Achtung! Alles Lookenspeepers!

Das computermachine ist nicht fuer gefingerpoken und mittengrabben. Ist easy schnappen der springenwerk, blowenfusen und poppencorken mit spitzensparken. Ist nicht fuer gewerken bei das dumbkopfen. Das rubbernecken sichtseeren keepen das cotten-pickenen hans in das pockets muss; relaxen und watchen das blinkenlights.

The demonstration

```
i = i + 1
```

Three operations

Read

Modify

Write

We can be interrupted at any time

A thread can "overwrite" the work done by another

The problem

Using a resource simultaneously

The result depends on ordering in time

This is known as a Race Condition

Two solutions

Prevent things from happening at the same time

Introduce a "bottleneck"

This removes concurrency!

Do not share resources

Send messages

This is a different "way of thinking". The problem must be "translated"

Some sort of "flag" that says if a resource is being used Modifying this flag must not introduce another race condition

Flag modifications must be indivisible

An Atomic Operation

Implemented using hardware instructions x86 lock prefix CMPXCHG

How this works isn't part of this course

Semaphore

Integer flag with value always greater than or equal to 0 Two operations:

```
wait() - decrements by one P/Prolaag/Probeer te verlagen
signal() - increments by one V/Verhogen
Aka. notify(), to indicate that control is not transferred to the waiter
```

⇒ Cannot decrement if the value is zero

Thread(s) will be awoken when someone else signal()s

Binary semaphore (as opposed to Counting Semaphore)

Can only have values 1 or 0

Available/unavailable

Locked/unlocked

Require that only the one using it can signal()

A concept of ownership

This is known as a Mutex (MUTual EXclusion)

With ownership we can also provide Priority Inheritance

Granularity

"Course-grained" locking: one huge global lock
Complete denial of concurrent execution
"Fine-grained" locking: one lock per resource
Quickly gets out of hand with many locks & resources

Creating a mutex

C

```
#include <pthread.h>
int main(){
    pthread mutex t mtx;
    // 2nd arg is a pthread_mutexattr_t
    pthread_mutex_init(&mtx, NULL);
    pthread_mutex_lock(&mtx);
    // Critical section
    pthread mutex unlock(&mtx);
    pthread mutex destroy(&mtx);
```

Python

```
from threading import Lock

mtx = Lock()

mtx.acquire()
# Critical section
mtx.release()

OR:

with mtx:
    # Critical section
# (Scope end)
```

http://pubs.opengroup.org/onlinepubs/7990989775/xsh/pthread.h.html

http://docs.python.org/2/library/threading.html#lock-objects

Message passing

	Synchronization	Communication
Message passing	Explicit (if synchronous) Implicit	Explicit
Shared Variables	Explicit	Implicit

The two approaches are fundamentally different

Message passing is "no-sharing" by default

Share memory by communicating, instead of communicating by sharing memory

Message passing

Synchronous vs asynchronous:

Sender must wait until receiver can receive "Phone" vs "Mail"

Symmetric vs asymmetric:

Receiver specifies where (which sender/channel) it is receiving from "Instant messaging" vs "email"

```
func make(Type, size IntegerType) Type
someChannel := make(chan T, 5) // makes a buffered (async) channel
make(chan T, 1) - An interesting special case: See the mutex similarity?
func foo(someChannel <-chan int) {} // this function can only read from
                             // the channel
func bar(someChannel chan<- int) {} // this function can only write to
                             // the channel
```

```
// Writing/sending
// Will only happen if
// 1) someone is waiting to read (unbuffered)
// or 2) the buffer is not full (buffered)
someChannel <- val</pre>
// Reading/receiving
// Will only happen when there is a value to read
val1 int
val1 <- someChannel</pre>
val2 := <- someChannel</pre>
// Receive & discard. Useful when waiting for events
<- someChannel
```

The "correct way":

```
for {
    select {
        // Receiving
        case msg1 := <- chan1:</pre>
             // action 1
        case msg2 := <- chan2:</pre>
             // action 2
        // Sending (use with caution...)
        case chan3 <- msg3:</pre>
             // action 3, whenever we sent something on chan3
```

Sending a message invokes a behaviour in the recipient Everything is triggered on events

Any of these could happen at any time:

Consider them all "simultaneously", take one action, consider them again Always responsive to any of them

No need for mutual exclusion

Does NOT mean there is no globally shared state

Solving concurrent access with MP

Think of threads/routines as "actors"/"office workers"

Put the resource in their mailbox, and have them put it in another mailbox when they are done with it.

If others need to read the resource, have the workers scribble over eachother on the office whiteboard.

Recruit a worker to manage the keys to the room with the resource. This worker either has the keys, or has lent them out.

Avoiding concurrent acces with MP

Give the resource to a worker (a server) And then tell **them** to change it

For-select-loop with:

Cases for each kind of modification (here: adding & subtracting)

A case for getting a copy of the current value

Pointers and bugs

Sending a pointer is a bug waiting to surface

Now two threads have access to the same memory location

Always duplicate reference types before sending

Which includes hash-maps and dynamic arrays

Some languages make the right choice and forbid sending reference types

Possibly useful doodad for Go

```
func Repeater(ch_in interface{}, chs_out ...interface{}) {
    for {
        v, _ := reflect.ValueOf(ch_in).Recv()
        for _, c := range chs_out {
            reflect.ValueOf(c).Send(v)
        }
    }
}
```