## CS4410

# Operating Systems 

## Rachit Agarwal

## Goal of Today's Lecture

- Understand the concurrency problem
- Understand the concurrency/synchronization terminology


## Concurrency and Synchronization

## Understanding the problem

## Recall Example 1.1: The racing threads—one possibility

Two threads: Thread A and Thread B, operating on a shared variable value (initiated to 0 )

```
value = value + 1;
If (value =/= -1)
    print ("Thread A wins");
```

```
value = value - 1;
If (value == -1)
    print ("Thread B wins");
```

Whats happening under the hood (inside the loop)?
(If threads were running concurrently)

```
rA = 0<- load rA, value
rA = 1 <- add rA, rA, 1
value = 1 <- store rA, value
```

$$
\begin{aligned}
& r B=0<- \text { load } r B \text {, value } \\
& r B=-1<- \text { sub } r B, r B, 1 \\
& \text { value }=-1<- \text { store } r B \text {, value }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Recall: Example 1.2: The racing threads—another possibility

Two threads: Thread A and Thread B, operating on a shared variable value (initiated to 0 )

```
value = value + 1;
If (value =/= -1)
    print ("Thread A wins");
```

```
value = value - 1;
If (value == -1)
    print ("Thread B wins");
```

Whats happening under the hood (inside the loop)?
(If threads were running concurrently)

```
rA = 0<- load rA, value
rA = 1 <- add rA,rA, 1
value = 1 <- store rA, value
```

$r B=-1<-$ sub $r B, r B, 1$
value $=-1<-$ store $r B$, value

## The crux of the problem

- Two concurrent threads (or processes)
- Accessing a shared resource (account)
- Without any coordination-with "synchronization"
- Lack of synchronization
- Creates race conditions
- Non-deterministic outputs, depending on thread scheduling
- In scenarios involving Shared resources + concurrent execution
- We need mechanisms for synchronization
- Ensure that we can reason about execution outputs
- Ensure deterministic outputs


## Example 3.1: The real-world ATM banking example

Shared bank account
Initial balance: \$1000;
both of you execute withdraw (account, 500) at the same time

```
balance = read_balance (account);
balance = balance - amount;
write_balance (account, balance);
return balance;
```

- What is the final balance?
- 500? 1000? 0?

Time

```
balance = read_balance (account);
```

balance = read_balance (account);
balance = balance - amount;
balance = balance - amount;
write_balance (account, balance);
write_balance (account, balance);
return balance;

```
return balance;
```

- Everyone is happy!


## Recall: Example 3.2: The real-world ATM banking example

Shared bank account
Initial balance: \$1000;
both of you execute withdraw (account, 500) at the same time

```
balance = read_balance (account);
balance = balance - amount;
```

```
balance = read_balance (account);
balance = balance - amount;
write_balance (account, balance);
return balance;
```

write_balance (account, balance);
return balance;

- What is the final balance?
- 500? 1000? 0?
- Bank goes berserk!


## Example 4: Too-much-milk problem

You in your lovely, cozy, non-shared apartment

| $3: 00$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $3: 05$ |  |
| $3: 10$ |  |
| $3: 15$ |  |
| $3: 20$ |  |
| $3: 25$ |  |
| $3: 30$ |  |$\quad$| Look in fridge. Out of milk. |
| :--- |$\quad$| Leave for store. |
| :--- |
| Arrive at store. |
| Buy milk. |
|  |

## Drink milk, be strong!

## Example 4: Too-much-milk problem

You and your (partly crazy) roommate in your not-so-lovely, not-so-cozy apartment


|  |
| :--- |
| Look in fridge. Out of milk. |
| Leave for store. |
| Arrive at store. |
| Buy milk. |
| Arrive home. Put milk in fridge. |

## Too much milk!

## Example 4: Too-much-milk problem

You and your (partly crazy) roommate in your not-so-lovely, not-so-cozy apartment

```
If (no Milk) {
    Buy milk;
```

If (no Milk) \{
Buy milk;
\}

Too much milk!

## Example 4: Potential solution? Attempt 1

You and your (partly crazy) roommate in your not-so-lovely, not-so-cozy apartment

## Attempt 1: Let us try the "freezing" idea

```
If (no Milk) {
    If (no Note) {
        Leave note;
        Buy milk;
        Remove note;
    }
}
```

```
If (no Milk) {
    If (no Note) {
        Leave note;
        Buy milk;
        Remove note;
    }
}
```

Does this work?

## Example 4: Potential solution? Attempt 1

You and your (partly crazy) roommate in your not-so-lovely, not-so-cozy apartment

## No!

```
If (no Milk) {
    If (no Note) {
        Leave note;
        Buy milk;
    Remove note;
    }
}
```

If (no Milk) \{
If (no Note) \{
Leave note;
Buy milk;
Remove note;
\}
$\}$

## Example 4: Potential solution? Attempt 2

You and your (partly crazy) roommate in your not-so-lovely, not-so-cozy apartment

## Attempt 2: Let us get smarter: freeze first

```
Leave note;
If (no Milk) {
    If (no Note) {
        Buy milk;
    }
}
Remove note;
```

```
Leave note;
If (no Milk) {
        If (no Note) {
            Buy milk;
    }
}
Remove note;
```

Does this work?

## Example 4: Potential solution? Attempt 2

You and your (partly crazy) roommate in your not-so-lovely, not-so-cozy apartment

## No!

```
Leave note;
If (no Milk) {
    If (no Note) {
        Buy milk;
    }
}
Remove note;
```

```
Leave note;
If (no Milk) {
    If (no Note) {
        Buy milk;
    }
}
Remove note;
```

Nobody ever buys milk!

## Example 4: Potential solution? Attempt 3

You and your (partly crazy) roommate in your not-so-lovely, not-so-cozy apartment

Attempt 3: May be different interpretations of notes

```
If (no Note) {
    If (no Milk) {
        Buy milk;
    }
    Leave note;
}
```

```
If (Note) {
    If (no Milk) {
        Buy milk;
    }
    Remove Note;
}
```

Does this work?

## Example 4: Potential solution? Attempt 3

You and your (partly crazy) roommate in your not-so-lovely, not-so-cozy apartment

No! Starvation!

```
If (no Note) {
    If (no Milk) {
            Buy milk;
    }
    Leave note;
}
```


## Example 4: Potential solution? Attempt 4

You and your (partly crazy) roommate in your not-so-lovely, not-so-cozy apartment

Attempt 4: Perhaps two notes?

```
Leave noteA;
If (no noteB) {
    If (no Milk) {
        Buy milk;
    }
}
Remove noteA;
```

```
Leave noteB;
If (no noteA) {
    If (no Milk) {
        Buy milk;
    }
}
Remove noteB;
```


## Does this work?

## Example 4: Potential solution? Attempt 4

You and your (partly crazy) roommate in your not-so-lovely, not-so-cozy apartment

Even worse! Lockup, deadlock, starvation!


## Example 4: Potential solution? Attempt 5

You and your (partly crazy) roommate in your not-so-lovely, not-so-cozy apartment
Attempt 5: What are we missing?
"If roommate is not doing something, I should do it"
"If roommate is doing something, I should not do it"

```
Leave noteA;
While (noteB) {
    Do nothing;
}
    If (no Milk) {
        Buy milk;
    }
Remove noteA;
```

```
Leave noteB;
If (no noteA) {
    If (no Milk) {
        Buy milk;
    }
}
Remove noteB;
```

Does this work?

## Example 4: Potential solution? Attempt 5

You and your (partly crazy) roommate in your not-so-lovely, not-so-cozy apartment

Case 1: While (noteB) "happens before" Leave noteB


## Example 4: Potential solution? Attempt 5

You and your (partly crazy) roommate in your not-so-lovely, not-so-cozy apartment

## Case 2.1:

While (noteB) happens after Leave noteB If (no noteA) happens before Leave noteA


## Example 4: Potential solution? Attempt 5

You and your (partly crazy) roommate in your not-so-lovely, not-so-cozy apartment

Case 2.2:
While (noteB) happens after Leave noteB
If (no noteA) happens after Leave nodeA


## This generalizes to n threads ...

Leslie Lamport's "Bakery Algorithm" (1974) generalizes this solution to n threads


Leslie Lamport
Massachusetts Computer Associates, Inc.

[^0]
## Discussion

- Our solution protects a single "critical section" piece of code for each thread

```
If (no Milk) {
Buy milk;
- Our solutions works, but is really unsatisfactory
- Complexity-even for this simple example
- Hard to convince of correctness
- Asymmetric code-You and your roommate have different codes
- What if there are lots of threads
- While your thread is waiting, the thread is wasting CPU time
- This is called "busy-waiting"
- Is there a better way?
- Better hardware support
- what if hardware can support executing critical section in "atomic" steps
- Better higher-level programming abstractions
- Using whatever atomic operations hardware supports

\section*{Atomic Operations}
- "Indivisible operations" supported by hardware
- Indivisible: An operation that always runs to completion or not at all
- No interruptions
- It cannot be stopped in the middle
- And state cannot be modified by someone else in the middle
- Fundamental building block
- If no atomic operations, then have no way for threads to work together
- What atomic operations should the hardware support?
- We have studied four examples, each with different complexity
- And with different set of operations

\section*{Atomic Operations}
- Most modern processors support a basic set of atomic operations
- Atomic read-write
- Atomic swap
- test-and-set
- fetch-and-add
- compare-and-swap
- store-conditional
- Covered in 3410—please review
- Can be used to implement higher-level primitives

\section*{Building higher-level primitives using atomic operations}
- We will study three primitives
- Locks—mostly covered in 3410
- Semaphores
- Conditional variables
- Monitors: locks + conditional variables
- Can be used to implement higher-level primitives

\section*{Recall: Locks}
- Lock: Used to restrict access to something important (shared data)
- Lock before accessing shared data
- read/write shared data (critical section)
- Other threads waiting at this point for the lock to be released
- Important idea: synchronization requires waiting
- Unlock
- Most operating systems offer two atomic operations on locks:
- lock.acquire()
- wait until lock is free, then mark it as busy atomically
- After the call returns, calling thread holds the lock
- lock.release()
- releases the lock
- Should be called only by the thread that holds the lock

\section*{Example 1: The racing threads with locks}
- Two threads: Thread A and Thread B, operating on a shared variable value (initiated to 0 )
```

Lock.acquire();
value = value + 1;
If (value != -1)
{
print("Thread A wins");
}
Lock.release();

```
```

Lock.acquire();
value = value - 1;
If (value == -1)
{
print("Thread B wins");
}
Lock.release();

```

The thread that acquires the lock first, wins!

\section*{Example 2: The complicated racing threads with locks}
- Two threads: Thread A and Thread B, operating on a shared variable value (initiated to 0 )
```

Lock.acquire();
while (value < 10)
{
value = value + 1;
}
print("Thread A wins");
Lock.release();

```
```

Lock.acquire();
while (value > -10)
{
value = value - 1;
}
print("Thread B wins");
Lock.release();

```

Again, the thread that acquires the lock first, wins!

\section*{Example 3: The real-world ATM banking example with locks}
- Initial balance: \$1000; two simultaneous withdrawals of \$500;
```

int withdraw(account, amount) {
lock.acquire();
balance = read_balance(account);
balance = balance - amount;
write_balance(account, balance);
lock.release();
return balance;
}

```
```

int withdraw(account, amount) {
lock.acquire();
balance = read_balance(account);
balance = balance - amount;
write_balance(account, balance);
lock.release();
return balance;
}

```

Balance is always deterministic! (0 in this case)
Note: Always release before returning from the function call

\section*{Example 4: Too-much-milk problem with locks}
- You and your (partly crazy) roommate in your not-so-lovely, not-so-cozy apartment
```

lock.acquire();
If (no Milk) {
Buy milk;
}
lock.acquire();

```
```

lock.acquire();
If (no Milk) {
Buy milk;
}
lock.acquire();

```

Drink milk and be strong without buying too much milk!

Do locks solve all problems?

\section*{Example 5: The producer-consumer problem}

\section*{Consumer}

- Suppose we want to build a fork dispenser for a cafe
- The dispenser (shared resource) has limited capacity
- Consumers pull out forks on one end of the dispenser
- removeFromDispenser()
- sleep()—consumer blocks until the producer wakes it up
- Error if tries to pull out a fork from an empty dispenser
- Error if cannot pull out a fork when there is one
- Owner adds forks on the other end of the dispenser
- addToDispenser()
- wakeup()-a routine for producer to wake up a consumer
- Error if tries to add a fork to a full dispenser

\section*{Example 5: The producer-consumer problem: Attempt 2}
- Suppose we implement producer and consumer this way
```

Consumers() {
while(true) {
if(forkCount == 0)
{
sleep();
}
Fork = removeFromDispenser();
forkCount = forkCount - 1;
if(forkCount == dispenserCapacity - 1)
{
wakeup(owner);
}
use(Fork);
}
}

```
```

Owner(fork) {
while(true) {
Fork = newFork();
if(forkCount == dispenserCapacity)
{
sleep();
}
addToDispenser(Fork);
forkCount = forkCount + 1;
if(forkCount == 1)
{
wakeup(consumer);
}
}
}

```

Are we done? Is this correct?

\section*{Example 5: The producer-consumer problem: Attempt 2}
- Can lead to "deadlocks"
- Step 1: The consumer reads forkCount (=0); about to enter if
- Step 2: Just before calling sleep()
- Consumer interrupted
- Producer adds a fork, puts it into dispenser, forkCount=1
- Since forkCount=1, tries to wake up the consumer
- But the consumer isn't sleeping yet-wakeup call lost
- Step 3: The consumer calls sleep()
- Goes to sleep;
- Never wakes up, since wakeup call only when forkCount=1
- Step 4: Producer fills up the dispenser
- Goes to sleep
- Never wakes up, since wakeup call only from consumer

\section*{Example 5: The producer-consumer problem}

```

Owner(fork) {
while(true)
{
Fork = newFork();
if(forkCount == dispenserCapacity)
{
sleep();
}
addToDispenser(Fork);
forkCount = forkCount + 1;
if(forkCount == 1)
{
wakeup(consumer);
}
}
}

```
    sleep();
    \}

\section*{Example 5: The producer consumer problem with locks}
- Suppose we implement producer and consumer this way
```

Consumers() {
while(true)
{
lock.acquire();
while(forkCount == 0)
{
lock.release();
lock.acquire();
}
Fork = removeFromDispenser();
forkCount = forkCount - 1;
lock.release();
use(Fork);
}
}

```
```

Owner(fork) {
while(true)
{
Fork = newFork();
lock.acquire();
while(forkCount == dispenserCapacity)
{
lock.release();
lock.acquire();
}
addToDispenser(Fork);
forkCount = forkCount + 1;
lock.release();
}
}

```

Too many CPU cycles wasted by the while loop!!!

\section*{Semaphores}
- Semaphores are a kind of generalized lock
- A semaphore is "stateful"
- Has a non-negative value associated with it
- Value is incremented and decremented atomically
- Semaphore has a positive value initially, and offers two atomic operations
- Down() or P()-stands for "proberen" (to test) in Dutch:
- waits for the semaphore value to become positive
- When so, atomically decrement it by 1
- Up() or V()一stands for "verhogen" (to increment) in Dutch:
- increment the semaphore value by 1
- wake up a thread waiting on P, if any
- Binary Semaphore: Semaphore with initial value 1
- Mutual exclusion like locks
- All problems solvable with locks can be solved with a binary semaphore```


[^0]:    A simple solution to the mutual exclusion problem is presented which allows the system to continue to operate

