

AssistantArgs* args = arguments;

Professor : Philippe Cudré-Mauroux

Assistant : Ines Arous

Submitted by Sylvain Julmy

Exercise 2

a)

The problem appears when we try to add multiple consumer. We have to add multiple waiting bit in order to manage multiple processes.

We can also imagine a world where the wakeup bit is set to 1 and the signal is not lost. Then, when the process would have to go to sleep, it would not and produce a buffer overflow when creating too much item.

b)

It would be a mutual exclusion problem with the count variable. We admit that the producer wakes up the consumer and then try to increment the variable *count* by 1. Normally, the result would be $1 + 1 = 2$ for the count variable. Instead, the consumer process would compute the expression $1 - 1 = 0$ when decrementing the *count* variable and then would overwrite the result, so the *count* variable would have value 0 instead of 1 or 2 if no race condition appears.

Exercise 3

The code for exercise 3 is available in appendix.

Exercise 4

At first, it is not always easy to express synchronization in terms of predicate proposition. We rather want to express synchronization in terms of index in the program (the position before executing the next statement). For example, we would have to express position in the program using boolean variables that are assigned to *true* when a certain position is reached.

Additionally, the implementation of `WAITUNTIL` itself requires to check many times the condition. So there is a loop on the condition like the following :

```
while(cond);
```

Exercise 5

a)

The mutex m_2 is playing the role of signal between function `sem_down` and `sem_up`. When we lock m_2 , the thread goes to sleep and unlocking m_2 wakeup the thread.

The mutex m_3 guaranteed that the value of *counter* can't be modified by another thread. When the program is going inside `sem_down`, the value of *counter* has to be -1 because it is the condition for the program to go inside the *if* of `sem_up`.

If we remove m_3 , we could have an increment of *counter* between the unlock of m_1 and the lock of m_2 , then *counter* = 0 and m_2 will stay blocked because we can't go inside the *if* of `sem_up`.

b)

We can remove the mutexes m_2 and m_3 and the controls structures inside `sem_up` and `sem_down`.