Concurrent Programming

Bernard Sufrin and Gavin Lowe

Hilary Term 2016-17



8a: Server Elimination

Server Elimination: Replumbing for efficiency

Interprocess communication through channels without the intervention of a mediating (server) process is (in general) more efficient because there are fewer context switches.

It is usually possible to restructure programs that use "active plumbing" components implemented by processes (e.g. zip, merge, tee, probe, prefix, map) that connect input and/or output channels so as to eliminate mediating (server) processes.

For example, we could build a merge2Gen class such that the following behave identically when \cdots only reads from out and only writes to 1, r

```
val m = new merge2Gen[T]
val out = m·out
val l = m·in1
val r = m·in2
val l, r, out = OneOne[T]
( merge(List(l,r), out)
| | · · ·
)()
```

The restructuring components can be built using low-level concurrency constructs, can be harder to understand, and may have subtly different synchronization or termination characteristics.

Example: Tee2Gen

Here we $sketch^1$ a component designed so that the following behave identically when \cdots only reads from 1, r (in separate processes) and only writes to out

```
val t = new Tee2Gen[T]
val out = t·out
val l = t·in1
val r = t·in2
```

```
val out, l, r = 0ne0ne[T]
( tee(out, List(l, r))
|| · · ·
)()
```



Our solution is structured as follows:



The readers are controlled using permit..., await... to operate signalling semaphores.

Reads must terminate before a write returns (because !, ? are synchronized in OneOne)

```
object out extends OutPort[T]
  _isOpenForWrite = true
   def !(value: T): Unit =
   { if (! _isOpenForWrite) throw new Closed(name)
     obi = value
     // permit both readers to proceed
     in1.permitRead
     in2.permitRead
     // await (possibly forced) synchronization with read terminations
     in1.awaitReadFinished
     // synchronization may have been due to a close
     if (! _isOpenForWrite) throw new Closed(name)
     in2 awaitReadFinished
     // synchronization may have been due to a close
     if (! _isOpenForWrite) throw new Closed(name)
```

The input ports must be read by different processes else this implementation could deadlock. (Does this *really* make the component useless?)



When the out port is closed, the in ports are forced to close.

```
override def close: Unit = {
    // once-only: mark closed and tell both inports
    if (_is0penForWrite) {
        _is0penForWrite = false
        in1·close
        in2·close
    }
}
```



permit... synchronizes the start of a read; await... synchronizes its termination.

```
class Reader extends InPort[T]
{ val canRead = BooleanSemaphore(false)
 val readFinished = BooleanSemaphore(false)
 def permitRead = canRead·release
 def awaitReadFinished = readFinished·acquire
```

When an in port is closed it forces the out port to close, then pretends that any outstanding reads/writes have terminated.



Reading is straightforward

Extended rendezvous in ? f synchronizes with out!v after the rendezvous f(v) has terminated

(in this case, the rendezvous is a three-way affair: both readers and the writer synchronize)

Contents

Server Elimination:	Replumbing for efficiency	 1
Example: Tee2Gen		 2

