

scheduling policies

- pre-emptive vs. non-pre-emptive
work conserving vs non-work conserving
real time vs. interactive vs compute centric

} categorization
of schedulers.

- metrics

- response time (user-level metric)

- dist. of cpu util
= cpu util.



|| fairness

- wait time / queuing delays

proportionate
behaviours.

- throughput / size of run queues

~ scheduler behav.

sample policies.

- FIFO / FCFS ~ work-conserving. non-deterministic | wait times.
worst-case large

- RR - round robin

time quantum / slot
??

pick processes for every
slot in a
round robin manner.

t ~ very fair / low WT, efficiency?

t >> 0 ~ start looking like FIFO

- WRR || proportionate scheduling. time quantum is
associated with a
priority / weight.
- DRR
- weighted RR

- deficit RR — collect time units in a slot if
not ~~util~~ utilized (deficit \leq max)

- Lottery scheduling.

RT
interactive

- work scheduling.
 - priority scheduling.
 - interactive
 - foreground
 - background.
- multi-queue priorities
- schedule processes in higher priority before others.
 - starvation.

① yesterday linux

- used multi-queue priorities
- assigned time intervals per process
- (shifted) processes to higher priorities based on wait times.

linux processes

- priority
- nice

② CFS — completely fair scheduler

- priority, nice (inputs).

'N' processes, assign $\frac{1}{N}$ of cpu to each.

SCHED_NORMAL

SCHED_FIFO

SCHED_RR

RT

scheduling class

own scheduling policy

① $\frac{\text{est. vruntime}}{\text{if ~~scheduled~~ process}} \sim \frac{\text{normalized runtime}}{\text{if each process on cpu.}}$

② schedule process w/ lowest vruntime