Spinlock: more considerations

• Interlocked Compare Exchange instruction in addition to test and set
  `InterlockedCompareExchange(Dest, Exchange, Comparand)`

• An optimization is calling Yield/Sched if the lock is held. Spinning is still possible but now less likely
Semaphores

• Semaphore = a synchronization primitive
  – higher level of abstraction than locks
  – invented by Dijkstra in 1968, as part of the THE operating system

• A semaphore is:
  – a variable that is manipulated through two operations, P and V (Dutch for “wait” and “signal”)
    • P(sem) (wait)
      – block until sem > 0, then subtract 1 from sem and proceed
    • V(sem) (signal)
      – add 1 to sem

• Do these operations **atomically**
Blocking in semaphores

• Each semaphore has an associated queue of threads
  – when P (sem) is called by a thread,
    • if sem was “available” (>0), decrement sem and let thread continue
    • if sem was “unavailable” (0), place thread on associated queue; run some other thread
  – when V (sem) is called by a thread
    • if thread(s) are waiting on the associated queue, unblock one
      – place it on the ready queue
      – might as well let the “V-ing” thread continue execution
    • otherwise (when no threads are waiting on the sem), increment sem
      – the signal is “remembered” for next time P(sem) is called
Two types of semaphores

• **Binary** semaphore (aka mutex semaphore)
  - sem is initialized to 1
  - guarantees mutually exclusive access to resource (e.g., a critical section of code)
  - only one thread/process allowed entry at a time
  - Logically equivalent to a lock with *blocking* rather than *spinning*

• **Counting** semaphore
  - Allow up to N threads continue (we’ll see why in a bit …)
  - sem is initialized to N
    - N = number of units available
  - represents resources with many (identical) units available
  - allows threads to enter as long as more units are available
Binary semaphore usage

• From the programmer’s perspective, P and V on a binary semaphore are just like Acquire and Release on a lock

P(sem)

do whatever stuff requires mutual exclusion; could conceivably be a lot of code

V(sem)

– same lack of programming language support for correct usage

• Important differences in the underlying implementation, however
Example: Bounded buffer problem

• AKA “producer/consumer” problem
  – there is a circular buffer in memory with N entries (slots)
  – producer threads insert entries into it (one at a time)
  – consumer threads remove entries from it (one at a time)

• Threads are concurrent
  – so, we must use synchronization constructs to control
    access to shared variables describing buffer state
Bounded buffer using semaphores
(both binary and counting)

```
var mutex: semaphore = 1 ; mutual exclusion to shared data
empty: semaphore = n    ; count of empty slots (all empty to start)
full: semaphore = 0         ; count of full slots (none full to start)
```

**producer:**
- `P(empty)` ; block if no slots available
- `P(mutex)` ; get access to pointers
- `<add item to slot, adjust pointers>`
- `V(mutex)` ; done with pointers
- `V(full)` ; note one more full slot

**consumer:**
- `P(full)` ; wait until there’s a full slot
- `P(mutex)` ; get access to pointers
- `<remove item from slot, adjust pointers>`
- `V(mutex)` ; done with pointers
- `V(empty)` ; note there’s an empty slot
- `<use the item>`

**Note:**
I have elided all the code concerning which is the first full slot, which is the last full slot, etc.
Example: Readers/Writers

• Description:
  – A single object is shared among several threads/processes
  – Sometimes a thread just reads the object
  – Sometimes a thread updates (writes) the object

  – **We can allow multiple readers at a time**
    • why?

  – **We can only allow one writer at a time**
    • why?
Readers/Readers using semaphores

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{var mutex: semaphore} &= 1 \quad ; \text{controls access to readcount} \\
\text{wrt: semaphore} &= 1 \quad ; \text{control entry for a writer or first reader} \\
\text{readcount: integer} &= 0 \quad ; \text{number of active readers}
\end{align*}
\]

writer:
\[
\begin{align*}
P(\text{wrt}) &\quad ; \text{any writers or readers?} \\
<\text{perform write operation}> \\
V(\text{wrt}) &\quad ; \text{allow others}
\end{align*}
\]

reader:
\[
\begin{align*}
P(\text{mutex}) &\quad ; \text{ensure exclusion} \\
\text{readcount}++ &\quad ; \text{one more reader} \\
\text{if readcount} &= 1 \text{ then } P(\text{wrt}) \quad ; \text{if we’re the first, synch with writers} \\
V(\text{mutex}) &\quad <\text{perform read operation}> \\
P(\text{mutex}) &\quad ; \text{ensure exclusion} \\
\text{readcount}-- &\quad ; \text{one fewer reader} \\
\text{if readcount} &= 0 \text{ then } V(\text{wrt}) \quad ; \text{no more readers, allow a writer} \\
V(\text{mutex}) &
\end{align*}
\]
Readers/Writers notes

• Notes:
  – the first reader blocks on P(wrt) if there is a writer
    • any other readers will then block on P(mutex)
  – if a waiting writer exists, the last reader to exit signals the waiting writer
    • can new readers get in while a writer is waiting?
    • so?
  – when writer exits, if there is both a reader and writer waiting, which one goes next?
Reader/writer Nuances

• Call EResource in Windows. Used the terms **exclusive** and **shared** access.
• Avoided starving exclusive by making shared requests wait.
• Allowed recursive acquisition of a lock. Meant keeping ownership information.
• Addressed an issue called priority inversion.
• Then one hack added after another.
  - Allowed to starve an exclusive waiter.
  - Allowed to release lock for another thread.
  - Augh…
Semaphores vs. Spinlocks

• Threads that are blocked at the level of program logic (that is, by the semaphore P operation) are placed on queues, rather than busy-waiting.

• Busy-waiting may be used for the “real” mutual exclusion required to implement P and V.
  – but these are very short critical sections – totally independent of program logic.
  – and they are not implemented by the application programmer.
Abstract implementation

- **P/wait(sem)**
  - acquire “real” mutual exclusion
    - if sem is “available” (>0), decrement sem; release “real” mutual exclusion; let thread continue
    - otherwise, place thread on associated queue; release “real” mutual exclusion; run some other thread

- **V/signal(sem)**
  - acquire “real” mutual exclusion
    - if thread(s) are waiting on the associated queue, unblock one
      (place it on the ready queue)
    - if no threads are on the queue, sem is incremented
      » the signal is “remembered” for next time P(sem) is called
  - release “real” mutual exclusion
  - [the “V-ing” thread continues execution, or may be preempted]
Pressing questions

• How do you acquire “real” mutual exclusion?

• Why is this any better than using a spinlock (test-and-set) or disabling interrupts (assuming you’re in the kernel) in lieu of a semaphore?

• What if some bozo issues an extra V?

• What if some bozo forgets to P before manipulating shared state?

• Could locks be implemented in exactly the same way? That is, “software locks” that you acquire and release, where the underlying implementation involves moving descriptors to/from a wait queue?
Condition Variables

- Basic operations
  - Wait()
    - Wait until some thread does a signal and release the associated lock, as an atomic operation
  - Signal()
    - If any threads are waiting, wake up one
    - Cannot proceed until lock re-acquired

- Signal() is not remembered
  - A signal to a condition variable that has no threads waiting is a no-op

- Qualitative use guideline
  - You wait() when you can’t proceed until some shared state changes
  - You signal() when shared state changes from “bad” to “good”
Bounded buffers with condition variables

### Code Snippet

```plaintext
var mutex: lock ; mutual exclusion to shared data
freeslot: condition ; there's a free slot
fullslot: condition ; there's a full slot

producer:
  lock(mutex) ; get access to pointers
  if [no slots available] wait(freeslot):
    <add item to slot, adjust pointers>
  signal(fullslot):
  unlock(mutex)

consumer:
  lock(mutex) ; get access to pointers
  if [no slots have data] wait(fullslot):
    <remove item from slot, adjust pointers>
  signal(freeslot):
  unlock(mutex):
  <use the item>
```

**Note 1:**
Do you see why `wait()` must release the associated lock?

**Note 2:**
How is the associated lock re-acquired?

[Let's think about the implementation of this inside the threads package]
The possible bug

• Depending on the implementation …
  – Between the time a thread is woken up by signal() and the time it re-acquires the lock, the condition it is waiting for may be false again
    • Waiting for a thread to put something in the buffer
    • A thread does, and signals
    • Now another thread comes along and consumes it
    • Then the “signalled” thread forges ahead …
  – Solution
    • Not
      – if [no slots available] wait(fullslot)
    • Instead
      – While [no slots available] wait(fullslot)
  – Could the scheduler also solve this problem?
Problems with semaphores, locks, and condition variables

• They can be used to solve any of the traditional synchronization problems, but it’s easy to make mistakes
  – they are essentially shared global variables
    • can be accessed from anywhere (bad software engineering)
  – there is no connection between the synchronization variable and the data being controlled by it
  – No control over their use, no guarantee of proper usage
    • Condition variables: will there ever be a signal?
    • Semaphores: will there ever be a V()?
    • Locks: did you lock when necessary? Unlock at the right time? At all?

• Thus, they are prone to bugs
  – We can reduce the chance of bugs by “stylizing” the use of synchronization
  – Language help is useful for this
One More Approach: Monitors

- A *monitor* is a **programming language construct** that supports
controlled access to shared data
  - synchronization code is added by the compiler
    - why does this help?

- A monitor is (essentially) a class in which every method automatically
acquires a lock on entry, and releases it on exit – it combines:
  - **shared data** structures (object)
  - **procedures** that operate on the shared data (object methods)
  - **synchronization** between concurrent threads that invoke those procedures

- Data can only be accessed from within the monitor, using the provided
procedures
  - protects the data from unstructured access
  - Prevents ambiguity about what the synchronization variable protects

- Addresses the key usability issues that arise with semaphores
A monitor

waiting queue of threads trying to enter the monitor

at most one thread in monitor at a time

Don’t confuse this box with the box we have used to denote a process!
Monitor facilities

• “Automatic” mutual exclusion
  – only one thread can be executing inside at any time
    • thus, synchronization is implicitly associated with the monitor – it “comes for free”
  – if a second thread tries to execute a monitor procedure, it blocks until the first has left the monitor
    • more restrictive than semaphores
    • but easier to use (most of the time)

• But, there’s a problem…
Problem: Bounded Buffer Scenario

- Buffer is empty
- Now what?
Problem: Bounded Buffer Scenario

- Buffer is full
- Now what?
Solution?

- Monitors require condition variables
- Operations on condition variables (just as before!)
  - wait(c)
    - release monitor lock, so somebody else can get in
    - wait for somebody else to signal condition
    - thus, condition variables have associated wait queues
  - signal(c)
    - wake up at most one waiting thread
      - “Hoare” monitor: wakeup immediately, signaller steps outside
    - if no waiting threads, signal is lost
      - this is different than semaphores: no history!
  - broadcast(c)
    - wake up all waiting threads
Bounded buffer using (Hoare) monitors

Monitor bounded_buffer {
    buffer resources[N];
    condition not_full, not_empty;

    produce(resource x) {
        if (array “resources” is full, determined maybe by a count)
            wait(not_full);
        insert “x” in array “resources”
        signal(not_empty);
    }

    consume(resource *x) {
        if (array “resources” is empty, determined maybe by a count)
            wait(not_empty);
        *x = get resource from array “resources”
        signal(not_full);
    }
}
Problem: Bounded Buffer Scenario

- Buffer is full
- Now what?
Bounded Buffer Scenario with CV’s

- Buffer is full
- Now what?

Queue of threads waiting for condition “not full” to be signaled
Runtime system calls for (Hoare) monitors

- EnterMonitor(m) \{guarantee mutual exclusion\}
- ExitMonitor(m) \{hit the road, letting someone else run\}
- Wait(c) \{step out until condition satisfied\}
- Signal(c) \{if someone’s waiting, step out and let them run\}

- EnterMonitor and ExitMonitor are inserted automatically by the compiler.
- This guarantees mutual exclusion for code inside of the monitor.
Bounded buffer using (Hoare) monitors

Monitor bounded_buffer {
  buffer resources[N];
  condition not_full, not_empty;

  procedure add_entry(resource x) {
    if (array “resources” is full, determined maybe by a count)
      wait(not_full);
    insert “x” in array “resources”
    signal(not_empty);
  }

  procedure get_entry(resource *x) {
    if (array “resources” is empty, determined maybe by a count)
      wait(not_empty);
    *x = get resource from array “resources”
    signal(not_full);
  }
}
There is a subtle issue with that code…

- Who runs when the signal() is done and there is a thread waiting on the condition variable?

- **Hoare monitors**: signal(c) means
  - run waiter immediately
  - signaller blocks immediately
    - condition guaranteed to hold when waiter runs
    - but, signaller must **restore monitor invariants** before signalling!
      - cannot leave a mess for the waiter, who will run immediately!

- **Mesa monitors**: signal(c) means
  - waiter is made ready, but the signaller continues
    - waiter runs when signaller leaves monitor (or waits)
  - signaller need not restore invariant until it leaves the monitor
  - being woken up is only a hint that something has changed
    - signalled condition may no longer hold
    - must recheck conditional case
Hoare vs. Mesa Monitors

- **Hoare monitors:**
  ```java
  if (notReady) wait(c)
  ```

- **Mesa monitors:**
  ```java
  while (notReady) wait(c)
  ```

- **Mesa monitors easier to use**
  - more efficient
  - fewer context switches
  - directly supports broadcast

- **Hoare monitors leave less to chance**
  - when wake up, condition guaranteed to be what you expect
Runtime system calls for Hoare monitors

- **EnterMonitor(m)** {guarantee mutual exclusion}
  - if m occupied, insert caller into queue m
  - else mark as occupied, insert caller into ready queue
  - choose somebody to run
- **ExitMonitor(m)** {hit the road, letting someone else run}
  - if queue m is empty, then mark m as unoccupied
  - else move a thread from queue m to the ready queue
  - insert caller in ready queue
  - choose someone to run
• **Wait(c)** `{step out until condition satisfied}`
  – if queue m is empty, then mark m as unoccupied
  – else move a thread from queue m to the ready queue
  – put the caller on queue c
  – choose someone to run

• **Signal(c)** `{if someone’s waiting, step out and let them run}`
  – if queue c is empty then put the caller on the ready queue
  – else move a thread from queue c to the ready queue, and put the caller into queue m
  – choose someone to run
Runtime system calls for Mesa monitors

• EnterMonitor(m) \{\text{guarantee mutual exclusion}\}
  – …
• ExitMonitor(m) \{\text{hit the road, letting someone else run}\}
  – …
• Wait(c) \{\text{step out until condition satisfied}\}
  – …
• Signal(c) \{\text{if someone’s waiting, give them a shot after I’m done}\}
  – if queue c is occupied, move one thread from queue c to queue m
  – return to caller
• Broadcast(c) \{food fight!\}
  – move all threads on queue c onto queue m
  – return to caller
Readers and Writers
(stolen from Cornell 😊)

Monitor ReadersN Writers {
    int WaitingWriters, WaitingReaders, NReaders, NWriters;
    Condition CanRead, CanWrite;

    Void BeginWrite()
    {
        if(NWriters == 1 || NReaders > 0)
        {
            ++WaitingWriters;
            wait(CanWrite);
            --WaitingWriters;
        }
        NWriters = 1;
    }

    Void BeginRead()
    {
        if(NWriters == 1 || WaitingWriters > 0)
        {
            ++WaitingReaders;
            wait(CanRead);
            Wait(CanRead);
            --WaitingReaders;
        }
        ++NReaders;
        Signal(CanRead);
    }

    Void EndWrite()
    {
        NWriters = 0;
        if(WaitingReaders)
            Signal(CanRead);
        else
            Signal(CanWrite);
    }

    Void EndRead()
    {
        if(--NReaders == 0)
            Signal(CanWrite);
    }
}
Monitors and Java

- Java offers something a bit like monitors
  - It should be clear that they’re not monitors in the full sense!
- Every Java object contains an intrinsic lock
- The `synchronized` keyword locks that lock
- Can be applied to methods, or blocks of statements
Synchronized methods

- Atomic integer is a commonly provided (or built) package

- public class atomicInt {
  int value;
  public atomicInt(int initVal) {
    value = initVal;
  }
  public synchronized postIncrement() {
    return value++;
  }
  public synchronized postDecrement() {
    return value--;
  }
  ...
}

Monitor Summary

• Language supports monitors
• Compiler understands them
  – Compiler inserts calls to runtime routines for
    • monitor entry
    • monitor exit
  – Programmer inserts calls to runtime routines for
    • signal
    • wait
  – Language/object encapsulation ensures correctness
    • Sometimes! With conditions, you still need to think about synchronization
• Runtime system implements these routines
  – moves threads on and off queues
  – ensures mutual exclusion!