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Synchronization

Project 1 due tonight
  - Again, try not to use a late day
    • But if you do, please carefully read and follow the instructions

Project 2 out Wednesday
Outline

**Synch 1**
- Two building blocks
- Three requirements for critical-section algorithms
- Algorithms people *don't* use for critical sections

**Synch 2**
- How critical sections are really implemented

**Synch 3**
- Condition variables
  - Under the hood
  - The atomic-sleep problem
- Semaphores, monitors – overview
Road Map

Two Fundamental operations

✔ Atomic instruction sequence
▷ Voluntary de-scheduling
Voluntary de-scheduling

The Situation
  - You hold lock on shared resource
  - But it's not in “the right mode”

Action sequence
  - Unlock shared resource
  - Write down “wake me up when…”
  - Block until resource changes state
What **Not** To Do

```c
while (!reckoning) {
    mutex_lock(&scenario_lk);
    if ((date >= 1906-04-18) &&
        (hour >= 5))
        reckoning = true;
    else
        mutex_unlock(&scenario_lk);
}
wreak_general_havoc();
mutex_unlock(&scenario_lk);
```
What **Not** To Do

```c
while (!reckoning) {
    mutex_lock(&scenario_lk);
    if ((date >= 1906-04-18) &&
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        mutex_unlock(&scenario_lk);
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mutex_unlock(&scenario_lk);
```
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```c
while (!reckoning) {
    mutex_lock(&scenario_lk);
    if ((date >= 1906-04-18) &&
        (hour >= 5))
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    else
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Is this code *right*?
What *Not* To Do

**Why is this wrong?**

- Make sure you understand!
- See previous two lectures
- Do *not* do this in P2 or P3
  - Not even if it is *really tempting* in P3
“Arguably Less Wrong”

```c
while (!reckoning) {
    mutex_lock(&scenario_lk);
    if ((date >= 1906-04-18) &&
        (hour >= 5))
        reckoning = true;
    else {
        mutex_unlock(&scenario_lk);
        sleep(1);
    }
}
wreak_general_havoc();
mutex_unlock(&scenario_lk);
```
“Arguably Less Wrong”

Don't do this either

– How wrong is “sleep(1)”?
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- How wrong is “sleep(1)”?
  - N-1 times it's much too short
  - Nth time it's much too long
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- How wrong is “sleep(1)”?
  - N-1 times it's much too short
  - Nth time it's much too long
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“Arguably Less Wrong”

Don't do this either

- How wrong is “sleep(1)”?
  - N-1 times it's much too short
  - Nth time it's much too long
  - It's wrong *every time*
- What's the problem?
“Arguably Less Wrong”

Don't do this either

- How wrong is “sleep(1)”?
  - N-1 times it's much too short
  - Nth time it's much too long
  - It's wrong every time
- What's the problem?
  - We don't really want to wait for some duration!
  - We want to wait for a condition change
“Honorable Mention”? 

```c
while (!reckoning) {
    mutex_lock(&scenario_lk);
    if ((date >= 1906-04-18) &&
        (hour >= 5))
        reckoning = true;
    else {
        mutex_unlock(&scenario_lk);
        yield(); // Better than sleep()?????
    }
}
wreak_general_havoc();
mutex_unlock(&scenario_lk);
```
Something Is Missing...

✔ “Protect shared state” is solved
  – We use a “mutex object”
  – Also encapsulates “Which code interferes with this?”
  – Good

✧ How to solve “block for the right duration”?
Something Is Missing

✔ "Protect shared state" is solved
  - We use a "mutex object"
  - Also encapsulates "Which code interferes with this?"
  - Good

@Enable

How to solve "block for the right duration"?
  - Get an expert to tell us!
  - Encapsulate "the right duration"...
    • ...into a condition variable object
Once More, With Feeling!

```c
mutex_lock(&scenario_lk);
while (cvarp = wait_on()) {
    cond_wait(cvarp, &scenario_lk);
}
wreak_general_havoc(); /* locked! */
mutex_unlock(&scenario_lk);
```
wait_on()?

```c
if (y < 1906)
    return (&new_year);
elif (m < 4)
    return (&new_month);
elif (d < 18)
    return (&new_day);
elif (h < 5)
    return (&new_hour);
else
    return (0); // done!
```

// Code is "conceptual example", not 100% correct
What Awakens Us?

```c
for (y = 1900; y < 2000; y++)
    for (m = 1; m <= 12; m++)
        for (d = 1; d <= days(m); d++)
            for (h = 0; h < 24; h++)
                ...
                cond_broadcast(&new_hour);
                cond_broadcast(&new_day);
                cond_broadcast(&new_month);
                cond_broadcast(&new_year);

// Code is “conceptual example”, not 100% correct
```
Condition Variable Requirements

Keep track of threads blocked “for a while”
Allow notifier thread(s) to unblock blocked thread(s)
Must be “thread-safe”
  - Many threads may call condition_wait() at same time
  - Many threads may call condition_signal() at same time
  - Say, those look like “interfering sequences”...
Why *Two* Parameters?

```c
condition_wait(&cvar, &mutex);
```

**Mutex required to examine/modify the “world” state**
- If you examine unlocked state, it's changing.

**Whoever awakens you will need to hold that mutex**
- So you'd better give it up.

**When you wake up, you will need to hold it again**
- “Convenient” for condition_wait() to un-lock/re-lock

**But there's something more subtle**
- Try to recall this issue when working on P2...
Inside a Condition Variable

\texttt{cvar->queue}
- of blocked threads
- FIFO, or more exotic

\texttt{cvar->mutex}
- Protects queue against interfering \texttt{wait()}/\texttt{signal()} calls
- This isn't the caller's mutex (locking caller's world state)
- This is our secret invisible mutex
Inside a Condition Variable

```c
cond_wait(cvar, world_mutex)
{
    lock(cvar->mutex);
    enq(cvar->queue, my_thread_id());
    unlock(world_mutex);
    ATOMICALLY
    {
        unlock(cvar->mutex);
        kernel_please_pause_this_thread();
    }
    lock(world_mutex);
}
```

What is this “ATOMICALLY” stuff?
What We Hope For

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><code>cond_wait(m,c)</code></th>
<th><code>cond_signal(c)</code></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>enq(c-&gt;que,me);</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>unlock(m);</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>unlock(c-&gt;m);</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>kern_thr_pause();</code></td>
<td><code>lock(c-&gt;m);</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>id = deq(c-&gt;que);</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>kern_thr_wake(id);</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><code>unlock(c-&gt;m);</code></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Pathological Execution Sequence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cond_wait((m,c))</th>
<th>cond_signal((c))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>enq((c-&gt;que,me));</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlock((m));</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlock((c-&gt;m));</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lock((c-&gt;m));</td>
<td>id = deq((c-&gt;que));</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kern_thr_wake((id));</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unlock((c-&gt;m));</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kern_thr_pause()</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{kern\_thr\_wake}\((id)\) \Rightarrow \text{ERR\_NOT\_ASLEEP}
\]
Achieving “wait() Atomicity”

Rules of the game
- There isn't an underlying unlock_and_block() primitive
- We have unlock(), and block(), and maybe “other stuff”
- From outside cond_wait()/cond_signal(), we must achieve apparent (as-if) “atomicity of unlock and block”.

Approaches
- Disable interrupts (if you are a kernel)
- Rely on OS to implement condition variables
  - (Why is this not the best idea?)
- Have a better kernel thread-block interface
- Hmmm....
Achieving “wait() Atomicity”

**P2 challenges**

- Understand the issues!
  - `mutex, cvar`
- Understand the host kernel we give you
- Put the parts together
  - Don't use “wrong” or “arguably less wrong” approaches!
  - Seek solid, clear solutions
    - There's more than one way to do it
    - Make sure to pick a correct way...
    - Try to pick a *good* way.
Outline

Last time
  - How mutual exclusion is really implemented

Condition variables
  - Under the hood
  - The atomic-sleep problem

⇒ Semaphores

Monitors
Semaphore Concept

**Semaphore is a different encapsulation object**
- Can produce mutual exclusion
- Can produce block-until-it's-time

**Intuition: counted resource**
- Integer represents “number available”
  - Number of buffers, number of pairs of scissors, ...
  - Semaphore object initialized to a particular count
- Thread blocks until it is allocated an instance
Semaphore Concept

**wait(), aka P(), Dutch probeer te verlagen (“try to decrease”)**
- wait until value > 0
- then decrement value (“taking” one instance)

**signal(), aka V(), Dutch verhogen (“increase”)**
- increment value (“releasing” one instance)

**Just one small issue...**
- wait() and signal() *must be atomic*
“Mutex-style” Semaphore

semaphore m = 1;

do {
    wait(m); /* mutex_lock() */
    ..critical section...
    signal(m); /* mutex_unlock() */

    ...remainder section...
} while (1);
**“Condition-style” Semaphore**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thread 0</th>
<th>Thread 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wait(c);</td>
<td>wait(c);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>result = 42;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signal(c);</td>
<td>use(result);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Condition with Memory”

Semaphores **retain memory** of signal() events
- “full/empty bit” - *unlike* condition variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thread 0</th>
<th>Thread 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>result = 42;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signal(c);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wait(c);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>use(result);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Semaphore vs. Mutex/Condition

**Good news**
- Semaphore is a higher-level construct
- Integrates mutual exclusion, waiting
- Avoids mistakes common in mutex/condition API
  - `signal()` too early is “lost”
  - ...

Semaphore vs. Mutex/Condition

Bad news

- Semaphore is a higher-level construct
- Integrates mutual exclusion, waiting
  - Some semaphores are “mutex-like”
  - Some semaphores are “condition-like”
  - How's a poor library to know?
    - Spin-wait or not???
Semaphores - 31 Flavors

**Binary semaphore**
- It counts, but only from 0 to 1!
  - “Available” / “Not available”
- Consider this a hint to the implementor...
  - “Think mutex!”

**Non-blocking semaphore**
- `wait(semaphore, timeout);`

**Deadlock-avoidance semaphore**
- `#include <deadlock.lecture>`
My Personal Opinion

One “simple, intuitive” synchronization object
   - In 31 performance-enhancing flavors!!!

“The nice thing about standards is that you have so many to choose from.”
   - Andrew S. Tanenbaum

Conceptually simpler to have two objects
   - One for mutual exclusion
   - One for waiting
   - ...after you've understood what's actually happening
Semaphore Wait: Inside Story

```c
wait(semaphore s)
    ACQUIRE EXCLUSIVE ACCESS
    --s->count;
    if (s->count < 0) {
        enqueue(s->queue, my_id());
        ATOMICALLY {
            RELEASE EXCLUSIVE ACCESS
            thread_block()
        }
    } else {
        RELEASE EXCLUSIVE ACCESS
    }
```
Semaphore Signal: Inside Story

```c
signal(semaphore s)

   ACQUIRE EXCLUSIVE ACCESS
   ++s->count;
   if (s->count <= 0) {
      tid = dequeue(s->queue);
      thread_unblock(tid);
   }

   RELEASE EXCLUSIVE ACCESS
```

What's all the shouting?

- An exclusion algorithm much like a mutex, or
- OS-assisted atomic de-scheduling / awakening
Monitor

Basic concept
- Semaphores eliminate some mutex/condition mistakes
- Still some common errors
  - Swapping “signal()” & “wait()”
  - Accidentally omitting one

Monitor: higher-level abstraction
- Module of high-level language procedures
  - All access some shared state
- Compiler adds synchronization code
  - Thread running in any procedure blocks all thread entries
Monitor “commerce”

```java
int cash_in_till[N_STORES] = { 0 };
int wallet[N_CUSTOMERS] = { 0 };

boolean buy(int cust, store, price) {
    if (wallet[cust] >= price) {
        cash_in_till[store] += price;
        wallet[cust] -= price;
        return (true);
    } else
    return (false);
}
```
Monitors – What about waiting?

Automatic mutual exclusion is nice...
  - ...but it is too strong

Sometimes one thread needs to wait for another
  - Automatic mutual exclusion forbids this
  - Must leave monitor, re-enter - when?

Have we heard this “when” question before?
void
stubbornly_cash_check(acct a, check c) {
    while (account[a].bal < check.val) {
        ...Sigh, must wait for a while...
        ...What goes here? I forget...
    }
    account[a].bal -= check.val;
}
Monitor Waiting – Wrong Solution

```java
boolean try_cash_check(acct a, check c) {
    if (account[a].bal < check.val)
        return (false); /* pass the buck */
    account[a].bal -= check.val;
    return (true);
}
```
Monitor condition variables

Similar to condition variables we've seen

condition_wait(cvar)

- Only one parameter
- Mutex-to-drop is implicit
  - (the “monitor mutex”)
- Operation
  - “Temporarily exit monitor” -- drop the mutex
  - Wait until signalled
  - “Re-enter monitor” - re-acquire the mutex
Monitor Waiting

void stubbornly_cash_check(acct a, check c) {
    while (account[a].bal < check.val) {
        cond_wait(account[a].activity);
    }
    account[a].bal -= check.val;
}

Q: Who would signal() this cvar?
Monitor condition variables

signal() policy question - which thread to run?
- Signalling thread? Signalled thread?
  - Can argue either way
- Or: signal() exits monitor as side effect!
- Different signal() policies mean different monitor flavors
Summary

Two fundamental operations
- Mutual exclusion for must-be-atomic sequences
- Atomic de-scheduling (and then wakeup)

Mutex/condition-variable ("pthreads") style
- Two objects for two core operations

Semaphores, Monitors
- Semaphore: one object
- Monitor: invisible compiler-generated object
- Same core ideas inside
Summary

What you should know
- Issues/goals
- Underlying techniques
- How environment/application design matters

All done with synchronization?
- Only one minor issue left
  - Deadlock