

Lecture 13

CprE 308

February 9, 2014

Intro

Today's Topics

- Mutual Exclusion (Mutex)
- Implementing Mutex

Threads and Mutual Exclusion

Threads and Mutual Exclusion

■ Thread 1

```
x = x + 1;
```

```
/*
```

```
ld  r1,x
```

```
add r1,1
```

```
st  r1,x
```

```
*/
```

■ Thread 2

```
x = x + 1;
```

```
/* same assembly code */
```

Threads and Mutual Exclusion

■ Thread 1

```
x = x + 1;
```

```
/*
```

```
ld  r1,x
```

```
add r1,1
```

```
st  r1,x
```

```
*/
```

■ Thread 2

```
x = x + 1;
```

```
/* same assembly code */
```

Final value of x could be 1 or 2 depending on the interleaving

Protect Shared Variables

- If written by many threads, then:
 - Each write should be “atomic”
 - Ensure other threads don't interfere with a *sequence of instructions*
 - A mutex or a “lock” associated with this variable

Protect Shared Variables

■ Thread 1

```
lock(mutex);  
x = x + 1;  
unlock(mutex);
```

■ Thread 2

```
lock(mutex);  
x = x + 1;  
unlock(mutex);
```


Does this need mutual exclusion?

- Thread 1

```
my_balance = my_balance + 1;  
your_balance = your_balance - 1;
```

- Thread 2

```
total = my_balance + your_balance;
```

Does this need mutual exclusion?

- Thread 1

```
my_balance = my_balance + 1;  
your_balance = your_balance - 1;
```

- Thread 2

```
total = my_balance + your_balance;
```

Yes. Interleaving may cause thread 2 to see an inconsistent state.

Do we need mutual exclusion?

- Thread 1

$x = x + 1;$

- Thread 2

$y = x;$

Do we need mutual exclusion?

- Thread 1

$x = x + 1;$

- Thread 2

$y = x;$

No. Since the reads and writes are atomic.

Code with the mutex

Mutex `b_mutex` protects `my_balance` and `your_balance`

- Thread 1

```
lock(b_mutex);  
my_balance = my_balance + 1;  
your_balance = your_balance - 1;  
unlock(b_mutex);
```

- Thread 2

```
lock(b_mutex);  
total = my_balance + your_balance;  
unlock(b_mutex);
```

Mutex and Critical Section

Only one thread can be in the critical section at a time

- Thread 1

```
Enter_Mutex();  
Critical_Section();  
Exit_Mutex();
```

- Thread 2

```
Enter_Mutex();  
Critical_Section();  
Exit_Mutex();
```

Implementing Mutex

Our Problem

- How to implement `enter_mutex()` and `exit_mutex()`?
 - User space (no OS support)
 - Inside the kernel
- Solution should satisfy
 - No two threads in the critical region at the same time

Software (user space) Solution 1

Enter Mutex:

```
while (busy == 1);  
busy = 1;
```

Critical Section:

```
account_balance++;
```

Exit Mutex:

```
busy = 0;
```

busy is a (shared) global variable.

Software (user space) Solution 1

Enter Mutex:

```
while (busy == 1);  
busy = 1;
```

Critical Section:

```
account_balance++;
```

Exit Mutex:

```
busy = 0;
```

busy is a (shared) global variable.

- No good, why?

Software (user space) Solution 2

■ Thread 1

Enter Mutex:

```
while (turn == 2);
```

Critical Section:

Exit Mutex:

```
turn = 2;
```

■ Thread 2

Enter Mutex:

```
while (turn == 1);
```

Critical Section:

Exit Mutex:

```
turn = 1;
```

turn is a (shared) global variable.

Problems with Solution 2

- Threads have to strictly alternate
- One thread wanting to enter the critical section might have to wait for another which does not want to

Problem Statement Refined

A solution to mutual exclusion should satisfy four conditions:

- 1 No two processes simultaneously in critical region
- 2 No assumptions made about speeds of CPUs
- 3 No process running outside its critical region may block another process
- 4 No process must wait forever to enter its critical region

Concurrent Threads

Initially, $v=0$.

- Thread 1:

```
for(i = 0; i < 10; i++)  
    v = v+1
```

- Thread 2:

```
for(i = 0; i < 10; i++)  
    v = v-1
```

Solutions to Mutual Exclusion

- Dekker's Algorithm - 1960's
- Peterson's Algorithm - 1981
- Hardware support (TSL)

Peterson's Solution

```
#define FALSE 0
#define TRUE 1
#define N 2

int turn;
int interested[N];
```


Peterson's Solution (cont.)

```
void enter_region(int process); /* 0 or 1 */
{
    int other;
    other = 1 - process;
    interested[process] = TRUE; /* show interest */
    turn = process; /* set flag */
    while (turn == process && interested[other] == TRUE)
}

void leave_region(int process) /* who is leaving */
{
    interested[process] = FALSE; /* indicate departure */
}
```

Hardware Support: TSL

- New Instruction: TSL R, Lock
 - TSL = “Test and Set Lock”
 - R = register
 - Lock = memory location
- Atomically (atomic = nothing can interfere)
 - Read Lock into R
 - Store a non-zero value into Lock

Mutual Exclusion using TSL

Hardware Support with TSL (Test and Set Lock) Instruction

TSL Reg, Lock

- Copy value of memory location Lock into Register Reg
- Simultaneously write non-zero value into Lock

TSL Example

```
/* set lock to non-zero, proceed if it was 0 earlier */
enter_region:
    TSL Reg, Lock /* Use TSL Instruction */
    if (Reg != 0) then /* not the first to set to zero */
        Jump enter_region /* try again */
    /* else proceed */

/* Critical section */
/* Increment Account Balance */

exit_region:
    Lock = 0
```

Problem

- Busy waiting

Problem

- Busy waiting
- Solution: yield to another thread if unable to lock first time

Eliminate Busy Waiting

```
/* set lock to non-zero, proceed if it was 0 earlier */
enter_region:
    TSL Reg, Lock /* Use TSL Instruction */
    if (Reg != 0) then { /* not the first to set to zero */
        thread_yield(); /* let somebody else run */
        Jump enter_region /* try again */
    }
    /* else proceed */

/* Critical section */
/* Increment Account Balance */

exit_region:
    Lock = 0
```

Another Solution: Disable Interrupts

- Disable interrupts during critical section
 - Prevent context switch
 - Enable interrupts after critical section
- Good: No busy waiting
- Problems?

Problem

- Critical Section must be short
 - No multiprogramming possible during critical section
- Cannot trust users to have a short critical section
- Used inside the kernel for mutual exclusion

Multiprocessors

- Disabling Interrupts doesn't work
 - Preventing a context switch doesn't ensure that only one process is running
- Use hardware support: TSL
 - Usually multiprocessors come equipped with such instructions

Disabling Interrupts: Use in `mutex_lock` (uniprocessor only)

- `mutex` is a data structure inside the kernel
- `mutex_lock()` traps into the kernel
 - Disable interrupts
 - Set Lock
 - If(unsuccessful) then: enable interrupts, `thread_yield()`, try again
 - Enable Interrupts

Summary of Mutex Implementations

- Software Solution
 - General solution - works anywhere
- Disabling interrupts
 - Single processor only
 - Use only in kernel mode
- Test and set lock
 - General solution - works on multiprocessors
 - Be careful to avoid busy waiting

Mutex usage in POSIX Threads

```
pthread_mutex_t m = PTHREAD_MUTEX_INITIALIZER;  
// shared by both threads
```

```
int x; // also shared
```

```
pthread_mutex_lock(&m);  
x = x + 1;  
pthread_mutex_unlock(&m);
```

Taking Multiple Locks

■ Thread 1

```
proc1() {  
    pthread_mutex_lock(&m1);  
    /* Use object 1 */  
    pthread_mutex_lock(&m2);  
    /* Use objects 1 and 2 */  
    pthread_mutex_unlock(&m2);  
    pthread_mutex_unlock(&m1);  
}
```

Taking Multiple Locks (Thread 2)

■ Thread 2

```
proc2() {  
    pthread_mutex_lock(&m2);  
    /* Use object 2 */  
    pthread_mutex_lock(&m1);  
    /* Use objects 1 and 2 */  
    pthread_mutex_unlock(&m1);  
    pthread_mutex_unlock(&m2);  
}
```

Deadlock




Figure 1:

Dealing with Deadlock

- Hard
 - is the system deadlocked?
 - will this move lead to deadlock?
- Easy
 - restrict use of mutexes so that deadlock can't happen

POSIX mutexes

man pthread_mutex_init on your Linux machine

```
int pthread_mutex_init(pthread_mutex_t *mutex,  
    const pthread_mutexattr_t *mutexattr);  
int pthread_mutex_lock(pthread_mutex_t *mutex);  
int pthread_mutex_trylock(pthread_mutex_t *mutex);  
int pthread_mutex_unlock(pthread_mutex_t *mutex);  
int pthread_mutex_destroy(pthread_mutex_t *mutex);
```