

# Sistemi Operativi

Corso di Laurea in Informatica

a.a. 2020-2021



**SAPIENZA**  
UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA

Gabriele Tolomei

Dipartimento di Informatica

Sapienza Università di Roma

[tolomei@di.uniroma1.it](mailto:tolomei@di.uniroma1.it)

# Recap from Last Lecture: Synchronization

- Concurrent accesses to shared resources by multiple cooperating processes/threads can lead to unexpected or erroneous behavior
- Process/Thread cooperation must guarantee consistency of any shared data/resource, regardless of CPU scheduling
- Maintaining shared data consistency requires mechanisms to ensure synchronized execution of critical sections by processes/threads
- Critical sections are specific pieces of code which contain shared resources that need to be "protected"

# Recap from Last Lecture: Locks

- Synchronization primitives ensure that only one process/thread at a time executes in a critical section (**mutual exclusion**)
- Locks allow protection of critical sections by atomically testing and taking/releasing the access to a critical section
- Locks can be implemented leveraging some HW support:
  - **disabling interrupts** (can miss or delay important events)
  - **atomic instructions** (busy waiting/spinlock inefficient)

# Higher-Level Synchronization Primitives

- More general synchronization mechanisms
  - Not only for safely accessing critical sections

# Higher-Level Synchronization Primitives

- More general synchronization mechanisms
  - Not only for safely accessing critical sections
- 2 common high-level synchronization primitives:
  - **Semaphores:** binary (mutex) and counting
  - **Monitors:** mutex and condition variables

# Semaphores: Overview

- Another data structure that provides mutual exclusion to critical sections

# Semaphores: Overview

- Another data structure that provides mutual exclusion to critical sections
- Can also play the role of an atomic counter

# Semaphores: Overview

- Another data structure that provides mutual exclusion to critical sections
- Can also play the role of an atomic counter
- Generalization of locks invented by **Dijkstra** in 1965



# Semaphores: Overview

- Another data structure that provides mutual exclusion to critical sections
- Can also play the role of an atomic counter
- Generalization of locks invented by **Dijkstra** in 1965
- Special type of (integer) variable that supports **2 atomic operations**
  - **wait()** (also **P()**): decrement, block until semaphore is open
  - **signal()** (also **V()**): increment, allow another thread to enter

# Blocking in Semaphores

- Associated with each semaphore is a queue of waiting processes/threads

# Blocking in Semaphores

- Associated with each semaphore is a queue of waiting processes/threads
- When **wait()** is called by a thread:
  - If semaphore is open thread continues, otherwise thread blocks on queue

# Blocking in Semaphores

- Associated with each semaphore is a queue of waiting processes/threads
- When **wait()** is called by a thread:
  - If semaphore is open thread continues, otherwise thread blocks on queue
- Then **signal()** opens the semaphore:
  - If a thread is waiting on the queue the thread is unblocked, whilst if no threads are waiting on the queue, the signal is remembered for the next thread

# Blocking in Semaphores

- Associated with each semaphore is a queue of waiting processes/threads
- When **wait()** is called by a thread:
  - If semaphore is open thread continues, otherwise thread blocks on queue
- Then **signal()** opens the semaphore:
  - If a thread is waiting on the queue the thread is unblocked, whilst if no threads are waiting on the queue, the signal is remembered for the next thread
- In other words, **signal()** is stateful and has "history"

# Semaphores: Types

- **Binary Semaphore** a.k.a. Mutex (same as a Lock)
  - Guarantees mutually exclusive access to a resource (i.e., only one process/thread executes in a critical section)
  - Its associated integer variable can only take 2 values: 0 or 1
  - Initialized to open (e.g., `value = 1`)

# Semaphores: Types

- **Binary Semaphore** a.k.a. Mutex (same as a Lock)
  - Guarantees mutually exclusive access to a resource (i.e., only one process/thread executes in a critical section)
  - Its associated integer variable can only take 2 values: 0 or 1
  - Initialized to open (e.g., `value = 1`)
- **Counting Semaphore**
  - To manage multiple shared resources
  - The initial value of the semaphore is usually the number of resources
  - A process can access to a resource as long as at least one is available

# Semaphores: Key Ideas

```
// Semaphore S  
  
S.wait(); // wait until S is available  
  
<critical section>  
  
S.signal(); notify other processes that S is open
```



# Semaphores: Key Ideas

```
// Semaphore S  
  
S.wait(); // wait until S is available  
  
<critical section>  
  
S.signal(); notify other processes that S is open
```

Each semaphore supports a queue of processes that are waiting to access the critical section (e.g., to buy milk)

# Semaphores: Key Ideas

```
// Semaphore S  
  
S.wait(); // wait until S is available  
  
<critical section>  
  
S.signal(); notify other processes that S is open
```

Each semaphore supports a queue of processes that are waiting to access the critical section (e.g., to buy milk)

If a process executes `S.wait()` and semaphore `S` is open (non-zero), it continues executing, otherwise the OS puts the process on the wait queue

# Semaphores: Key Ideas

```
// Semaphore S  
  
S.wait(); // wait until S is available  
  
<critical section>  
  
S.signal(); notify other processes that S is open
```

Each semaphore supports a queue of processes that are waiting to access the critical section (e.g., to buy milk)

If a process executes `S.wait()` and semaphore `S` is open (non-zero), it continues executing, otherwise the OS puts the process on the wait queue

A `S.Signal()` unblocks one process on semaphore `S`'s wait queue

# Binary Semaphore: Example

"Too Much Milk" Using **Lock**

```
# Thread Bob  
  
Lock.acquire()  
  
if (!milk):  
    buy_milk()  
  
Lock.release()
```

```
# Thread Carl  
  
Lock.acquire()  
  
if (!milk):  
    buy_milk()  
  
Lock.release()
```

# Binary Semaphore: Example

"Too Much Milk" Using **Lock**

```
# Thread Bob  
  
Lock.acquire()  
  
if (!milk):  
    buy_milk()  
  
Lock.release()
```

```
# Thread Carl  
  
Lock.acquire()  
  
if (!milk):  
    buy_milk()  
  
Lock.release()
```

"Too Much Milk" Using **Semaphore**

```
# Thread Bob  
  
S.wait()  
  
if (!milk):  
    buy_milk()  
  
S.signal()
```

```
# Thread Carl  
  
S.wait()  
  
if (!milk):  
    buy_milk()  
  
S.signal()
```

# Binary Semaphore: Example

"Too Much Milk" Using **Lock**

"Too Much Milk" Using **Semaphore**

# Thread Bob	# Thread Carl	# Thread Bob	# Thread Carl
Lock.acquire()	Lock.acquire()	<b>S.wait()</b>	<b>S.wait()</b>
if (!milk): buy_milk()	if (!milk): buy_milk()	<b>if</b> (!milk): buy_milk()	<b>if</b> (!milk): buy_milk()
Lock.release()	Lock.release()	<b>S.signal()</b>	<b>S.signal()</b>

# Semaphore: Implementation

```
Class Semaphore {  
    public void wait(Thread t);  
    public void signal();  
    private int value;  
    private int guard;  
    private Queue q;  
  
    Semaphore(int val) {  
        // initialize semaphore  
        // with val and empty queue  
        this.value = val;  
        this.q = null;  
    }  
}
```

# Semaphore: Implementation

```
Class Semaphore {  
    public void wait(Thread t);  
    public void signal();  
    private int value;  
    private int guard;  
    private Queue q;  
  
    Semaphore(int val) {  
        // initialize semaphore  
        // with val and empty queue  
        this.value = val;  
        this.q = null;  
    }  
}
```

```
public void wait(Thread t) {  
    while(test&set(this.guard) == 1) {  
        // while busy do nothing  
    }  
    this.value -= 1;  
    if(this.value < 0) {  
        q.push(t);  
        t.sleep_and_reset_guard_to_0();  
    }  
    else {  
        this.guard = 0;  
    }  
}
```



# Semaphore: Implementation

```
Class Semaphore {  
    public void wait(Thread t);  
    public void signal();  
    private int value;  
    private int guard;  
    private Queue q;  
  
    Semaphore(int val) {  
        // initialize semaphore  
        // with val and empty queue  
        this.value = val;  
        this.q = null;  
    }  
}
```

```
public void wait(Thread t) {  
    while(test&set(this.guard) == 1) {  
        // while busy do nothing  
    }  
    this.value -= 1;  
    if(this.value < 0) {  
        q.push(t);  
        t.sleep_and_reset_guard_to_0();  
    }  
    else {  
        this.guard = 0;  
    }  
}
```

```
public void signal() {  
    while(test&set(this.guard) == 1) {  
        // while busy do nothing  
    }  
    this.value += 1;  
    if(!q.isEmpty()) {  
        t = q.pop();  
        push_onto_ready_queue(t);  
    }  
    this.guard = 0;  
}
```

# Semaphore: Implementation

```
Class Semaphore {  
    public void wait(Thread t);  
    public void signal();  
    private int value;  
    private int guard;  
    private Queue q;  
  
    Semaphore(int val) {  
        // initialize semaphore  
        // with val and empty queue  
        this.value = val;  
        this.q = null;  
    }  
}
```

```
public void wait(Thread t) {  
    while(test&set(this.guard) == 1) {  
        // while busy do nothing  
    }  
    this.value -= 1;  
    if(this.value < 0) {  
        q.push(t);  
        t.sleep_and_reset_guard_to_0();  
    }  
    else {  
        this.guard = 0;  
    }  
}
```

```
public void signal() {  
    while(test&set(this.guard) == 1) {  
        // while busy do nothing  
    }  
    this.value += 1;  
    if(!q.isEmpty()) {// this.value <= 0  
        t = q.pop();  
        push_onto_ready_queue(t);  
    }  
    this.guard = 0;  
}
```

# Semaphore: Implementation

```
Class Semaphore {  
    public void wait(Thread t);  
    public void signal();  
    private int value;  
    private int guard;  
    private Queue q;  
  
    Semaphore(int val) {  
        // initialize semaphore  
        // with val and empty queue  
        this.value = val;  
        this.q = null;  
    }  
}
```

```
public void wait(Thread t) {  
    while(test&set(this.guard) == 1) {  
        // while busy do nothing  
    }  
    this.value -= 1;  
    if(this.value < 0) {  
        q.push(t);  
        t.sleep_and_reset_guard_to_0();  
    }  
    else {  
        this.guard = 0;  
    }  
}
```

```
public void signal() {  
    while(test&set(this.guard) == 1) {  
        // while busy do nothing  
    }  
    this.value += 1;  
    if(!q.isEmpty()) {// this.value <= 0  
        t = q.pop();  
        push_onto_ready_queue(t);  
    }  
    this.guard = 0;  
}
```

**wait()** and **signal()** are of course atomic!

either interrupts must be disabled or **test&set** used

# Semaphore: Example

A


```
S.wait()  
S.wait()  
S.signal()  
S.signal()
```

S = 2

B

```
S.wait()  
S.signal()
```

# Semaphore: Example



A possible execution flow

S (value)	Queue	A	B
2	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec

# Semaphore: Example

A

```
S.wait()  
S.wait()  
S.signal()  
S.signal()
```

B

```
S.wait()  
S.signal()
```

A possible execution flow

A: S.wait()

S (value)	Queue	A	B
2	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec

# Semaphore: Example

A

```
S.wait()  
S.wait()  
S.signal()  
S.signal()
```

B

```
S.wait()  
S.signal()
```

A possible execution flow

A: S.wait()

S (value)	Queue	A	B
2	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
1	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec

# Semaphore: Example

A

```
S.wait()  
S.wait()  
S.signal()  
S.signal()
```

B

```
S.wait()  
S.signal()
```

A possible execution flow

A: S.wait()

B: S.wait()

S (value)	Queue	A	B
2	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
1	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec



# Semaphore: Example

A

```
S.wait()  
S.wait()  
S.signal()  
S.signal()
```

B

```
S.wait()  
S.signal()
```

A possible execution flow

A: S.wait()

B: S.wait()

S (value)	Queue	A	B
2	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
1	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
0	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec

# Semaphore: Example

A

```
S.wait()  
S.wait()  
S.signal()  
S.signal()
```

B

```
S.wait()  
S.signal()
```

A possible execution flow

A: S.wait()

B: S.wait()

A: S.wait()

S (value)	Queue	A	B
2	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
1	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
0	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec

# Semaphore: Example

A

```
S.wait()
S.wait()
S.signal()
S.signal()
```

B

```
S.wait()
S.signal()
```

A possible execution flow

A: S.wait()

B: S.wait()

A: S.wait()

S (value)	Queue	A	B
2	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
1	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
0	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
-1	A	blocked	ready to exec

# Semaphore: Example

A

```
S.wait()
S.wait()
S.signal()
S.signal()
```

B

```
S.wait()
S.signal()
```

A possible execution flow

A: S.wait()  
B: S.wait()  
A: S.wait()  
B: S.signal()

S (value)	Queue	A	B
2	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
1	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
0	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
-1	A	blocked	ready to exec

# Semaphore: Example

A

```
S.wait()
S.wait()
S.signal()
S.signal()
```

B

```
S.wait()
S.signal()
```

A possible execution flow

A: S.wait()

B: S.wait()

A: S.wait()

B: S.signal()

S (value)	Queue	A	B
2	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
1	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
0	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
-1	A	blocked	ready to exec
0	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec

# Semaphore: Example

A

```
S.wait()
S.wait()
S.signal()
S.signal()
```

B

```
S.wait()
S.signal()
```

A possible execution flow

	S (value)	Queue	A	B
	2	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
A: S.wait()	1	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
B: S.wait()	0	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
A: S.wait()	-1	A	blocked	ready to exec
B: S.signal()	0	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
A: S.signal()	1	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec
A: S.signal()	2	∅	ready to exec	ready to exec

# Semaphores: Purposes

- **Mutual Exclusion:** used to guard critical sections
  - The initial value of the semaphore is set to 1
  - Call **wait()** before the critical section, **signal()** after the critical section


# Semaphores: Purposes

- **Mutual Exclusion:** used to guard critical sections
  - The initial value of the semaphore is set to 1
  - Call **wait()** before the critical section, **signal()** after the critical section
- **Scheduling Constraints:** used to enforce threads to wait
  - The initial value of the semaphore is set to 0
  - Example → **join()** or **waitpid()**




# Semaphores: Purposes

- **Mutual Exclusion:** used to guard critical sections
  - The initial value of the semaphore is set to 1
  - Call **wait()** before the critical section, **signal()** after the critical section
- **Scheduling Constraints:** used to enforce threads to wait
  - The initial value of the semaphore is set to 0
  - Example → **join()** or **waitpid()**



# Semaphores: Purposes

- **Mutual Exclusion:** used to guard critical sections
  - The initial value of the semaphore is set to 1
  - Call **wait()** before the critical section, **signal()** after the critical section
- **Scheduling Constraints:** used to enforce threads to wait
  - The initial value of the semaphore is set to 0
  - Example → **join()** or **waitpid()**



# Producer-Consumer

## Producer Process:

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

## Consumer Process:

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

Both the producer and the consumer share a **common buffer** (of items)

# Producer-Consumer

## Producer Process:

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

## Consumer Process:

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

Both the producer and the consumer share a **common buffer** (of items)

counter keeps track of the number of items currently in the buffer

# Producer-Consumer

## Producer Process:

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

## Consumer Process:

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

Both the producer and the consumer share a **common buffer** (of items)

counter keeps track of the number of items currently in the buffer

possible race condition as counter can be updated by the producer and consumer

# Producer-Consumer: Race Condition

**Producer:**

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

**Consumer:**

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

**Interleaving:**

Assuming the initial value of counter is 5

$T_0$ :	producer	execute	$register_1 = counter$	{ $register_1 = 5$ }
$T_1$ :	producer	execute	$register_1 = register_1 + 1$	{ $register_1 = 6$ }
$T_2$ :	consumer	execute	$register_2 = counter$	{ $register_2 = 5$ }
$T_3$ :	consumer	execute	$register_2 = register_2 - 1$	{ $register_2 = 4$ }
$T_4$ :	producer	execute	$counter = register_1$	{ $counter = 6$ }
$T_5$ :	consumer	execute	$counter = register_2$	{ $counter = 4$ }

# Producer-Consumer: Race Condition

**Producer:**

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

**Consumer:**

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

**Interleaving:**

Assuming the initial value of counter is 5

$T_0$ :	producer	execute	$register_1 = counter$	{ $register_1 = 5$ }
$T_1$ :	producer	execute	$register_1 = register_1 + 1$	{ $register_1 = 6$ }
$T_2$ :	consumer	execute	$register_2 = counter$	{ $register_2 = 5$ }
$T_3$ :	consumer	execute	$register_2 = register_2 - 1$	{ $register_2 = 4$ }
$T_4$ :	producer	execute	$counter = register_1$	{ $counter = 6$ }
$T_5$ :	consumer	execute	$counter = register_2$	{ $counter = 4$ }

**Q1:** What would be the resulting value of counter if the order of statements  $T_4$  and  $T_5$  were reversed?

# Producer-Consumer: Race Condition

**Producer:**

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

**Consumer:**

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

**Interleaving:**

Assuming the initial value of counter is 5

$T_0$ :	producer	execute	$register_1 = counter$	{ $register_1 = 5$ }
$T_1$ :	producer	execute	$register_1 = register_1 + 1$	{ $register_1 = 6$ }
$T_2$ :	consumer	execute	$register_2 = counter$	{ $register_2 = 5$ }
$T_3$ :	consumer	execute	$register_2 = register_2 - 1$	{ $register_2 = 4$ }
$T_4$ :	producer	execute	$counter = register_1$	{ $counter = 6$ }
$T_5$ :	consumer	execute	$counter = register_2$	{ $counter = 4$ }

**Q1:** What would be the resulting value of counter if the order of statements  $T_4$  and  $T_5$  were reversed?

**Q2:** What *should* the value of counter be after one producer and one consumer, assuming the original value was 5?



# Producer-Consumer: Desiderata

- Mutual Exclusion
  - Access to the shared buffer of items must be granted to a single thread at a time (either to the producer or the consumer)

# Producer-Consumer: Desiderata

- **Mutual Exclusion**
  - Access to the shared buffer of items must be granted to a single thread at a time (either to the producer or the consumer)
- **Scheduling Constraints**
  - Producer can only produce a new item iff the buffer is **not full**
  - Consumer can only consume an item iff the buffer is **not empty**

# Producer-Consumer: Java Example

# Semaphores: Wrap Up

- Generalization of locks
- Can be used for **3 purposes**:
  - To ensure mutually exclusive execution of a critical section as locks do (binary semaphore)
  - To control access to a shared pool of resources (counting semaphore)
  - To enforce scheduling constraints so as to execute threads according to some specific order

# What's wrong with Semaphores?

- Not easy to get the meaning of waiting/signaling on a semaphore
- They are essentially shared global variables
- There is no direct connection between the semaphore and the data which the semaphore controls access to
- They serve multiple purposes (e.g., mutex, scheduling constraints, etc.)
- Their correctness depends on the programmer's ability

# What's wrong with Semaphores?

- Not easy to get the meaning of waiting/signaling on a semaphore
- They are essentially shared global variables
- There is no direct connection between the semaphore and the data which the semaphore controls access to
- They serve multiple purposes (e.g., mutex, scheduling constraints, etc.)
- Their correctness depends on the programmer's ability

**Solution:** Use a higher level primitive called **monitors**

# What is a Monitor?

- A monitor is a programming language construct that controls access to shared data

# What is a Monitor?

- A monitor is a programming language construct that controls access to shared data
- Similar to a (Java/C++) class that embodies all together: **data**, **operations**, and **synchronization**




# What is a Monitor?

- A monitor is a programming language construct that controls access to shared data
- Similar to a (Java/C++) class that embodies all together: **data**, **operations**, and **synchronization**
- Synchronization code added by compiler, enforced at runtime

# What is a Monitor?

- A monitor is a programming language construct that controls access to shared data
- Similar to a (Java/C++) class that embodies all together: **data**, **operations**, and **synchronization**
- Synchronization code added by compiler, enforced at runtime
- Unlike classes, monitors:
  - guarantee mutual exclusion, i.e., only one thread may execute a monitor's method at a time
  - require all data to be private

# Monitor: A Schematic Overview



An entry queue of processes waiting their turn to execute monitor operations (methods)

# Monitor: A Formal Definition

- Defines a lock and zero or more **condition variables** for managing concurrent access to shared data

# Monitor: A Formal Definition

- Defines a lock and zero or more **condition variables** for managing concurrent access to shared data
- Uses the lock to ensure that only a single thread is active within the monitor at any time

# Monitor: A Formal Definition

- Defines a lock and zero or more **condition variables** for managing concurrent access to shared data
- Uses the lock to ensure that only a single thread is active within the monitor at any time
- The lock provides of course mutual exclusion for shared data

# Monitor: Java Implementation Example

- It is straightforward to turn a Java class into a monitor by just:
  - Making all the data private
  - Making all methods (or non-private ones) **synchronized**

# Monitor: Java Implementation Example

- It is straightforward to turn a Java class into a monitor by just:
  - Making all the data private
  - Making all methods (or non-private ones) **synchronized**
- The **synchronized** keyword indicates the method is subject to mutual exclusion



# Monitor: Java Implementation Example

```
class Queue {  
    ...  
    private ArrayList<Item> data;  
    ...  
  
    public void synchronized add(Item i) {  
        data.add(i);  
    }  
  
    public Item synchronized remove() {  
        if (!data.isEmpty()) {  
            Item i = data.remove(0);  
            return i;  
        }  
    }  
}
```

# Monitor: Java Implementation Example

```
class Queue {  
    ...  
    private ArrayList<Item> data;  
    ...  
  
    public void synchronized add(Item i) {  
        data.add(i);  
    }  
  
    public Item synchronized remove() {  
        if (!data.isEmpty()) {  
            Item i = data.remove(0);  
            return i;  
        }  
    }  
}
```

What happens if a thread tries to remove an element from an empty queue?

# Condition Variables

- In the previous example, the **remove()** method should wait until something is available on the queue

# Condition Variables

- In the previous example, the **remove()** method should wait until something is available on the queue
  - Intuitively, the thread should sleep inside of the critical section

# Condition Variables

- In the previous example, the **remove()** method should wait until something is available on the queue
  - Intuitively, the thread should sleep inside of the critical section
  - But if the thread sleeps while still holding a lock then no other threads can access the queue, add an item to it, and eventually wake up the sleeping thread

# Condition Variables

- In the previous example, the **remove()** method should wait until something is available on the queue
  - Intuitively, the thread should sleep inside of the critical section
  - But if the thread sleeps while still holding a lock then no other threads can access the queue, add an item to it, and eventually wake up the sleeping thread
  - **Deadlock** (more on this later...)

# Condition Variables

- In the previous example, the **remove()** method should wait until something is available on the queue
  - Intuitively, the thread should sleep inside of the critical section
  - But if the thread sleeps while still holding a lock then no other threads can access the queue, add an item to it, and eventually wake up the sleeping thread
  - **Deadlock** (more on this later...)
- Solution: **condition variables**
  - Enable a thread to sleep within a critical section
  - Any lock held by the thread is atomically released before going to sleep

# Condition Variables: Operations

- Each condition variable supports 3 operations:



# Condition Variables: Operations

- Each condition variable supports **3 operations**:
  - **wait** → release lock and go to sleep atomically (queue of waiters)

# Condition Variables: Operations

- Each condition variable supports **3 operations**:
  - **wait** → release lock and go to sleep atomically (queue of waiters)
  - **signal** → wake up a waiting thread if one exists, otherwise it does nothing

# Condition Variables: Operations

- Each condition variable supports **3 operations**:
  - **wait** → release lock and go to sleep atomically (queue of waiters)
  - **signal** → wake up a waiting thread if one exists, otherwise it does nothing
  - **broadcast** → wake up all waiting threads

# Condition Variables: Operations

- Each condition variable supports **3 operations**:
  - **wait** → release lock and go to sleep atomically (queue of waiters)
  - **signal** → wake up a waiting thread if one exists, otherwise it does nothing
  - **broadcast** → wake up all waiting threads
- **Rule**: thread must hold the lock when doing condition variable operations
- **Note**: condition variables are not boolean objects!

# Condition Variables in Java

- Use **wait()** to give up the lock

# Condition Variables in Java

- Use **wait()** to give up the lock
- Use **notify()** to signal that the condition a thread is waiting on is satisfied

# Condition Variables in Java

- Use **wait()** to give up the lock
- Use **notify()** to signal that the condition a thread is waiting on is satisfied
- Use **notifyAll()** to wake up all waiting threads

# Condition Variables in Java

- Use **wait()** to give up the lock
- Use **notify()** to signal that the condition a thread is waiting on is satisfied
- Use **notifyAll()** to wake up all waiting threads
- Concretely, one condition variable per object



# Monitor: Java Implementation Example

```
class Queue {  
    ...  
    private ArrayList<Item> data;  
    ...  
  
    public void synchronized add(Item i) {  
        data.add(i);  
        notify();  
    }  
  
    public Item synchronized remove() {  
        while (data.isEmpty()) {  
            wait(); // give up the lock and sleep  
        }  
        Item i = data.remove(0);  
        return i;  
    }  
}
```

# Condition Variables are *not* Semaphores!

- Same operations yet entirely different semantics

# Condition Variables are *not* Semaphores!

- Same operations yet entirely different semantics
- Access to the monitor is controlled by a lock

# Condition Variables are *not* Semaphores!

- Same operations yet entirely different semantics
- Access to the monitor is controlled by a lock
- **wait()** blocks the calling thread, and gives up the lock
  - to call **wait()**, the thread has to be in the monitor (hence has lock)
  - on a semaphore, **wait()** just blocks the thread on the queue

# Condition Variables are *not* Semaphores!

- Same operations yet entirely different semantics
- Access to the monitor is controlled by a lock
- **wait()** blocks the calling thread, and gives up the lock
  - to call **wait()**, the thread has to be in the monitor (hence has lock)
  - on a semaphore, **wait()** just blocks the thread on the queue
- **signal()** causes a waiting thread to wake up
  - If there is no waiting thread, the signal is lost though!
  - on a semaphore, signal increases the counter, allowing future entry even if no thread is currently waiting

# `signal()`: Mesa- vs. Hoare-style Monitors

- **Mesa-style** (Nachos, Java, and most real OSs)
  - The signaling thread places a waiter on the ready queue, but signaler continues inside monitor
  - Condition is not necessarily true when waiter runs again
  - Returning from **`wait()`** is only a hint that something changed
  - Must re-check the conditional case

# `signal()`: Mesa- vs. Hoare-style Monitors

- **Mesa-style** (Nachos, Java, and most real OSs)
  - The signaling thread places a waiter on the ready queue, but signaler continues inside monitor
  - Condition is not necessarily true when waiter runs again
  - Returning from **`wait()`** is only a hint that something changed
  - Must re-check the conditional case
- **Hoare-style** (most textbooks)
  - The signaling thread immediately switches to a waiting thread
  - The condition that the waiter was anticipating is guaranteed to hold when waiter

# Mesa vs. Hoare Monitors

- Mesa-style

```
while (empty) {  
    wait(condition);  
}
```



# Mesa vs. Hoare Monitors

- Mesa-style

```
while (empty) {  
    wait(condition);  
}
```

- Hoare-style

```
if (empty) {  
    wait(condition);  
}
```

# Mesa vs. Hoare Monitors

- Mesa-style

```
while (empty) {  
    wait(condition);  
}
```

Easier to use and more efficient

- Hoare-style

```
if (empty) {  
    wait(condition);  
}
```

Easier to reason about the program's behaviour

# Mesa vs. Hoare

## Mesa

```
class Queue {  
    ...  
    private ArrayList<Item> data;  
    ...  
  
    public void synchronized add(Item i) {  
        data.add(i);  
        notify();  
    }  
  
    public Item synchronized remove() {  
        while (data.isEmpty()) {  
            wait(); // give up the lock and sleep  
        }  
        Item i = data.remove(0);  
        return i;  
    }  
}
```

The waiting thread may need to wait again after it is awakened, because some other thread could grab the lock and remove the item before it gets to run

## Hoare

```
class Queue {  
    ...  
    private ArrayList<Item> data;  
    ...  
  
    public void synchronized add(Item i) {  
        data.add(i);  
        notify();  
    }  
  
    public Item synchronized remove() {  
        if (data.isEmpty()) {  
            wait(); // give up the lock and sleep  
        }  
        Item i = data.remove(0);  
        return i;  
    }  
}
```

The waiting thread runs immediately after an item is added to the queue

# Readers-Writers Problem

- An object is shared among many threads, each belonging to one of two classes:
  - **Readers:** read data, never modify it
  - **Writers:** read data and modify it

# Readers-Writers Problem

- An object is shared among many threads, each belonging to one of two classes:
  - **Readers:** read data, never modify it
  - **Writers:** read data and modify it
- Simplest solution:
  - Use a single lock on the data object for each operation
  - May be too restrictive!

# Readers-Writers Problem

- An object is shared among many threads, each belonging to one of two classes:
  - **Readers:** read data, never modify it
  - **Writers:** read data and modify it
- Simplest solution:
  - Use a single lock on the data object for each operation
  - May be too restrictive!
- Each read or write of the shared data must happen within a critical section
- Guarantee mutual exclusion for writers
- Allow multiple readers to execute in the critical section at once

# Readers-Writers Problem

- 2 variations of the problem depending on whether priority is on readers or writers

# Readers-Writers Problem

- **2 variations** of the problem depending on whether priority is on readers or writers
- **first readers-writers** problem (priority to readers)
  - if a reader wants access to the data, and there is not already a writer accessing it, then access is granted to the reader
  - possible starvation of the writers, as there could always be more readers coming along to access the data



# Readers-Writers Problem

- **2 variations** of the problem depending on whether priority is on readers or writers
- **first readers-writers** problem (priority to readers)
  - if a reader wants access to the data, and there is not already a writer accessing it, then access is granted to the reader
  - possible starvation of the writers, as there could always be more readers coming along to access the data
- **second readers-writers** problem (priority to the writers)
  - when a writer wants access to the data it jumps to the head of the queue
  - possible starvation of the readers, as they are all blocked as long as there are writers

# (First) Readers-Writers Problem: Solution I

- Use a counter and 2 binary semaphores
  - **numReaders** → used by the reader processes to count the number of readers currently accessing the data
  - **mutex** → binary semaphore used only by the readers for controlled access to **numReaders**
  - **rw\_mutex** → binary semaphore used to block and release the writers

# (First) Readers-Writers Problem: Solution I

- Use a counter and 2 binary semaphores
  - **numReaders** → used by the reader processes to count the number of readers currently accessing the data
  - **mutex** → binary semaphore used only by the readers for controlled access to **numReaders**
  - **rw\_mutex** → binary semaphore used to block and release the writers
- The first reader to come along will block on **rw\_mutex** if there is currently a writer accessing the data

# (First) Readers-Writers Problem: Solution I

- Use a counter and 2 binary semaphores
  - **numReaders** → used by the reader processes to count the number of readers currently accessing the data
  - **mutex** → binary semaphore used only by the readers for controlled access to **numReaders**
  - **rw\_mutex** → binary semaphore used to block and release the writers
- The first reader to come along will block on **rw\_mutex** if there is currently a writer accessing the data
- All following readers will only block on **mutex** for their turn to increment **numReaders**

# Solution I: Discussion

- The first reader blocks if there is a writer; any other reader who tries to enter gets blocked on **mutex**

# Solution I: Discussion

- The first reader blocks if there is a writer; any other reader who tries to enter gets blocked on **mutex**
- Only the last reader to exit signals a waiting writer

# Solution I: Discussion

- The first reader blocks if there is a writer; any other reader who tries to enter gets blocked on **mutex**
- Only the last reader to exit signals a waiting writer
- When a writer exits, if there is both a reader and writer waiting, which goes next depends on the scheduler

# Solution I: Discussion

- The first reader blocks if there is a writer; any other reader who tries to enter gets blocked on **mutex**
- Only the last reader to exit signals a waiting writer
- When a writer exits, if there is both a reader and writer waiting, which goes next depends on the scheduler
- If a writer exits and a reader goes next, then all readers that are waiting will fall through (at least one is waiting on **rw\_mutex** and zero or more can be waiting on **mutex**)



# Solution I: Discussion

- The first reader blocks if there is a writer; any other reader who tries to enter gets blocked on **mutex**
- Only the last reader to exit signals a waiting writer
- When a writer exits, if there is both a reader and writer waiting, which goes next depends on the scheduler
- If a writer exits and a reader goes next, then all readers that are waiting will fall through (at least one is waiting on **rw\_mutex** and zero or more can be waiting on **mutex**)
- Does this solution guarantee all threads will make progress?

# Solution I: Discussion

- The first reader blocks if there is a writer; any other reader who tries to enter gets blocked on **mutex**
- Only the last reader to exit signals a waiting writer
- When a writer exits, if there is both a reader and writer waiting, which goes next depends on the scheduler
- If a writer exits and a reader goes next, then all readers that are waiting will fall through (at least one is waiting on **rw\_mutex** and zero or more can be waiting on **mutex**)
- Does this solution guarantee all threads will make progress?
- Alternatively, let a writer enter its critical section first (priority to writers)

# Solution II: Using Monitors

# Summary

- 3 synchronization primitives:

# Summary

- 3 synchronization primitives:
  - Locks → the simplest one

# Summary

- 3 synchronization primitives:
  - Locks → the simplest one
  - Semaphores → a generalization of locks

# Summary

- 3 synchronization primitives:
  - Locks → the simplest one
  - Semaphores → a generalization of locks
  - Monitors → highest-level primitives that wrap methods with mutex

# Summary

- 3 synchronization primitives:
  - Locks → the simplest one
  - Semaphores → a generalization of locks
  - Monitors → highest-level primitives that wrap methods with mutex
- Examples of typical synchronization problems:



# Summary

- 3 synchronization primitives:
  - Locks → the simplest one
  - Semaphores → a generalization of locks
  - Monitors → highest-level primitives that wrap methods with mutex
- Examples of typical synchronization problems:
  - Producers-Consumers

# Summary

- 3 synchronization primitives:
  - Locks → the simplest one
  - Semaphores → a generalization of locks
  - Monitors → highest-level primitives that wrap methods with mutex
- Examples of typical synchronization problems:
  - Producers-Consumers
  - Readers-Writers