

# Synchronization

## **Reminders:**

Quiz 3 review: Tuesday, May 5th 7:30-9:30pm

Quiz 3: Thursday, May 7th 7:30-9:30pm


Quiz 3 covers L16-L20 and labs 5 and 6

# Thread-Level Parallelism


---

- Divide computation among multiple **threads of execution**
  - Multiple *independent sequential threads* which compete for shared resources such as memory and I/O devices
  - Multiple *cooperating sequential threads*, which communicate with each other
- Communication models:
  - Shared memory:
    - Single address space
    - Implicit communication by memory loads & stores
  - Message passing:
    - Separate address spaces
    - Explicit communication by sending and receiving messages

## Shared Memory




## Message Passing



# Synchronization

---

- Need for synchronization arises whenever there are parallel processes in a system
  - *Forks and Joins*: A parallel process may want to wait until several events have occurred
  - *Producer-Consumer*: A consumer process must wait until the producer process has produced data
  - *Mutual Exclusion*: Operating system has to ensure that a resource is used by only one process at a given time




# Thread-safe programming

---

- Multithreaded programs can be executed on a uniprocessor by *timesharing*
  - Each thread is executed for a while (timer interrupt) and then the OS switches to another thread, repeatedly
- *Thread-safe* multithreaded programs behave the same way regardless of whether they are executed on multiprocessors or a single processor

In this lecture, we will assume that each thread has its own processor to run on

# Synchronous Communication



Precedence Constraints:

$$a \preceq b$$

“*a precedes b*”

- Can't consume data before it's produced

$$send_i \preceq rcv_i$$




- Producer can't "overwrite" data before it's consumed

$$rcv_i \preceq send_{i+1}$$




# FIFO (First-In First-Out) Buffers



FIFO buffers relax synchronization constraints. The producer can run up to N values ahead of the consumer:

$$\text{rcv}_i \leq \text{send}_{i+N}$$

Typically implemented as a “Ring Buffer” in shared memory:



# Shared-memory FIFO Buffer: First Try

---

## SHARED MEMORY:

```
char buf[N];           /* The buffer */  
int in=0, out=0;
```

## PRODUCER:

```
void send(char c){  
    buf[in] = c;  
    in = (in + 1) % N;  
}
```

## CONSUMER:

```
char rcv(){  
    char c;  
    c = buf[out];  
    out = (out + 1) % N;  
    return c;  
}
```

Not correct. Why?

Doesn't enforce any precedence constraints  
(e.g., rcv() could be invoked prior to any send() )

# Semaphores (Dijkstra, 1962)

---

Programming construct for synchronization:

- New data type: *semaphore*, an integer  $\geq 0$   
`semaphore s = K; // initialize s to K`
- New operations (defined on semaphores):
  - `wait(semaphore s)`  
*wait until  $s > 0$ , then  $s = s - 1$*
  - `signal(semaphore s)`  
 *$s = s + 1$  (one waiting thread may now be able to proceed)*
- Semantic guarantee: A semaphore  $s$  initialized to  $K$  enforces the precedence constraint:

$$\text{signal}(s)_i < \text{wait}(s)_{i+K}$$

The  $i^{\text{th}}$  call to `signal(s)` must complete  
before the  $(i+K)^{\text{th}}$  call to `wait(s)` completes



# Semaphores for Precedence

`semaphore s = 0;`

Thread A

A1;

A2;

`signal(s);`

A3;

A4;

A5;

Thread B

B1;

B2;

B3;

`wait(s);`

B4;

B5;

Goal: Want statement A2 in thread A to complete before statement B4 in thread B begins.

A2 < B4

Recipe:

- Declare semaphore = 0
- `signal(s)` at start of arrow
- `wait(s)` at end of arrow

# Semaphores for Resource Allocation

---

Abstract problem:

- Pool of K resources
- Many threads, each needs resource for occasional uninterrupted period
- Must guarantee that at most K resources are in use at any time

Solution using semaphores:

In shared memory:

```
semaphore s = K; // K resources
```

Using resources:

```
wait(s); // Allocate a resource
...      // use it for a while
signal(s); // return it to pool
```

Invariant: Semaphore value = number of resources left in pool

# FIFO Buffer with Semaphores: 2<sup>nd</sup> Try

---

## SHARED MEMORY:

```
char buf[N];           /* The buffer */  
int in = 0, out = 0;  
semaphore chars = 0;
```

## PRODUCER:

```
void send(char c) {  
    buf[in] = c;  
    in = (in + 1) % N;  
    signal(chars);  
}
```

## CONSUMER:

```
char rcv() {  
    char c;  
    wait(chars);  
    c = buf[out];  
    out = (out + 1) % N;  
    return c;  
}
```

Precedence managed by semaphore:  $\text{send}_i < \text{rcv}_i$   
Resource managed by semaphore: # of chars in buf

Still not correct. Why? **Producer can overflow buffer.**  
**Must enforce  $\text{rcv}_i < \text{send}_{i+N}$  !**

# FIFO Buffer with Semaphores

Correct implementation (for single producer + single consumer)

---

## SHARED MEMORY:

```
char buf[N];           /* The buffer */
int in = 0, out = 0;
semaphore chars = 0, spaces = N;
```

## PRODUCER:

```
void send(char c) {
    wait(spaces);
    buf[in] = c;
    in = (in + 1) % N;
    signal(chars);
}
```

## CONSUMER:


```
char rcv() {
    char c;
    wait(chars);
    c = buf[out];
    out = (out + 1) % N;
    signal(spaces);
    return c;
}
```

Resources managed by semaphores: characters in FIFO, spaces in FIFO.

Works with single producer and consumer. But what about multiple producers and consumers?

# Simultaneous Transactions

Suppose you and your friend visit the ATM at exactly the same time, and remove \$50 from your account. What happens?



```
void debit(int account, int amount) {  
    t = balance[account];  
    balance[account] = t - amount;  
}
```

What is *supposed* to happen?

// assume t0 has address of balance[account]

Thread # 1

```
lw t1, 0(t0)  
sub t1, t1, a1  
sw t1, 0(t0)
```

...

Thread #2

...

```
lw t1, 0(t0)  
sub t1, t1, a1  
sw t1, 0(t0)
```

Result: You have \$100, and your bank balance is \$100 less.

# But What If Both Calls Interleave?

---

```
// assume t0 has address of balance[account]
```

Thread # 1

```
lw t1, 0(t0)
```

```
sub t1, t1, a1  
sw t1, 0(t0)
```

...

Thread #2

```
lw t1, 0(t0)  
sub t1, t1, a1  
sw t1, 0(t0)
```

...

Result: You have \$100, and your bank balance is only \$50 less!



We need to be careful when writing concurrent programs. In particular, when modifying shared data.

For certain code segments, called **critical sections**, we would like to ensure that no two executions overlap.

This constraint is called **mutual exclusion**.


Solution: embed critical sections in wrappers (e.g., “transactions”) that guarantee their atomicity, i.e., make them appear to be single, instantaneous operations.

# Semaphores for Mutual Exclusion

---

```
semaphore lock = 1;

void debit(int account, int amount) {
    wait(lock);    // Wait for exclusive access
    t = balance[account];
    balance[account] = t - amount;
    signal(lock); // Finished with lock
}
```



“a *precedes* b  
or  
b *precedes* a”  
(i.e., they don’t overlap)

Lock controls access to critical section

Issue: Lock granularity


- One lock for all accounts?

- One lock per account?

- One lock for all accounts ending in 004?

# Producer/Consumer Atomicity Problems

Consider multiple producer threads:



*Problem: Producers interfere with each other*



# FIFO Buffer with Semaphores

Correct multi-producer, multi-consumer implementation

---

## SHARED MEMORY:

```
char buf[N];           /* The buffer */
int in = 0, out = 0;
semaphore chars = 0, spaces = N;
semaphore lock = 1;
```

## PRODUCER:

```
void send(char c) {
    wait(spaces);
    wait(lock);
    buf[in] = c;
    in = (in + 1) % N;
    signal(lock);
    signal(chars);
}
```

## CONSUMER:

```
char rcv() {
    char c;
    wait(chars);
    wait(lock);
    c = buf[out];
    out = (out + 1) % N;
    signal(lock);
    signal(spaces);
    return c;
}
```

# The Power of Semaphores

---

## SHARED MEMORY:

```
char buf[N];           /* The buffer */
int in = 0, out = 0;
semaphore chars = 0, spaces = N;
semaphore lock = 1;
```

## PRODUCER:

```
void send(char c) {
    wait(spaces);
    wait(lock);
    buf[in] = c;
    in = (in + 1) % N;
    signal(lock);
    signal(chars);
}
```

## CONSUMER:

```
char rcv() {
    char c;
    wait(chars);
    wait(lock);
    c = buf[out];
    out = (out + 1) % N;
    signal(lock);
    signal(spaces);
    return c;
}
```

A single synchronization primitive that enforces both:

Precedence relationships:

$$\text{send}_i < \text{rcv}_i$$
$$\text{rcv}_i < \text{send}_{i+N}$$

Mutual-exclusion relationships:  
protect variables  
*in* and *out*

# Semaphore Implementation

---

Semaphores are themselves shared data and implementing wait and signal operations require read/modify/write sequences that must be executed as critical sections. So how do we guarantee mutual exclusion in these particular critical sections without using semaphores?

Approaches:

- Use a special instruction (e.g., “test and set”) that performs an **atomic read-modify-write**. Depends on atomicity of single instruction execution. This is the most common approach.
- Implement them using system calls. Works in uniprocessors only, where the kernel is uninterruptible.



# Synchronization: The Dark Side

The naïve use of synchronization constraints can introduce its own set of problems, particularly when a thread requires access to more than one protected resource.

```
void transfer(int account1, int account2, int amount) {  
    wait(lock[account1]);  
    wait(lock[account2]);  
    balance[account1] = balance[account1] - amount;  
    balance[account2] = balance[account2] + amount;  
    signal(lock[account2]);  
    signal(lock[account1]);  
}
```



transfer(6031, 6004, 50)



transfer(6004, 6031, 50)

What can go wrong here?

Thread 1: wait(lock[6031]);

Thread 2: wait(lock[6004]);

Thread 1: wait(lock[6004]); // cannot complete  
// until thread 2 signals

Thread 2: wait(lock[6031]); // cannot complete  
// until thread 1 signals

No thread can make progress → Deadlock


# Dining Philosophers

Philosophers think deep thoughts, but have simple secular needs. When hungry, a group of  $N$  philosophers will sit around a table with  $N$  chopsticks interspersed between them. Food is served, and each philosopher enjoys a leisurely meal using the chopsticks on either side to eat.

They are exceedingly polite and patient, and each follows the following dining protocol:

## Philosopher's algorithm:

- Take (wait for) LEFT stick
- Take (wait for) RIGHT stick
- EAT until sated
- Replace both sticks



*Wait, I think I see a  
problem here...*

*Shut up!!*




# Deadlock!

No one can make progress because they are all waiting for an unavailable resource.

## CONDITIONS:

- 1) Mutual exclusion: Only one thread can hold a resource at a given time
- 2) Hold-and-wait: A thread holds allocated resources while waiting for others
- 3) No preemption: A resource can not be removed from a thread holding it
- 4) Circular wait



*Cousin Tom is spared!*

*He still doesn't look too happy...*



**SOLUTIONS:**  
**Avoidance**

**-or-**


**Detection and Recovery**

# One Solution

Assign a unique number to each chopstick, request resources in a consistent order:

*New Algorithm:*

- Take LOW stick
- Take HIGH stick
- EAT
- Replace both sticks.



*Simple proof:*

Deadlock means that each philosopher is waiting for a resource held by some other philosopher ...

But, the philosopher holding the highest numbered chopstick can't be waiting for any other philosopher (no hold-and-wait cycle) ...

Thus, there can be no deadlock.


# Example: Dealing With Deadlocks

Can you fix the transfer method to avoid deadlock?

```
void transfer(int account1, int account2, int amount) {  
    int a = min(account1, account2);  
    int b = max(account1, account2);  
    wait(lock[a]);  
    wait(lock[b]);  
    balance[account1] = balance[account1] - amount;  
    balance[account2] = balance[account2] + amount;  
    signal(lock[b]);  
    signal(lock[a]);  
}
```



Transfer(6031, 6004, 50)



Transfer(6004, 6031, 50)



# Summary

---

- Communication among parallel threads or asynchronous processes requires synchronization
  - Precedence constraints: a partial ordering among operations
  - Semaphores as a mechanism for enforcing precedence constraints
  - Mutual exclusion (critical sections, atomic transactions) as a common compound precedence constraint
  - Solving Mutual Exclusion via binary semaphores
  - Synchronization serializes operations, limits parallel execution
- Many alternative synchronization mechanisms exist!
- Deadlock:
  - Consequence of undisciplined use of synchronization mechanism
  - Can be avoided in special cases, detected and corrected in others

Thank you!

*Next lecture:  
Modern Processor  
Architecture*