


# Chapter 5: Process Synchronization

---





# Chapter 5: Process Synchronization

---

- Background
- The Critical-Section Problem
- Peterson's Solution
- Synchronization Hardware
- Mutex Locks
- Semaphores
- Classic Problems of Synchronization
- Monitors
- Synchronization Examples
- Alternative Approaches





# 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	<code>register1 = counter</code>	{register1 = 5}
S1: producer execute	<code>register1 = register1 + 1</code>	{register1 = 6}
S2: consumer execute	<code>register2 = counter</code>	{register2 = 5}
S3: consumer execute	<code>register2 = register2 - 1</code>	{register2 = 4}
S4: producer execute	<code>counter = register1</code>	{counter = 6}
S5: consumer execute	<code>counter = register2</code>	{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  $p_i$  is in its critical section, no other process  $p_j$  may be in its ( $p_j$ ) 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





# Semaphore

- Synchronization tool that provides more sophisticated ways 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**
- 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 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**





# Classical Problems of Synchronization

---

- Classical problems:
  - Bounded-Buffer Problem
  - Readers and Writers Problem
  - Dining-Philosophers Problem





# Bounded-Buffer Problem

---

- $n$  buffers, each can hold one item
- Semaphore **mutex** initialized to the value 1
- Semaphore **full** initialized to the value 0
- Semaphore **empty** initialized to the value  $n$





# Bounded Buffer Problem (Cont.)

- The structure of the producer process

```
do {  
    ...  
    /* produce an item in next_produced */  
    ...  
    wait(empty);  
    wait(mutex);  
    ...  
    /* add next produced to the buffer */  
    ...  
    signal(mutex);  
    signal(full);  
} while (true);
```





# Bounded Buffer Problem (Cont.)

- The structure of the consumer process

```
Do {  
    wait(full);  
    wait(mutex);  
    ...  
    /* remove an item from buffer to next_consumed */  
    ...  
    signal(mutex);  
    signal(empty);  
    ...  
    /* consume the item in next consumed */  
    ...  
} while (true);
```





# Readers-Writers Problem

- A data set is shared among a number of concurrent processes
  - Readers – only read the data set; they do **not** perform any updates
  - Writers – can both read and write
- Problem – although multiple readers may be allowed to read at the same time
  - Only one single writer can access the shared data at the same time
- Several variations of how readers and writers are considered – all involve some form of priorities
- Shared Data
  - Data set
  - Semaphore **rw\_mutex** initialized to 1
  - Semaphore **mutex** initialized to 1
  - Integer **read\_count** initialized to 0







# Readers-Writers Problem Variations


---

- **First** variation – no reader kept waiting unless writer has permission to use shared object
- **Second** variation – once writer is ready, it performs the write ASAP
- Both may have starvation leading to even more variations





# Dining-Philosophers Problem



- Philosophers spend their lives alternating thinking and eating
- Don't interact with their neighbors, occasionally try to pick up 2 chopsticks (one at a time) to eat from bowl
  - Need both to eat, then release both when done
- In the case of 5 philosophers
  - Shared data
    - ▶ Bowl of rice (data set)
    - ▶ Semaphore **chopstick** [5] initialized to 1





# Dining-Philosophers Problem Algorithm

- The structure of Philosopher *i*:

```
do {  
    wait (chopstick[i] );  
    wait (chopstick[ (i + 1) % 5] );  
  
    // eat  
  
    signal (chopstick[i] );  
    signal (chopstick[ (i + 1) % 5] );  
  
    // think  
  
} while (TRUE);
```

- What is the problem with this algorithm?





# Monitors

- A high-level abstraction that provides a convenient and effective mechanism for process synchronization
- *Abstract data type*, internal variables only accessible by code within the procedure
- Only one process may be active within the monitor at a time
- But not powerful enough to model some synchronization schemes

```
monitor monitor-name
{
    // shared variable declarations
    procedure P1 (...) { ... }


    procedure Pn (...) {.....}

    Initialization code (...) { ... }
}
}
```





# Schematic view of a Monitor






# Condition Variables

- **condition  $x$ ,  $y$ ;**
- Two operations are allowed on a condition variable:
  - **$x.\text{wait}()$**  – a process that invokes the operation is suspended until  **$x.\text{signal}()$**
  - **$x.\text{signal}()$**  – resumes one of processes (if any) that invoked  **$x.\text{wait}()$** 
    - ▶ If no  **$x.\text{wait}()$**  on the variable, then it has no effect on the variable





# Monitor with Condition Variables





# Condition Variables Choices

- If process P invokes **`x.signal()`** , and process Q is suspended in **`x.wait()`** , what should happen next?
  - Both Q and P cannot execute in parallel. If Q is resumed, then P must wait
- Options include
  - **Signal and wait** – P waits until Q either leaves the monitor or it waits for another condition
  - **Signal and continue** – Q waits until P either leaves the monitor or it waits for another condition
  - Both have pros and cons – language implementer can decide







# Monitor Solution to Dining Philosophers

```
monitor DiningPhilosophers
{
    enum { THINKING; HUNGRY, EATING) state [5] ;
    condition self [5];

    void pickup (int i) {
        state[i] = HUNGRY;
        test(i);
        if (state[i] != EATING) self[i].wait;
    }

    void putdown (int i) {
        state[i] = THINKING;
        // test left and right neighbors
        test((i + 4) % 5);
        test((i + 1) % 5);
    }
}
```





# Solution to Dining Philosophers (Cont.)

```
void test (int i) {
    if ((state[(i + 4) % 5] != EATING) &&
        (state[i] == HUNGRY) &&
        (state[(i + 1) % 5] != EATING) ) {
        state[i] = EATING ;
        self[i].signal () ;
    }
}

initialization_code() {
    for (int i = 0; i < 5; i++)
        state[i] = THINKING;
}
}
```





# Solution to Dining Philosophers (Cont.)


---

- Each philosopher  $i$  invokes the operations **pickup()** and **putdown()** in the following sequence:

`DiningPhilosophers.pickup(i);`

**EAT**

`DiningPhilosophers.putdown(i);`





# Resuming Processes within a Monitor

---

- If several processes queued on condition x, and x.signal() executed, which should be resumed?
- FCFS frequently not adequate
- **conditional-wait** construct of the form x.wait(c)
  - Where c is **priority number**
  - Process with lowest number (highest priority) is scheduled next



# End of Chapter 5

---

