Exercise 1.7 (page 11)

- For the static list accessing problem with I items,
- Instead of using a bound on the average (over all initial configurations) static optimal to derive 2l/(l+1) lower bound, show that we can use the frequency count of items in the request sequence.

Solution

- List size = /
- Size if request sequence $|\sigma| = n$
- Online algorithm
 - Adversary always asks for the last element in the list.

- So, the cost for online alg = In

- Offline algorithm looks at the request sequence, and rearranges the list according to the frequency count of items in the request sequence.
- Cost for arranging the list according to FC is less than $\frac{l^2}{2}$

Solution

- Cost for offline (FC based) algorithm
- Let the access probabilities of each of the elements be p₁ ≥ p₂ ≥ ≥ p_l ≥ 0
 ∑_{i=1}^l p_i = 1, then ∑_{i=1}^l i.p_i ≤ l+1/2, and if ∀i, p_i = 1/l, the summation would be 1.
- Let f_i be the frequency of item i's access, $f_1 \ge f_2 \ge ... \ge f_i$, $f_i = np_i$
- Cost of the offline algorithm = $\frac{l^2}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^{l} i * f_i$

$$=\frac{l^2}{2}+n\left(\sum_{i=1}^l i.p_i\right) \leq \frac{l^2}{2}+n\frac{l+1}{2}$$

solution



• =
$$\frac{2nl}{l^2 + nl\left(\frac{l+1}{l}\right)} = \frac{2nl^2}{l^3 + nl^*(l+1)}$$

• As n grows beyond *I*,

$$CR = \frac{2l}{l+1}$$

Exercise 3.5 (page 38) Prove that FWF is a marking algorithm

Marking algorithm

- Divide request sequence 'σ' into 'K' phases.
 - Each phase contains K distinct page requests.
 - Result: K-phase partition.
- A marking algorithm never evicts a marked page from its fast memory.
 - During each phase (with k distinct page requests), there are at most K page faults.

FWF (Flush When Full)

- When the fast memory is full, a request for a page not in fast memory causes the cache to be cleared.
- Inherent marking (Marking not explicitly maintained).
 - Can be seen as
 - Pages being marked as soon as they are brought into the cache
 - Once cache is full, all pages are unmarked.
 - All unmarked pages are evicted (flush), when the k+1th distinct page request arrives.

Proof

- If FWF is not a marking ALG
- FWF evicts a *'marked'* page *'x'* during some k-phase.
- When 'x' was first requested, it will be brought into the cache and 'marked'.
- Similarly during the same *k-phase*, k-1 other distinct pages are brought into the cache and marked.
- For 'x' to be evicted, there needs to be a new (k+1th) distinct request.
 - During the same k-phase, there can be a maximum of k distinct requests.
 - Contradiction!
- Therefore, FWF is a marking algorithm

Example

- K = 3
- *σ* = a,e,a,g,h,f,a,h,b,g,h,a,k,a,b
- Start of each phase, cache is empty
- Phase marking



- So during each k-phase, there are at most k page faults, and none of the *'marked'* pages are flushed.
- Therefore, FWF is a marking algorithm.

Exercise 3.8 (page 39)

- Prove that LRU, FIFO and CLOCK are conservative algorithms.
- A conservative algorithm, "on any consecutive input subsequence containing k or fewer distinct page references, will incur k or fewer page faults".

Input sequence

- Consider k=3
- $\sigma = g,h,a,b,b,c,a,c,e,h$
- Blue → subsequence with k (=3) or fewer distinct page references.
- Need to show that there are at most 3 page faults for the subsequence.
- Assume initial cache configuration



Observation

- After the subsequence (in blue) starts, before caching all k pages, if there are k or fewer page faults, then condition for conservative ALG holds good
 - Once cached, k pages are not evicted unless the subsequence ends (i.e. the k+1th distinct request is made).

LRU

 σ = g,h,a,b,b,c,a,c,e,h



Number of page faults to handle the subsequence = 3 = k.

Therefore, LRU is a conservative algorithm

FIFO

counter = order in which item was brought in

 σ = g,h,a,b,b,c,a,c,e,h



Number of page faults to handle the subsequence = 3 = k. Therefore, FIFO is a conservative algorithm

CLOCK

