Review: A Concurrent Program Example

- Two threads, A and B, compete with each other
  - One tries to increment a shared counter
  - The other tries to decrement the counter

```
Thread A               Thread B
i = 0;                i = 0;
while (i < 10)        while (i > -10)
i = i + 1;            i = i - 1;
printf("A wins!");  printf("B wins!");
```

- Assume that memory loads and stores are atomic, but incrementing and decrementing are not atomic
- Who wins? Could be either
- Is it guaranteed that someone wins? Why or why not?
- What if both threads have their own CPU running at same speed? Is it guaranteed that it goes on forever?

Review: Hand Simulating Multiprocessor Example

- Inner loop looks like this:

```
Thread A     Thread B
r1=0 load r1, M[i] r1=0 load r1, M[i]
r1=1 add r1, r1, 1 r1=-1 sub r1, r1, 1
M[i]=1 store r1, M[i] M[i]=-1 store r1, M[i]
```

- Hand Simulation:
  - And we're off. A gets off to an early start
  - B says "hmph, better go fast" and tries really hard
  - A goes ahead and writes "1"
  - B goes and writes "-1"
  - A says "HUH?? I could have sworn I put a 1 there"

Review: Too Much Milk Solution #3

- Here is a possible two-note solution:

```
Thread A     Thread B
leave note A; leave note B;
while (note B) {
  if (noNote A) {
    do nothing;
  }
  if (noMilk) {
    buy milk;
  }
  remove note A;
}
```

- Does this work? Yes. Both can guarantee that:
  - It is safe to buy, or
  - Other will buy, ok to quit
- At A:
  - if no note B, safe for A to buy,
  - otherwise wait to find out what will happen
- At B:
  - if no note A, safe for B to buy
  - Otherwise, A is either buying or waiting for B to quit
Goals for Today

• Hardware Support for Synchronization
• Higher-level Synchronization Abstractions
  - Semaphores, monitors, and condition variables
• Programming paradigms for concurrent programs

High-Level Picture

• The abstraction of threads is good:
  - Maintains sequential execution model
  - Allows simple parallelism to overlap I/O and computation
• Unfortunately, still too complicated to access state shared between threads
  - Consider “too much milk” example
  - Implementing a concurrent program with only loads and stores would be tricky and error-prone
• Today, we’ll implement higher-level operations on top of atomic operations provided by hardware
  - Develop a “synchronization toolbox”
  - Explore some common programming paradigms

Where are we going with synchronization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Shared Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-level API</td>
<td>Locks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Load/Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disable Ints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test&amp;Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comp&amp;Swap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• We are going to implement various higher-level synchronization primitives using atomic operations
  - Everything is pretty painful if only atomic primitives are load and store
  - Need to provide primitives useful at user-level

How to implement Locks?

• Lock: prevents someone from doing something
  - Lock before entering critical section and before accessing shared data
  - Unlock when leaving, after accessing shared data
  - Wait if locked
    » Important idea: all synchronization involves waiting
• Atomic Load/Store: get solution like Milk #3
  - Looked at this last lecture
  - Pretty complex and error prone
• Hardware Lock instruction
  - Is this a good idea?
  - Complexity?
    » Done in the Intel 432.
    » Each feature makes hardware more complex and slow
  - What about putting task to sleep?
    » How do you handle the interface between the hardware and scheduler?
Naïve use of Interrupt Enable/Disable

- How can we build multi-instruction atomic operations?
  - Recall: dispatcher gets control in two ways.
    - Internal: Thread does something to relinquish the CPU
    - External: Interrupts cause dispatcher to take CPU
- On a uniprocessor, can avoid context-switching by:
  - Avoiding internal events (although virtual memory tricky)
  - Preventing external events by disabling interrupts

- Consequently, naïve Implementation of locks:
  - LockAcquire { disable Ints; }
  - LockRelease { enable Ints; }

- Problems with this approach:
  - Can’t let user do this! Consider following:
    - LockAcquire();
    - While(TRUE) {};
  - Real-Time system—no guarantees on timing!
    - Critical Sections might be arbitrarily long
  - What happens with I/O or other important events?
    - “Reactor about to meltdown. Help?”

Better Implementation of Locks by Disabling Interrupts

- Key idea: maintain a lock variable and impose mutual exclusion only during operations on that variable

```c
int value = FREE;

Acquire() {
    disable interrupts;
    if (value == BUSY) {
        put thread on wait queue;
        Go to sleep();
        // Enable interrupts?
    } else {
        value = BUSY;
    }
    enable interrupts;
}

Release() {
    disable interrupts;
    if (anyone on wait queue) {
        take thread off wait queue
        Place on ready queue;
    } else {
        value = FREE;
    }
    enable interrupts;
}
```

New Lock Implementation: Discussion

- Why do we need to disable interrupts at all?
  - Avoid interruption between checking and setting lock value
- Otherwise two threads could think that they both have lock

```c
Acquire() {
    disable interrupts;
    if (value == BUSY) {
        put thread on wait queue;
        Go to sleep();
        // Enable interrupts?
    } else {
        value = BUSY;
    }
    enable interrupts;
}
```

- Note: unlike previous solution, the critical section (inside `Acquire()`) is very short
  - User of lock can take as long as they like in their own critical section: doesn’t impact global machine behavior
  - Critical interrupts taken in time!

Interrupt re-enable in going to sleep

- What about re-enabling ints when going to sleep?

```c
Acquire() {
    disable interrupts;
    if (value == BUSY) {
        put thread on wait queue;
        Go to sleep();
    } else {
        value = BUSY;
    }
    enable interrupts;
}
```

- Before Putting thread on the wait queue?
  - Release can check the queue and not wake up thread
- After putting the thread on the wait queue
  - Release puts the thread on the ready queue, but the thread still thinks it needs to go to sleep
  - Misses wakeup and still holds lock (deadlock!)
- Want to put it after sleep(). But - how?
Administrivia

- First Design Document due Monday 9/26
  - Subsequently need to schedule design review with TA (through web form)
  - Note that Much of the design document grade comes from first version (some from final version)
- CVS group accounts should be setup
  - Check out the CVS Quick Start Guide for instructions on how to get your CVS repository working
  - If you change your key – need to let us know!
- Anyone interested in being a note-taker?
  - Have a student who needs help with note taking
  - Can receive payment for this help

How to Re-enable After Sleep()

- In Nachos, since ints are disabled when you call sleep:
  - Responsibility of the next thread to re-enable ints
  - When the sleeping thread wakes up, returns to acquire and re-enables interrupts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thread A</th>
<th>Thread B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disable ints</td>
<td>sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>context switch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enable ints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interrupt disable and enable across context switches

- An important point about structuring code:
  - In Nachos code you will see lots of comments about assumptions made concerning when interrupts disabled
  - This is an example of where modifications to and assumptions about program state can't be localized within a small body of code
  - In these cases it is possible for your program to eventually "acquire" bugs as people modify code
- Other cases where this will be a concern?
  - What about exceptions that occur after lock is acquired? Who releases the lock?
    ```java
    mylock.acquire();
    a = b / 0;
    mylock.release()
    ```

Atomic Read-Modify-Write instructions

- Problems with previous solution:
  - Can't give lock implementation to users
  - Doesn't work well on multiprocessor
    » Disabling interrupts on all processors requires messages and would be very time consuming
- Alternative: atomic instruction sequences
  - These instructions read a value from memory and write a new value atomically
  - Hardware is responsible for implementing this correctly on both uniprocessors (not too hard) and multiprocessors (requires help from cache coherence protocol)
  - Unlike disabling interrupts, can be used on both uniprocessors and multiprocessors
Examples of Read-Modify-Write

- **test&set (&address)** { /* most architectures */
  result = M[address];
  M[address] = 1;
}
- **swap (&address, register)** { /* x86 */
  temp = M[address];
  M[address] = register;
  register = temp;
}
- **compare&swap (&address, reg1, reg2)** { /* 68000 */
  if (reg1 == M[address]) {
    M[address] = reg2;
    return success;
  } else {
    return failure;
  }
}
- **load-linked&store conditional(&address)** { /* R4000, alpha */
  loop:
  l1 r1, M[address];
  movi r2, 1; /* Can do arbitrary comp */
  sc r2, M[address];
  beqz r2, loop;
}

Implementing Locks with test&set

- **Another flawed, but simple solution:**
  ```c
  int value = 0; // Free
  Acquire() {
    while (test&set(value)); // while busy
  }
  Release() {
    value = 0;
  }
  ```
- **Simple explanation:**
  - If lock is free, test&set reads 0 and sets value=1, so lock is now busy. It returns 0 so while exits.
  - If lock is busy, test&set reads 1 and sets value=1 (no change). It returns 1, so while loop continues
  - When we set value = 0, someone else can get lock
- **Busy-Waiting:** thread consumes cycles while waiting

Better Locks using test&set

- Can we build test&set locks without busy-waiting?
  - Can't entirely, but can minimize!
  - Idea: only busy-wait to atomically check lock value
  ```c
  int guard = 0;
  int value = FREE;
  Acquire() {
    while (test&set(guard));
    if (value == BUSY) {
      put thread on wait queue; 
      go to sleep() & guard = 0;
    } else {
      value = BUSY;
      guard = 0;
    }
  }
  Release() {
    while (test&set(guard));
    if anyone on wait queue {
      take thread off wait queue
      Place on ready queue;
    } else {
      value = FREE;
    }
    guard = 0;
  }
  ```
- Note: sleep has to be sure to reset the guard variable
  - Why can't we do it just before or just after the sleep?
Higher-level Primitives than Locks

- Goal of last couple of lectures:
  - What is the right abstraction for synchronizing threads that share memory?
  - Want as high a level primitive as possible
- Good primitives and practices important!
  - Since execution is not entirely sequential, really hard to find bugs, since they happen rarely
  - UNIX is pretty stable now, but up until about mid-80s (10 years after started), systems running UNIX would crash every week or so - concurrency bugs
- Synchronization is a way of coordinating multiple concurrent activities that are using shared state
  - This lecture and the next present a couple of ways of structuring the sharing

Semaphores

- Semaphores are a kind of generalized lock
  - First defined by Dijkstra in late 60s
  - Main synchronization primitive used in original UNIX
- Definition: a Semaphore has a non-negative integer value and supports the following two operations:
  - P(): an atomic operation that waits for semaphore to become positive, then decrements it by 1
    - Think of this as the wait() operation
  - V(): an atomic operation that increments the semaphore by 1, waking up a waiting P, if any
    - This of this as the signal() operation
- Note that P stands for "proberen" (to test) and V stands for "verhogen" (to increment) in Dutch

Semaphores Like Integers Except

- Semaphores are like integers, except
  - No negative values
  - Only operations allowed are P and V - can't read or write value, except to set it initially
  - Operations must be atomic
    - Two P's together can't decrement value below zero
    - Similarly, thread going to sleep in P won't miss wakeup from V - even if they both happen at same time
- Semaphore from railway analogy
  - Here is a semaphore initialized to 2 for resource control:

Two Uses of Semaphores

- Mutual Exclusion (initial value = 1)
  - Also called "Binary Semaphore".
  - Can be used for mutual exclusion:

```plaintext
semaphore.P();
// Critical section goes here
semaphore.V();
```
- Scheduling Constraints (initial value = 0)
  - Locks are fine for mutual exclusion, but what if you want a thread to wait for something?
  - Example: suppose you had to implement ThreadJoin which must wait for thread to terminate:

```plaintext
Initial value of semaphore = 0
ThreadJoin {
  semaphore.P();
}
ThreadFinish {
  semaphore.V();
}
```
Producer-consumer with a bounded buffer

- Problem Definition
  - Producer puts things into a shared buffer
  - Consumer takes them out
  - Need synchronization to coordinate producer/consumer
- Don't want producer and consumer to have to work in lockstep, so put a fixed-size buffer between them
  - Need to synchronize access to this buffer
  - Producer needs to wait if buffer is full
  - Consumer needs to wait if buffer is empty
- Example 1: GCC compiler
  - `cpp | cc1 | cc2 | as | ld`
- Example 2: Coke machine
  - Producer can put limited number of cokes in machine
  - Consumer can't take cokes out if machine is empty

Correctness constraints for solution

- Correctness Constraints:
  - Consumer must wait for producer to fill buffers, if none full (scheduling constraint)
  - Producer must wait for consumer to empty buffers, if all full (scheduling constraint)
  - Only one thread can manipulate buffer queue at a time (mutual exclusion)
- Remember why we need mutual exclusion
  - Because computers are stupid
  - Imagine if in real life: the delivery person is filling the machine and somebody comes up and tries to stick their money into the machine
- General rule of thumb: Use a separate semaphore for each constraint
  - Semaphore fullBuffers; // consumer’s constraint
  - Semaphore emptyBuffers; // producer’s constraint
  - Semaphore mutex; // mutual exclusion

Full Solution to Bounded Buffer

```
Semaphore fullBuffer = 0; // Initially, no coke
Semaphore emptyBuffers = numBuffers; // Initially, num empty slots
Semaphore mutex = 1; // No one using machine

Producer(item) {
    emptyBuffers.P(); // Wait until space
    mutex.P(); // Wait until buffer free
    Enqueue(item);
    mutex.V();
    fullBuffers.V(); // Tell consumers there is more coke
}

Consumer() {
    fullBuffers.P(); // Check if there’s a coke
    mutex.P(); // Wait until machine free
    item = Dequeue();
    mutex.V();
    emptyBuffers.V(); // tell producer need more
    return item;
}
```
Motivation for Monitors and Condition Variables

- Semaphores are a huge step up; just think of trying to do the bounded buffer with only loads and stores
  - Problem is that semaphores are dual purpose:
    » They are used for both mutex and scheduling constraints
    » Example: the fact that flipping of P's in bounded buffer gives deadlock is not immediately obvious. How do you prove correctness to someone?

- Cleaner idea: Use locks for mutual exclusion and condition variables for scheduling constraints
- Definition: Monitor: a lock and zero or more condition variables for managing concurrent access to shared data
  - Some languages like Java provide this natively
  - Most others use actual locks and condition variables

Monitor with Condition Variables

- Lock: the lock provides mutual exclusion to shared data
  - Always acquire before accessing shared data structure
  - Always release after finishing with shared data
  - Lock initially free

- Condition Variable: a queue of threads waiting for something inside a critical section
  - Key idea: make it possible to go to sleep inside critical section by atomically releasing lock at time we go to sleep
  - Contrast to semaphores: Can't wait inside critical section

Simple Monitor Example

- Here is an (infinite) synchronized queue

```
Lock lock;
Condition dataready;
Queue queue;

AddToQueue(item) {
  lock.Acquire();  // Get Lock
  queue.enqueue(item);  // Add item
  dataready.signal();  // Signal any waiters
  lock.Release();  // Release Lock
}

RemoveFromQueue() {
  lock.Acquire();  // Get Lock
  while (queue.isEmpty()) {
    dataready.wait(&lock);  // If nothing, sleep
  }
  item = queue.dequeue();  // Get next item
  lock.Release();  // Release Lock
  return(item);
}
```

Summary

- Important concept: Atomic Operations
  - An operation that runs to completion or not at all
  - These are the primitives on which to construct various synchronization primitives

- Talked about hardware atomicity primitives:
  - Disabling of Interrupts, test&set, swap, comp&swap, load-locked/store conditional

- Showed several constructions of Locks
  - Must be very careful not to waste/tie up machine resources
    » Shouldn't disable interrupts for long
    » Shouldn't spin wait for long
  - Key idea: Separate lock variable, use hardware mechanisms to protect modifications of that variable

- Talked about Semaphores, Monitors, and Condition Variables
  - Higher level constructs that are harder to “screw up”