Deadlock (1)

Dave Eckhardt

Roger Dannenberg
Bruce Maggs
Geoff Langdale

Synchronization – P2

- **You should already have (Friday):**
  - **Figured out where stubs belong, why**
  - **Made some system calls**
  - **Designed mutexes & condition variables**
  - **Drawn pictures of thread stacks (even if not perfect)**
- **Goal for today:**
  - **Coded mutexes and condition variables**
  - **Thoughtful design for thr_create(), maybe thr_join()**
  - ***Some* code for thr_create(), and some "experience"**
  - **The `startle` test running**

Synchronization – P2

- **Scoreboard**
  - **If you're running `startle`, you'll be on the scoreboard**
    - **4 groups already are**
  - **Pretty much everybody should be running `getpid_test1`**
    - **That by itself will put you on the scoreboard**

Synchronization – P2

- Scoreboard
  - If you're running `startle`, you'll be on the scoreboard
    - 4 groups already are
  - Pretty much everybody should be running `getpid_test1`
    - That by itself will put you on the scoreboard
- Tests
  - Running tests early is good
  - *Reading* tests early is good

Synchronization – P2

- Scoreboard
  - If you're running `startle`, you'll be on the scoreboard
    - 4 groups already are
  - Pretty much everybody should be running `getpid_test1`
    - That by itself will put you on the scoreboard
- Tests
  - Running tests early is good
  - *Reading* tests early is good
- Design for robustness!
  - Passing tests is not enough
  - Reminders: “Questions”, “Errors”

Debugging Reminder

- **We can't really help with queries like:**
  - **We did x... then something strange happened...**
  - **...can you tell us why?**
- **You need to progress beyond "*something* happened"**
  - **What happened, exactly?**

Debugging Reminder

- **We can't really help with queries like:**
  - **We did x... then something strange happened...**
  - **...can you tell us why?**
- **You need to progress beyond "*something* happened"**
  - **What happened, exactly?**
  - **printf() is not always the right tool**
    - **Output correct only if run-time environment is right**
    - **Captures only what you told it to, only "C-level" stuff**
    - ***Changes your code* by its mere presence!!!**

Debugging Reminder

- We can't really help with queries like:
  - We did x... then something strange happened...
  - ...can you tell us why?
- You need to progress beyond "*something* happened"
  - What happened, exactly?
  - printf() is not always the right tool
    - Output correct only if run-time environment is right
    - Captures only what you told it to, only "C-level" stuff
    - *Changes your code* by its mere presence!!!
  - We're serious about examining register dumps!
  - Overall, maybe re-read "Debugging" lecture notes

Synchronization – Readings

- **Next three lectures**
  - **OSC – Deadlock: 6.5.3, 6.6.3, Chapter 7**
  - **OS:P+P – Advanced Synchronization: Chapter 6**
- **Reading ahead**
  - **Virtual Memory**
  - **Scheduling**

Outline

- **Process/resource graph**
- **What is deadlock?**
- **Deadlock *prevention***
- **Next time**
  - **Deadlock *avoidance***
  - **Deadlock *recovery***

Tape Drives

- **A word on "tape drives"**
  - **Ancient computer resource**
  - **Access is sequential, read/write**
  - **Any tape can be mounted on any drive**
  - **One tape at a time is mounted on a drive**

IBM 3420 (1970-1987)
www.ibm.com/ibm/history
Not for publication

Data General 6023
wps.com/NOVA4

Tape Drives

- A word on “tape drives”
  - Ancient computer resource
  - Access is sequential, read/write
  - Any tape can be mounted on any drive
  - One tape at a time is mounted on a drive
    - Doesn't make sense for multiple processes to simultaneously access a drive
    - Reading/writing a tape takes a while
- Think “CD burner”...

IBM 3420 (1970-1987)
www.ibm.com/ibm/history
Not for publication

Data General 6023
wps.com/NOVA4

Process/Resource graph



Process/Resource graph



Waiting



Release



Reallocation



Multi-instance Resources



Definition of Deadlock

- **A deadlock**
  - **Set of N processes**
  - **Each waiting for an event**
    - **...which can be caused *only by another process in the set***
- **Every process will wait forever**

Deadlock Examples

- **Simplest form**
  - **Process 1 owns printer, wants tape drive**
  - **Process 2 owns tape drive, wants printer**

Deadlock Examples

- Simplest form
  - Process 1 owns printer, wants tape drive
  - Process 2 owns tape drive, wants printer
- Less-obvious
  - Three tape drives
  - Three processes
    - Each has one tape drive
    - Each wants “just” one more
  - Can't blame anybody, but problem is still there

Deadlock Requirements

- **Four “ingredients”**
  - **Mutual Exclusion**
  - **Hold & Wait**
  - **No Preemption**
  - **Circular Wait**

Mutual Exclusion

- Resources aren't “thread-safe” (“reentrant”)
- Must be allocated to one process/thread at a time
- Can't be shared
  - Programmable Interrupt Timer
    - Can't have a different reload value for each process

Hold & Wait

- **Process holds some resources while waiting for more**

```
mutex_lock(&m1);
mutex_lock(&m2);
mutex_lock(&m3);
```

- **This locking behavior is *typical***

No Preemption

- Can't force a process to give up a resource
- Interrupting a CD-R burn creates a “coaster”
  - So don't do that
- Obvious solution
  - CD-R device driver forbids second simultaneous open( )
  - If you can't open it, you can't pre-empt it...

Circular Wait

- **Process 0 needs something process 4 has**
  - **Process 4 needs something process 7 has**
  - **Process 7 needs something process 1 has**
  - **Process 1 needs something process 0 has – uh-oh...**
- **Described as “cycle in the resource graph”**

Cycle in Resource Graph



Deadlock Requirements

- **Four "ingredients"**
  - **Mutual Exclusion**
  - **Hold & Wait**
  - **No Preemption**
  - **Circular Wait**

- ***Each deadlock*** **requires** ***all four***

Multi-Instance Cycle



Multi-Instance Cycle *(With Rescuer!)*



Cycle Broken



Dining Philosophers

- **The scene**
  - **410 staff members at a Chinese restaurant**
  - **A little short on utensils**

Dining Philosophers



Dining Philosophers

- **Processes**
  - **5, one per person**
- **Resources**
  - **5 bowls (dedicated to a diner: no contention: ignore)**
  - **5 chopsticks (1 between every adjacent pair of diners)**
- **Contrived example?**
  - **Illustrates contention, starvation, deadlock**

Dining Philosophers

- **A simple rule for eating**
  - **Wait until the chopstick to your right is free; take it**
  - **Wait until the chopstick to your left is free; take it**
  - **Eat for a while**
  - **Put chopsticks back down**

Dining Philosophers Deadlock

- **Everybody reaches right...**
  - **...at the same time?**

Reaching Right



Successful Acquisition



Deadlock!



Dining Philosophers – State

```
int stick[5] = { -1 }; /* owner */
condition avail[5]; /* newly avail. */
mutex table = { available };

/* Right-handed convention */
right = diner;              /* D3 ⇒ S3 */
left = (diner + 4) % 5;  /* D3 ⇒ 7 ⇒ S2 */
```

start_eating(int diner)

```
mutex_lock(table);

while (stick[right] != -1)
  condition_wait(avail[right], table);
stick[right] = diner;

while (stick[left] != -1)
  condition_wait(avail[left], table);
stick[left] = diner;

mutex_unlock(table);
```

done_eating(int diner)

```
mutex_lock(table);

stick[left] = stick[right] = -1;
condition_signal(avail[right]);
condition_signal(avail[left]);

mutex_unlock(table);
```

Can We Deadlock??

- **At first glance the table mutex protects us**
  - **Can't have “everybody reaching right at same time”...**
  - **...mutex means only one person can access table...**
  - **...so allows only one reach at the same time, right?**

Can We Deadlock??

- At first glance the table mutex protects us
  - Can't have “everybody reaching right at same time”...
  - ...mutex means only one person can access table...
  - ...so allows only one reach at the same time, right?
- Maybe we can!
  - *condition_wait()* is a “reach”
  - Can everybody end up in condition_wait()?

First diner gets both chopsticks



Next gets right, waits on left



Next two get right, wait on left



Last waits on right



First diner stops eating - *briefly*



First diner stops eating - *briefly*



Next Step – *One* Possibility



“Natural” –
longest-waiting diner progresses

Next Step – *Another* Possibility



Or –
somebody else!

Last diner gets right, waits on left



First **diner gets right, waits on left**



Now things get boring



Deadlock - What to do?

- **Prevention**
- **Avoidance**
- **Detection/Recovery**
- **Just reboot when it gets “too quiet”**

1: Prevention

- **Restrict behavior or resources**
  - **Find a way to violate one of the 4 conditions**
    - **To wit...?**
- **What we will talk about today**
  - **4 conditions, 4 possible ways**

2: Avoidance

- **Processes *pre-declare* usage patterns**
- **Dynamically examine requests**
  - **Imagine what other processes could ask for**
  - **Keep system in "safe state"**

3: Detection/Recovery

- **Maybe deadlock won't happen today...**
- **...Hmm, it seems quiet...**
- **...Oops, here is a cycle...**
- ***Abort some process***
  - **Ouch!**

4: Reboot When It Gets “Too Quiet”

- **Which systems would be so simplistic?**

Four Ways to Forgiveness

- *Each deadlock* requires *all four*
  - Mutual Exclusion
  - Hold & Wait
  - No Preemption
  - Circular Wait
- "Deadlock Prevention" - this is a technical term
  - *Pass a law* against one (pick one)
  - Deadlock happens only if somebody *transgresses!*

Four Ways to Forgiveness

- *Each deadlock* requires *all four*
  - Mutual Exclusion
  - Hold & Wait
  - No Preemption
  - Circular Wait
- "Deadlock Prevention" - this is a technical term
  - *Pass a law* against one (pick one)
  - Deadlock happens only if somebody *transgresses!*
- Consider a ban for each of the ingredients...

Outlaw Mutual Exclusion?

- **Approach: *ban* single-user resources**
  - **Require all resources to “work in shared mode”**
- **Problem**
  - **Chopsticks???**
  - **Many resources don't work that way**

Outlaw Hold&Wait?

- **Approach: acquire resources *all-or-none***

```
start_eating(int diner)

mutex_lock(table);
while (1)
  if (stick[lt] == stick[rt] == -1)
    stick[lt] = stick[rt] = diner
    mutex_unlock(table)
    return;
  condition_wait(released, table);
```

Problems

- "Starvation"
  - Larger resource set makes grabbing everything harder
    - No guarantee a diner eats in bounded time
- Low utilization
  - Larger peak resource needs hurts whole system always
    - Must allocate 2 chopsticks (and waiter!)
    - Nobody else can use waiter while you eat

Outlaw Non-preemption?

- **“Outlaw non-preemption” means “preempt”**

Outlaw Non-preemption?

- **Approach: preempt resources from sleeping processes!**

```
start_eating(int diner)
right = diner;   rright = (diner+1)%5;
mutex_lock(table);
while (1)
  if (stick[right] == -1)
    stick[right] = diner
  else if (stick[rright] != rright)
    /* right person can't be eating: take! */
    stick[right] = diner;
...same for left...wait() if must...
mutex_unlock(table);
```

Problem

- **Some resources cannot be cleanly preempted**
  - **CD burner**

Outlaw Circular Wait?

- Approach: impose *total order* on all resources
- Require acquisition in *strictly increasing order*
  - Static order may work: allocate memory, then files
  - Dynamic – may need to "start over" sometimes
    - Traversing a graph
      - lock(4), visit(4) /* 4 has an edge to 13 */
      - lock(13), visit(13) /* 13 has an edge to 0 */
      - lock(0)?

Outlaw Circular Wait?

- Approach: impose *total order* on all resources
- Require acquisition in *strictly increasing order*
  - Static order may work: allocate memory, then files
  - Dynamic – may need to "start over" sometimes
    - Traversing a graph
      - lock(4), visit(4) /* 4 has an edge to 13 */
      - lock(13), visit(13) /* 13 has an edge to 0 */
      - lock(0)?
        - Nope!
        - unlock(4), unlock(13)
        - lock(0), lock(4), lock(13), ...

Assigning Diners a Total Order

- **Lock order: 4, 3, 2, 1, 0 ≡ right chopstick, then left**
  - **Diner 4 ⇒ lock(4); lock(3);**
  - **Diner 3 ⇒ lock(3); lock(2);**

Assigning Diners a Total Order

- Lock order: 4, 3, 2, 1, 0 ≡ right chopstick, then left
  - Diner 4 ⇒ lock(4); lock(3);
  - Diner 3 ⇒ lock(3); lock(2);
  - Diner 0 ⇒ lock(0); lock(4); /* violates lock order! */
- Requires special-case locking code to get order right

```
if diner == 0
  right = (diner + 4) % 5;
  left = diner;
else
  right = diner;
  left = (diner + 4) % 5;
...
```

Problem

- **May not be possible to force allocation order**
  - **Some trains go east, some go west**

"The Last Spike"
reflectivelens.blogspot.com
2011-06-12

Deadlock Prevention problems

- Typical resources *require* mutual exclusion
- All-at-once allocation can be *painful*
  - Hurts efficiency
  - May starve
  - Resource needs may be unpredictable
- Preemption may be *impossible*
  - Or may lead to starvation
- Ordering restrictions may be *impractical*

Deadlock Prevention

- **Pass a law against one of the four ingredients**
  - **Great if you can find a tolerable approach**
- ***Very*** **tempting to just let processes try their luck**

Deadlock is not...

- ...a simple synchronization bug
  - Deadlock remains even when those are cleaned up
  - Deadlock is a resource usage design problem
- ...the same as starvation
  - Deadlocked processes don't ever get resources
  - Starved processes don't ever get resources
  - Deadlock is a “progress” problem; starvation is a “bounded waiting” problem
- ....that “after-you, sir” dance in the corridor
  - That's “livelock” – continuous changes of state without forward progress

Next Time

- **Deadlock Avoidance**
- **Deadlock Recovery**