

Question 2:

Part A:

```
int lock(int *val) {  
    int success = TestAndSet(&val);  
    if (success == 0)  
        return 1;  
    return 0;  
}  
  
void unlock(int *val) {  
    int success = TestAndSet(&val);  
    if (success == 1)  
        return 1;  
    return 0;  
}
```

Part B:

Assuming that `TestAndSet(int *val)` works atomically, this will ensure mutual exclusion. This particular implementation assumes some behavior about `TestAndSet`: there are two states (0: locked, 1: unlocked). Each time the function is called, it returns the new value of the `val` variable passed to the function. This value is then checked inside each function to ensure the correct value has been returned.

Question 3:

The issue here is due to the fact that increment and decrement operations are not atomic. The first check the value, mutate it it, then return it. As such, since `x` isn't locked when it is either being incremented or decremented, we can't know what the value will necessarily be. This is called a race condition.

Let's assume that incrementing occurs first. First, `x` will be checked (0), it will then be incremented (1), and returned. However, we don't know what value the decrement operation sees `x` as. If it checks it before `x` is stored, it will read 0 and return -1.

Under the best circumstances, `x` will be 0 at the end. However, the value could vary within the range of -1 or +1, as at most, there could be one out of order read that could affect the value incorrectly.