



# Chapter 6: Process Synchronization

---





# Chapter 6: Process Synchronization

---

- n Background
- n The Critical-Section Problem
- n Peterson's Solution
- n Synchronization Hardware
- n Mutex Locks
- n Semaphores
- n Classic Problems of Synchronization
- n Monitors
- n Synchronization Examples
- n Alternative Approaches





# Objectives

---

- n To introduce the critical-section problem, whose solutions can be used to ensure the consistency of shared data
- n To present both software and hardware solutions of the critical-section problem
- n To examine several classical process-synchronization problems
- n To explore several tools that are used to solve process synchronization problems






# Background

- n Processes can execute concurrently
  - | May be interrupted at any time, partially completing execution
- n Concurrent access to shared data may result in data inconsistency
- n Maintaining data consistency requires mechanisms to ensure the orderly execution of cooperating processes
- n Illustration of the problem:

Suppose that we wanted to provide a solution to the consumer-producer problem that fills all the buffers. We can do so by having an integer **counter** that keeps track of the number of full buffers. Initially, **counter** is set to 0. It is incremented by the producer after it produces a new buffer and is decremented by the consumer after it consumes a buffer.





# Producer

```
while (true) {  
    /* produce an item in next produced */  
  
    while (counter == BUFFER_SIZE) ;  
        /* do nothing */  
    buffer[in] = next_produced;  
    in = (in + 1) % BUFFER_SIZE;  
    counter++;  
}
```






# Consumer

```
while (true) {  
    while (counter == 0)  
        ; /* do nothing */  
    next_consumed = buffer[out];  
    out = (out + 1) % BUFFER_SIZE;  
    counter--;  
    /* consume the item in next consumed */  
}
```





# Race Condition

n **counter++** could be implemented as

```
register1 = counter
register1 = register1 + 1
counter = register1
```

n **counter--** could be implemented as

```
register2 = counter
register2 = register2 - 1
counter = register2
```

n Consider this execution interleaving with “count = 5” initially:

S0: producer execute	<b>register1 = counter</b>	{register1 = 5}
S1: producer execute	<b>register1 = register1 + 1</b>	{register1 = 6}
S2: consumer execute	<b>register2 = counter</b>	{register2 = 5}
S3: consumer execute	<b>register2 = register2 - 1</b>	{register2 = 4}
S4: producer execute	<b>counter = register1</b>	{counter = 6}
S5: consumer execute	<b>counter = register2</b>	{counter = 4}






# Critical Section Problem

- n Consider system of  $n$  processes  $\{p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{n-1}\}$
- n Each process has **critical section** segment of code
  - | Process may be changing common variables, updating table, writing file, etc
  - | When one process is executing in its critical section, no other processes are allowed to execute in their critical sections
- n Critical section problem is to design a protocol that the processes can use to cooperate
- n Each process must ask permission to enter critical section in **entry section**, may follow critical section with **exit section**, then **remainder section**







# Critical Section

**n** General structure of process  $p_i$  is

do {

*entry section*


critical section

*exit section*

remainder section

} while (true);






# Solution to Critical-Section Problem

- Mutual Exclusion - If process  $P_i$  is executing in its critical section, then no other processes can be executing in their critical sections
- Progress - If no process is executing in its critical section and there exist some processes that wish to enter their critical sections, then the selection of the processes that will enter the critical section next cannot be postponed indefinitely
- Bounded Waiting - A bound must exist on the number of times that other processes are allowed to enter their critical sections after a process has made a request to enter its critical section and before that request is granted
  - Assume that each process executes at a nonzero speed
  - No assumption concerning **relative speed** of the  $n$  processes
- Two approaches depending on if kernel is preemptive or non-preemptive
  - **Preemptive** – allows preemption of process when running in kernel mode
  - **Non-preemptive** – runs until exits kernel mode, blocks, or voluntarily yields CPU
    - ▶ Essentially free of race conditions in kernel mode





# Peterson's Solution

- n Good algorithmic description of solving the problem
- n Two process solution
- n Assume that the **load** and **store** instructions are atomic; that is, cannot be interrupted
- n The two processes share two variables:
  - | `int turn;`
  - | `Boolean flag[2]`
- n The variable **turn** indicates whose turn it is to enter the critical section
- n The **flag** array is used to indicate if a process is ready to enter the critical section. **flag[i] = true** implies that process  $P_i$  is ready!





# Algorithm for Process $P_i$ and $P_j$


```
do {  
    flag[i] = true;  
    turn = j;  
    while (flag[j] && turn == j);  
        critical section  
    flag[i] = false;  
        remainder section  
} while (true);
```

```
do {  
    flag[j] = true;  
    turn = i;  
    while (flag[i] && turn == i);  
        critical section  
    flag[j] = false;  
        remainder section  
} while (true);
```

n Provable that

- Mutual exclusion is preserved
- Progress requirement is satisfied
- Bounded-waiting requirement is met





# Synchronization Hardware

- n Many systems provide hardware support for critical section code
- n All solutions below based on idea of **locking**
  - | Protecting critical regions via locks
- n Uniprocessors – could disable interrupts
  - | Currently running code would execute without preemption
  - | Generally too inefficient on multiprocessor systems
    - ▶ Operating systems using this not broadly scalable
- n Modern machines provide special **atomic** hardware instructions
  - | Either test memory word and set value
  - | Or swap contents of two memory words





# Solution to Critical-section Problem Using Locks

```
do {  
    acquire lock  
        critical section  
    release lock  
        remainder section  
} while (TRUE);
```






# test\_and\_set Instruction

## n Definition

```
boolean test_and_set (boolean *target)
{
    boolean rv = *target;
    *target = TRUE;
    return rv;
}
```

- The test\_and\_set instruction is executed atomically





# Solution using test\_and\_set()

n Shared boolean variable lock, initialized to FALSE


n Solution

```
do {  
    while (test_and_set(&lock))  
        ; /* do nothing */  
    /* critical section */  
    lock = false;  
    /* remainder section */  
} while (true);
```

■ Do not satisfy the bounded-waiting requirement








# compare\_and\_swap Instruction

## n Definition

```
int compare_and_swap(int *value, int expected, int new_value)
{
    int temp = *value;
    if (*value == expected)
        *value = new_value;
    return temp;
}
```

- The compare\_and swap instruction is executed atomically





# Solution using compare\_and\_swap

- n Shared Boolean variable lock initialized to FALSE; Each process has a local Boolean variable key
- n Solution

```
do {  
    while (compare and swap(&lock, 0, 1) != 0)  
        ; /* do nothing */  
    /* critical section */  
    lock = 0;  
    /* remainder section */  
} while (true);
```

- n Do not satisfy the bounded-waiting requirement





# Bounded-waiting Mutual Exclusion with test\_and\_set

```
do {
    waiting[i] = true;
    key = true;
    while (waiting[i] && key)
        key = test_and_set(&lock);
    waiting[i] = false;
    /* critical section */
    j = (i + 1) % n;
    while ((j != i) && !waiting[j])
        j = (j + 1) % n;
    if (j == i)
        lock = false;
    else
        waiting[j] = false;
    /* remainder section */
} while (true);
```






# Mutex Locks

- n Previous hardware solutions are complicated and generally inaccessible to application programmers
- n OS designers build software tools to solve critical section problem
- n Simplest is mutex lock
- n Protect critical regions with it by first **acquire()** a lock then **release()** it
  - | Boolean variable indicating if lock is available or not
- n Calls to **acquire()** and **release()** must be atomic
  - | Usually implemented via hardware atomic instructions
- n But this solution requires **busy waiting**
  - | This lock therefore called a **spinlock**






# acquire() and release()

```
acquire() {  
    while (!available)  
        ; /* busy wait */  
    available = false;;  
}  
release() {  
    available = true;  
}  
  
do {  
    acquire lock  
    critical section  
    release lock  
    remainder section  
} while (true);
```





# Semaphore

- n Synchronization tool that does not require busy waiting
- n Semaphore S – integer variable
- n Two standard operations modify S: **wait()** and **signal()**
  - | Originally called **P()** and **V()**
- n Less complicated
- n Can only be accessed via two indivisible (atomic) operations

```
wait (S) {  
    while (S <= 0)  
        ; // busy wait  
    S--;  
}  
  
signal (S) {  
    S++;  
}
```





# Semaphore Usage

- n **Counting semaphore** – integer value can range over an unrestricted domain
- n **Binary semaphore** – integer value can range only between 0 and 1
  - | Then a **mutex lock**
- n Can implement a counting semaphore S as a binary semaphore
- n Can solve various synchronization problems
- n Consider  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  that require  $S_1$  to happen before  $S_2$

P1 :

$S_1$  ;


**signal (synch) ;**

P2 :

**wait (synch) ;**

$S_2$  ;





# Semaphore Implementation

- n Must guarantee that no two processes can execute `wait()` and `signal()` on the same semaphore at the same time
- n Thus, implementation becomes the critical section problem where the wait and signal code are placed in the critical section
  - | Could now have **busy waiting** in critical section implementation
    - ▶ But implementation code is short
    - ▶ Little busy waiting if critical section rarely occupied
- n Note that applications may spend lots of time in critical sections and therefore this is not a good solution







# Semaphore Implementation with no Busy waiting (1)

- n With each semaphore there is an associated waiting queue
- n Each entry in a waiting queue has two data items:
  - | value (of type integer)
  - | pointer to next record in the list
- n Two operations:
  - | **block** – place the process invoking the operation on the appropriate waiting queue
  - | **wakeup** – remove one of processes in the waiting queue and place it in the ready queue






# Semaphore Implementation with no Busy waiting (2)

```
typedef struct{
    int value;
    struct process *list;
} semaphore;

wait(semaphore *S) {
    S->value--;
    if (S->value < 0) {
        add this process to S->list;
        block();
    }
}

signal(semaphore *S) {
    S->value++;
    if (S->value <= 0) {
        remove a process P from S->list;
        wakeup(P);
    }
}
```





# Deadlock and Starvation


- n **Deadlock** – two or more processes are waiting indefinitely for an event that can be caused by only one of the waiting processes
- n Let  $S$  and  $Q$  be two semaphores initialized to 1

$P_0$   
`wait(S) ;`  
`wait(Q) ;`  
  
.  
`signal(S) ;`  
`signal(Q) ;`

$P_1$   
`wait(Q) ;`  
`wait(S) ;`  
  
.  
`signal(Q) ;`  
`signal(S) ;`

- n **Starvation** – indefinite blocking
  - | A process may never be removed from the semaphore queue in which it is suspended
- n **Priority Inversion** – Scheduling problem when lower-priority process holds a lock needed by higher-priority process
  - | Solved via **priority-inheritance protocol**





# Classical Problems of Synchronization

---

- n Classical problems used to test newly-proposed synchronization schemes
  - | Bounded-Buffer Problem
  - | Readers and Writers Problem
  - | Dining-Philosophers Problem






# Bounded-Buffer Problem

---

- n** n buffers, each can hold one item
- n** Semaphore **mutex** initialized to the value 1
- n** Semaphore **full** initialized to the value 0
- n** Semaphore **empty** initialized to the value n






# Bounded Buffer Problem (Cont.)

n The structure of the producer process

```
do {  
    ...  
    /* produce an item in next_produced */  
    ...  
    wait(empty);  
    wait(mutex);  
    ...  
    /* add next produced to the buffer */  
    ...  
    signal(mutex);  
    signal(full);  
} while (true);
```






# Bounded Buffer Problem (Cont.)

n The structure of the consumer process

```
do {  
    wait(full);  
    wait(mutex);  
    ...  
    /* remove an item from buffer to next_consumed */  
    ...  
    signal(mutex);  
    signal(empty);  
    ...  
    /* consume the item in next consumed */  
    ...  
} while (true);
```





# Readers-Writers Problem

- n A data set is shared among a number of concurrent processes
  - | Readers – only read the data set; they do not perform any updates
  - | Writers – can both read and write
- n Problem – allow multiple readers to read at the same time
  - | Only one single writer can access the shared data at the same time
- n Several variations of how readers and writers are treated – all involve priorities
- n Shared Data
  - | Data set
  - | Semaphore **rw\_mutex** initialized to 1
  - | Semaphore **mutex** initialized to 1
  - | Integer **read\_count** initialized to 0







# Readers-Writers Problem (Cont.)

n The structure of a reader process

```
do {  
    wait(mutex) ;  
    read_count++;  
    if (read_count == 1)  
        wait(rw_mutex) ;  
    signal(mutex) ;  
    ...  
    /* reading is performed */  
    wait(mutex) ;  
    read_count-- ;  
    if (read_count == 0)  
        signal(rw_mutex) ;  
    signal(mutex) ;  
} while (true) ;
```

n The structure of a writer process

```
do {  
    wait(rw_mutex) ;  
    ...  
    /* writing is performed */  
    ...  
    signal(rw_mutex) ;  
} while (true) ;
```






# Readers-Writers Problem Variations


---

- n First variation – No reader kept waiting unless writer has permission to use shared object
- n Second variation – once writer is ready, it performs write asap
- n Both may have starvation leading to even more variations
- n Problem is solved on some systems by kernel providing reader-writer locks






# Dining-Philosophers Problem



- n Philosophers spend their lives thinking and eating
- n Don't interact with their neighbors, occasionally try to pick up 2 chopsticks (one at a time) to eat from bowl
  - | Need both to eat, then release both when done
- n In the case of 5 philosophers
  - | Shared data
    - ▶ Bowl of rice (data set)
    - ▶ Semaphore **chopstick** [5] initialized to 1






# Dining-Philosophers Problem Algorithm

n The structure of Philosopher  $i$ :

```
do {  
    wait ( chopstick[i] );  
    wait ( chopstick[ (i + 1) % 5] );  
  
    // eat  
  
    signal ( chopstick[i] );  
    signal ( chopstick[ (i + 1) % 5] );  
  
    // think  
  
} while (TRUE);
```

n What is the problem with this algorithm?





# Problems with Semaphores

- n Incorrect use of semaphore operations:
  - | signal (mutex) .... wait (mutex)
  - | wait (mutex) ... wait (mutex)
  - | Omitting of wait (mutex) or signal (mutex) (or both)
- n Deadlock and starvation





# Monitors

- n A high-level abstraction that provides a convenient and effective mechanism for process synchronization
- n Abstract data type, internal variables only accessible by code within the procedure
- n Only one process may be active within the monitor at a time
- n But not powerful enough to model some synchronization schemes

```
monitor monitor-name
{
    // shared variable declarations
    procedure P1 (...) { ... }


    procedure Pn (...) {.....}


    Initialization code (...) { ... }
}
}
```





# Schematic view of a Monitor





# Condition Variables


- n condition x, y;
- n Two operations on a condition variable:
  - | **x.wait ()** – a process that invokes the operation is suspended until **x.signal ()**
  - | **x.signal ()** – resumes one of processes (if any) that invoked **x.wait ()**
    - ▶ If no **x.wait ()** on the variable, then it has no effect on the variable








# Monitor with Condition Variables





# Condition Variables Choices

- n If process P invokes `x.signal ()`, with Q in `x.wait ()` state, what should happen next?
  - | If Q is resumed, then P must wait
  
- n Options include
  - | Signal and wait – P waits until Q leaves monitor or waits for another condition
  - | Signal and continue – Q waits until P leaves the monitor or waits for another condition
  - | Both have pros and cons – language implementer can decide
  - | Monitors implemented in Concurrent Pascal compromise
    - ▶ P executing signal immediately leaves the monitor, Q is resumed
  - | Implemented in other languages including Mesa, C#, Java





# Solution to Dining Philosophers

monitor DiningPhilosophers

```
{
    enum { THINKING; HUNGRY, EATING)
    state[5] ;
    condition self [5];


    void pickup (int i) {
        state[i] = HUNGRY;
        test(i);
        if (state[i] != EATING) self [i].wait;
    }

    void putdown (int i) {
        state[i] = THINKING;
        // test left and right neighbors
        test((i + 4) % 5);
        test((i + 1) % 5);
    }
}
```

```
void test (int i) {
    if ( (state[(i + 4) % 5] != EATING)
        &&
        (state[i] == HUNGRY) &&
        (state[(i + 1) % 5] != EATING) )
    {
        state[i] = EATING ;
        self[i].signal () ;
    }
}

initialization_code() {
    for (int i = 0; i < 5; i++)
        state[i] = THINKING;
}
}
```





# Solution to Dining Philosophers (Cont.)

- n Each philosopher  $i$  invokes the operations `pickup()` and `putdown()` in the following sequence:


`DiningPhilosophers.pickup (i);`

EAT

`DiningPhilosophers.putdown (i);`

- n No deadlock, but starvation is possible





# Monitor Implementation Using Semaphores

## n Variables

```
semaphore mutex; // (initially = 1)
semaphore next;  // (initially = 0)
int next_count = 0;
```

## n Each procedure F will be replaced by

```
wait(mutex);
...
body of F;

...
if (next_count > 0)
    signal(next)
else
    signal(mutex);
```

## n Mutual exclusion within a monitor is ensured





# Monitor Implementation – Condition Variables

- n For each condition variable  $x$ , we have:

```
semaphore x_sem; // (initially = 0)
int x_count = 0;
```

- n The operation  $x.\text{wait}$  can be implemented as:

```
x_count++;
if (next_count > 0)
    signal(next);
else
    signal(mutex);
wait(x_sem);
x_count--;
```





# Monitor Implementation (Cont.)

n The operation `x.signal` can be implemented as:

```
if (x_count > 0) {  
    next_count++;  
    signal(x_sem);  
    wait(next);  
    next_count--;  
}
```





# Resuming Processes within a Monitor

- n If several processes queued on condition x, and x.signal() executed, which should be resumed?
- n FCFS frequently not adequate
- n **conditional-wait** construct of the form x.wait(c)
  - | Where c is **priority number**
  - | Process with lowest number (highest priority) is scheduled next








# A Monitor to Allocate Single Resource

```
monitor ResourceAllocator
{
    boolean busy;
    condition x;
    void acquire(int time) {
        if (busy)
            x.wait(time);
        busy = TRUE;
    }
    void release() {
        busy = FALSE;
        x.signal();
    }
    initialization code() {
        busy = FALSE;
    }
}
```





# Synchronization Examples

---

- n Solaris
- n Windows XP
- n Linux
- n Pthreads





# Solaris Synchronization

- n Implements a variety of locks to support multitasking, multithreading (including real-time threads), and multiprocessing
- n Uses **adaptive mutexes** for efficiency when protecting data from short code segments
  - | Starts as a standard semaphore spin-lock
  - | If lock held, and by a thread running on another CPU, spins
  - | If lock held by non-run-state thread, block and sleep waiting for signal of lock being released
- n Uses **condition variables**
- n Uses **readers-writers** locks when longer sections of code need access to data
- n Uses **turnstiles** to order the list of threads waiting to acquire either an adaptive mutex or reader-writer lock
  - | Turnstiles are per-lock-holding-thread, not per-object
- n Priority-inheritance per-turnstile gives the running thread the highest of the priorities of the threads in its turnstile






# Windows XP Synchronization

- n Uses interrupt masks to protect access to global resources on uniprocessor systems
- n Uses **spinlocks** on multiprocessor systems
  - | Spinlocking-thread will never be preempted
- n Also provides **dispatcher objects** user-land which may act mutexes, semaphores, events, and timers
  - | **Events**
    - ▶ An event acts much like a condition variable
  - | Timers notify one or more thread when time expired
  - | Dispatcher objects either **signaled-state** (object available) or **non-signaled state** (thread will block)





# Linux Synchronization

---

## n Linux:


- | Prior to kernel Version 2.6, disables interrupts to implement short critical sections
- | Version 2.6 and later, fully preemptive

## n Linux provides:

- | semaphores
- | spinlocks
- | reader-writer versions of both

## n On single-cpu system, spinlocks replaced by enabling and disabling kernel preemption





# Pthreads Synchronization

---

- n Pthreads API is OS-independent
- n It provides:
  - | mutex locks
  - | condition variables
- n Non-portable extensions include:
  - | read-write locks
  - | spinlocks

