CSE 451: Operating Systems Autumn 2005

Lecture 7 Synchronization

Hank Levy Levy@cs.washington.edu Allen Center 596

Synchronization

- Threads cooperate in multithreaded programs
 - to share resources, access shared data structures
 - e.g., threads accessing a memory cache in a web server
 - also, to coordinate their execution
 - e.g., a disk reader thread hands off a block to a network writer
- For correctness, we have to control this cooperation
 - must assume threads interleave executions arbitrarily and at different rates
 - scheduling is not under application writers' control
 - we control cooperation using synchronization
 - · enables us to restrict the interleaving of executions
- Note: this also applies to processes, not just threads
 - and it also applies across machines in a distributed system

Shared Resources

- We'll focus on coordinating access to shared resources
 - basic problem:
 - two concurrent threads are accessing a shared variable
 - if the variable is read/modified/written by both threads, then access to the variable must be controlled
 - otherwise, unexpected results may occur
- Over the next two lectures, we'll look at:
 - mechanisms to control access to shared resources
 - low level mechanisms like locks
 - higher level mechanisms like mutexes, semaphores, monitors, and condition variables
 - patterns for coordinating access to shared resources
 - bounded buffer, producer-consumer, ...

The classic example

• Suppose we have to implement a function to withdraw money from a bank account:

```
int withdraw(account, amount) {
   balance = get_balance(account);
   balance -= amount;
   put_balance(account, balance);
   return balance;
}
```

- Now suppose that you and your S.O. share a bank account with a balance of \$100.00
 - what happens if you both go to separate ATM machines, and simultaneously withdraw \$10.00 from the account?

Example continued

- Represent the situation by creating a separate thread for each person to do the withdrawals
 - have both threads run on the same bank mainframe:


<pre>int withdraw(account, amount) {</pre>
<pre>balance = get_balance(account);</pre>
balance -= amount;
<pre>put_balance(account, balance);</pre>
return balance;
}

```
int withdraw(account, amount) {
   balance = get_balance(account);
   balance -= amount;
   put_balance(account, balance);
   return balance;
}
```

- What's the problem with this?
 - what are the possible balance values after this runs?

Interleaved Schedules

• The problem is that the execution of the two threads can be interleaved, assuming preemptive scheduling:



- What's the account balance after this sequence?
 - who's happy, the bank or you? ;)

The crux of the matter

- The problem is that two concurrent threads (or processes) access a shared resource (account) without any synchronization
 - creates a race condition
 - output is non-deterministic, depends on timing
- We need mechanisms for controlling access to shared resources in the face of concurrency
 - so we can reason about the operation of programs
 - essentially, re-introducing determinism
- Synchronization is necessary for any shared data structure
 - buffers, queues, lists, hash tables, ...

When are Resources Shared?

- Local variables are not shared
 - refer to data on the stack, each thread has its own stack
 - never pass/share/store a pointer to a local variable on another thread's stack
- Global variables are shared
 - stored in the static data segment, accessible by any thread
- Dynamic objects are shared
 - stored in the heap, shared if you can name it
 - in C, can conjure up the pointer
 - e.g. void *x = (void *) 0xDEADBEEF
 - in Java, strong typing prevents this
 - must pass references explicitly

Mutual Exclusion

- We want to use mutual exclusion to synchronize access to shared resources
- Code that uses mutual exclusion to synchronize its execution is called a critical section
 - only one thread at a time can execute in the critical section
 - all other threads are forced to wait on entry
 - when a thread leaves a critical section, another can enter

Critical Section Requirements

- Critical sections have the following requirements
 - mutual exclusion
 - at most one thread is in the critical section
 - progress
 - if thread T is outside the critical section, then T cannot prevent thread S from entering the critical section
 - bounded waiting (no starvation)
 - if thread T is waiting on the critical section, then T will eventually enter the critical section
 - assumes threads eventually leave critical sections
 - performance
 - the overhead of entering and exiting the critical section is small with respect to the work being done within it


Mechanisms for Building Crit. Sections


- Locks
 - very primitive, minimal semantics; used to build others
- Semaphores
 - basic, easy to get the hang of, hard to program with
- Monitors
 - high level, requires language support, implicit operations
 - easy to program with; Java "synchronized()" as example
- Messages
 - simple model of communication and synchronization based on (atomic) transfer of data across a channel
 - direct application to distributed systems

Locks

- A lock is a object (in memory) that provides the following two operations:
 - acquire(): a thread calls this before entering a critical section
 - release(): a thread calls this after leaving a critical section
- Threads pair up calls to acquire() and release()
 - between acquire() and release(), the thread holds the lock
 - acquire() does not return until the caller holds the lock
 - at most one thread can hold a lock at a time (usually)
 - so: what can happen if the calls aren't paired?
- Two basic flavors of locks
 - spinlock
 - blocking (a.k.a. "mutex")

Using Locks






- What happens when green tries to acquire the lock?
- Why is the "return" outside the critical section?
 - is this ok?

Spinlocks

• How do we implement locks? Here's one attempt:



- Why doesn't this work?
 - where is the race condition?

Implementing locks (continued)

- Problem is that implementation of locks has critical sections, too!
 - the acquire/release must be atomic
 - atomic == executes as though it could not be interrupted
 - code that executes "all or nothing"
- Need help from the hardware
 - atomic instructions
 - test-and-set, compare-and-swap, ...
 - disable/reenable interrupts
 - to prevent context switches

Spinlocks redux: Test-and-Set

• CPU provides the following as one atomic instruction:

```
bool test_and_set(bool *flag) {
   bool old = *flag;
   *flag = True;
   return old;
}
```

• So, to fix our broken spinlocks, do:

```
struct lock {
    int held = 0;
}
void acquire(lock) {
    while(test_and_set(&lock->held));
}
void release(lock) {
    lock->held = 0;
}
```

Problems with spinlocks

- Horribly wasteful!
 - if a thread is spinning on a lock, the thread holding the lock cannot make process
- How did lock holder yield the CPU in the first place?
 - calls yield() or sleep()
 - involuntary context switch
- Only want spinlocks as primitives to build higher-level synchronization constructs

Disabling Interrupts

• An alternative:

```
struct lock {
}
void acquire(lock) {
    cli(); // disable interrupts
}
void release(lock) {
    sti(); // reenable interupts
}
```

- Can two threads disable interrupts simultaneously?
- What's wrong with interrupts?
 - only available to kernel (why? how can user-level use?)
 - insufficient on a multiprocessor
 - back to atomic instructions
- Like spinlocks, only use to implement higher-level synchronization primitives