Last Time

• Introduced Threads
  – Why we want them, what they are, how they differ from processes
  – Kernel vs. User
  – Independent vs. Cooperating

• Too Much Milk
  – Race conditions: different result based on scheduling
Too Much Milk: Solution #3

You (Thread A)
leave note A
while(note B)
do nothing;
if(noMilk)
buy milk;
remove note A

Your Roommate (Thread B)
leave note B
if(noNote A)
if(noMilk)
buy milk;
remove note B

Does this work?  A. Yes  B. No
Too Much Milk: Lock Solution

You (Thread A)
Lock->Acquire();
if(noMilk)
    buy milk;
Lock->Release();

Your Roommate (Thread B)
Lock->Acquire();
if(noMilk)
    buy milk;
Lock->Release();
Too Much Milk: Taking Turns

turn = A

You (Thread A)
while (turn != A)
  do nothing;
if (noMilk)
  buy milk;

Your Roommate (Thread B)
while (turn != B)
  do nothing;
if (noMilk)
  buy milk;

turn = B;

Does this work?
Today’s Agenda

• Synchronization Terminology
  – Atomic Operations
  – Mutual exclusion, critical sections
    • Safety, Liveness, Bounded waiting

• Synchronization Primitives
  – Locks
  – Semaphores
Threads and the Scheduler
(or, Why Multi-threaded Programming is Hard)

Given two threads, A and B, how might their executions be scheduled?

A
B

A
B

A
B

A
B

A
B
Concurrencey Quiz

If two threads execute this program concurrently, how many different final values of the global variable X are there?

Initially, X == 0.

Thread 1

```c
void increment() {
    int tmp = X;
    tmp = tmp + 1;
    X = tmp;
}
```

Thread 2

```c
void increment() {
    int tmp = X;
    tmp = tmp + 1;
    X = tmp;
}
```

A. 0  
B. 1  
C. 2  
D. More than 2
Schedules/Interleavings

- Model of concurrent execution
- Interleave statements from each thread into a single thread
- If any interleaving yields incorrect results, some synchronization is needed

If \( X == 0 \) initially, \( X == 1 \) at the end. **WRONG** result!
Formalizing "Too Much Milk"

• Shared variable operations
  – “Look in the fridge for milk” – check a variable
  – “Put milk away” – update a variable
Formalizing “Too Much Milk”

You (Thread A)
leave note A
while(note B)
do nothing;
if(noMilk)
buy milk;
remove note A

Your Roommate (Thread B)
leave note B
if(noNote A)
if(noMilk)
buy milk;
remove note B

Entry Section

Critical Section

Exit Section
Critical Sections and Correctness

Four properties are required for correctness:

1. Safety: only one thread in the critical section
2. Liveness: if no threads are executing a critical section, and a thread wishes to enter a critical section, that thread must be guaranteed to eventually enter the critical section
3. Bounded waiting: if a thread wishes to enter a critical section, then there exists a bound on the number of other threads that may enter the critical section before that thread does
4. Failure atomicity: it’s okay for a thread to die in the critical section
Formalizing “Too Much Milk”

• Shared variable operations
  – “Look in the fridge for milk” – check a variable
  – “Put milk away” – update a variable

• Safety property
  – At most one person buys milk

• Liveness
  – Someone buys milk when needed
Safety and Liveness, More Generally

Properties defined over the execution of a program

• Safety: “nothing bad happens”
  – Holds in every finite execution prefix
    • Windows never crashes
    • No patient is ever given the wrong medication
    • A program never terminates with the wrong answer

• Liveness: “something good eventually happens”
  – No partial execution is irremediable
    • Windows always reboots
    • Medications are eventually distributed to patients
    • A program eventually terminates
Safety and Liveness for Critical Sections

- Only one thread is concurrently in the critical section
  A. Safety
  B. Liveness
  C. Both

- A thread that wants to enter the critical section will eventually succeed
  A. Safety
  B. Liveness
  C. Both

- Bounded waiting: If a thread $i$ is in entry section, then there is a bound on the number of times that other threads are allowed to enter the critical section (only 1 thread is allowed in at a time) before thread $i$’s request is granted.
  A. Safety   B. Liveness   C. Both
Mutual Exclusion

• Exactly one thread (or process) is doing a particular activity at a time. Usually related to critical sections.
  – Active thread excludes its peers

• Some computer resources cannot be accessed by multiple threads at the same time
  – E.g., a printer can’t print two documents at once

• For shared memory architectures, data structures are often mutually exclusive
  – Two threads adding to a linked list can corrupt the list
When to Use Mutual Exclusion/Critical Sections

*Anytime* you access shared data

- If a thread checks a value
  - Even if it is “just a quick” read
- If a thread updates a piece of shared data
  - *What data is shared?*

*Learn it! Live it! Breathe it!*
Terminology

• *Atomic Operation*: an operation that is uninterruptible

• *Synchronization*: Using atomic operations to ensure cooperation between threads

✔ *Mutual Exclusion*: Exactly one thread (or process) is doing a particular activity at a time. Usually related to critical sections

✔ *Critical Section*: A piece of code that only one thread can execute at a time
Formalizing “Too Much Milk”

You (Thread A)
leave note A
while(note B)
do nothing;
if(noMilk)
buy milk;
remove note A

Your Roommate (Thread B)
leave note B
if(noNote A)
if(noMilk)
buy milk;
remove note B
Atomic Operations

• Operations that are uninterruptible---run to completion or not at all
  – What about $x = x + 1$?
    • load $x$
    • add 1
    • store $x$
  – if($x == 1$) $x=2$?
    • load $x$
    • compare
    • store $x$ (maybe)

• What operations are uninterruptible?
Synchronization
Our Ideal Solution

• Satisfies correctness properties
  – Safety, liveness, bounded wait
  – Easy to convince ourselves it does so
• No busy waiting (spin locks)
  – Threads should block when waiting and then be awakened when it is their turn (a wait queue)
• Extendable to many threads (not just two!)
  – Symmetric
• Anything else?
Support for Synchronization

Most systems provide support for *atomic routines* for synchronization

- **Locks**: One thread holds a lock at a time, executes the critical section, releases the lock
- **Semaphores**: More general version of locks
- **Monitors**: Connects shared data to synchronization primitive

=> *All require some hardware support (and waiting!)*. 
Locks, Generally

A lock allows one thread to prevent another thread from doing something

- Lock before entering a critical section or before accessing shared data
- Unlock when leaving a critical section or when access to shared data is complete
- Wait if locked
Locks, More Formally

- **Locks** provide mutual exclusion to shared data with two atomic routines:
  - \textit{Lock::Acquire}: wait until lock is free, then grab it
  - \textit{Lock::Release}: unlock and wake up any thread waiting in Acquire

- Locks have two states: Busy and Free
  - Lock is initially free

- Rules for using a lock:
  - Acquire the lock before accessing shared data
  - Release the lock after finishing with shared data
Locks and Too Much Milk

Our solution used notes as locks:

1. Leave a note (acquire a lock)
2. Remove a note (release the lock)
3. Do not buy any milk if there is a note (wait)

What would it look like with actual locks?
Too Much Milk: Lock Solution

Lock myLock;

You (Thread A)
myLock->Acquire();
if(noMilk)
  buy milk;
myLock->Release();

Your Roommate (Thread B)
myLock->Acquire();
if(noMilk)
  buy milk;
myLock->Release();
So... Implementing Locks
Key Observations

• Why do we need mutual exclusion?
  – The scheduler!

• On a uniprocessor, a operation is atomic if no context switch can occur in the middle of the operation
  – Mutual exclusion by preventing the context switch

• Context switches occur because of:
  – Internal events: systems calls and exceptions
  – External events: interrupts
Thwarting the Scheduler
(or Keeping Control)

So... how can a thread keep control?
   – Internal events: Easy! Don’t yield, don’t request
     I/O, don’t cause any exceptions
   – External events: ????
Disabling Interrupts

• Tells the hardware to delay handling any external events until after the thread is finished modifying the critical section
• In some implementations, done by setting and unsetting the interrupt status bit
Disabling Interrupts: Simplest Solution

Lock::Acquire()
{
    disable interrupts;
}

Lock::Release()
{
    enable interrupts;
}

Does this work?

Is this a good idea?

No!

• Once interrupts are disabled, thread can’t be stopped
• Critical section can be very long---can’t wait too long
to respond to interrupts
Disabling Interrupts: Simple Solution

Lock::Acquire()
{
  disable interrupts;
  while(value == BUSY){
    enable interrupts;
    disable interrupts;
  }
  value = BUSY;
  enable interrupts;
}

Lock::Release()
{
  disable interrupts;
  value = FREE;
  enable interrupts;
}

So... Let’s shorten the length of the critical section. Instead of disabling interrupts for the entire critical section, let’s only use them to protect the lock’s data structure.
Disabling Interrupts: No Busy Wait

Lock::Acquire()

disable interrupts;
if(value==BUSY) {
    add thread to wait queue
    thread->block()
}
else
    value = BUSY;
enable interrupts;

Lock::Release()

disable interrupts;
if queue is not empty{
    take thread1 off wait queue
    put thread1 on ready queue
}
else
    value = FREE;
enable interrupts;
Re-enabling Interrupts

```cpp
Lock::Acquire()
{
    disable interrupts;
    if (value == BUSY) {
        enable interrupts;
        add thread to wait queue
        thread->block()
    } else
        value = BUSY;
    enable interrupts;
}

Lock::Release()
{
    disable interrupts;
    if (queue is not empty) {
        take thread1 off wait queue
        put thread1 on ready queue
    } else
        value = FREE;
    enable interrupts;
}
Re-enabling Interrupts

Lock::Acquire(){
    disable interrupts;
    if(value==BUSY) {
        add thread to wait queue
        enable interrupts;
        thread->block()
    } else
    value = BUSY;
    enable interrupts;
}

Lock::Release(){
    disable interrupts;
    if queue is not empty{
        take thread1 off wait queue
        put thread1 on ready queue
    } else
    value = FREE;
    enable interrupts;
}
Re-enabling Interrupts

Where else?

– The running thread itself: the first thing a thread does when it starts to execute is enable interrupts

– In the CPU scheduler: When the scheduler selects and starts the next running process, it can enable interrupts

  • Remember, the scheduler can get control when a thread gives it up voluntarily
Larger Question: Is this a good idea?

• Should user processes be able to disable interrupts?
  – No.

• What happens on multiprocessors?
  – Disabling interrupts affects only the CPU on which the thread is executing
    • Threads on other CPUs can enter the critical section!

• On a uniprocessor, the OS does use this technique when it is updating some data structures
  – Important for Pintos!
What are we trying to do?

• Ensure mutual exclusion, liveness, etc.
• But, practically?
  – See if another thread is executing the section
    \textit{(read a variable)}
  – If it isn’t, grab the lock \textit{(modify and write a variable)}
  – If it is, wait
  – Atomically
• So we want a read-modify-write instruction
Atomic Read-Modify-Write Instructions

• Atomic read-modify-write instructions *atomically* read a value from memory into a register and write a new value.
  – read a memory location into a register AND
  – write a new value to the location

• Uniprocessor just needs a new instruction

• On multiprocessors, the processor issuing the instruction:
  – must invalidate the value other processes may have in their caches
  – must lock the memory bus to prevent other processors from accessing memory until it is finished
Example RMW Instructions

- **Test&Set**: most architectures
  - Reads a value from memory
  - Writes “1” back to the memory location

- **Compare&Swap (CAS)**: 68000
  - Test the value against some constant
  - If the test is true, set value in memory to a different value
  - Report the result of the test in a flag

- **Load Linked/Store Conditional (LL/SC)**: Alpha, PowerPC, ARM
  - LL returns value of memory location
  - A subsequent SC to that memory location succeeds only if that location has not been updated since LL

- **Exchange**: x86
  - Swaps value between register and memory
Implementing Locks with Test&Set

Lock::Acquire()
{
    while (test&set(value)==1) 
    
}  

Lock::Release()
{
    value = 0;  
}  

• If lock is free (value==0),
  test&set reads 0, sets value to 1, and returns 0. The Lock is not busy, test in the while fails, and Acquire is complete

• If lock is busy (value==1),
  test&set reads 1, sets value to 1, and returns 1. The while continues to loop until an Release executes
Problems!

- Occupies CPU by performing busy waiting, or *spinning*
  - Could be okay as long as critical section is much shorter than the scheduling quantum

- What happens if threads have different priorities?
  - If the thread waiting for the lock has higher priority than the thread using the lock?
  - This is called the *priority inversion* problem
    - possible whenever there is a busy wait

- **BUT** there is low latency to acquire the lock
  - If it becomes free, waiting thread gets it as soon as it is scheduled again
Test&Set with Cheaper Busy Waiting

Lock::Acquire(){
    while(1) {
        if(test&set(value)==0)
            break;
        else sleep(1);
    }
    value = 1;
}

Lock::Release(){
    value = 0;
}

Voluntary yield of the CPU
Test&Set and Busy Waiting

• Can we implement locks with test&set without
  – busy waiting OR
  – disabling interrupts?
• No.
• BUT we can busy wait on the lock rather than the critical section...
  – Add a variable that tracks whether the lock is in use (for us, guard)
Test\&Set with Minimal Busy Waiting

int value;   /*critical section indicator*/
int guard;   /*lock indicator*/

Lock::Acquire(int thread){
    while(test\&set(guard)==1) ;
    if(value != FREE){
        put thread on wait queue;
        thread->block()&set guard=0;
    } else {
        value=BUSY;
        guard = 0;
    }
}

Lock::Release(int thread){
    while(test\&set(guard)==1) ;
    if wait queue is not empty{
        take thread off wait queue;
        put thread on ready queue;
    } else {
        value=FREE;
    }
    guard = 0;
}
Is mutual exclusion enough?

• Locks provide mutual exclusion
  – Protect critical sections
  – Implementing them may require a critical section
    • Use atomic RMW operations to break the cycle
• But... we need more
  – What if we need to wait for another thread to take action?
  – What if there is more than one resource available?
Semaphores
Semaphores

- Semaphores offer elegant solutions to synchronization problems
  - Mutual exclusion and more general synchronization
- Semaphores are basically generalized locks
  - Support two atomic operations (Up & Down!)
  - Has a value, but the value has more options than busy/free
  - Supports a queue of threads that are waiting to access a resource
- Invented by Dijkstra in 1965
Two Types of Semaphores

• Binary semaphore
  – Same as a lock
  – Guarantees mutually exclusive access to a resource
  – Has two values: 0 or 1 (busy or free)
  – Initial value is always free (1)

• Counted semaphore
  – Represents a resource with many units available
  – Initial count is typically the number of resources
    • always a non-negative integer
  – Allows a thread to continue as long as more instances are available
  – Used for more general synchronization

Only implementation difference is the initial value!
Semaphores as Locks
(Binary Semaphores)
Using Binary Semaphores

S->Down() //wait until semaphore S
//is available (value>=1), then
<critical section> //decrement

S->Up () //signal to other processes
//that semaphore S is free
//increment value

• If a process executes S->Down() and semaphore S is free, it continues executing. Otherwise, the OS puts the process on the wait queue for semaphore S.
• S->Up() unblocks one process on semaphore S’s wait queue
Semaphores: Atomic Operations

- Down()
  - Actually P() (*Proberen*, or “pass” in Dutch)
  - Decrements the value
  - When down() returns, the thread has the resource
  - Can block: if resource not available (as indicated by count), the thread will be placed on a wait queue and put to sleep

- Up()
  - Actually V() (*Verhogen*, or “release” in Dutch)
  - Increments the value
  - Never blocks
  - If a thread is asleep on the wait queue, it will be awakened
Implementing Down() and Up()

int value = val;  //initial value depends on the problem and  
//indicates number of resources available

Semaphore::Down()
{
    if(value == 0)
    {
        add t to wait queue;
        t->block()
    }
    value = value – 1;
}

Semaphore::Up()
{
    value = value + 1;
    if(t on wait queue)
    {
        remove t from wait queue;
        wakeup(t);
    }
}
Too Much Milk: Semaphore Solution

Semaphore milkSema = 1;

You (Thread A)

milkSema->Down();
if(noMilk)
  buy milk;
milkSema->Up();

Your Roommate (Thread B)

milkSema->Down();
if(noMilk)
  buy milk;
milkSema->Up();
iClicker Question

If you have a binary semaphore, how many potential values does it have?

A. 0
B. 1
C. 2
D. 3
E. 4
Getting New Functionality
(Counted Semaphores)
Counted Semaphores

• Represent a resource with many units available
• Initial count is the number of resources
• Lets threads continue as long as more instances are available
Using Counted Semaphores

S->Down() //wait until semaphore S
//is available (value>=1), then
<access the resource> //decrement

S->Up () //signal to other processes
//that semaphore S is free
//increment value

• If a process executes S->Down() and semaphore S is free, it continues executing. Otherwise, the OS puts the process on the wait queue for semaphore S.
• S->Up() unblocks one process on semaphore S’s wait queue
When to Use Semaphores

• Mutual Exclusion
  – Use to protect the critical section (see Too Much Milk Example)

• Control Access to a Pool of Resources
  – Counted semaphore

• General Synchronization
  – Use to enforce general scheduling constraints where the threads must wait for some circumstance
  – Value is typically 0 to start
Summary

• Critical sections identify pieces of code that cannot be executed in parallel by multiple threads
  – Typically code that accesses or modifies shared variables
• Locks define critical sections
  – Lock implementation generally requires hardware support
  – Locks can busy-wait, and busy-waiting cheaply is important
• Semaphores are basically generalized locks
  – Used for mutual exclusion and more general synchronization
  – Each semaphore supports a queue of processes that are waiting to access a critical section
  – No busy waiting! Threads sleep inside down() until they have the resource
Announcements

• Discussion sections Friday! Problem Set 3 posted.
• Project 0 due Friday, 11:59p
• Project 1 posted today
  – Discussion Section this week will provide an introduction to Pintos. Read the documentation first!
• Exam 1 in two weeks (Wednesday)
  – 7p-9p UTC 2.112A
• If you didn’t hear from me, your iClicker is registered!