TO:

Multics Performance Log

FROM:

A. Sekino

SUBJECT:

Result of Daily Multics Performance Measurements

(Period: August 19 to September 1)

Comparison of 3.8 and 3.1.1 System Performance

DATE:

September 4, 1969

Though the daily measurement of Multics was interrupted on account of the one-week PDP-8 troubleshooting encountered in the above period, several runs were made recently. In this note the result of those runs and the observations about it will be described.

Because the new "edm" command is installed, the standard script MFTN3, which is used in the daily measurements, was modified to match the new "edm" conventions. Actually "s" was replaced by "w" and "q" with zero think time between them, considering "w" "q" as one sub-command. Therefore, neither the total think time involved in the script nor the total number of interactions have been changed; so that the coming measurement results can be directly compared with the former results.

1. Summary of the measurements

time unit: second average: per interaction

Date	Run #	# of users	system	Total CPU time	Total # of P. F.	Total real time	Average CPU time	Average # of P. F.
8/19	MPM25	18	3.4					
8/27	мрм26	17	3.7	63,097	3785	3210	.956	57
8/28	мрм27	17	3.8	73.907	3834	34 5 0	1.119	58
8/29	мрм28	17	3.8	67.540	3526	2610	1.023	53
8/29	мрм29	7	3.8	59.323	2964	2430	.898	44
8/30	мрм30	6	3.8	57.154	2825	2370	.865	42
8/30	мрм31	5	3.8	50.974	2184	2310	.772	33
9/1	мрм32	8	3.8	51.411	2280	2250	.778	34

Notes: 1. Only the first half of the script was run in MPM25.

2. Many drum errors (about 100 non-fatal errors/hour) occurred in MPM26 and MPM27. Accordingly, the total real time was father long in each case.

- 3. The execution time of "fortran" was very long in MPM27, making the total CPU time very long. The CPU time spent by "fortran" was 16.4 seconds.
- 2. The current system performance relative to 3.1.1

The performance of the current system summarized on the previous page was compared in detail with that of 3.1.1 in two cases, namely in a heavy load case and a light load case. The results appear on the following pages.

A comparison of the system performance (CPU time) in a heavy load case (Table 1 and 2) shows an interesting result. Some observations about it are given below.

1. Generally speaking, CPU time spent by each command of the script on the current system became shorter than before. The performance ratio is

Average total CPU time on
$$3.7-3.8$$
Average total CPU time on $3.1.1$

$$= \frac{68.2}{72.2} = 0.945$$

Therefore, about $\underline{5\%}$ improvement in CPU time is observed.

- 2. The "login" command runs much faster than before.
- 3. The "edm" command runs much faster than before. Four runs of "edm" in the script gained 4.1 seconds.
- 4. The "fortran" command requires much longer CPU time than before at the <u>first time</u> it is issued. Further usage of "fortran" required rather shorter CPU time.

On the other hand, a comparison of the system performance in a light load case (Table 3 and 4) shows that the current system performance in a light load situation is much worse than before. However, the result seems to be rather inaccurate because the performance of the <u>few</u> user system strongly depends on what and how those few users are computing.

Table 1

3.1.1 System Performance

** Heavy Load Case ***

	CPU time spo	not by each	command (sea	ond)
Run # Date # of users system#	MPM 13 7/29 17 3:1:1	MPM15 7/31 17 3.1.1	MPM 16 8/1 17 3.1.1	Average 17 3.1.1
login	10.1	10.2	10.2	10,2
edm fortran fortran rename print "execution" List setacl remove edm fortran rename print "execution" List setacl "execution" List setacl	7846113231564611201323	70362132227536112144	7046213321763611211	794611322166361122111
Total	68.1	72.6	75.9	72.2

Table 2
Current System Performance
*** Heavy Load Case ***

	•	4		•			
	CPU	time spe	nt by each	command	(se	cond)	
Run # Date # of users system#		MPM26 8/27 17 3,7	MPM27 8/28 17 3.8	MPM28 8/29 17 3.8		Average 17 3.7~3.8	Comparison of this and 3.1.1
login		6.0	6.6	6.3		6.3	-3,9
edm fortran edm fortran rename print "execution" List setacl remove edm fortran edm fortran rename print "execution" List setacl emove		52355601033-15019800-0	66351132215537112111	22367361441033113241		6335113221458718103130	-+
Total		63, 1	73,9	67.5		68.2	-4.0

Table 3
3.1.1 System Performance
*** Light Load Case ***

		20000	•	
CPU	time spent	ey each c	ommand (seco	nd)
Run #	MPM12	MPM17	MPMIO	Average
Date	7/29	8/2	7/27	()7
# of users system#	4 3,1,1	7 3.1.1	9	6.7
390011171	2////	21111	3.1.1	3.1.1
login	6.9	7.9	8.7	7.8
edm	2,6	5,3	5.4	4,4
fortran	6.0	7.1	9.0	7.4
redm	1.4	2.7	3.4	2.5
fortran rename	1,2	1,3	1,4	1,3
print	.6	1.0		1,9
"execution"	2.0	2,8	3,1	2.6
List	1,3	1.6	2,6	1.6
setacl	1.5	1 ,8	2,4	1.9
remove	.8	1.1	3 , 6	1 2
edm	1.4 3.7	3.7 4.4	4,6	2.9
fortran edm	1,9	2.4	2.1	2,1
fortran	3,5	4.1	4.3	4.0
rename	.7	, 9	1.1	19
print	•4	, 8		8
"execution"	1,2	1,7	2.0	1.6
List	, 7	1.0	, 9	, 9
setacl remove	, 9	1.0	1,0	1.0
TEMOVE	,	1 1 -	1 1	
Total	36,0	49.7	56,4	47.4

Table 4

Current System Performance

*** Light Load Case ***

	,	0				
	CPU comm	and spen	t by ea	ch command	(second)
Run # Date # of users system#	MPM31 8/30 5 3.8	MPM30 8/30 6 3.8	MPM 29 8/29 7 3,8	MPM32 9/1 8 3.8	Average 6.5 3.8	Comparison of this and 3.1.1
login	4.6	5.0	4.8	4.6	4.8	- 3,0
edm fortran fortran rename print "execution" List setacl remove edm fortran rename print "execution" List setacl memove	3824-7885024396089-158	60341130459254167917	28-55807645568293331	5724-3-2-3424-8092-	849569-83333695-70-39 4924-3-2-3424-21-5	40433 524 144852 1424 1
Total	51,0	57,2	59,3	51.4	54.7	+ 7,3