

CSE 332 Winter 2024

Lecture 22: Concurrency

Nathan Brunelle

<http://www.cs.uw.edu/332>

Memory Sharing With ForkJoin

- Idea of ForkJoin:
 - Reduce span by having many parallel tasks
 - Each task is responsible for **its own portion** of the input/output
 - If one task needs another's result, use `join()` to ensure it uses the final answer
- This does not help when:
 - Memory accessed by threads is overlapping or unpredictable
 - Threads are doing independent tasks using same resources (rather than implementing the same algorithm)

Example: Shared Queue

```
enqueue(x){
    if ( back == null ){
        back = new Node(x);
        front = back;
    }
    else {
        back.next = new Node(x);
        back = back.next;
    }
}
```

Imagine two threads are both using the same linked list based queue.

What could go wrong?

Concurrent Programming

- **Concurrency:**
 - Correctly and efficiently managing access to shared resources across multiple possibly-simultaneous tasks
- **Requires synchronization to avoid incorrect simultaneous access**
 - Use some way of “blocking” other tasks from using a resource when another modifies it or makes decisions based on its state
 - That blocking task will free up the resource when it’s done
- **Warning:**
 - Because we have no control over when threads are scheduled by the OS, even correct implementations are highly non-deterministic
 - Errors are hard to reproduce, which complicates debugging

Bank Account Example

- The following code implements a bank account object correctly for a synchronized situation
- Assume the initial balance is 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.  
}
```

What Happens here?

```
withdraw(100);  
withdraw(75)
```

Bank Account Example - Parallel

- Assume the initial balance is 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:

```
withdraw(100);
```

Thread 2:

```
withdraw(75);
```

Interleaving

- Due to time slicing, a thread can be interrupted at any time
 - Between any two lines of code
 - Within a single line of code
- The sequence that operations occur across two threads is called an interleaving
- Without doing anything else, we have no control over how different threads might be interleaved

A “Good” Interleaving

- Assume the initial balance is 150

Thread 1:

```
withdraw(100);
```

Thread 2:

```
withdraw(75);
```

```
int b = getBalance();  
if (amount > b)  
    throw new Exception();  
setBalance(b - amount);
```

```
int b = getBalance();  
if (amount > b)  
    throw new Exception();  
setBalance(b - amount);
```


A “Bad” Interleaving

- Assume the initial balance is 150

Thread 1:

```
withdraw(100);
```

Thread 2:

```
withdraw(75);
```

```
int b = getBalance();  
  
if (amount > b)  
    throw new Exception();  
setBalance(b - amount);
```

```
int b = getBalance();  
if (amount > b)  
    throw new Exception();  
setBalance(b - amount);
```

A Bad Fix

- Assume the initial balance is 150

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

A still “Bad” Interleaving

- Assume the initial balance is 150

Thread 1:

```
withdraw(100);
```

Thread 2:

```
withdraw(75);
```

```
if (amount > getBalance())  
    throw new Exception();  
setBalance(getBalance() - amount);  
setBalance(getBalance() - amount);
```

```
if (amount > getBalance())  
    throw new Exception();  
setBalance(getBalance() - amount);
```

What we want – Mutual Exclusion

- While one thread is withdrawing from the account, we want to exclude all other threads from also withdrawing
- Called mutual exclusion:
 - One thread using a resource (here: a bank account) means another thread must wait
 - We call the area of code that we want to have mutual exclusion (only one thread can be there at a time) a **critical section**.
- The programmer must implement critical sections!
 - It requires programming language primitives to do correctly

A Bad attempt at Mutual Exclusion

```
class BankAccount {
    private int balance = 0;
    private Boolean busy = false;
    int getBalance() { return balance; }
    void setBalance(int x) { balance = x; }
    void withdraw(int amount) {
        while (busy) { /* wait until not busy */ }
        busy = true;
        int b = getBalance();
        if (amount > b)
            throw new WithdrawTooLargeException();
        setBalance(b - amount);
        busy = false;}
    // other operations like deposit, etc.
}
```

A still “Bad” Interleaving

- Assume the initial balance is 150

Thread 1:

withdraw(100);

```
while (busy) { /* wait until not busy */ }
```

```
busy = true;
```

```
int b = getBalance();
```

```
if (amount > b)
```

```
    throw new Exception();
```

```
setBalance(b - amount);
```

```
busy = false;
```

Thread 2:

withdraw(75);

```
while (busy) { /* wait until not busy */ }
```

```
busy = true;
```

```
int b = getBalance();
```

```
if (amount > b)
```

```
    throw new Exception();
```

```
setBalance(b - amount);
```

```
busy = false;
```

Solution

- We need a construct from Java to do this
- One Solution – A **Mutual Exclusion Lock** (called a Mutex or Lock)
- We define a **Lock** to be a ADT with operations:
 - New:
 - make a new lock, initially “not held”
 - Acquire:
 - If lock is not held, mark it as “held”
 - These two steps always done together in a way that cannot be interrupted!
 - If lock is held, pause until it is marked as “not held”
 - Release:
 - Mark the lock as “not held”

Almost Correct Bank Account Example

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

Questions:

1. What is the critical section?
2. What is the Error?

Try...Finally

- Try Block:
 - Body of code that will be run
- Finally Block:
 - Always runs once the program exits try block (whether due to a return, exception, anything!)

Correct (but not Java) Bank Account Example

```
class BankAccount {
    private int balance = 0;
    private Lock lck = new Lock();
    int getBalance() { return balance; }
    void setBalance(int x) { balance = x; }
    void withdraw(int amount) {
        try{
            lk.acquire();
            int b = getBalance();
            if (amount > b)
                throw new WithdrawTooLargeException();
            setBalance(b - amount); }
        finally { lk.release(); } }
    // other operations like deposit, etc.
}
```

Questions:

1. Should deposit have its own lock object, or the same one?
2. What about getBalance?
3. What about setBalance?

A still “Bad” Interleaving

- Assume the initial balance is 150

Thread 1:

```
withdraw(100);
```

Thread 2:

```
if(getBalance()<75)  
    setBalance(75);
```

```
try{  
    lk.acquire();  
    int b = getBalance();  
    if (amount > b)  
        throw new Exception();  
  
    setBalance(b - amount); }  
finally { lk.release(); }
```

```
if(getBalance() < 75)  
    setBalance(75);
```

What's wrong here...

```
class BankAccount {
    private int balance = 0;
    private Lock lck = new Lock();
    int setBalance(int x) {
        try{
            lk.acquire();
            balance = x; }
        finally{ lk.release(); } }
    void withdraw(int amount) {
        try{
            lk.acquire();
            int b = getBalance();
            if (amount > b)
                throw new WithdrawTooLargeException();
            setBalance(b - amount); }
        finally { lk.release(); } }
```

Withdraw calls setBalance!

Withdraw can never finish because in setBalance the lock will always be held!

Re-entrant Lock (Recursive Lock)

- Idea:
 - Once a thread has acquired a lock, future calls to acquire on the same lock will not block progress
- If the lock used in the previous slide is re-entrant, then it will work!

Re-entrant Lock Details

- A re-entrant lock (a.k.a. recursive lock)
- “Remembers”
 - the thread (if any) that currently holds it
 - a count of “layers” that the thread holds it
- When the lock goes from not-held to held, the count is set to 0
- If (code running in) the current holder calls acquire:
 - it does not block
 - it increments the count
- On release:
 - if the count is > 0 , the count is decremented
 - if the count is 0, the lock becomes not-held

Java's Re-entrant Lock Class

- `java.util.concurrent.locks.ReentrantLock`
- Has methods `lock()` and `unlock()`
- Important to guarantee that lock is always released!!!
- Recommend something like this:

```
myLock.lock();  
try { // method body }  
finally { myLock.unlock(); }
```

How this looks in Java

```
java.util.concurrent.locks.ReentrantLock;
```

```
class BankAccount {  
    private int balance = 0;  
    private ReentrantLock lk = new ReentrantLock();  
    int setBalance(int x) {  
        try{  
            lk.lock();  
            balance = x; }  
        finally{ lk.unlock(); } }  
    void withdraw(int amount) {  
        try{  
            lk.lock();  
            int b = getBalance();  
            if (amount > b)  
                throw new WithdrawTooLargeException();  
            setBalance(b - amount); }  
        finally { lk.unlock(); } } }  
}
```


Java Synchronized Keyword

- Syntactic sugar for re-entrant locks
- You can use the synchronized statement as an alternative to declaring a ReentrantLock
- Syntax: `synchronized(/* expression returning an Object */) {statements}`
- Any Object can serve as a “lock”
 - Primitive types (e.g. int) cannot serve as a lock
- Acquires a lock and blocks if necessary
 - Once you get past the “{”, you have the lock
- Released the lock when you pass “}”
 - Even in the cases of returning, exceptions, anything!
 - Impossible to forget to release the lock

Bank Account Using Synchronize (Attempt 1)

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

Bank Account Using Synchronize (Attempt 2)

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

Since we have one lock per account regardless of operation, it's more intuitive to use the account object itself as the lock!

More Syntactic Sugar!

- Using the object itself as a lock is common enough that Java has convenient syntax for that as well!
- Declaring a method as “**synchronized**” puts its body into a synchronized block with “this” as the lock

Bank Account Using Synchronize (Final)

```
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 new WithdrawTooLargeException();  
        setBalance(b - amount); }  
    // other operations like deposit (which would use synchronized)  
}
```

Race Condition

- Occurs when the computation result depends on scheduling (how threads are interleaved)
 - We, as programmers can't influence scheduling of threads
 - We need to write programs that work independent of scheduling
 - E.g.: if two threads are withdrawing, different schedules could cause different threads to see the `WithdrawTooLargeException`
- Data Race:
 - When there is the potential for two threads to be writing a variable in parallel
 - When there is the potential for one thread to be reading a variable while another writes to it
 - E.g.: Two threads insert the same into a hash table. The second thread in the schedule will overwrite the insert from the first.
- Bad Interleaving:
 - A race condition other than a data race
 - Usually it looks like exposing a “bad” intermediate state
 - E.g.: Two threads insert into a hash table. We compute the index for each key, then one thread resizes the table, now the other index might be incorrect.

Example: Shared Stack (no problems so far)

```
class Stack {  
    private E[] array = (E[])new Object[SIZE];  
    private int index = -1;  
    synchronized boolean isEmpty() {  
        return index==-1;  
    }  
    synchronized void push(E val) {  
        array[++index] = val;  
    }  
    synchronized E pop() {  
        if(isEmpty())  
            throw new StackEmptyException();  
        return array[index--];  
    }  
}
```

Critical sections of this code?

Race Condition, but no Data Race

```
class Stack {  
    private E[] array = (E[])new Object[SIZE];  
    private int index = -1;  
    synchronized boolean isEmpty() { ... }  
    synchronized void push(E val) { ... }  
    synchronized E pop() { ... }  
    E peek(){  
        E ans = pop();  
        push(ans);  
        return ans;  
    }  
}
```

Critical sections of this code?

Race Condition, including a Data Race

```
class Stack {  
    private E[] array = (E[])new Object[SIZE];  
    private int index = -1;  
    synchronized boolean isEmpty() { ... }  
    synchronized void push(E val) { ... }  
    synchronized E pop() { ... }  
    E peek(){  
        System.out.println(index);  
        E ans = pop();  
        push(ans);  
        return ans;  
    }  
}
```

Peek and isEmpty

Expected Behavior:

Thread 2 should not see an empty stack if there is a push but no pop.

Thread 1:

```
peek();
```

Thread 2:

```
push(x);  
boolean b = isEmpty();
```

```
E ans = pop();
```

```
push(ans);  
return ans;
```

```
push(x);
```

```
boolean b = isEmpty();
```

Peek and Push

Expected Behavior:

Thread 2 items from a stack are popped in LIFO order

Thread 1:

```
peek();
```

Thread 2:

```
push(x);  
push(y);  
System.out.println(pop());  
System.out.println(pop());
```

```
E ans = pop();  
push(ans);  
return ans;
```

```
push(x);  
push(y);  
System.out.println(pop());  
System.out.println(pop());
```

Peek and Push

Expected Behavior:

Thread 2 items from a stack are popped in LIFO order

Thread 1:

```
peek();
```

Thread 2:

```
push(x);  
push(y);  
System.out.println(pop());  
System.out.println(pop());
```

```
int ans = pop();
```

```
push(ans);  
return ans;
```

```
push(x);
```

```
push(y);
```

```
System.out.println(pop());  
System.out.println(pop());
```

How to fix this?

Make a bigger critical section

```
class Stack {  
    private E[] array = (E[])new Object[SIZE];  
    private int index = -1;  
    synchronized boolean isEmpty() { ... }  
    synchronized void push(E val) { ... }  
    synchronized E pop() { ... }  
    E peek(){  
        E ans = pop();  
        push(ans);  
        return ans;  
    }  
}
```

How to fix this?

Make a bigger critical section

```
class Stack {
    private E[] array = (E[])new Object[SIZE];
    private int index = -1;
    synchronized boolean isEmpty() { ... }
    synchronized void push(E val) { ... }
    synchronized E pop() { ... }
    synchronized E peek(){
        E ans = pop();
        push(ans);
        return ans;
    }
}
```

Did this fix it?

No! Now it has a data race!

```
class Stack {  
    private E[] array = (E[])new Object[SIZE];  
    private int index = -1;  
    synchronized boolean isEmpty() { ... }  
    synchronized void push(E val) { ... }  
    synchronized E pop() { ... }  
    E peek(){  
        return array[index];  
    }  
}
```

Parallel Code Conventional Wisdom

Memory Categories

All memory must fit one of three categories:

1. Thread Local: Each thread has its own copy
2. Shared and Immutable: There is just one copy, but nothing will ever write to it
3. Shared and Mutable: There is just one copy, it may change
 - Requires Synchronization!

Thread Local Memory

- Whenever possible, avoid sharing resources
- Dodges all race conditions, since no other threads can touch it!
 - No synchronization necessary! (Remember Ahmdal's law)
- Use whenever threads do not need to communicate using the resource
 - E.g., each thread should have its own Random object
- In most cases, most objects should be in this category

Immutable Objects



- Whenever possible, avoid changing objects
 - Make new objects instead
- Parallel reads are not data races
 - If an object is never written to, no synchronization necessary!
- Many programmers over-use mutation, minimize it

Shared and Mutable Objects

- For everything else, use locks
- Avoid all data races
 - Every read and write should be protected with a lock, even if it “seems safe”
 - Almost every Java/C program with a data race is wrong
- Even without data races, it still may be incorrect
 - Watch for bad interleavings as well!

Consistent Locking

- For each location needing synchronization, have a lock that is always held when reading or writing the location
- The same lock can (and often should) “guard” multiple fields/objects
 - Clearly document what each lock guards!
 - In Java, the lock should usually be the object itself (i.e. “this”)
- Have a mapping between memory locations and lock objects and stick to it!



Lock Granularity

- Coarse Grained: Fewer locks guarding more things each
 - One lock for an entire data structure
 - One lock shared by multiple objects (e.g. one lock for all bank accounts)
- Fine Grained: More locks guarding fewer things each
 - One lock per data structure location (e.g. array index)
 - One lock per object or per field in one object (e.g. one lock for each account)
- Note: there's really a continuum between them...

Example: Separate Chaining Hashtable

- Coarse-grained: One lock for the entire hashtable
- Fine-grained: One lock for each bucket
- Which supports more parallelism in insert and find?
- Which makes rehashing easier?
- What happens if you want to have a size field?

Tradeoffs

- Coarse-Grained Locking:
 - Simpler to implement and avoid race conditions
 - Faster/easier to implement operations that access multiple locations (because all guarded by the same lock)
 - Much easier for operations that modify data-structure shape
- Fine-Grained Locking:
 - More simultaneous access (performance when coarse grained would lead to unnecessary blocking)
 - Can make multi-location operations more difficult: say, rotations in an AVL tree
- Guideline:
 - Start with coarse-grained, make finer only as necessary to improve performance

Similar But Separate Issue: Critical Section Granularity

- Coarse-grained
 - For every method that needs a lock, put the entire method body in a lock
- Fine-grained
 - Keep the lock only for the sections of code where it's necessary
- Guideline:
 - Try to structure code so that expensive operations (like I/O) can be done outside of your critical section
 - E.g., if you're trying to print all the values in a tree, maybe copy items into an array inside your critical section, then print the array's contents outside.

Atomicity

- Atomic: indivisible
- Atomic operation: one that should be thought of as a single step
- Some sequences of operations should behave as if they are one unit
 - Between two operations you may need to avoid exposing an intermediate state
 - Usually ADT operations should be atomic
 - You don't want another thread trying to do an insert while another thread is rotating the AVL tree
- Think first in terms of what operations need to be atomic
 - Design critical sections and locking granularity based on these decisions

Use Pre-Tested Code

- Whenever possible, use built-in libraries!
- Other people have already invested tons of effort into making things both efficient and correct, use their work when you can!
 - Especially true for concurrent data structures
 - Use thread-safe data structures when available
 - E.g. Java as ConcurrentHashMap

Deadlock

- Occurs when two or more threads are mutually blocking each other
- T1 is blocked by T2, which is blocked by T3, ..., Tn is blocked by T1
 - A cycle of blocking

Bank Account

```
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);  
    }  
}
```

The Deadlock

Expected Behavior:

Thread 2 items from a stack are popped in LIFO order

Thread 1:

```
x.transferTo(1,y);
```

Thread 2:

```
y.transferTo(1,x);
```

acquire lock for account x b/c transferTo is synchronized
acquire lock for account y b/c deposit is synchronized
release lock for account y after deposit
release lock for account x at end of transferTo

acquire lock for account y b/c transferTo is synchronized
acquire lock for account x b/c deposit is synchronized
release lock for account x after deposit
release lock for account y at end of transferTo

The Deadlock

Expected Behavior:

Thread 2 items from a stack are popped in LIFO order

Thread 1:

```
x.transferTo(1,y);
```

Thread 2:

```
y.transferTo(1,x);
```

acquire lock for account x b/c transferTo is synchronized

acquire lock for account y b/c deposit is synchronized

release lock for account y after deposit

release lock for account x at end of transferTo

acquire lock for account y b/c transferTo is synchronized

acquire lock for account x b/c deposit is synchronized

release lock for account x after deposit

release lock for account y at end of transferTo

Resolving Deadlocks

- Deadlocks occur when there are multiple locks necessary to complete a task and different threads may obtain them in a different order
- Option 1:
 - Have a coarser lock granularity
 - E.g. one lock for ALL bank accounts
- Option 2:
 - Have a finer critical section so that only one lock is needed at a time
 - E.g. instead of a synchronized transferTo, have the withdraw and deposit steps locked separately
- Option 3:
 - Force the threads to always acquire the locks in the same order
 - E.g. make transferTo acquire both locks before doing either the withdraw or deposit, make sure both threads agree on the order to acquire

Option 1: Coarser Locking

```
static final Object BANK = new Object();  
class BankAccount {  
    ...  
    synchronized void withdraw(int amt) {...}  
    synchronized void deposit(int amt) {...}  
    void transferTo(int amt, BankAccount a) {  
        synchronized(BANK){  
            this.withdraw(amt);  
            a.deposit(amt);  
        }  
    }  
}
```

Option 2: Finer Critical Section

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

Option 3: First Get All Locks In A Fixed Order

```
class BankAccount {  
    ...  
    synchronized void withdraw(int amt) {...}  
    synchronized void deposit(int amt) {...}  
    void transferTo(int amt, BankAccount a) {  
        if (this.acctNum < a.acctNum){  
            synchronized(this){  
                synchronized(a){  
                    this.withdraw(amt);  
                    a.deposit(amt);  
                }  
            }  
        }  
        else {  
            synchronized(a){  
                synchronized(this){  
                    this.withdraw(amt);  
                    a.deposit(amt);  
                }  
            }  
        }  
    }  
}
```