: epoch

• (As mentioned earlier for RR...)
• Every runnable task gets allocated a quantum
  – CPU time the task is allowed to consume before it’s stopped by the OS
• When all quanta of all runnable tasks becomes zero
  – Start a new epoch, namely
  – Allocate an additional running time to all tasks
    • (Runnable or not)
Definitions: priorities

• **Task’s priority**
  – Every task is associated with an integer
  – Higher value indicates higher priority to run
  – Every task has two different kinds of priorities...

• **Task’s static priority component**
  – Doesn’t change with time
  – Unless user invokes the `nice()` system call
  – Determines he max quantum for this task

• **Task’s dynamic priority component**
  – The (i) remaining time for this task to run *and* (ii) its current priority
  – Decreases over time (while the task is assigned a CPU and is running)
  – When reaches zero, OS forces task to yield the CPU
  – Reinitialized at the start of every epoch according to the static component
Definitions: HZ, resolution, and ticks

• **HZ**
  - Linux gets a timer interrupt HZ times a second
  - Namely, it gets an interrupt every 1/HZ second
  - (HZ=100 for x86 / Linux 2.4)

• **Tick**
  - The time the elapses between to consecutive timer interrupts
  - A tick duration is therefore 1/HZ
  - Namely, tick = 10 milliseconds by default

• **Scheduler timing resolution**
  - The OS measures the passage of time by counting ticks
  - The units of the *dynamic* priority component is ‘ticks’
Definitions: per-task scheduling info

• Every task is associated with a task_struct
• Every task_struct has 5 fields used by the scheduler
  1. nice
  2. counter
  3. processor
  4. need_resched
  5. mm
Definitions: task’s nice (kernel vs. user)

• The static component
  – In kernel, initialized to 20 by default
  – Can be changed by nice() and sched_setscheduler()
    • To be any value between 1 ... 40

• User’s nice (parameter to the nice system call)
  – Between -20 ... 19;
  – Smaller value indicates higher priority (<0 requires superuser)

• Kernel’s nice (field in task_struct used by the scheduler)
  – As noted, between 1 ... 40
  – Higher value indicates higher priority (in contrast to user’s nice)

• Conversion
  – Kernel’s nice = 20 - user’s nice
Definitions: task’s counter

- **The dynamic component (time to run in epoch & priority)**
  - Upon task creation
    - `child.counter = parent.counter/2; parent.counter -= child.counter;`
  - Upon a new epoch
    - `task.counter = task.counter/2 + NICE_TO_TICKS(task.nice) = half of dynamic + convert_to_ticks(static)`

- **NICE_TO_TICKS**
  - In 2.4, scales 20 (=DEF_PRIORITY) to number of ticks comprising 50 ms
  - Namely, scale s20 to 5 ticks (recall that each tick is 10 ms by default):
    - `#define NICE_TO_TICKS(nice)  ( (nice)/4 + 1 )`
    - (The +1 is to make sure value is always > 0)

- **Quantum range is therefore**
  - `( 1/4 + 1=) 1 tick = 10 ms (min)`
  - `(20/4 + 1=) 6 ticks = 60 ms (default)`
  - `(40/4 + 1=) 11 ticks = 110 ms (max)`
Definitions: processor, need_resched, mm

• Task’s processor
  – Logical ID of last core upon which task has executed most recently
  – If task is currently running
    • ‘processor’ = logical ID of core upon which the task executes now

• Task’s need_resched
  – Boolean checked by kernel just before switching back to user-mode
  – If set, search for a “better” task than the one currently running
  – If such a task is found, context switch to it
  – Since this flag is checked only for the currently running task
    • Usually easier to think of it a per-core rather than per-task variable

• Task’s mm
  – A pointer to the task’s “memory address space” (more details later on)
Scheduler is comprised of 4 functions

1. **goodness()**
   - Given a task, return how desirable it is
   - Compare tasks by this value to decide which will run next

2. **schedule()**
   - Actual implementation of the scheduling algorithm
   - Uses goodness to decide which task will run next on a given core

3. **__wake_up_common()**
   - Wake up a task when the event it has been waiting for happened
   - Event may be, e.g., completion of I/O

4. **reschedule_idle**
   - Given a task, check whether it can be scheduled on some core
   - Preferably on an idle one, but if there aren't any, by preempting a less desirable task (according to goodness)
   - Used by both **__wake_up_common()** and by **schedule()**
How desirable is a task on a given core?

```c
int goodness(task t, cpu this_cpu) {    // bigger = more desirable
    g = t.counter
    if( g == 0 )
        // exhausted quantum, wait until next epoch
        return 0
    if( t.processor == this_cpu )
        // try to avoid migration between cores
        g += PROC_CHANGE_BONUS
    if( t.mm == this_cpu.current_task.mm )
        // prioritize threads sharing same address space
        // as context-switch would be cheaper
        g += SAME_ADDRESS_SPACE_BONUS
    return g
}
```
Try to schedule task on *some* core

```c
void reschedule_idle(task t) {
    next_cpu = NIL
    if( t.processor is idle ) // t’s most recent core is idle
        next_cpu = t.processor
    else if( there exists an idle cpu ) // some other core is idle
        next_cpu = least recently active idle cpu
    else // no core is idle; is t more desirable
        // than a currently running task?
        threshold = PREEMPTION THRESHOLD
        foreach cpu c in [all cpus] // find c where t is most desirable
            gdiff = goodness(t,c) - goodness( c.current_task,c)
            if( gdiff > threshold )
                threshold = gdiff
                next_cpu = c
    if( next_cpu != NIL ) // found a core for t
        prev_need = next_cpu.current_task.need_resched
        next_cpu.current_task.need_resched = true
        if( (prev_need == false) && (next_cpu != this_cpu) )
            interrupt next_cpu
}
```
Wakeup blocked task(s)

void __wake_up_common(wait_queue q) {
    // blocked tasks residing in q wait for an event that has just happened
    // so try to reschedule all of them...
    foreach task t in [q]
        remove t from q
        add t to ready-to-run list
        reschedule_idle(t)
}
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The heart of the scheduler

```c
void schedule(cpu this_cpu) {
    // called when need_resched of this_cpu is on, when switching from
    // kernel mode back to user mode. need_resched can set by, e.g., the
    // tick handler, or by I/O device drivers that initiate a slow operation
    // (and hence move the associated tasks to a wait_queue)
    prev = this_cpu.current_task

    START:
    if( prev's state is runnable )
        next = prev
        next_g = goodness(prev, this_cpu)
    else
        next_g = -1

    foreach task t in [runnable && not executing]
        // search for ‘next’ = the next task to run on this_cpu
        cur_g = goodness(t, this_cpu)
        if( cur_g > next_g )
            next = t
            next_g = cur_g
}
```
The heart of the scheduler – continued

// ...continue function from previous slide...

if( next_g == -1 ) // no ready tasks
    end function // schedules “idle task” (halts this_cpu)

else if( next_g == 0 ) // all quanta exhausted => start new epoch
    foreach task t
        t.counter = t.counter/2 + NICE_TO_TICKS(t.nice)
        goto START;

else if( next != prev )
    next.processor = this_cpu
    next.need_resched = false // 'next' will run next
    context_switch(prev, next);
    if( prev is still runnable )
        reschedule_idle(prev) // perhaps on another core

    // ‘next’ (which may be equal to ‘prev’) will run next....
Definitions: task’s counter

• Recall that
  – task.counter = task.counter/2 + NICE_TO.Ticks(task.nice)
    = half of dynamic + convert_to_ticks(static)

• Claim
  – The counter value of an I/O-bound task will quickly converge to $2\alpha$
  – (Prove it yourselves)

• Corollary
  – By default, an I/O bound task will have a counter of 12 ticks (=120 ms)
  – (So long as it remains I/O bound that consume negligible CPU time)

• Notice
  – As noted earlier, this is why text editors remain responsive
  – Even in the face of heavy CPU-bound background tasks
  – When awakened upon event (e.g., key press), usually immediately get the CPU
Aftermath

• <=2.4 is in fact a multi-level priority queue
  – Every priority level integer is (logically) a RR queue
  – When counter is decreased => task moves between queues

• Drawback
  – It is linear scheduler...
  – Indeed, the “O(1)” scheduler (successor of <=2.4) is O(1)
  – The CFS scheduler (successor of O(1)) is O(logn)
Price of linearity – motivating the $O(1)$

- duration of schedule() [cycles]
- number of runnable tasks in the system

CPU 1 of 4
CPU 2 of 4