An Experimental Comparison of Concurrent Data Structures

Mark Gibson

# Acknowledgements:

David Gregg

Jeremy Jones

Contents

[Acknowledgements: 1](#_Toc384062716)

[1 Introduction: (Thin) 2](#_Toc384062717)

[1.1 My Work: 2](#_Toc384062718)

[2 Background & Literature Review: (Fatish) 2](#_Toc384062719)

[2.1 What Motivated You? 2](#_Toc384062720)

[2.2 Locked & Lockless Programming 3](#_Toc384062721)

[2.3 Previous Work 4](#_Toc384062722)

[2.3.1 The Art of Multiprocessor Programming 4](#_Toc384062723)

[2.3.2 Designing Concurrent Data Structures 4](#_Toc384062724)

[2.3.3 Implementing Concurrent Data Objects 4](#_Toc384062725)

[2.3.4 Experimental Analysis of Algorithms 5](#_Toc384062726)

[2.3.5 A Lock-Free, Cache Efficient Shared Ring Buffer 5](#_Toc384062727)

[2.3.6 Resizable Scalable Concurrent Hash Tables 5](#_Toc384062728)

[3 Method: (Fat) 5](#_Toc384062729)

[3.1 What do you have to do? 5](#_Toc384062730)

[3.2 How will you do it? 5](#_Toc384062731)

[3.2.2 List of locked modes 6](#_Toc384062732)

[3.3.1 Ring Buffer 8](#_Toc384062733)

[3.2.2 Linked List 9](#_Toc384062734)

[3.2.2.1 Singly Linked List 9](#_Toc384062735)

[3.2.2.2 Doubly Linked Buffer 10](#_Toc384062736)

[3.2.2.3 Singly Linked Buffer 10](#_Toc384062737)

[3.2.4 Hash Table 10](#_Toc384062738)

[4 Experiments & Evaluation: (Fatish) 14](#_Toc384062739)

[4.1 Does your method work? 14](#_Toc384062740)

[4.1.1 Ring Buffer 14](#_Toc384062741)

[4.1.2 Linked List 14](#_Toc384062742)

[4.1.3 Hash Table 14](#_Toc384062743)

[5 Afterword: (Thin) 15](#_Toc384062744)

[5.1 What happened? 15](#_Toc384062745)

[5.2 Lessons learnt? 15](#_Toc384062746)

[5.3 References: 15](#_Toc384062747)

# **1 Introduction**: (Thin)

## 1.1 My Work:

I have implemented three concurrent data structures, a ring buffer, linked list and a hash table. Each has one or two variations with regards to how they operate, such as the utilisation and placement of different pointers.

I have implemented them with a mixture of locked and lock free algorithms. Among the locked implementations are a simple pthread mutex, a compare-and-swap lock and a ticket lock. For the lockless implementations I used the C++ 11 atomic library [reference] which contained the necessary atomic operations.

I have gathered data from these three data structures using varying thread counts and other variables, such as list or table size. The data was gathered from a total of three machines

**Context:**

**Structure:**

**Results:**

# **2 Background & Literature Review**: (Fatish)

## 2.1 What Motivated You?

I had been introduced to the idea of concurrency in the third year of my degree and it had piqued my interest. The solutions that concurrency provided for such computing problems as the memory and power wall to me seemed quite elegant. I saw the potential that this technology had and so I took another module based on concurrency in my final year so that I may learn about it in a greater depth. This proved useful to my understanding and so when it came to choosing a project for my final year, I decided to combine my new found interest in concurrency with data structures, something I had always liked since I was introduced to them due to my ability to visualise them in my mind and their inherent usefulness in Computer Science.

The problem that presents itself is that there does not seem to be a huge amount of data comparing the performance of concurrent data structures on different architectures. There is plenty of work done with regards to designing concurrent data structures [Moir et al. 2001] and implementing them [Herlihy. 1993], though considering the amount of research done on that topic, there is little to go on when it comes to comparing these structures across different architectures, to see how they affect the performance of the data structures.

Hence, I am hoping to add to what little has been done in this area by performing my tests and analysis.

## 2.2 Locked & Lockless Programming

A lock in terms of computer science is a synchronisation mechanism which is used to control access to a resource in an environment that contains more than one thread of execution [reference]. A common lock to implement using pthreads is a mutex, which is used to protect a shared resource. It works by only ever allowing one thread to ‘own’ it and only the thread who owns the mutex can access the resource [reference]. While this is a convenient way of ensuring mutual exclusion [reference], it does not scale with an increased amount of computing power or threads [reference], as only one thread can access the resource at any given time.

The term Lockless in computer science when referring to a non-blocking algorithm [reference] equates to an algorithm where threads who are competing for a shared resource do not have their execution postponed by mutual exclusion. These algorithms, while not using locks such as a mutex, still use atomic instructions as a means to protect a shared resource [reference].

The term Lock Free when discussing non-blocking algorithms, means that individual threads are allowed to starve, but progress is guaranteed on a system wide level. At least one of the threads will make progress when a program’s threads are run for sufficiently long.

The term Wait Free when discussing non-blocking algorithms represents the strongest non-blocking guarantee of progress. It guarantees both system wide progress and starvation freedom for the threads [reference]. Every operation has abound on the number of steps the algorithm will take before the operation completes [reference]. It is for this reason that all wait free algorithms are also lock free [reference].

An Atomic Instruction is an operation that completes in a single step relative to other threads. When an atomic instruction is performed, no other thread can observe the instruction half completed, it will either complete entirely or not do anything, much like have transactions in databases work [reference]. Without this guarantee of completion, lockless programming would not be possible, as there would be no way, other than using a lock such as a mutex, to protect a shared resource used by multiple threads [reference].

A Concurrent Data Structure in computer science is a data structure that has been designed and implemented for use by multiple threads [reference]. As a result they are significantly more difficult to design and verify than regular, serial data structures, due to the asynchronous nature of threads. However, this added complexity can pay off as concurrent data structures can be very scalable if the shared resources of the data structure can be properly protected and utilised by the threads working on it [reference].

## 2.3 Previous Work

### 2.3.1 The Art of Multiprocessor Programming

When it came to researching what work had been done before now, I initially looked towards “The Art of Multiprocessor Programming” by Maurice Herlihy and Nir Shavit. It covers much of the current state of multiprocessor programming, detailing some of the various problems that are encountered with concurrent programming, such as the Producer-Consumer problem [reference] and the ABA problem [reference]. It then delves into the foundations of shared memory [reference] and the basics of multithreaded programming, detailing the spin lock and the issue of contention, where many threads vie for control of the lock [reference]. It then goes through several data structures, such as the linked list and hash table, describing the different aspects of design and implementation and the problems one faces when attempting to implement locked and lockless forms of these structures. Considering how closely this book follows my own work, it was only natural that it inspired me and guided me while I was choosing, designing and implementing the data structures for my project.

### 2.3.2 Designing Concurrent Data Structures

“Designing Concurrent Data Structures” by Mark Moir and Nir Shavit, goes into depth on the processes required to successfully design a concurrent data structure, both in the general sense, talking about issues like blocking and non-blocking techniques [reference], performance and verification techniques [reference] while also going into detail for a range of specific data structures, like Stacks and Queues, Linked Lists and hash tables.

### 2.3.3 Implementing Concurrent Data Objects

“A Methodology for Implementing Highly Concurrent Data Objects” by Maurice Herlihy goes through the process of implementing a concurrent data structure, highlighting the issues with the conventional techniques of relying on critical sections [reference] and instead leaning towards a lockless approach, and the differences between lock-free and wait-free approaches.

### 2.3.4 Experimental Analysis of Algorithms

“A Theoretician’s Guide to the Experimental Analysis of Algorithms” by David S. Johnson discusses the issues that can arise when attempting to analyse algorithms experimentally, where he goes over several principles which he feels are essential to properly and accurately analysing algorithms ranging from, “Use Reasonably Efficient Implementations”[reference] to, “Ensure Comparability”[reference]. In addition, he also goes over ideas and techniques of presenting data [reference] which I found to be most interesting.

### 2.3.5 A Lock-Free, Cache Efficient Shared Ring Buffer

### 2.3.6 Resizable Scalable Concurrent Hash Tables

# **3 Method**: (Fat)

## 3.1 What do you have to do?

My work is as follows; firstly, I need to design and implement the three concurrent data structures. This involves adding both locked and lockless modes of operation to the data structures to allow them to be used by multiple threads.

Secondly, I need to run these data structures on the three different computer architectures I have at my disposal and gather data on their performance. This data will be based on the number of iterations performed by each program per second, the number of threads running concurrently and size of the data structure in question.

Finally I need to gather this data together and analyse it for anything of interest. To aid in the collection and analysis of this data as accurately as possible I will be using tools like Perf [Perf Wiki. Available: <https://perf.wiki.kernel.org/index.php/Main_Page>] which can measure hardware counters and record such things as idle CPU cycles, cache misses and page faults.

## 3.2 How will you do it?

After consulting with my supervisor, we agreed to take a modular approach to the project. I would select a data structure, implement it and gather data from it before moving onto the next one. I believed that this approach would help prevent confusion regarding different data sets, as I would only move on to another structure once the current one is finished. In this way I would build my project up piece by piece.

**Recap of Locked (defined in background) & how I will be implementing it**

**Recap of lockless & how I will be implementing it**

### 3.2.2 List of locked modes

#### 3.2.2.1 LOCKED

This lock would be composed of a pthread mutex [reference]. I chose it as I found it to be a very simple lock to implement. I also considered that, due to its simplicity, that it would provide an excellent baseline for me to test other locks against.

#### 3.2.2.2TTAS

I decided to implement a TestandTestandSet lock (TTAS) [Herlihy et al, 2008, pg. 144]. This works by using the C++ 11 atomic exchange instruction [Atomic Operations Library. Available: <http://en.cppreference.com/w/cpp/atomic>] to atomically set and unset a lock. Each thread repeatedly checks the lock, if they find that it is equal to one then they sleep for a specified amount of time using the usleep instruction [usleep(3) – Linux man page. Available: http://linux.die.net/man/3/usleep]. After they wake up, the thread then checks the lock again to see if it is equal to one, if so then it starts the loop again, if not then sets the lock to one and enters the critical section [Herlihy et al, 2008, pg.22]. Upon finishing, the thread then sets the lock to zero and the process continues on. I decided to implement this algorithm as it is an efficient implementation of a spinlock as the sleep instruction stops the cpu traffic from becoming overwhelming [Herlihy et al, 2008, pg.147].

#### 3.2.2.3 TTASNP

This locked mode is the TTAS lock but without the sleep instruction after the second while loop. I added this as I was interested in the effect that the sleep instruction has on the performance of the lock in relation to my different data structures.

#### 3.2.2.4 TTAS\_RELAX

This is near identical to the normal TTAS lock but with one difference, the sleep instruction is replaced by the intrinsic \_mm\_pause() which is designed to reduce the performance impact that repeated thread polling can have on bus traffic and the CPU’s pipeline [reference]. I added this mode as, like with the TTASNP mode, I was curious as to how the change would affect the lock’s performance and if the intrinsic gave this mode an advantage over the sleep instruction.

#### 3.2.2.5 TAS

I wanted to implement a TestandSet (TAS) lock because it is somewhat less sophisticated when compared to the TTAS lock [Herlihy et al, 2008, pg. 144]. It is more basic because, while the regular TTAS lock tells a thread to sleep after it has failed to acquire the lock, the TAS lock does no such thing and simply allows the thread to continue polling. This leads to a dramatic increase in the amount of bus traffic between the CPUs in the machine and therefore results in fewer iterations per second and hence, a loss in performance when compared to the TTAS lock [Herlihy et al, 2008, pg.145].

#### 3.2.2.6 TASWP

Like with the TTAS lock, I decided to add a sleep instruction to the TAS lock to investigate what, if any difference it would have on the lock’s performance

#### 3.2.2.7 TAS\_RELAX

Again, as with the TTAS lock, I decided to compare the sleep instruction implemented in TASWP and TTASWP with the intrinsic \_mm\_pause to investigate the difference, if any it would have on the different locks.

#### 3.2.2.8 CASLOCK

The next lock I decided to implement was a lock based on the atomic instruction, ‘compare and swap’ which takes a value and compares it to another. If the first and second values are equal then the first value is replaced by a third value [Herlihy et al, 2008, pg.113]. This can then be placed within a loop, where threads continuously poll until one of them exchanges the lock successfully and breaks free into the critical section. This can create a lot of bus traffic however, similar to that of the TAS lock and so I added an exponential back off, similar in style to the TTAS lock, where a thread, upon failing to acquire the lock would sleep, but with each failed attempt, would sleep for a progressively larger time up to a defined maximum.

#### 3.2.2.9 CASLOCKND

As with previous locking modes, I wanted to ensure that lock was implemented thoroughly, with different variations, and so I chose to implement the CASLOCK but without the exponential back-off to investigate if it was really necessary and if so when and in which scenarios it made a difference.

#### 3.2.2.10 CASLOCK\_RELAX

Similar to both the TAS\_RELAX and TTAS\_RELAX, the CASLOCK\_RELAX mode replaced the exponential back-off, but instead of getting rid of it all together I replaced it with the intrinsic \_mm\_pause to investigate which had the better performance between it and the back-off.

#### 3.2.2.11 TICKET

The final type of lock I added was a ticket lock, where each thread is given a ticket, and they are allowed to enter the critical section whenever their ticket is being served [Herlihy et al, 2008, pg.32]. This lock performs very poorly at higher thread counts, as due to the queue like nature of the threads when using the ticket lock, if a thread is de-scheduled as it is in the critical section then the entire queue is held up as a result, leading to a significant drop in performance [reference]. As with the TTAS lock, if a thread polls and finds that it is not its turn in the queue yet it sleeps, where the amount of time sleeping is proportional to how far back in the queue the thread is, so if the thread is relatively close to the top of the queue it will sleep for less than if it was near the bottom of the queue.

#### 3.2.2.12 TICKET\_RELAX

As with the previous locks, I decided to compare the impact of the sleep instruction on the ticket lock by replacing it with the intrinsic \_mm\_pause and compare the two for performance.

### 3.3.1 Ring Buffer

For my first data structure I decided to go for a circular FIFO queue. I chose this due to its relative simplicity when compared to other data structures and I felt that it would give me an opportunity to get to grips with the atomic libraries I would be working with, as well as give me a chance to finalise how I will be collecting data from the data structures.

#### 3.3.1.1 Locked

For the locked variation I decided to go for a simple locking strategy where if a thread wished to interact with the buffer that it would acquire a lock, perform its operation and release the lock. This approach would only allow one thread to access the buffer at any one time and so would hopefully provide a nice contrast to the lockless implementation.

While implementing the different locked modes I came across the idea of implementing the locks in assembly, something which had already been done for some of the locks [Spinlocks and Read Write Locks. Available: <http://locklessinc.com/articles/locks/> ]I decided to compare the performance of some of the locks I had already written to their assembly counterparts. If it was the case that the assembly implementations proved to have an advantage over the C++ versions then I would switch to them in order to procure more accurate results. Hence, I integrated them into the buffer and compared them to their C++ implementations to try and identify a performance difference. After comparing the locks, I found the difference in performance to be negligible between them and so decided to stick with the C++ implementation of the locks, as I found them easier to work with.

#### 3.3.1.2 Lockless

For my lockless implementation of the ring buffer, I decided to implement a single producer – single consumer model. To push, the front of the buffer is taken and the index after it is examined. If the back of the buffer is not pointing there, then an item is pushed to the front of the buffer, and the index after it becomes the new front. Alternatively, to pop, the back of the buffer checks that it does not share the current index with the front of the buffer, and only then will it remove an item from the buffer.

I found this to be a good introduction to the C++11 atomic library as I was able to get to grips with declaring atomic variables and calling the library’s functions, such as std::atomic\_fetch\_add which atomically increments a value by a given amount [reference].

### 3.2.2 Linked List

### 3.2.2.1 Singly Linked List

#### 3.2.2.1.1 Locked

For my next data structure, I decided to implement a singly linked list. I did this because I already had some experience with implementing this structure both serially and concurrently from previous assignments during my time in college. In addition, it is relatively simple and I had hoped that it would act as a stepping stone to the more advanced data structure when the time came.

As with the ring buffer I added both locked and lockless versions. The locked versions were all the same as the ring buffer, where a lock would be acquired, the add or remove code would be executed and the lock would then be released. The following locked modes of operation were implemented for the ring buffer: Simple pthread mutex lock, TestAndTestAndSet, TestAndTestAndSet with no pause instruction, Compare and Swap lock, Compare and Swap lock with no backoff, TestAndSet, TestAndSet with a pause and finally, a ticket lock.

#### 3.2.2.1.1 Lockless

I decided to base my lockess implementation of the atomic instruction ‘compare\_exchange’ from the C++ 11 atomic library. I declared a pointer of type Node to be atomic which represented the head of the linked list. I then used this to atomically switch the list’s pointers whenever a node was added or removed. Interestingly, I only had to use this atomic instruction a subset of the total cases in my code. For example, whenever the list was empty, or when the head had to be changed, I had to use the atomic instruction to change the head. However, for cases where node wanted to insert itself in the middle of the list, no atomic instruction seemed necessary. I tested this on a list with differing maximum sizes, with the lowest being of size 5 nodes and yet the list remained valid through every test.

For the lockless list, I decided to test it with a list of three different maximum key ranges, where, as each key was randomly generated, it would be subjected to the modulo of the key range and since the list was ordered and had no duplicates, this was put in place a hard cap on the maximum size of the list. I originally picked the values of 100, 100,000 and 100,000,000 to be the key ranges, but keeping in mind the cost of the modulo operation in terms of CPU cycles [reference] I decided to replace these with powers of two, namely 128, 131072 and 134217728 as I knew that the compiler I was using, g++ would optimise the modulo operation by replacing it with a bit shift operation, which requires far less CPU cycles [reference] and minimising the cost of using such large numbers.

### 3.2.2.2 Doubly Linked Buffer

#### 3.2.2.2.1 Locked

After implementing the linked list and observing some of the data that was being gathered I saw that once the list started to get long, past 1,000 nodes, the performance dropped off significantly. I concluded that it was due to the time being spent by the threads traversing the list looking for an insertion point or a node to delete.

I felt that this was not optimal, as the size of the list was interfering with the comparison of the locking algorithms. Hence, I decided to remove the traversal issue all together and implemented a multi-consumer, multi-producer linked list buffer. This worked by always adding and removing from the head and tail respectively. There was no traversal of the list necessary and while this did mean that the list would no longer be ordered or free from duplicates, it was my opinion that this would provide clearer data from the locking algorithms.

#### 3.2.2.2.2 Lockless

As I was implementing it initially, I felt that to take my original linked list and to convert it into the FIFO buffer that I wanted I would need to introduce a second pointer to each node, which would point to the node previous to it, essentially making it a doubly-linked list, as after removing a node from the end, the tail would need to know what the previous node in the list was so that it could point to it.

### 3.2.2.3 Singly Linked Buffer

#### 3.2.2.3.1 Locked

It was only after I had finished implementing the buffer that I realised that I did not need the second pointer for each node if I simply rearranged the placement of the pointers. If I swapped the head and tail pointers around then I would again only need one pointer per node to implement the data structure. It worked as follows: the tail pointer would keep track of the oldest node in the list. Whenever a new node was added, the last node to be added would then be pointed to this node and the head pointer would move to the new head. It was in essence, flipping my initial implementation around but that small change reduced the complexity and size of the data structure as now, each node again only needed to store one pointer and all the code that was added to deal with the second pointer could be removed.

#### 3.2.2.3.2 Locked

### 3.2.4 Hash Table

**Lockless**

For designing the lockless hash table I made the following decisions based on research done with regards to lockless hash tables; it would be a closed addressing hash table, each index in the table would point to a linked list, so any collisions would result in a node being added onto the relevant list. Finally, it would have a coarse-grained resize function, which involved transferring the lists or buckets to a new, larger table [reference].

To represent the buckets I decided to use the lockless linked list I had already implemented, as I had already tested it when I was collecting the data from it and it would save me time. I decided to go with my FIFO buffer implementation of the linked list to eliminate traversing the buckets as an issue. I gave each bucket two atomic variables, a head and tail pointer, which would reduce the time spent adding/removing nodes and would ensure that I could do it atomically through the use of the C++11 atomic library. This would be the only use of the atomic library; the hash table itself did not have any atomic variables.

After I had implemented the data structure I ran into two points of interest. The first was that as the program ran, it would sometimes post extremely low results for one of the iterations, usually the iteration using four threads in total. To try and discern the cause I added in a counter that tracked the failure rate of the atomic instructions in both the add and remove functions, but this proved to not be the cause of the problem as the resulting values I was getting were both quite low, no more than fifty failures per iteration and these did not correlate to the drop in performance I was observing. I decided to put it aside for a while, with the intention of returning and utilising the tool perf to try and find the cause of the performance drop.

The second point of interest I encountered was that the program occasionally caused a segmentation fault while it was running at high thread counts, around 32 threads or more, though sometimes it occurred at lower counts such as 8. As the problem’s frequency seemed to increase at higher counts my first thought was that it might be a contention issue. After reviewing the code, I noticed that I was accessing the hash table a lot during both the add and remove function calls in the form of “htable->table[hash]”. I believed that this may be the cause of the segmentation faults, as if a thread was halfway through an add, another thread may change the value of the hash among other things, leading to a segmentation fault. I tried to solve this by instead passing the bucket reference to a variable, tmpList which I would then use in the computation. In addition, I added several more checks into my code, checking that tmpList still pointed to the place it was supposed to and that if it was not then abort the operation and try again. To test to see if the problem had been fixed by my changes I set it to run twenty times, one after another, with the intention that if a segmentation fault would appear, indicating that the problem had not been fixed , that it would in these conditions. Luckily, this was not the case and my implementation seemed to be working correctly.

**Locked**

For the locked version of the hash table, I decided to have two implementations. The first implementation involved locking the entire hash table with a lock whenever a thread wanted to interact with the table. The second implementation differed from the first in that there was no global lock, but instead each bucket had its own lock. So whenever a thread wished to interact with a specific bucket, it would obtain the bucket’s lock and perform its work, in this way it allowed for the absence of a global lock and instead had a more modular approach which I would then compare to the first locked implementation.

**Global Lock**

The premise for the globally locked hash table was simple, I wanted a baseline to compare my other two implementations on, the lockless and lock per bucket variations. In addition, I felt that it would be useful to get the add and remove functions working and tested in this implementation before moving onto more advanced variations.

As this was a baseline implementation, I decided to go for a very basic locking strategy, where a lock was acquired before a thread interacted with the table at all, and that the lock was global, in that only one thread could interact with the hash table at any given time, any other thread that attempted to interact with the table would be blocked.

**Lock Per Bucket**

This variation of my locked implementation of the hash table would be different in the sense that instead of threads acquiring a global lock, where only one thread would be able to access the table at any one time, each list in the table, or bucket, would have its own lock. In this way, multiple threads could work on the hash table at any given time and that they would acquire a lock for the bucket they were about to interact with so a thread would only be blocked if it attempted to interact with a bucket that another thread was already interacting with.

I felt that this implementation was more complex than the globally locked variety, I ran into some trouble when I attempted to implement the rest of the locking modes besides the basic pthread mutex lock, though I discovered that it was because I had mixed up a reference to one bucket’s lock with another. After I had corrected this I was able to implement the rest of the locked modes, TAS, CAS, TICKET etc with no further delays.

**Resizing**

To keep search times constant, I had to add in functionality to allow my hash table to resize itself when buckets got too full [reference]. I decided to implement a locked resize function first, which involved going through each bucket and rehashing each key. Then the key would be transferred to the new table, based on its new hash. I was able to write this part of the implementation serially, as it is only called inside the add function, where at which point a lock will have already been obtained, making the need for additional locks irrelevant.

For my lockless implementation I investigated several potential methods, one of which involved leaving the keys where they were and forming new lists from them by dynamically creating each bucket [reference, concurrent hash table]. Another option from the same paper was to resize the table in place, where the current table was made bigger and the keys rehashed. Yet another option was to incrementally resize the table, where all adds started to add to another table, with remove and contain calls checking both tables and only switching to the new table when all the keys had been transferred from the old [reference]. I decided to try and implement the first solution and see how I got on. I immediately ran into problems with segmentation faults as I was unable to implement a necessary amount of atomicity to stop the threads from interfering with each other. This problem persisted for the two other solutions I attempted, each was plagued by segmentation faults which I was unable to get rid of. In the end I had to settle for using a lock, similar to my locked implementation, where only one thread was allowed access to resize the table.

To compensate for my inability to implement a lockless resize function, I planned to test my implementations with a large initial table size. I hoped that this would minimise the need for the table to resize and so have the smallest impact on the performance, allowing me to compare the locked and lockless algorithms almost purely based on what I had written already, the add and remove functions.

**Contains Function**

Before I began testing my hash table I decided that I wanted it to replicate a real world hash table as closely as possible. To do this I would need to add in a contains function, a function that took key and searched for it in the hash table [reference]. I would need to implement this functionality in all three of my hash table variations. The implementation itself was relatively easy, I randomly produced a key, got its hash and then retrieved the bucket associated with that hash. Once I had that I then iterated through the bucket until I had either found the key or I reached the end of the bucket.

**Tracking Search Results**

As a means to record positive and negative hash table searches I added in two variables, pSearches and nSearches to represent the total number of positive and negative searches each time the program ran. I did this because I planned to utilise these when I was testing the table to see if there were any correlations between the number of successful/unsuccessful searches and the table performance

**Choose function**

With the addition of the contains function in my hash table, I now encountered something which I had not done so far in the project. Whereas with the ring buffer and linked list there were just two functions, the hash table now had three. I could no longer simply assign half of the threads to adding and half to removing items. I had to come up with a better solution. An additional concern was that I wanted to replicate the function call ratios for hash tables, which are about 90% contains calls, 9% add calls and 1% remove calls [reference Art of Multiprocessor…]. In the end I decided to implement the choose function.

The choose function would be relatively simple, now, whenever a thread was spawned, it would call the choose function, instead of calling the add or remove function. Inside the choose function, a number would be randomly generated, initially I used the modulo operation to cap the number at 100 and then used an if-else block, where if the number was greater than 9 then the thread would call the contains function, else if it was greater than 0 it would call the add function, else it would call the remove function. After testing I found that this replicated the function call ratios I had encountered earlier, though I decided to change the cap of 100 to 128, so that the compiler would streamline the operation [reference], and hence, I changed the values in the if-else block to correspond to it.

# **4 Experiments & Evaluation**: (Fatish)

## 4.1 Does your method work?

### 4.1.1 Ring Buffer

Since the ring buffer is a circular FIFO queue, the size of the queue is not important, as threads will be reading/writing from the same place anyway, hence, the following data was collected by using a buffer with 1000 elements.

INSERT GRAPH FOR RING BUFFER

For this, I am using the number of times that the critical section was entered, represented on the y-axis as iterations per second. The number of threads used is on the x-axis and goes from 1 to 128. Four different architectures were used, with each being subject to both modes of operation, Locked and Spinlock.

### 4.1.2 Linked List

### 4.1.3 Hash Table

# **5 Afterword**: (Thin)

## 5.1 What happened?

## 5.2 Lessons learnt?
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