### EE 382V: Parallel Algorithms

Fall 2017

Lecture 3: August 19

Lecturer: Vijay Garg Scribe: Howie Benefiel

# 3.1 Lamport Clocks

The motivation for this is that we need some mechanism to tell us  $e \to f$ .

**Definition 3.1** A map C is a logical clock if  $c: E \to \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $e \to f \Rightarrow c(e) < c(f)$ 

Notice in Definition 3.1 that C is a unidirectional material conditional, not bidirectional. Numbers should monotonically increase with a process Every process should send a number when it receives an event - take  $max(P_1, P_n)$  then add 1.

# 3.1.1 Lamport Clock Algorithm

${\bf Algorithm} \ {\bf 1} \ {\bf Calculate} \ {\bf a} \ {\bf logical} \ {\bf clock} \ {\bf for} \ {\bf a} \ {\bf distributed} \ {\bf system}$	
$c \leftarrow 0$	ightharpoons Initialization
$c \leftarrow c + 1$	$\triangleright$ on internal event
$c \leftarrow c + 1$	$\triangleright$ on send event
Send c with message	
$c \leftarrow max(c,d) + 1$	$\triangleright$ on receive of message with d as clock

This algorithm will always return a logical clock which will monotonically increase with events in the system.

## 3.2 Vector Clocks

#### 3.2.1 Motivation

Using the simple Lamport Clock, we cannot infer that e happened before f. That is because of the unidirectional implication in the definition. To get a complete ordering, can we come up with a map where

**Definition 3.2** 
$$V: E \to \mathbb{N}^n$$
 s.t.  $e \to f \Leftrightarrow V(e) < V(f)$ 

Notice in Definition 3.3 that we have if and only if. This means that if we have the values V(e) and V(f), we can determine whether e happened before f.

**Definition 3.3** x, y are vectors in n-dimension

$$\forall i : x[i] \le y[i] \land \exists j : x[j] < y[j]$$

3-2 Lecture 3: August 19

As an example of how this comparison works, (2,7,9) < (3,7,9) and (2,7,9)||(3,5,2). To map natural numbers to poset, you need vectors. You cannot do it with a scalars. As an example of how this works,

# 3.2.2 Algorithm for Vector Clock

#### Algorithm 2 An algorithm to track vector clocks

```
\begin{array}{l} \underline{P_i ::} \ \ V : \ \operatorname{array}[1 \dots n] \ \text{of int} \\ \underline{\operatorname{init}:} \ \ \operatorname{all} \ 0 \text{'s except} \ V[i] = 1; \\ V[i] \leftarrow V[i] + 1 \\ \text{Send V with message} \\ V \leftarrow \max(V, W) \\ V[i] \leftarrow V[i] + 1 \\ \end{array} \qquad \qquad \triangleright \ \underline{\operatorname{for internal event}} \\ \text{Send V with message} \\ V \leftarrow \max(V, W) \\ V[i] \leftarrow V[i] + 1 \\ \end{array}
```

**Proof:** The proof that this algorithm returns a consistent clock which gives a total order is taken in two parts.

```
1<sup>st</sup> Part: e \to f \Rightarrow V(e) < V(f) Proof
```

This is proven by the vector increasing along each edge in the system diagram.

```
2<sup>nd</sup> Part: e \not\to f \Rightarrow V(e) \not< V(f)

\underline{Proof}

e \not\to f \Rightarrow there is no path from e to f \Rightarrow V(f)[i] < V(e)[i]

e is on P_i \land f is on P_j \Rightarrow V(e) \not< V(f) \blacksquare \underline{Explanation} P_2 does not know about P_1, so P_1's values for P_1 must be larger.
```

### 3.2.3 Directly Precedes

If we only care about direct messages, i.e., no transitivity, we can get away with only sending the component for the sending process. Each process still stores a full vector with an element for each process.