

Atomics and visibility problem

Safe concurrent operations Integer operations

Stefan Schindler @dns2utf8

Wednesday, 24. October 2018

Rust Zürichsee Meetup hosted by coredump.ch

Table of contents

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Integer Data
- 3. Watching a value from another thread
- 4. Atomic Operations
- 5. Conclusion

Introduction

Who I am?

My name is Stefan and I ...

- · studied Computer Science at HSR
- · started with Rust in 2016
- · maintain crates: threadpool, wipe_buddy, son_grid_engine, ... some more
- · organize RustFest.eu next up in Rome November 24th to 27th
- talk about rust
- \cdot am looking for a new rusty job

What will we learn tonight?

- · What is a Symbol?
- · What is a Register?
- · What is an Atomic Operation?
- · What is the visibility problem?
- · How to solve it?

Integer Data

Where is index?

```
let data = vec![42, 42, 42, 42];

let mut index = 0; // <-- what is the kind of index?
let length = data.len();
while index < length {
    println!("{}: {}", index, data[index]);
    index += 1
}</pre>
```

and where will it be stored at runtime?

Watching a value from another thread

Scenario

- Control thread allocates global memory for threshold
- Thread_W will wait for **threshold** to pass a certain value and then alert the user
- \cdot Thread_S is waiting over input from the world and updates ${\tt threshold}$

```
use std::thread::{sleep, spawn};
use std::time::Duration:
#[allow(non upper case globals)]
static mut threshold: isize = 0:
const MAX TEST: usize = 100000;
fn main() {
  let counter = spawn(|| {
    loop {
// note: mutable statics can be mutated by multiple
// threads: aliasing violations or data races will
// cause undefined behavior
      unsafe {
          threshold = (threshold + 1) % 100;
          //println!("counter: {}", threshold);
```

```
let watcher = spawn(|| {
    sleep(Duration::from millis(500));
    let mut history = Vec::with capacity(MAX TEST);
    let mut last = unsafe { threshold };
    let mut count = 0;
    for in 0..MAX TEST {
        let threshold local = unsafe { threshold };
        if last == threshold local {
            count += 1:
        } else {
            history.push((last, count));
            last = threshold local;
            count = 0;
    history
```

Debug mode

```
[ ...
    (88, 0), (93, 0), (98, 0), (4, 0), (10, 0),
    (15, 0), (20, 0), (26, 0), (31, 0), (36, 0),
    (41, 0), (46, 0), (53, 0), (58, 0), (63, 0)
]
n transitions recorded: 99769
```

Now we want more speed. What to do?

```
Debug mode
```

```
[ ...
    (88, 0), (93, 0), (98, 0), (4, 0), (10, 0),
    (15, 0), (20, 0), (26, 0), (31, 0), (36, 0),
    (41, 0), (46, 0), (53, 0), (58, 0), (63, 0)
]
n transitions recorded: 99769
```

Release mode

```
[]
n transitions recorded: 0
```

What happend? Why did it stop working? Feel free to guess

```
A new counter function:
let counter = spawn(|| {
  let threshold ptr = unsafe {
                         &mut threshold as *mut isize };
  loop {
      unsafe {
          write volatile(
            threshold ptr.
            (read volatile(threshold ptr) + 1) % 100);
```

Atomic Operations

Atomic Access

FROM PAGE 117 SECTION 7.3.2 [2]

Cacheable, naturally-aligned single loads or stores of up to a quadword are atomic on any processor model, as are misaligned loads or stores of less than a quadword that are contained entirely within a naturally-aligned quadword. Misaligned load or store accesses typically incur a small latency penalty. Model-specific relaxations of this quadword atomicity boundary, with respect to this latency penalty, may be found in a given processor's Software Optimization Guide. Misaligned accesses can be subject to interleaved accesses from other processors or cache-coherent devices which can result in unintended behavior.

Atomicity for misaligned accesses can be achieved where necessary by using the **XCHG** instruction or any suitable **LOCK**-prefixed instruction. Note that misaligned locked accesses may incur a significant performance penalty on various processor models.

The LOCK prefix F0

FROM PAGE 112 SECTION 3.5.1.3 [1]

The LOCK prefix causes certain read-modify-write instructions that access memory to occur atomically. The mechanism for doing so is implementation-dependent (for example, the mechanism may involve locking of data-cache lines that contain copies of the referenced memory operands, and/or bus signaling or packet-messaging on the bus). The prefix is intended to give the processor exclusive use of shared memory operands in a multiprocessor system.

The prefix can only be used with forms of the following instructions that write a memory operand: ADC, ADD, AND, BTC, BTR, BTS, CMPXCHG, CMPXCHG8B, DEC, INC, NEG, NOT, OR, SBB, SUB, XADD, XCHG, and XOR. An invalid-opcode exception occurs if LOCK is used with any other instruction.

For further details on these prefixes, see "Lock Prefix" in Volume 3 [3].

Performance differences

Old Intel performance for Atomic Interger Operation: 20 - 120 cycles
Old AMD performance for Atomic Integer Operation: 40 cycles
Most recent AMD architecture[1] online TODO...

```
Let s be clever and fast!

const N_PARTIES: usize = 4;
const N_INCREMENTS: usize = 100000;

static GLOBAL_COUNTER: usize = 0;
```

```
pub fn counter race() {
    (0...N PARTIES).map(| i| {
        spawn(move || {
  let counter ptr = unsafe { &mut GLOBAL COUNTER as *mut usize };
            for in 0..N INCREMENTS {
                unsafe {
 write volatile(counter ptr, read volatile(counter ptr) + 1);
    .collect::<Vec< >>() .into iter()
    .for each(|t| t.join().expect("counter thread failed"));
let counter ptr = unsafe { &mut GLOBAL COUNTER as *mut usize };
    println!("expected: {}, got: {}", N PARTIES * N INCREMENTS,
            unsafe { read volatile(counter ptr) });
                                                                    21 / 27
```

read_volatile and write_volatile

expected: 400000, got: 129861

What to do?

What do we know about the result? Do we have a lower band of what we can expect?

```
static GLOBAL ATOMIC COUNTER: AtomicUsize = ATOMIC USIZE INIT;
pub fn counter race atomic() {
    (0...N PARTIES).map(| | {
        spawn(|| {
            for in 0..N INCREMENTS {
                GLOBAL ATOMIC COUNTER.fetch add(1. Ordering::Relaxed):
    .collect::<Vec< >>()
    .into iter()
    .for each(|t| t.join().expect("counter thread failed"));
println!("expected: {}, got: {}", N_PARTIES * N_INCREMENTS,
        GLOBAL ATOMIC COUNTER.load(Ordering::SeqCst));
                                                                    23 / 27
```

```
read_volatile and write_volatile
```

expected: 400000, got: 129861

Atomic .fetch add and .load

expected: 400000, got: 400000

Hurray!



Conclusion

Summary

Multi-Thread-Programms require atomic operations. Using them with an abstraction allows us to keep the development speed up.

Slides: dns2utf8/atomics_and_visibility_problem

Questions?

Manipulate data in RAM - 0

What if we have a list of objects and we need the value furthest away from Zero?

```
fn absolute_max(result: &mut i64, list: &Vec<i64>) {
    for i in list {
        let abs = if i < 0 { -i } else { i };
        if result < abs {
            result = i;
        }
    }
}</pre>
```

Quick question: Where is the data? and why does it not compile?

Manipulate data in RAM - 1

```
Making it compile with rust reveals the problem:
fn absolute max(result: &mut i64, list: &Vec<i64>) {
    for i in list {
        let i = *i:
        let result local = *result;
        let abs i = if i < 0 { -i } else { i }:</pre>
        let abs r = if result local < 0 { -result local } else { result</pre>
        if abs r < abs i {</pre>
             *result = i:
```

Full source:

References i



AMD64 Architecture Programmes's Manual, Volume 1: Application Programming, December 2017.

Revision 3.22: amd.com/system/files/TechDocs/24592.pdf.

AMD, Reading, MA.

AMD64 Architecture Programmes's Manual, Volume 2: System Programming, September 2018.

Revision 3.30: amd.com/system/files/TechDocs/24594.pdf.

AMD, Reading, MA.

AMD64 Architecture Programmes's Manual, Volume 3: General-Purpose and System Instructions, May 2018.

Revision 3.26: amd.com/system/files/TechDocs/24594.pdf.