



Chapter 6: Process Synchronization





Module 6: Process Synchronization

- Background
- The Critical-Section Problem
- Peterson's Solution
- Synchronization Hardware
- Semaphores
- Classic Problems of Synchronization
- Monitors
- Synchronization Examples
- Atomic Transactions






Objectives


- To introduce the critical-section problem, whose solutions can be used to ensure the consistency of shared data
- To present both software and hardware solutions of the critical-section problem
- To introduce the concept of an atomic transaction and describe mechanisms to ensure atomicity






Background


- Concurrent access to shared data may result in data inconsistency
- Maintaining data consistency requires mechanisms to ensure the orderly execution of cooperating processes
- 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 **count** that keeps track of the number of full buffers. Initially, count 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 and put in nextProduced */  
    while (counter == BUFFER_SIZE)  
        ; // do nothing  
    buffer [in] = nextProduced;  
    in = (in + 1) % BUFFER_SIZE;  
    counter++;  
}
```






Consumer

```
while (true) {  
    while (counter == 0)  
        ; // do nothing  
    nextConsumed = buffer[out];  
    out = (out + 1) % BUFFER_SIZE;  
    counter--;  
  
    /* consume the item in nextConsumed */  
}
```





Race Condition

- `counter++` could be implemented as


```
register1 = counter  
register1 = register1 + 1  
counter = register1
```

- `counter--` could be implemented as

```
register2 = counter  
register2 = register2 - 1  
count = register2
```

- Consider this execution interleaving with “`count = 5`” initially:

```
S0: producer execute register1 = counter {register1 = 5}  
S1: producer execute register1 = register1 + 1 {register1 = 6}  
S2: consumer execute register2 = counter {register2 = 5}  
S3: consumer execute register2 = register2 - 1 {register2 = 4}  
S4: producer execute counter = register1 {count = 6 }  
S5: consumer execute counter = register2 {count = 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 in critical section, no other may be in its 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**
- Especially challenging with preemptive kernels





Critical Section

- General structure of process p_i is

```
do {  
    entry section  
    critical section  
    exit section  
    remainder section  
} while (TRUE);
```


Figure 6.1 General structure of a typical process P_i .





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





Peterson's Solution

- Two process solution
- Assume that the LOAD and STORE 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);
```

- Provable that
 1. Mutual exclusion is preserved
 2. Progress requirement is satisfied
 3. Bounded-waiting requirement is met






Synchronization Hardware


- Many systems provide hardware support for critical section code
- Uniprocessors – could disable interrupts
 - Currently running code would execute without preemption
 - Generally too inefficient on multiprocessor systems
 - ▶ Operating systems using this not broadly scalable
- Modern machines provide special atomic hardware instructions
 - ▶ **Atomic = non-interruptable**
 - Either test memory word and set value
 - Or swap contents of two memory words





Solution to Critical-section Problem Using Locks

```
do {  
    acquire lock  
    critical section  
    release lock  
    remainder section  
} while (TRUE);
```






TestAndSet Instruction

- Definition:

```
boolean TestAndSet (boolean *target)
{
    boolean rv = *target;
    *target = TRUE;
    return rv;
}
```







Solution using TestAndSet

- Shared boolean variable lock, initialized to FALSE
- Solution:

```
do {  
    while ( TestAndSet (&lock ) )  
        ; // do nothing  
  
    // critical section  
  
    lock = FALSE;  
  
    // remainder section  
  
} while (TRUE);
```





Swap Instruction

- Definition:

```
void Swap (boolean *a, boolean *b)
{
    boolean temp = *a;
    *a = *b;
    *b = temp;
}
```







Solution using Swap

- Shared Boolean variable lock initialized to FALSE; Each process has a local Boolean variable key
- Solution:


```
do {  
    key = TRUE;  
    while ( key == TRUE)  
        Swap (&lock, &key );  
  
        // critical section  
  
    lock = FALSE;  
  
    // remainder section  
  
} while (TRUE);
```






Bounded-waiting Mutual Exclusion with TestAndSet()


```
do {
    waiting[i] = TRUE;
    key = TRUE;
    while (waiting[i] && key)
        key = TestAndSet(&lock);
    waiting[i] = FALSE;
    // critical section
    j = (i + 1) % n;
    while ((j != i) && !waiting[j])
        j = (j + 1) % n;
    if (j == i)
        lock = FALSE;
    else
        waiting[j] = FALSE;
    // remainder section
} while (TRUE);
```






Semaphore

- Synchronization tool that does not require busy waiting
- Semaphore S – integer variable
- Two standard operations modify S : **wait()** and **signal()**
 - Originally called **P()** and **V()**
- Less complicated
- Can only be accessed via two indivisible (atomic) operations
 - `wait (S) {
 while S <= 0
 ; // no-op
 S--;
}
● signal (S) {
 S++;
}`






Semaphore as General Synchronization Tool

- **Counting** semaphore – integer value can range over an unrestricted domain
- **Binary** semaphore – integer value can range only between 0 and 1; can be simpler to implement
 - Also known as **mutex locks**
- Can implement a counting semaphore **S** as a binary semaphore
- Provides mutual exclusion


```
Semaphore mutex; // initialized to 1  
do {  
    wait (mutex);  
    // Critical Section  
    signal (mutex);  
    // remainder section  
} while (TRUE);
```





Semaphore Implementation

- Must guarantee that no two processes can execute `wait ()` and `signal ()` on the same semaphore at the same time
- Thus, implementation becomes the critical section problem where the wait and signal code are placed in the critical section
 - Could now have **busy waiting** in critical section implementation
 - ▶ But implementation code is short
 - ▶ Little busy waiting if critical section rarely occupied
- Note that applications may spend lots of time in critical sections and therefore this is not a good solution





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





Semaphore Implementation with no Busy waiting (Cont.)

- Implementation of wait:

```
wait(semaphore *S) {  
    S->value--;  
    if (S->value < 0) {  
        add this process to S->list;  
        block();  
    }  
}
```

- Implementation of signal:

```
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

wait (S);

wait (Q);

.

.

.

signal (S);

signal (Q);

P_1

wait (Q);

wait (S);

.

.

.

signal (Q);

signal (S);

- **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 used to test newly-proposed synchronization schemes
 - 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 nextp  
  
    wait (empty);  
    wait (mutex);  
  
    // add the item 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 nextc  
  
    signal (mutex);  
    signal (empty);  
  
    // consume the item in nextc  
  
} 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 – allow multiple readers 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 treated – all involve priorities
- Shared Data
 - Data set
 - Semaphore **mutex** initialized to 1
 - Semaphore **wrt** initialized to 1
 - Integer **readcount** initialized to 0






Readers-Writers Problem (Cont.)

- The structure of a writer process

```
do {  
    wait (wrt) ;  
  
    // writing is performed  
  
    signal (wrt) ;  
} while (TRUE);
```





Readers-Writers Problem (Cont.)

- The structure of a reader process

```
do {  
    wait (mutex) ;  
    readcount ++ ;  
    if (readcount == 1)  
        wait (wrt) ;  
    signal (mutex)  
  
    // reading is performed  
  
    wait (mutex) ;  
    readcount - - ;  
    if (readcount == 0)  
        signal (wrt) ;  
    signal (mutex) ;  
} while (TRUE);
```






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 write asap
- Both may have starvation leading to even more variations
- Problem is solved on some systems by kernel providing reader-writer locks






Dining-Philosophers Problem



- Philosophers spend their lives 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?





Problems with Semaphores

- Incorrect use of semaphore operations:
 - signal (mutex) wait (mutex)
 - wait (mutex) ... wait (mutex)
 - Omitting of wait (mutex) or signal (mutex) (or both)
- Deadlock and starvation





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 on a condition variable:
 - `x.wait ()` – a process that invokes the operation is suspended until `x.signal ()`
 - `x.signal ()` – resumes one of processes (if any) that invoked `x.wait ()`
 - ▶ If no `x.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 ()`, with Q in `x.wait ()` state, what should happen next?
 - If Q is resumed, then P must wait
- Options include
 - **Signal and wait** – P waits until Q leaves monitor or waits for another condition
 - **Signal and continue** – Q waits until P leaves the monitor or waits for another condition
 - Both have pros and cons – language implementer can decide
 - Monitors implemented in Concurrent Pascal compromise
 - ▶ P executing signal immediately leaves the monitor, Q is resumed
 - Implemented in other languages including Mesa, C#, Java





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);`

- No deadlock, but starvation is possible





Monitor Implementation Using Semaphores

- Variables


```
semaphore mutex; // (initially = 1)
semaphore next; // (initially = 0)
int next_count = 0;
```

- Each procedure F will be replaced by

```
wait(mutex);
...
body of F;
...
if (next_count > 0)
    signal(next)
else
    signal(mutex);
```

- Mutual exclusion within a monitor is ensured






Monitor Implementation – Condition Variables

- For each condition variable **x**, we have:

```
semaphore x_sem; // (initially = 0)  
int x_count = 0;
```

- The operation **x.wait** can be implemented as:

```
x-count++;  
if (next_count > 0)  
    signal(next);  
else  
    signal(mutex);  
wait(x_sem);  
x-count--;
```





Monitor Implementation (Cont.)

- The operation `x.signal` can be implemented as:

```
if (x-count > 0) {  
    next_count++;  
    signal(x_sem);  
    wait(next);  
    next_count--;  
}
```





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





A Monitor to Allocate Single Resource


```
monitor ResourceAllocator
{
    boolean busy;
    condition x;
    void acquire(int time) {
        if (busy)
            x.wait(time);
        busy = TRUE;
    }
    void release() {
        busy = FALSE;
        x.signal();
    }
    initialization code() {
        busy = FALSE;
    }
}
```





Synchronization Examples

- Solaris
- Windows XP
- Linux
- Pthreads





Solaris Synchronization


- Implements a variety of locks to support multitasking, multithreading (including real-time threads), and multiprocessing
- Uses **adaptive mutexes** for efficiency when protecting data from short code segments
 - Starts as a standard semaphore spin-lock
 - If lock held, and by a thread running on another CPU, spins
 - If lock held by non-run-state thread, block and sleep waiting for signal of lock being released
- Uses **condition variables**
- Uses **readers-writers** locks when longer sections of code need access to data
- Uses **turnstiles** to order the list of threads waiting to acquire either an adaptive mutex or reader-writer lock
 - Turnstiles are per-lock-holding-thread, not per-object
- Priority-inheritance per-turnstile gives the running thread the highest of the priorities of the threads in its turnstile





Windows XP Synchronization

- Uses interrupt masks to protect access to global resources on uniprocessor systems
- Uses **spinlocks** on multiprocessor systems
 - Spinlocking-thread will never be preempted
- Also provides **dispatcher objects** user-land which may act mutexes, semaphores, events, and timers
 - **Events**
 - ▶ An event acts much like a condition variable
 - Timers notify one or more thread when time expired
 - Dispatcher objects either **signaled-state** (object available) or **non-signaled state** (thread will block)





Linux Synchronization


- Linux:
 - Prior to kernel Version 2.6, disables interrupts to implement short critical sections
 - Version 2.6 and later, fully preemptive
- Linux provides:
 - semaphores
 - spinlocks
 - reader-writer versions of both
- On single-cpu system, spinlocks replaced by enabling and disabling kernel preemption





Pthreads Synchronization


- Pthreads API is OS-independent
- It provides:
 - mutex locks
 - condition variables
- Non-portable extensions include:
 - read-write locks
 - spinlocks






Atomic Transactions


- System Model
- Log-based Recovery
- Checkpoints
- Concurrent Atomic Transactions





System Model

- Assures that operations happen as a single logical unit of work, in its entirety, or not at all
- Related to field of database systems
- Challenge is assuring atomicity despite computer system failures
- **Transaction** - collection of instructions or operations that performs single logical function
 - Here we are concerned with changes to stable storage – disk
 - Transaction is series of **read** and **write** operations
 - Terminated by **commit** (transaction successful) or **abort** (transaction failed) operation
 - Aborted transaction must be **rolled back** to undo any changes it performed






Types of Storage Media

- Volatile storage – information stored here does not survive system crashes
 - Example: main memory, cache
- Nonvolatile storage – Information usually survives crashes
 - Example: disk and tape
- Stable storage – Information never lost
 - Not actually possible, so approximated via replication or RAID to devices with independent failure modes


Goal is to assure transaction atomicity where failures cause loss of information on volatile storage





Log-Based Recovery


- Record to stable storage information about all modifications by a transaction
- Most common is [write-ahead logging](#)
 - Log on stable storage, each log record describes single transaction write operation, including
 - ▶ Transaction name
 - ▶ Data item name
 - ▶ Old value
 - ▶ New value
 - $\langle T_i \text{ starts} \rangle$ written to log when transaction T_i starts
 - $\langle T_i \text{ commits} \rangle$ written when T_i commits
- Log entry must reach stable storage before operation on data occurs





Log-Based Recovery Algorithm

- Using the log, system can handle any volatile memory errors
 - $\text{Undo}(T_i)$ restores value of all data updated by T_i
 - $\text{Redo}(T_i)$ sets values of all data in transaction T_i to new values
- $\text{Undo}(T_i)$ and $\text{redo}(T_i)$ must be **idempotent**
 - Multiple executions must have the same result as one execution
- If system fails, restore state of all updated data via log
 - If log contains $\langle T_i \text{ starts} \rangle$ without $\langle T_i \text{ commits} \rangle$, $\text{undo}(T_i)$
 - If log contains $\langle T_i \text{ starts} \rangle$ and $\langle T_i \text{ commits} \rangle$, $\text{redo}(T_i)$





Checkpoints


- Log could become long, and recovery could take long
- Checkpoints shorten log and recovery time.
- Checkpoint scheme:
 1. Output all log records currently in volatile storage to stable storage
 2. Output all modified data from volatile to stable storage
 3. Output a log record <checkpoint> to the log on stable storage
- Now recovery only includes T_i , such that T_i started executing before the most recent checkpoint, and all transactions after T_i . All other transactions already on stable storage





Concurrent Transactions


- Must be equivalent to serial execution – [serializability](#)
- Could perform all transactions in critical section
 - Inefficient, too restrictive
- [Concurrency-control algorithms](#) provide serializability






Serializability


- Consider two data items A and B
- Consider Transactions T_0 and T_1
- Execute T_0 , T_1 atomically
- Execution sequence called **schedule**
- Atomically executed transaction order called **serial schedule**
- For N transactions, there are $N!$ valid serial schedules





Schedule 1: T_0 then T_1

	T_0	T_1
	read(A)	
	write(A)	
	read(B)	
	write(B)	
		read(A)
		write(A)
		read(B)
		write(B)






Nonserial Schedule


- Nonserial schedule allows overlapped execute
 - Resulting execution not necessarily incorrect
- Consider schedule S, operations O_i, O_j
 - Conflict if access same data item, with at least one write
- If O_i, O_j consecutive and operations of different transactions & O_i and O_j don't conflict
 - Then S' with swapped order $O_j O_i$ equivalent to S
- If S can become S' via swapping nonconflicting operations
 - S is conflict serializable





Schedule 2: Concurrent Serializable Schedule

	T_0	T_1
T_0	read(A) write(A)	
T_1		read(A) write(A)
	read(B) write(B)	
		read(B) write(B)





Locking Protocol


- Ensure serializability by associating lock with each data item
 - Follow locking protocol for access control
- Locks
 - Shared – T_i has shared-mode lock (S) on item Q, T_i can read Q but not write Q
 - Exclusive – T_i has exclusive-mode lock (X) on Q, T_i can read and write Q
- Require every transaction on item Q acquire appropriate lock
- If lock already held, new request may have to wait
 - Similar to readers-writers algorithm





Two-phase Locking Protocol

- Generally ensures conflict serializability
- Each transaction issues lock and unlock requests in two phases
 - Growing – obtaining locks
 - Shrinking – releasing locks
- Does not prevent deadlock






Timestamp-based Protocols


- Select order among transactions in advance – [timestamp-ordering](#)
- Transaction T_i associated with timestamp $TS(T_i)$ before T_i starts
 - $TS(T_i) < TS(T_j)$ if T_i entered system before T_j
 - TS can be generated from system clock or as logical counter incremented at each entry of transaction
- Timestamps determine serializability order
 - If $TS(T_i) < TS(T_j)$, system must ensure produced schedule equivalent to serial schedule where T_i appears before T_j





Timestamp-based Protocol Implementation

- Data item Q gets two timestamps
 - $W\text{-timestamp}(Q)$ – largest timestamp of any transaction that executed $\text{write}(Q)$ successfully
 - $R\text{-timestamp}(Q)$ – largest timestamp of successful $\text{read}(Q)$
 - Updated whenever $\text{read}(Q)$ or $\text{write}(Q)$ executed
- **Timestamp-ordering protocol** assures any conflicting **read** and **write** executed in timestamp order
- Suppose T_i executes **read**(Q)
 - If $TS(T_i) < W\text{-timestamp}(Q)$, T_i needs to read value of Q that was already overwritten
 - ▶ **read** operation rejected and T_i rolled back
 - If $TS(T_i) \geq W\text{-timestamp}(Q)$
 - ▶ **read** executed, $R\text{-timestamp}(Q)$ set to $\max(R\text{-timestamp}(Q), TS(T_i))$








Timestamp-ordering Protocol

- Suppose T_i executes `write(Q)`
 - If $TS(T_i) < R\text{-timestamp}(Q)$, value Q produced by T_i was needed previously and T_i assumed it would never be produced
 - ▶ `Write` operation rejected, T_i rolled back
 - If $TS(T_i) < W\text{-timestamp}(Q)$, T_i attempting to write obsolete value of Q
 - ▶ `Write` operation rejected and T_i rolled back
 - Otherwise, `write` executed
- Any rolled back transaction T_i is assigned new timestamp and restarted
- Algorithm ensures conflict serializability and freedom from deadlock





Schedule Possible Under Timestamp Protocol



End of Chapter 6

