

Condition variable deadlock



6 I have a problem with a deadlock in my code related to the use of condition variables. This is more of a design question than a pure code question. I have no problem actually writing code once I understand the correct design. I have the following scenario:

1. Thread A waits on a condition variable.
2. Thread B calls `notify_all`, and thread A wakes up.

1 This is of course what I want to happen, and is what does happen when everything works as expected. But sometimes, I get the following scenario instead:

1. Thread A executes the code right before it begins to wait on the condition variable.
2. Thread B calls `notify_all`, thinking that thread A is waiting.
3. Thread A begins waiting on the condition variable, not realizing that thread B already told it to stop waiting. Deadlock.

What is the best way to resolve this? I can't think of a reliable way to check whether thread A is actually waiting, in order to know when I should call `notify_all` in thread B. Do I have to resort to `timed_lock`? I would hate to.

`c++` `multithreading` `synchronization`

[share](#) [improve this question](#)

asked Apr 9 '13 at 20:54



[Philip Bennefall](#)

697 1 13 26

What library are you using? What OS? – [bash.d](#) Apr 9 '13 at 20:56

Use a semaphore. – [Martin James](#) Apr 9 '13 at 21:01

[add a comment](#)

2 Answers

[active](#) [oldest](#) [votes](#)

5 During the period just before Thread A waits on condition variable it must be holding a mutex. The easiest solution is to make sure that Thread B is holding the same mutex at the time it calls `notify_all`. So something like this:

```
std::mutex m;
std::condition_variable cv;
int the_condition = 0;

Thread A: {
    std::unique_lock<std::mutex> lock(m);
    do something
    while (the_condition == 0) {
        cv.wait(lock);
    }
}
```

```
now the_condition != 0 and thread A has the mutex
do something else
} // releases the mutex;

Thread B: {
    std::unique_lock<std::mutex> lock(m);
    do something that makes the_condition != 0
    cv.notify_all();
} // releases the mutex
```

This guarantees that Thread B only does the `notify_all()` either before Thread A acquires the mutex or while Thread A is waiting on the condition variable.

The other key here, though, is the while loop waiting for the `_condition` to become true. Once A has the mutex it should not be possible for any other thread to change the `_condition` until A has tested the `_condition`, found it false, and started waiting (thus releasing the mutex).

The point is: what you are really waiting for is for the value of the `_condition` to become non-zero, the `std::condition_variable::notify_all` is just telling you that thread B thinks thread A should wake up and retest.

[share](#) [improve this answer](#)

[edited Apr 9 '13 at 21:14](#)

[answered Apr 9 '13 at 21:05](#)



[Wandering Logic](#)

2,459 1 11 21

-
- 3 +1 Note that `std::condition_variable::wait` also has an overload that accepts a predicate. So instead of `while(the_condition == 0) cv.wait(lock);` you could instead write `cv.wait(lock, [&]{ return the_condition != 0; });` – [Andrew Durward Apr 9 '13 at 21:16](#)

@AndrewDurward: That's sweet! I didn't know that. – [Wandering Logic Apr 9 '13 at 21:18](#)

-
- 1 Ah yes, of course. Ridiculously simple. Just lock the same mutex that the condition variable uses, when changing the condition to actually be true in thread B. I have implemented your suggestion in my code and it solves the problem. Thank you! – [Philip Bennefall Apr 9 '13 at 21:59](#)
-

[add a comment](#)