

sh (4)	sh (5)
 capable of both synchronous and asynchronous execution synchronous: wait for completion asychronous: in parallel with shell (runs in the background) allows control of stdin, stdout, stderr enables environment setting for processes (using inheritance between processes) sets default directory 	 creating your own shell scripts naming: DON'T ever name your script (or any executable file) "test" since that's a sh command executing the notation #! inside your file tells UNIX which shell should execute the commands in your file example — create a file called "myscript.sh" #!/bin/sh echo hello world make the script executable: unix-prompt# chmod +x myscript.sh execute the script: unix-prompt# ./myscript.sh or just unix-prompt# myscript.sh
cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix 5	cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix 6
 sh (6) — quoting quote (') 'something': preserve everything literally and don't evaluate anything that is inside the quotes 	<pre>sh (7) — quoting example • filename=t.sh #!/bin/sh hello=*hi* echo 0=\$hello echo 1='\$hello'</pre>
 double quote (") "something": preserve most things literally, but also allow \$ variable expansion (but not ' evaluation) backquote (`) 'something': try to execute something as a command 	<pre>echo 1= "shello" echo 3= "shello" echo 4= "shello" echo 5= "shello" echo 5= "shello" echo s= "ishello" filename=hi #!/bin/sh echo "how did you get in here?" • output= unix\$ t.sh 0=hi 1=\$hello 2=hi 3=how did you get in here? 4=how did you get in here? 5='hi'</pre>
cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix 7	cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix 8

cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix





sh (16) — if	sh (17) — case	
• syntax	• example:	
<pre>if test-commands; then</pre>	<pre>case test-var in value1) consequent-commands;; value2) consequent-commands;; *) default-commands; esac</pre>	
fi	• pattern matching:	
<pre>• colon (:) is a null command • example #!/bin/sh if expr \$TERM = "xterm"; then echo "hello xterm"; else echo "something else"; fi</pre>	 -?) matches a string with exactly one character -?*) matches a string with one or more characters [yY] [yY][eE][sS]) matches y, Y, yes, YES, yES -/*/*[0-9]) matches filename with wildcards like /xxx/yyy/zzz3 notice two semi-colons at the end of each clause stops after first match with a value you don't need double quotes to match string values! 	
cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix 17	cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix 18	
<pre>sh(18) — case example #!/bin/sh case "\$TERM" in xterm) echo "hello xterm";; vt100) echo "hello vt100";; *) echo "something else";; esac</pre>	sh (19) — expansion • biggest difference from traditional programming languages • shell substitutes and executes • order: - brace expansion - tilde expansion - parameter and variable expansion - command substitution - arithmetic expansion - word splitting - filename expansion	





cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix







-2157		0.6 -1-1	
S S I S /.	corno /i	112266130	-11D1X
	opring 20	705 Sicili	

make tutorial (10)

- Now let's talk about *dependencies*, which is one of the really nifty things about make. A dependency is something that tells make whether or not it needs to execute the rules associated with a target. Dependencies are listed on the same line as a target, after the colon (:) which follows the name of the target. Multiple dependencies are separated by spaces.
- In the figure below, our makefile includes dependencies for all three targets.



41

- For the first target (a.out), the dependency listed is lab1.c.
- When make executes to build this target, it compares the "last modified" date of the target file (if it exists) with the last modified date of its dependency. If the dependency is *newer* than its target, then the target's rule is executed. If a file bearing the same name as the target doesn't exist, then the target's rule is executed as well. The same goes for the second target. If the file lab1 exists and it is older than its dependency, lab1.c, or if lab1 doesn't exist, then the target's rule is executed.
- For the third target (hw1), there are two dependencies: hw1.c and inv.c. If either one of these files is newer than hw1, or if hw1 doesn't exist, then the target's three rules are all executed.
- Adding dependencies doesn't change the way the makefile is executed. You would still type make a.out or make lablor make hwl to build each of the three targets.

cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix

42

make tutorial (11)

- Now, let's examine this third target a little more closely. To be more precise, the target itself, hw1, actually depends directly on hw1.0 and inv.0, not the C source files.
- In addition, if you edit hw1.c but not inv.c since the last time you built the target, then you really only need to recompile hw1.c, not both hw1.c and inv.c.
- So let's split this up into its three constituent rules, as illustrated in the figure below.



- Doing this adds two targets to the makefile. This means that in addition to being able to type make a.out or make labl or make hwl to build each of the three original targets, you could also build either of the two "intermediate" targets by typing make hwl.o or make inv.o.
- These are referred to as "intermediate" because building these two targets only results in updated object code, not executable programs.

cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix

make tutorial (12)

- You probably noticed in the figure on the previous page that the rules for the last two targets are very similar. Indeed, they are identical except for the file names. This is where *default rules* come in handy.
- In the figure below, the *rule* portions of the last two targets are removed and replaced by the single *default rule* at the top of the file.



- The default rule has two parts to it:
 - 1. The SUFFIXES define which file extensions have default targets associated with them.
 - 2. The *default target* is listed with its associated *default rule*. In this example, the default target gives a default rule for building any . o file out of a . c file.
- The default rule uses another special variable: \$*. This variable stands for the *filename* portion of the dependency that invoked the rule. In other words, if hw1.c invoked the rule (because it was newer than its target hw1.0), then the special variable \$* would take on the value hw1. Similarly, if inv.c invoked the rule (because it was newer than its target inv.o), then the special variable \$* would take on the value inv.
- Note that these changes do not affect the way the makefile is executed. Default targets cannot be built directly by specifying them on the command line, so we still have 5 targets that can be built with this makefile; and each of these targets is specified in the same way as in the figure on make tutorial page (11).

cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix

make tutorial (13)

- Another feature of make is the ability to user-defined constants.
- The example shown in the figure below illustrates the use of three user-defined constants:
 - CC (which stands for the C Compiler)
 - LINK (which stands for the Linker)
 - CCFLAGS (which contains the flags to be used when the C Compiler is invoked)
- Note that the C Compiler and the Linker are actually the same program (gcc), but defining them separately provides the flexibility to use different programs for each if we wanted to do so.



45





software engineering: what is it? software engineering: why? • Stephen Schach: "Software engineering is a discipline whose aim is the production of • in school, you learn the mechanics of programming fault-free software, delivered on time and within budget, that satisfies the user's needs." • you are given the specifications • includes: • you know that it is possible to write the specified program in the time allotted - requirements analysis • but not so in the real world ... - human factors - what if the specifications are not possible? - functional specification - what if the time frame is not realistic? - software architecture - what if you had to write a program that would last for 10 years? - design methods • in the real world: - programming for reliability - software is usually late, overbudget and broken - programming for maintainability - software usually lasts longer than employees or hardware - team programming methods • the real world is cruel and software is fundamentally brittle - testing methods - configuration management 57 cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix 58 software engineering: who? software engineering: time. • the average manager has no idea how software needs to be implemented • you never have enough time • the average customer says: "build me a system to do X" • software is often underbudgeted • the average layperson thinks software can do anything (or nothing) • the marketing department always wants it tomorrow • most software ends up being used in very different ways than how it was designed to be • even though they don't know how long it will take to write it and test it used • "Why can't you add feature X? It seems so simple ... " • "I thought it would take a week ..." • "We've got to get it out next week. Hire 5 more programmers..."



examples: therac-25 (2). examples: therac-25 (3). • BUT • main cause: • in case of software error, cryptic codes were displayed to the operator, such as: • a race condition often happened when operators entered data quickly, then hit the "MALFUNCTION xx" up-arrow key to correct the data and the values were not reset properly where 1 < xx < 64• the manufacturing company never tested quick data entry - their testers weren't that • operators became insensitive to these cryptic codes fast since they didn't do data entry on a daily basis · they thought it was impossible to overdose a patient • apparently the problem had existed on earlier models, but a hardware interlock mechanism prevented the software race condition from occurring • however, from 1985-1987, six patients received massive overdoses of radiation and several died • in this version, they took out the hardware interlock mechanism because they trusted the software cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix 65 cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix 66 examples: ariane 501 (1). examples: ariane 501 (2). • next-generation launch vehicle, after ariane 4 • perfect launch · presigious project for ESA • ariane 501 flies much faster than ariane 4 • maiden flight: june 4, 1996 • horizontal velocity component goes out of bounds • inertial reference system (IRS), written in ada • IRS in both main and redundant systems go into diagnostic mode - computed position, velocity, acceleration • control system receives diagnotic data but interprets it as wierd position data - dual redundancy • attempts to correct it ... - calibrated on launch pad • ka-boom! - relibration routine runs after launch (active but not used) • failure at altitude of 2.5 miles • one step in recalibration converted floating point value of horizontal velocity to integer • 25 tons of hydrogen, 130 tons of liquid oxygen, 500 tons of solid propellant • ada automatically throws out of bounds exception if data conversion is out of bounds • if exception isn't handled... IRS returns diagnostic data instead of position, velocity, acceleration

examples: ariane 501 (3). the mythical man-month. • expensive failure: • Fred Brooks (1975) • book written after his experiences in the OS/360 design - ten years - \$7 billion • major themes: · horizontal velocity conversion was deliberately left unchecked - Brooks' Law: "Adding manpower to a late software project makes it later." - the "black hole" of large project design: getting stuck and getting out • who is to blame? - organizing large team projects and communication • "mistakes were made" – documentation!!! • software had never been tested with actual flight parameters - when to keep code; when to throw code away • problem was easily reproduced in simulation, after the fact - dealing with limited machine resources • most are supplemented with practical experience cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix 70 cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix 69 no silver bullet. mechanics. • paper written in 1986 (Brooks) • well-established techniques and methodologies: • "There is no single development, in either technology or management technique, which - team structures by itself promises even one order-of magnitude improvement within a decade of - software lifecycle / waterfall model productivity, in reliability, in simplicity." - cost and complexity planning / estimation • why? software is inherently complex - reusability, portability, interoperability, scalability • lots of people disagree(d), but there is no proof of a counter-argument - UML, design patterns • Brooks' point: there is no revolution, but there is evolution when it comes to software development

 team structures. why Brooks' Law? training time increased communications: pairs grow by n² while people/work grows by n how to divide software? this is not task sharing types of teams democratic "chief programmer" synchronize-and-stabilize teams eXtreme Programming teams 	lifecycles. • software is not a build-one-and-throw-away process • that's far too expensive • so software has a <i>lifecycle</i> • we need to implement a <i>process</i> so that software is maintained correctly • examples: - build-and-fix - waterfall
cs3157-spring2005-sktar-unix 73 software lifecycle model.	cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix 74
 7 basic phases (Schach): requirements (2%) specification/analysis (5%) design (6%) implementation (module coding and testing) (12%) integration (8%) maintenance (67%) retirement percentages in ()'s are average cost of each task during 1976-1981 testing and documention should occur throughout each phase note which is the most expensive! 	 what are we doing, and why? need to determine what the client needs, not what the client <i>wants</i> or <i>thinks</i> they need worse — requirements are a moving target! common ways of building requirements include: prototyping natural-language requirements document use interviews to get information (not easy!) example: your online store



cs3157-spring2005-sklar-unix

