Interactive Scheduling
Two Level Scheduling

• Interactive systems commonly employ two-level scheduling
  – CPU scheduler and Memory Scheduler
    • Memory scheduler was covered in VM
  – We will focus on CPU scheduling
Round Robin Scheduling

- Each process is given a \textit{timeslice} to run in
- When the timeslice expires, the next process preempts the current process, and runs for its timeslice, and so on
  - The preempted process is placed at the end of the queue
- Implemented with
  - A ready queue
  - A regular timer interrupt
Our Earlier Example

- 5 Process
  - Process 1 arrives slightly before process 2, etc…
  - All are immediately runnable
  - Execution times indicated by scale on x-axis
Round Robin Schedule

Timeslice = 1 unit
Round Robin Schedule

Timeslice = 3 units
Round Robin

• Pros
  – Fair, easy to implement

• Con
  – Assumes everybody is equal

• Issue: What should the timeslice be?
  – Too short
    • Waste a lot of time switching between processes
    • Example: timeslice of 4ms with 1 ms context switch = 20% round robin overhead
  – Too long
    • System is not responsive
    • Example: timeslice of 100ms
      – If 10 people hit “enter” key simultaneously, the last guy to run will only see progress after 1 second.
    • Degenerates into FCFS if timeslice longer than burst length
Priorities

• Each Process (or thread) is associated with a priority
• Provides basic mechanism to influence a scheduler decision:
  – Scheduler will always chooses a thread of higher priority over lower priority
• Priorities can be defined internally or externally
  – Internal: e.g. I/O bound or CPU bound
  – External: e.g. based on importance to the user
Example

- 5 Jobs
  - Job number equals priority
  - Priority 1 > priority 5
  - Release and execution times as shown

- Priority-driven preemptively scheduled
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Priorities

- Usually implemented by multiple priority queues, with round robin on each queue
- Con
  - Low priorities can starve
    - Need to adapt priorities periodically
      - Based on ageing or execution history
Traditional UNIX Scheduler

- **Two-level scheduler**
  - High-level scheduler schedules processes between memory and disk
  - Low-level scheduler is CPU scheduler
- Based on a multi-level queue structure with round robin at each level
Traditional UNIX Scheduler

- The highest priority (lower number) is scheduled
- Priorities are re-calculated once per second, and re-inserted in appropriate queue
  - Avoid starvation of low priority threads
  - Penalise CPU-bound threads
Traditional UNIX Scheduler

- **Priority** = \( CPU_{usage} + nice + base \)
  - \( CPU_{usage} \) = number of clock ticks
    - Decays over time to avoid permanently penalising the process
  - \( Nice \) is a value given to the process by a user to permanently boost or reduce its priority
    - Reduce priority of background jobs
  - \( Base \) is a set of hardwired, negative values used to boost priority of I/O bound system activities
    - Swapper, disk I/O, Character I/O
Some Issues with Priorities

• Require adaption over time to avoid starvation (not considering hard real-time which relies on strict priorities).
• Adaption is:
  – usually ad-hoc,
    • hence behaviour not thoroughly understood, and unpredictable
  – Gradual, hence unresponsive
• Difficult to guarantee a desired share of the CPU
• No way for applications to trade CPU time
Lottery Scheduling

• Each process is issued with “lottery tickets” which represent the right to use/consume a resource
  – Example: CPU time

• Access to a resource is via “drawing” a lottery winner.
  – The more tickets a process possesses, the higher chance the process has of winning.
Lottery Scheduling

• Advantages
  – Simple to implement
  – Highly responsive
    • can reallocate tickets held for immediate effect
  – Tickets can be traded to implement individual scheduling policy between co-operating threads
  – Starvation free
    • A process holding a ticket will eventually be scheduled.
Example Lottery Scheduling

• Four process running concurrently
  – Process A: 15% CPU
  – Process B: 25% CPU
  – Process C: 5% CPU
  – Process D: 55% CPU

• How many tickets should be issued to each?
Lottery Scheduling Performance

Observed performance of two processes with varying ratios of tickets

Figure 4: Relative Rate Accuracy. For each allocated ratio, the observed ratio is plotted for each of three 60 second runs. The gray line indicates the ideal where the two ratios are identical.
Figure 5: **Fairness Over Time.** Two tasks executing the Dhrystone benchmark with a 2:1 ticket allocation. Averaged over the entire run, the two tasks executed 25378 and 12619 iterations/sec., for an actual ratio of 2.01:1.
Fair-Share Scheduling

- So far we have treated processes as individuals
- Assume two users
  - One user has 1 process
  - Second user has 9 processes
- The second user gets 90% of the CPU
- Some schedulers consider the owner of the process in determining which process to schedule
  - E.g., for the above example we could schedule the first user’s process 9 times more often than the second user’s processes
- Many possibilities exist to determine a fair schedule
  - E.g. Appropriate allocation of tickets in lottery scheduler