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Synchronization – P2

- You should *really* have, today:
  - Drawn pictures of thread stacks (even if not perfect)
  - Figured out where stubs belong, why
  - Made some system calls
  - Designed mutexes & condition variables

- Wednesday:
  - 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

- Project 2 reminder...
  - Don't split the coding in a bad way
    - One popular bad way: Person A codes list/queue, syscall stubs
    - Person B codes everything else
    - Person A will probably be in big trouble on the exam
Synchronization

• Later today “make” may start beeping/delaying
  – Generally addressed by “make update”
  – Generally a good idea to glance at any new files
    – Don't forget to look at “old” files too!
Outline

- Review
  - Prevention/Avoidance/Detection
- Today
  - Avoidance
  - Detection/Recovery
Deadlock – Alternative Approaches

- **Prevention**
  - *Pass a law* against one of four ingredients
    - Note: static, absolute ban
    - Every legal application is continuously deadlock-free

- **Avoidance**
  - Processes *pre-declare usage patterns*
    - Note: more complicated for application, but more flexible
    - Request manager avoids “unsafe states”

- **Detection/Recovery**
  - Clean up only when trouble really happens
Deadlock Prevention – Satisfactory?

- Deadlock prevention *passes laws*
  - Unenforceable: shared CD-writers???
  - Annoying
    - Inefficient if extra resources must be held
    - Mandatory lock-acquisition order may induce starvation
      - Locked 23, 24, 25, ... 88, 89, now must lock 0...
    - *Lots* of starvation opportunities
- Do we really need such strict laws?
  - Couldn't we be more “situational”?
Deadlock \textit{Avoidance} Assumptions

1. Processes pre-declare usage patterns
   - Could enumerate all paths through allocation space
     - Request R1, Request R2, Release R1, Request R3, ...
       - or else I will instead -
     - Request R1, Request R3, Release R3, Request R1, ...
   - Easier: declare \textit{maximal resource usage}
     - I will never need more than 7 tape drives and 1 printer
Deadlock Avoidance Assumptions

2. Processes proceed to completion
   (a) Don't hold onto resources forever
       • Obvious how this helps!
   (b) Complete in “reasonable” time
       • So it is ok, if necessary, to stall P2 until P1 completes
       • We will try to avoid this
Safe Execution Sequence

- \((P_1, P_2, P_3, \ldots P_n)\) is a *safe sequence* if
  - Every process \(P_i\) can be satisfied using
    - currently-free resources \(F\), plus
    - resources currently held by \(P_1, P_2, \ldots P_i\)
  - Claim: \(P_i\)'s waiting is bounded by the sequence:
    - \(P_1\) will run to completion, release resources
    - \(P_2\) can complete with \(F + P_1's + P_2's\)
    - \(P_3\) can complete with \(F + P_1's + P_2's + P_3's\)
    - \(P_i\) won't wait forever, so no wait cycle, no deadlock □
Safe State

- System in a *safe state* iff...
  - there exists at least one safe sequence

- Worst-case situation
  - Every process asks for every resource at once
  - Solution: follow a safe sequence (run processes serially)
    - Slow, but not as slow as a deadlock!

- Serial execution is *worst-case*, not typical
  - Usually processes execute in parallel
Request Manager - Naïve

- Grant a resource request if
  - Enough resources are free now
- Otherwise, tell requesting process to *wait*
  - While *holding* resources
    - Which are *non-preemptible*, ...
- Easily leads to deadlock
Request Manager – Avoidance

• Grant a resource request if
  – Enough resources are free now, and
  – Enough resources would still be free
    • For some process to acquire the rest of its resources, complete, and release all held resources
    • And then another one
    • And then you

• Otherwise, tell requesting process to wait
  – While holding a smaller set of resources...
    • ...which we previously proved it's ok to hold, because other processes don't need them to complete
### Example (from text)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Max = declared
Has = allocated
Room = Max - Has
Example (from text)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Max} = \text{declared}  \\
\textbf{Has} = \text{allocated}  \\
\textbf{Room} = \text{Max - Has}

The system has 12 items.
### Example (from text)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- \(\text{Max} = \text{declared}\)
- \(\text{Has} = \text{allocated}\)
- \(\text{Room} = \text{Max} - \text{Has}\)

9 items are allocated
Example (from text)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\text{Max}=\text{declared}$

$\text{Has}=\text{allocated}$

$\text{Room}=\text{Max} - \text{Has}$

3 items are free
Example (from text)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Max = declared
Has = allocated
Room = Max - Has

“Is it safe?”

“Yes it’s safe; it’s very safe, so safe you wouldn’t believe it.”

(from "Marketon Man")
How would we show that this state is safe?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{Max} = \text{declared} \\
\text{Has} = \text{allocated} \\
\text{Room} = \text{Max} - \text{Has}
\]
### $P1: 2 \Rightarrow 4$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### P1: Complete

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**P0: 5 ⇒ 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Run P1, P0, P2" is a *safe sequence*.  
So the system was in a *safe state*. 

**P0: Complete**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example (from text)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can P2 acquire more now?

“Is it safe?”

“No, it’s not safe; it’s very dangerous, be careful.”
Now, only P1 can be satisfied without waiting.
**P1: 2 ⇒ 4?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### P1: Complete

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**P1: Complete**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problem: P0 and P2 are each allowed to ask for >4. If either does, it must wait, hoping the other frees some up. If both ask for more than 4 total, both wait: **deadlock!**
P1: Complete

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1: Is deadlock inevitable?

Q2: Did we miss some possible sequence other than (P1, ...)?
Avoidance - Key Ideas

- **Safe state**
  - Some safe sequence exists
  - Prove it by *finding one*
- **Unsafe state: No safe sequence exists**
- **Unsafe *may not be fatal***
  - Processes might exit early
  - Processes might not use max resources today
Avoidance – Tradeoff

- Allowing only safe states is more flexible than Prevention
  - Some of the “laws” are inconvenient to follow
- But rejecting all unsafe states reduces efficiency
  - System could enter unsafe state and then return to safety...
  - How often would the system “retreat from disaster”?
- Hmm...
Avoidance - Unique Resources

- Unique resources instead of multi-instance?
  - Graph algorithm

- Three edge types
  - Claim (future request)
  - Request
  - Assign
“Claim” (Future-Request) Edges

P1
Tape 1

P2
Tape 2

P3
Tape 3
Claim ⇒ Request

- P1
  - Tape 1

- P2
  - Tape 2

- P3
  - Tape 3
Request ⇒ Assignment

P1

Tape 1

P2

Tape 2

P3

Tape 3
Safe: No Cycle

![Diagram showing P1, P2, and P3 with tapes 1, 2, and 3 without cycles]
Which Requests Are Safe?

- Pretend to satisfy request
- Look for cycles in resultant graph
A Dangerous Request

P1

Tape 1

P2

Tape 2

P3

Tape 3
See Any Cycles?
Are “Pretend” Cycles Fatal?

- Must we worry about all cycles?
  - Nobody is waiting on a “pretend” cycle
    - Lots of the edges are only potential request edges
    - We don't have a deadlock
- “Is it safe?”
Are “Pretend” Cycles Fatal?

- *No* process can, without waiting
  - Acquire maximum-declared resource set
- So *no process* can acquire, complete, release
  - (for sure, without maybe waiting)
- Any new request *could* form a cycle
  - “No, it's not safe, it's very dangerous, be careful.”
- What to do?
  - Don't grant the request (block the process *now*, *before* it gets that tape drive, instead of blocking it later, *while* it holds it)
Avoidance - Multi-instance Resources

- Example
  - N interchangeable tape drives
  - Could represent by N tape-drive nodes
  - Needless computational expense

- Business credit-line model
  - Bank assigns maximum loan amount ("credit limit")
  - Business pays interest on current borrowing amount
Avoiding “bank failure”

- Bank is “ok” when there is a *safe sequence*
- One company can
  - Borrow up to its credit limit
  - Do well
  - IPO
  - Pay back its full loan amount
- And then another company, etc.
No safe sequence?

- **Company tries to borrow up to limit**
  - Bank has no cash
  - Company C1 must wait for money C2 has
  - Maybe C2 must wait for money C1 has
- **In real life**
  - C1 cannot make payroll
  - C1 goes bankrupt
  - Loan never paid back in full
    - Can model as “infinite sleep”
int cash;
int limit[N];    /* credit limit */
int out[N]     /* borrowed */;
boolean done[N]; /* global temp! */
int future;    /* global temp! */

int progressor (int cash) {
    for (i = 0; i < N; ++i)
        if (!done[i])
            if (cash >= limit[i] - out[i])
                return (i);
    return(-1);
}
Banker's Algorithm

```c
boolean is_safe(void) {
    future = cash;
    done[0..N] = false;

    while ((p = progressor(future)) > 0) {
        future += out[p];
        done[p] = true;
    }
    return (done[0..N] == true)
}
```
Banker's Algorithm

```c
boolean is_safe(void) {
    future = cash;
    done[0..N] = false;

    while ((p = progressor(future)) > 0) {
        future += out[p];
        done[p] = true;
    }
    return (done[0..N] == true)
}
```

What if progressor chooses processes in the wrong order?
Banker's Algorithm

- Can we loan more money to a company?
  - Pretend we did
    - update cash and out[i]
  - Is it safe?
    - Yes: lend more money
    - No: un-do to pre-pretending state, sleep

- Multi-resource version
  - Generalizes easily to N independent resource types
  - See text
Avoidance - Summary

- **Good news** - *No deadlock*
  - No *static* “laws” about resource requests
  - Allocations flexible according to system state
- **Bad news**
  - Processes must pre-declare maximum usage
  - Avoidance is *conservative*
    - Many “unsafe” states are *almost* safe
    - System throughput reduced – extra sleeping
    - 3 processes, can allocate only 2 tape drives!?!?
Deadlock - What to do?

- **Prevention**
  - *Pass a law* against one of four ingredients

- **Avoidance**
  - Processes *pre-declare usage patterns*
  - Request manager avoids “unsafe states”

- **Detection/Recovery**
  - *Clean up only when trouble really happens*
Detection & Recovery - Approach

- Don't be paranoid
  - Don't refuse requests that *might* lead to trouble
    - (someday)
    - Most things work out ok in the end
- Even paranoids have enemies
  - Sometimes a deadlock *will* happen
  - Need a plan for noticing
  - Need a policy for reacting
  - Somebody must be told “try again later”
Detection - Key Ideas

- “Occasionally” scan for wait cycles
- Expensive
  - Must lock out all request/allocate/deallocate activity
  - Global mutex is the “global variable” of concurrency
  - Detecting cycles is an N-squared kind of thing
Scanning Policy

- Throughput balance
  - Scan too often - system becomes (very) slow
  - Scan before every sleep? Only in small systems
  - Scan too rarely - system becomes (extremely) slow

- Policy candidates
  - Scan every <interval>
  - Scan when CPU is “too idle”
Detection - Algorithms

- Detection: Unique Resources
  - Search for cycles in resource graph
    - (see above)
- Detection: Multi-instance Resources
  - Slight variation on Banker's Algorithm
    - (see text)
- Find a deadlock? Now what?
  - Abort
  - Preempt
Recovery - Abort

- Evict processes from the system
- All processes in the cycle?
  - Simple & blame-free policy
  - Lots of re-execution work later!
- *Just one* process in the cycle?
  - *Which* one?
    - Priority? Work remaining? Work to clean up?
    - Often immediately creates a smaller cycle – re-scan?
Recovery – Abort Just One?

P3's plan
A(R3); A(R1); A(R2)
Recovery – Abort Just One?

P3's plan
A(R3); A(R1); A(R2)
Recovery – Abort Just One?

R1

P3's plan
A(R3); A(R1); A(R2)

P3

R2

P2

R3
Recovery – Can we do better?

- Aborting processes is undesirable
  - Re-running processes is *expensive*
  - Long-running tasks may *never* complete
  - Starvation
Recovery - Resource Preemption

- Tell some process(es): time to give, not take
  - lock(R300) \(\Rightarrow\) “Ok”
  - lock(R346) \(\Rightarrow\) “EDEADLOCK”

- What does “EDEADLOCK” mean?
  - Can't just retry the request (make sure you see this)
  - Must release other resources you hold, try later
  - Forced release may require “rollback” (yuck)

- Policy question: which process loses?
  - Lowest-numbered? \(\Rightarrow\) starvation!
Summary - Deadlock

• Deadlock is...
  – Set of processes
  – Each one waiting for something held by another

• Four “ingredients”

• Three approaches
  – (aside from “Hmmm...<reboot>”)

Deadlock - Approaches

- Prevention - Pass a law against one of:
  - Mutual exclusion (unlikely!)
  - Hold & wait (maybe, but...)
  - No preemption (maybe?)
  - Circular wait (popular, if feasible; watch out for...)

- An architectural choice may *preclude* some features, algorithms, ...
Deadlock - Approaches

- **Avoidance** - “Stay out of danger”
  - Requires pre-declaration of usage patterns
  - Not all “danger” turns into trouble
- **Detection & Recovery**
  - Scan frequency: delicate balance
  - Preemption is hard, messy
- **Rebooting**
  - Was it really hung?
Summary - Starvation

• starvation ≠ deadlock:
  – Starvation and Deadlock share the property that at least one process is not making progress.
  – With starvation there is a schedule where the process makes progress (but the schedule is not taken).

• Starvation is a ubiquitous danger

• “Solutions” to deadlock leave us vulnerable to starvation.
  – If you’re the class of application impacted, you are no better off than if you were deadlocked.