



Chapter 5: Process Synchronization






Objectives

- To present the concept of process synchronization.
- To introduce the critical-section problem, whose solutions can be used to ensure the consistency of shared data
- To present both software and hardware solutions of the critical-section problem






Background

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

- **counter++** could be implemented as

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


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

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

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

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






Critical Section Problem

- Consider system of n processes $\{p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{n-1}\}$
- Each process has **critical section** segment of code
 - Process may be changing common variables, updating table, writing file, etc
 - When one process in critical section, no other may be in its critical section
- **Critical section problem** is to design protocol to solve this
- Each process must ask permission to enter critical section in **entry section**, may follow critical section with **exit section**, then **remainder section**






Critical Section

- General structure of process P_i

```
do {  
    entry section  
    critical section  
    exit section  
    remainder section  
} while (true);
```





Algorithm for Process P_i

do {

```
while (turn == j);
```


critical section

```
turn = j;
```

remainder section

} while (true);






Solution to Critical-Section Problem

1. **Mutual Exclusion** - If process P_i is executing in its critical section, then no other processes can be executing in their critical sections
2. **Progress** - If no process is executing in its critical section and there exist some processes that wish to enter their critical section, then the selection of the processes that will enter the critical section next cannot be postponed indefinitely
3. **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





Critical-Section Handling in OS

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

- Good algorithmic description of solving the problem
- Two process solution
- Assume that the **load** and **store** machine-language instructions are atomic; that is, cannot be interrupted
- The two processes share two variables:
 - `int turn;`
 - `Boolean flag[2]`
- The variable `turn` indicates whose turn it is to enter the critical section
- 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

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





Peterson's Solution (Cont.)

□ Provable that the three CS requirement are met:

1. Mutual exclusion is preserved


P_i enters CS only if:

either `flag[j] = false` or `turn = i`

2. Progress requirement is satisfied

3. Bounded-waiting requirement is met






Solution to Critical-section Problem Using Locks

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





Semaphore

- Synchronization tool that provides more sophisticated ways (than Mutex locks) for process to synchronize their activities.
- Semaphore **S** – integer variable
- Can only be accessed via two indivisible (atomic) operations

- **wait()** and **signal()**

- ▶ Originally called **P()** and **V()**

- Definition of the **wait()** operation

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

- Definition of the **signal()** operation

```
signal(S) {  
    S++;  
}
```





Semaphore Usage

- **Counting semaphore** – integer value can range over an unrestricted domain
- **Binary semaphore** – integer value can range only between 0 and 1
 - Same as a **mutex lock**
- Can solve various synchronization problems
- Consider P_1 and P_2 that require S_1 to happen before S_2
Create a semaphore “**synch**” initialized to 0

P1 :

$S_1;$

signal (synch) ;


P2 :

wait (synch) ;

$S_2;$

- Can implement a counting semaphore **S** as a binary semaphore






Semaphore Implementation

- Must guarantee that no two processes can execute the **wait()** and **signal()** on the same semaphore at the same time
- Thus, the 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
- 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

- With each semaphore there is an associated waiting queue
- Each entry in a waiting queue has two data items:
 - value (of type integer)
 - pointer to next record in the list
- 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
- ```
typedef struct{
 int value;
 struct process *list;
} semaphore;
```






## Implementation with no Busy waiting (Cont.)

---

```
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

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

| $P_0$                    | $P_1$                    |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <code>wait(S) ;</code>   | <code>wait(Q) ;</code>   |
| <code>wait(Q) ;</code>   | <code>wait(S) ;</code>   |
| <code>...</code>         | <code>...</code>         |
| <code>signal(S) ;</code> | <code>signal(Q) ;</code> |
| <code>signal(Q) ;</code> | <code>signal(S) ;</code> |

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

