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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
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
Travel Advisory

- Exam is upcoming...
  - Soon we will begin an exam-conflict process; when you receive mail, please act on it right away

- That week and the week after are popular dates for mid-term exams in many classes

- If you provide a recruiter with a list of “blackout” dates, that person should schedule around that list

- Computing such a list is a good idea
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 resources
  - 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”...
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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

- 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

- 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
  ```c
  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”
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Deadlock Requirements

- Mutual Exclusion
- Hold & Wait
- No Preemption
- Circular Wait
- *Each deadlock requires all four*
Multi-Instance Cycle
Multi-Instance Cycle *(With Rescuer!)*
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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

- EA
- RL
- KJ
- TB
- CW
Successful Acquisition

- EA
- RL
- KJ
- TB
- CW
Deadlock!
Dining Philosophers – State

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

/* Right-handed convention */
right = diner; /* 3 ⇒ 3 */
left = (diner + 4) % 5; /* 3 ⇒ 7 ⇒ 2 */
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!*
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?

- Acquire resources *all-or-none*

  ```c
  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?

- Steal resources from sleeping processes!

```c
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?

- 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 \equiv \text{right chopstick, then left}
  - Diner 4 \Rightarrow \text{lock}(4); \text{lock}(3);
  - Diner 3 \Rightarrow \text{lock}(3); \text{lock}(2);
Assigning Diners a Total Order

- Lock order: 4, 3, 2, 1, 0 \equiv \text{right chopstick, then left}
  - Diner 4 \Rightarrow \text{lock}(4); \text{lock}(3);
  - Diner 3 \Rightarrow \text{lock}(3); \text{lock}(2);
  - Diner 0 \Rightarrow \text{lock}(0); \text{lock}(4); \quad /* \text{violates lock order!} */
- Requires special-case locking code to get order right

```c
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