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OS scheduler

- OS scheduler schedules process on CPU cores
  - One process at a time per CPU core
  - Processes and kernel-level threads are scheduled similarly

- **Scheduling policy**: which one of the ready/runnable processes should be run next on a given CPU core?
  - Mechanism of context switching (save context of old process in its kernel stack/PCB and restore context of new process) is independent of policy

- Simple scheduling policies have good theoretical guarantees, but not practical for real operating systems
  - Real-life schedulers are very complex, involve many heuristics
Preemptive vs. non-preemptive schedulers

- When is the OS scheduler invoked to trigger a context switch?
  - Only when a process is in kernel mode for a trap

- Non-preemptive scheduler performs only voluntary context switches
  - Process makes blocking system call
  - Process has exited or has been terminated

- Preemptive scheduler performs involuntary context switches also
  - Process can be context switched out even if process is still runnable/ready
  - OS can ensure that no process runs for too long on CPU, starving others

- Timer interrupts: special interrupts that go off periodically to trap to OS
  - Used by OS to get back control, trigger involuntary context switches

- Modern systems use preemptive schedulers
  - Process can be context switched out any time in its execution
Goals of CPU scheduling policy

• Maximize **utilization**: efficient use of CPU hardware
• Minimize **completion time** of a process (time from process creation to completion)
• Minimize **response time** of a process (time from process creation to first time it is run)
  • Important for interactive processes
• **Fairness**: all processes get a fair share of CPU
  • Can account for priorities also
• Low **overhead** of scheduling policy
  • Scheduler does not take too long to make a decision (even with large #processes)
  • Scheduler does not cause too many context switches (~1 microsecond to switch)
Simplest policy: First In First Out

- Newly created processes are put in a **FIFO queue**, scheduler runs them one after another from queue
- **Non-preemptive**: process allowed to run till it terminates or blocks
  - When process unblocks, the next run is separate “job”, added to queue again
- Problem: short processes can get stuck behind big processes
  - Response time of interactive processes may be poor
- Example schedule: P1 (1-5), P2 (6-8), P3 (9 to 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>CPU time needed (units)</th>
<th>Arrives at end of time unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shortest Job First (SJF)

- Assume **CPU burst** of a process (amount of time a process runs on CPU until termination/blocking) is known
- Pick process with **smallest CPU burst** to run next, non-preemptive
  - Store processes in a heap-like data structure, extract process with min CPU burst
- Provably optimal average completion time when all processes arrive at the same time
  - But short processes that arrive late can still get stuck behind long ones
- Example schedule: P1 (1-5), P3 (6-7), P2 (8-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>CPU burst</th>
<th>Arrival time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shortest Remaining Time First (SRTF)

- Preemptive version of SJF
- A newly arrived process can preempt a running process, if CPU burst of new process is shorter than remaining time of running process
  - Avoids problem of short process getting stuck behind long one
- Example schedule: P1 runs for 1 unit, P2 (2-4), P3 (5-6), P1 (7-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>CPU burst</th>
<th>Arrival time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Round Robin (RR) / Weighted Fair Queueing (WFQ)

- Processes are run one after the other for a **time slice** each, fairly sharing CPU
- Can also assign different **weights** or **priorities** to processes (can be set by users)
  - Time slice will be in proportion to the weight or priority
- **Preemptive policy**: timer interrupt allows enforcing context switch after time slice
- Good for fairness and response time
  - Time slice should not be too big, for good responsiveness
- Real life schedulers may not be able to enforce time slice **exactly**
  - What if timer interrupt is not exactly aligned with time slice?
  - What if process blocks before its time slice?
- Practical modification: keep track of run time of process, schedule process that has used least fraction of its fair share
  - Compensate excess/deficit running time in future time slices
- **Linux scheduler** is a variant of weighted fair queueing
Multi-level feedback queue (MLFQ)

- Multiple queues, one for each priority level
  - Schedule processes from highest priority queue to lowest
  - Use round robin scheduling for processes within same priority level
- Priority set by user or OS, but decays with age
  - Job that uses up its time slice at a priority level goes to lower priority level
  - Why? Ensures short I/O-bound processes that don’t use their full slice get priority over long CPU-bound processes that use their fair share all the time
- Periodically reset all processes to highest priority level to avoid starvation of low priority or CPU-bound processes
Multicore scheduling

- Scheduling decision needs to be made separately for each CPU core.
- Do we bind a process to a particular CPU core always, or do we let a process run on any CPU core that is free?
  - Is the queue of ready processes common to all cores, or maintained per core?
- Ensuring a process runs on the same core as far as possible is better
  - Cache locality: process-related memory is likely to be in CPU caches of the core.
  - In NUMA systems, better to run process on core that is close to the RAM region that has process memory.
  - Per-core queue of ready processes avoids synchronization across cores.
- But, we must be flexible too
  - If CPU core overloaded, some of its processes must move to another core.
  - Load balancing across cores to ensure uniform workload distribution.
Summary

- In this lecture:
  - Scheduling policy: goals ✓
  - Example policies: FIFO, SJF, SRTF, RR, WFQ, MLFQ ✓
  - Considerations for multicore systems ✓

- Think of examples of scheduling policies in real life systems. Do you see queues in daily life? What kind of scheduling policies do they use?