7 Memory Consistency [65 points]

A programmer writes the following two C code segments. She wants to run them concurrently on a multicore processor, called SC, using two different threads, each of which will run on a different core. The processor implements *sequential consistency*, as we discussed in the lecture.

	Thread T0		Thread T1
Instr. T0.0	a = X[0];	Instr. T1.0	Y[0] = 1;
Instr. T0.1	b = a + Y[0];	Instr. T1.1	*flag = 1;
Instr. T0.2	while($*flag == 0$);	Instr. T1.2	X[1] *= 2;
Instr. T0.3	Y[0] += 1;	Instr. T1.3	a = 0;

X, Y, and flag have been allocated in main memory, while a and b are contained in processor registers. A read or write to any of these variables generates a single memory request. The initial values of all memory locations and variables are 0. Assume each line of the C code segment of a thread is a *single* instruction.

(a) [15 points] What is the final value of Y[0] in the SC processor, after both threads finish execution? Explain your answer.

2.

Initials: Solutions

Explanation. Y[0] is set equal to 1 by instruction T1.0. Then, it will be incremented by instruction T0.3. The sequential consistency model ensures that the operations of each individual thread are executed in the order specified by its program. Across threads, the ordering is enforced by the use of flag. Thread 0 will remain in instruction T0.2 until flag is set by T1.1, i.e., after Y[0] is initialized. So, instruction T0.3 must be executed after instruction T1.0, causing Y[0] to be first set to 1 and then incremented.

(b) [15 points] What is the final value of b in the SC processor, after both threads finish execution? Explain your answer.

0 or 1.

Explanation. There are *at least* two possible sequentially-consistent orderings that lead to *at most* two different values of b at the end:

Ordering 1: T1.0 \rightarrow T0.1 - Final value = 1. Ordering 2: T0.1 \rightarrow T1.0 - Final value = 0.

Final Exam Page 18 of 25

With the aim of achieving higher performance, the programmer tests her code on a new multicore processor, called RC, that implements weak consistency. As discussed in the lecture, the weak consistency model has no need to guarantee a strict order of memory operations. For this question, consider a very weak model where there is no guarantee on the ordering of instructions as seen by different cores.

seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3	tion T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, we that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before bective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could tion T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent values of Y[0] at the end: we of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. We of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	Explanation. Since there is no guarantee of a strict order of memory operations, as seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent orderings that lead to different values of Y[0] at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.
Explanation. Since there is no guarantee of a strict order of memory operations seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-conforderings that lead to different values of $Y[0]$ at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	tion T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, we that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before bective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could tion T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent values of Y[0] at the end: we of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. We of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	Explanation. Since there is no guarantee of a strict order of memory operations, as seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent orderings that lead to different values of $Y[0]$ at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.
Explanation. Since there is no guarantee of a strict order of memory operations seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-conforderings that lead to different values of Y[0] at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	tion T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, we that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before bective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could be tion T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent values of Y[0] at the end: The of T0: T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. The of T0: T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	Explanation. Since there is no guarantee of a strict order of memory operations, as seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent orderings that lead to different values of $Y[0]$ at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.
Explanation. Since there is no guarantee of a strict order of memory operations seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-conforderings that lead to different values of Y[0] at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	tion T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, we that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before bective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could be tion T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent values of Y[0] at the end: The of T0: T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. The of T0: T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	Explanation. Since there is no guarantee of a strict order of memory operations, as seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent orderings that lead to different values of $Y[0]$ at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.
Explanation. Since there is no guarantee of a strict order of memory operations seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-conforderings that lead to different values of Y[0] at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	tion T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, we that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before bective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could be tion T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent values of Y[0] at the end: The of T0: T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. The of T0: T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	Explanation. Since there is no guarantee of a strict order of memory operations, as seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent orderings that lead to different values of $Y[0]$ at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.
Explanation. Since there is no guarantee of a strict order of memory operations seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-conforderings that lead to different values of Y[0] at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	tion T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, we that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before bective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could be tion T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent values of Y[0] at the end: The of T0: T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. The of T0: T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	Explanation. Since there is no guarantee of a strict order of memory operations, as seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent orderings that lead to different values of $Y[0]$ at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.
Explanation. Since there is no guarantee of a strict order of memory operations seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-conforderings that lead to different values of Y[0] at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	tion T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, we that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before bective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could be tion T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent values of Y[0] at the end: The of T0: T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. The of T0: T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	Explanation. Since there is no guarantee of a strict order of memory operations, as seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent orderings that lead to different values of $Y[0]$ at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.
Explanation. Since there is no guarantee of a strict order of memory operations seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-conforderings that lead to different values of Y[0] at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	tion T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, we that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before bective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could be tion T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent values of Y[0] at the end: The of T0: T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. The of T0: T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	Explanation. Since there is no guarantee of a strict order of memory operations, as seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent orderings that lead to different values of $Y[0]$ at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.
Explanation. Since there is no guarantee of a strict order of memory operations seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-conforderings that lead to different values of Y[0] at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	tion T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, we that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before bective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could be tion T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent values of Y[0] at the end: The of T0: T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. The of T0: T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	Explanation. Since there is no guarantee of a strict order of memory operations, as seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent orderings that lead to different values of $Y[0]$ at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.
seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-con orderings that lead to different values of Y[0] at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	tion T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, we that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before sective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could be tion T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent values of Y[0] at the end: we of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. We of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.	seen by different cores, instruction T1.1 could complete before or after instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0. If instruction T1.1 completes before instruction T1.0, from the perspective of the core that executes T0, instruction T0.3 could complete before or after instruction T1.0. Thus, there are three possible weakly-consistent orderings that lead to different values of Y[0] at the end: Ordering 1 (from the perspective of T0): T1.0 \rightarrow T1.1 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2. Ordering 2 (from the perspective of T0): T1.1 \rightarrow T1.0 \rightarrow T0.3 - Final value = 2.

Final Exam Page 19 of 25