CSE 332: Data Structures and Parallelism

Spring 2022

Richard Anderson

Lecture 20: Locks and Deadlocks

Announcements

- Starting Monday – graphs and graph algorithms
  - Readings: Weiss, chapter 9

Midterm

MEDIAN	MAXIMUM	MEAN	STD DEV
81.75%	99.0%	76.38%	17.11%



Really sharing memory between Threads



Banking

- Two threads both trying to `withdraw(100)` from the same account:
- Assume initial `balance` 150

```
class BankAccount {
  private int balance = 0;
  int  getBalance()       { return balance; }
  void setBalance(int x) { balance = x; }
  void withdraw(int amount) {
    int b = getBalance();
    if(amount > b)
      throw new WithdrawTooLargeException();
    setBalance(b – amount);
  }
  … // other operations like deposit, etc.
}
```

Thread 1

```
x.withdraw(100);
```

Thread 2

```
x.withdraw(100);
```


Race Conditions

A race condition: program executes inconsistently due to thread due to unexpected order of threads

Write-write
T1: a = 0;
T2: a = 1;

Write-read
T1: a = 0;
T2: b = a;

Read-read (not a problem)
T1: b = a;
T2: c = a;

Corrected Version

```
class BankAccount {
  private int balance = 0;
  synchronized int getBalance()
    { return balance; }
  synchronized void setBalance(int x)
    { balance = x; }
  synchronized void withdraw(int amount) {
     int b = getBalance();
     if(amount > b)
       throw …
     setBalance(b – amount);
  }
  // deposit would also use synchronized
}
```

synchronized provides a re-entrant lock for each back account

Locking Guidelines

- Correctness
- Consistency: make it well-defined
- Granularity: coarse to fine
- Critical Sections: make them small, atomic
- Leverage libraries

Consistent Locking

- Clear mapping of locks to resources
  - followed by all methods
  - clearly documented
  - same lock can guard multiple resources



  - what's a resource? Conceptual:
    - object
    - field
    - data structure (e.g., linked list, hash table)

Lock Granularity

- Coarse grained: fewer locks, more objects per lock
  - e.g., one lock for entire data structure (e.g., linked list)



  - advantage:
  - disadvantage:
- Fine grained: more locks, fewer objects per lock
  - e.g., one lock for each item in the linked list

Lock Granularity

- Example: hashtable with separate chaining
  - coarse grained: one lock for whole table
  - fine grained: one lock for each bucket
- Which supports more concurrency for **insert** and **lookup**?
- Which makes implementing **resize** easier?
- Suppose hashtable maintains a **numElements** field. Which locking approach is better?

Critical Sections

- Critical sections:
  - how much code executes while you hold the lock?
  - want critical sections to be short
  - make them "atomic": think about smallest sequence of operations that have to occur at once (without data races, interleavings)

Critical Sections

- Suppose we want to change a value in a hash table
  - assume one lock for the entire table
  - computing the new value takes a long time ("expensive")

```
synchronized(lock) {
  v1 = table.lookup(k);
  v2 = expensive(v1);
  table.remove(k);
  table.insert(k,v2);
}
```


Critical Sections

- Suppose we want to change a value in the hash table
  - assume one lock for the entire table
  - computing the new value takes a long time ("expensive")
  - will this work?

```
synchronized(lock) {
  v1 = table.lookup(k);
}
v2 = expensive(v1);
synchronized(lock) {
  table.remove(k);
  table.insert(k,v2);
}
```


Critical Sections

- Suppose we want to change a value in the hash table
  - assume one lock for the entire table
  - computing the new value takes a long time ("expensive")
  - convoluted fix:

```
done = false;
while(!done) {
  synchronized(lock) {
    v1 = table.lookup(k);
  }
  v2 = expensive(v1);
  synchronized(lock) {
    if(table.lookup(k)==v1) {
      done = true; // I can exit the loop!
      table.remove(k);
      table.insert(k,v2);
}}}
```


Another Bank Operation

- Consider transferring money:

```
class BankAccount {
  …
  synchronized void withdraw(int amt) {…}
  synchronized void deposit(int amt) {…}
  synchronized void transferTo(int amt,
                               BankAccount a) {
    this.withdraw(amt);
    a.deposit(amt);
  }
}
```

- What can go wrong?

Deadlock

- `x` and `y` are two different accounts

Time

Thread 1: `x.transferTo(1,y)`	Thread 2: `y.transferTo(1,x)`
acquire lock for `x`	
withdraw from `x`	
	acquire lock for `y`
	withdraw from `y`
block on lock for `y`	*block on lock for* `x`

Deadlock = Cycles

- Multiple threads depending on each other in a cycle



  - T2 has lock that T1 needs
  - T3 has lock that T2 needs
  - T1 has lock that T3 needs

- Solution?

How to Fix Deadlock?

- In Banking example

```
class BankAccount {
  …
  synchronized void withdraw(int amt) {…}
  synchronized void deposit(int amt) {…}
  synchronized void transferTo(int amt,
                               BankAccount a) {
    this.withdraw(amt);
    a.deposit(amt);
  }
}
```


How to Fix Deadlock?

- Separate withdraw from deposit

```
class BankAccount {
  …
  synchronized void withdraw(int amt) {…}
  synchronized void deposit(int amt) {…}
  synchronized void transferTo(int amt,
                               BankAccount a) {
    this.withdraw(amt);
    a.deposit(amt);
  }
}
```

- Problems?

Possible Solutions

1. **`transferTo`** not synchronized
   - exposes intermediate state after **`withdraw`** before **`deposit`**
   - may be okay here, but exposes wrong total amount in bank
2. Coarsen lock granularity: one lock for all accounts works, but sacrifices concurrent deposits/withdrawals
3. Give every bank-account a unique ID and always acquire locks in the same ID order
   - *Entire program* should obey this order to avoid cycles

Ordering Accounts

- Transfer from bank account 5 to account 9



1. lock A5
2. lock A9
3. withdraw from A5
4. deposit to A9

Ordering Accounts

- Transfer from bank account 5 to account 9



1. lock A5
2. lock A9
3. withdraw from A5
4. deposit to A9

Transfer from bank account 9 to account 5



1. lock
2. lock
3. withdraw from
4. deposit to

Ordering Accounts

- Transfer from bank account 5 to account 9



1. lock A5
2. lock A9
3. withdraw from A5
4. deposit to A9

Transfer from bank account 9 to account 5



1. lock
2. lock
3. withdraw from
4. deposit to

No interleavings will produce deadlock!
- T1 cannot block on A9 until it has A5
- T2 cannot acquire A9 until it has A5

Banking Without Deadlocks

```
class BankAccount {
  …
  private int acctNumber; // must be unique
  void transferTo(int amt, BankAccount a) {
    if(this.acctNumber < a.acctNumber)
       synchronized(this) {
       synchronized(a) {
          this.withdraw(amt);
          a.deposit(amt);
       }}
    else
       synchronized(a) {
       synchronized(this) {
          this.withdraw(amt);
          a.deposit(amt);
       }}
  }
}
```


Lock Ordering

- Useful in many situations
  - e.g., when moving an item from work queue A to B, need to acquire locks in a particular order
- Doesn't always work
  - not all objects can be naturally ordered
  - Java StringBuffer append is subject to deadlocks
    - thread 1: append string A onto string B
    - thread 2: append string B onto string A

Locking a Hashtable

- Consider a hashtable with
  - many simultaneous **`lookup`** operations
  - rare **`insert`** operations
- What's the right locking strategy?

Read vs. Write Locks

- Recall race conditions
  - two simultaneous write to same location
  - one write, one simultaneous read
- But two simultaneous reads OK
- Synchronize is too strict
  - blocks simultaneous reads

Readers/Writer Locks

A new synchronization ADT: The readers/writer lock

- A lock's states fall into three categories:
  - "not held"
  - "held for writing" by one thread
  - "held for reading" by *one or more* threads
- **`new:`** make a new lock, initially "not held"
- **`acquire_write:`** block if currently "held for reading" or "held for writing", else make "held for writing"
- **`release_write:`** make "not held"
- **`acquire_read:`** block if currently "held for writing", else make/keep "held for reading" and increment *readers count*
- **`release_read:`** decrement readers count, if 0, make "not held"

0 ≤ writers ≤ 1
0 ≤ readers
writers==0 || readers==0

In Java

- Java's **`synchronized`** statement does not support readers/writer
- Instead, library
- **`java.util.concurrent.locks.ReentrantReadWriteLock`**
- Different interface: methods **`readLock`** and **`writeLock`** return objects that themselves have **`lock`** and **`unlock`** methods

Concurrency Summary

- Parallelism is powerful, but introduces new concurrency issues:
  - Data races
  - Interleaving
  - Deadlocks
- Requires synchronization
  - Locks for mutual exclusion
- Guidelines for correct use help avoid common pitfalls