Announcements

- **Programming Contest**
  - [http://www-cse.ucsd.edu/users/calder/UCSDProgramContest/](http://www-cse.ucsd.edu/users/calder/UCSDProgramContest/)
  - Friday 10/12 (this Friday!)
  - Accounts at 4:30pm, practice at 5:30pm, contest at 6pm
  - **Why do the programming contest?**
    - 1st: $600, 2nd: $400, …
    - Compete to be a member of the UCSD ACM Programming Team
    - Last year we went to finals – and finals are in Hawaii this year!

- **Race Condition**
  - Chancellor’s 5K Run/Walk on 10/19 @ 12:15am
  - If you run, you get a gold star on your next homework
  - If you beat me (not difficult), you get two gold stars

---
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Higher-Level Synchronization

- We looked at using locks to provide mutual exclusion
- Locks work, but they have some drawbacks when critical sections are long
  - Spinlocks – inefficient
  - Disabling interrupts – can miss or delay important events
- Instead, we want synchronization mechanisms that
  - Block waiters
  - Leave interrupts enabled inside the critical section
- Look at two common high-level mechanisms
  - **Semaphores**: binary (mutex) and counting
  - **Monitors**: mutexes and condition variables
- Use them to solve common synchronization problems

Semaphores

- Semaphores are another data structure that provides mutual exclusion to critical sections
  - Block waiters, interrupts enabled within CS
  - Described by Dijkstra in THE system in 1968
- Semaphores can also be used as atomic counters
  - More later
- Semaphores support two operations:
  - `wait(semaphore)`: decrement, block until semaphore is open
    - Also `P()`, after the Dutch word for test, or `down()`
  - `signal(semaphore)`: increment, allow another thread to enter
    - Also `V()` after the Dutch word for increment, or `up()`
Blocking in Semaphores

- Associated with each semaphore is a queue of waiting processes
- When wait() is called by a thread:
  - If semaphore is open, thread continues
  - If semaphore is closed, thread blocks on queue
- Then signal() opens the semaphore:
  - If a thread is waiting on the queue, the thread is unblocked
  - If no threads are waiting on the queue, the signal is remembered for the next thread
    - In other words, signal() has “history” (c.f. condition vars later)
    - This “history” is a counter

Semaphore Types

- Semaphores come in two types
- Mutex semaphore
  - Represents single access to an resource
  - Guarantees mutual exclusion to a critical section
- Counting semaphore
  - Represents a resource with many units available, or a resource that allows certain kinds of unsynchronized concurrent access (e.g., reading)
  - Multiple threads can pass the semaphore
  - Number of threads determined by the semaphore “count”
    - mutex has count = 1, counting has count = N
Use is similar to our locks, but semantics are different

```c
struct Semaphore {
    int value;
    Queue q;
} S;
withdraw (account, amount) {
    wait(S);
    balance = get_balance(account);
    balance = balance - amount;
    put_balance(account, balance);
    signal(S);
    return balance;
}
```

Threads block

- It is undefined which thread runs after a signal

---

**Semaphores in Nachos**

```c
wait (S) {
    Disable interrupts;
    while (S.value == 0) {
        enqueue(S.q, current_thread);
        thread_sleep(current_thread);
    }
    S.value = S.value - 1;
    Enable interrupts;
}
```

- thread_sleep() assumes interrupts are disabled
  - Note that interrupts are disabled only to enter/leave critical section
- Need to be able to reference current thread

```c
signal (S) {
    Disable interrupts;
    thread = dequeue(S.q);
    thread_start(thread);
    S.value = S.value + 1;
    Enable interrupts;
}
```
Using Semaphores

- We’ve looked at a simple example for using synchronization
  - Mutual exclusion while accessing a bank account
- Now we’re going to use semaphores to look at more interesting examples
  - Readers/Writers
  - Bounded Buffers

Readers/Writers Problem

- Readers/Writers Problem:
  - An object is shared among several threads
  - Some threads only read the object, others only write it
  - We can allow multiple readers
  - But only one writer
- How can we use semaphores to control access to the object to implement this protocol?
- Use three variables
  - int readcount – number of threads reading object
  - Semaphore mutex – control access to readcount
  - Semaphore w_or_r – exclusive writing or reading
Readers/Writers

// number of readers
int readcount = 0;
// mutual exclusion to readcount
Semaphore mutex = 1;
// exclusive writer or reading
Semaphore w_or_r = 1;

writer {
    wait(w_or_r); // lock out readers
    Write;
    signal(w_or_r); // up for grabs
}

reader {
    wait(mutex); // lock readcount
    readcount += 1; // one more reader
    if (readcount == 1)
        wait(w_or_r); // synch w/ writers
    signal(mutex); // unlock readcount
    Read:
    wait(mutex); // lock readcount
    readcount -= 1; // one less reader
    if (readcount == 0)
        signal(w_or_r); // up for grabs
    signal(mutex); // unlock readcount
}

Readers/Writers Notes

- If there is a writer
  - First reader blocks on w_or_r
  - All other readers block on mutex
- Once a writer exits, all readers can fall through
  - Which reader gets to go first?
- The last reader to exit signals a waiting writer
  - If no writer, then readers can continue
- If readers and writers are waiting on w_or_r, and a writer exits, who goes first?
  - Again, depends on scheduler
- Why doesn't a writer need to use mutex?
Problem: There is a set of resource buffers shared by producer and consumer threads
- **Producer** inserts resources into the buffer set
  - Output, disk blocks, memory pages, processes, etc.
- **Consumer** removes resources from the buffer set
  - Whatever is generated by the producer
- Producer and consumer execute at different rates
  - No serialization of one behind the other
  - Tasks are independent (easier to think about)
  - The buffer set allows each to run without explicit handoff

Use three semaphores:
- **mutex** – mutual exclusion to shared set of buffers
  » Binary semaphore
- **empty** – count of empty buffers
  » Counting semaphore
- **full** – count of full buffers
  » Counting semaphore
Bounded Buffer (3)

Semaphore mutex = 1; // mutual exclusion to shared set of buffers
Semaphore empty = N; // count of empty buffers (all empty to start)
Semaphore full = 0; // count of full buffers (none full to start)

producer {
  while (1) {
    Produce new resource;
    wait(empty); // wait for empty buffer
    wait(mutex); // lock buffer list
    Add resource to an empty buffer;
    signal(mutex); // unlock buffer list
    signal(full); // note a full buffer
  }
}

consumer {
  while (1) {
    wait(full); // wait for a full buffer
    wait(mutex); // lock buffer list
    Remove resource from a full buffer;
    signal(mutex); // unlock buffer list
    signal(empty); // note an empty buffer
    Consume resource;
  }
}

Where are the critical sections?

What happens if operations on mutex and full/empty are switched around?

Producer-Consumer and Bounded Buffer are classic examples of synchronization problems

The Mating Whale problem in Project 1 is another
  • You can use semaphores to solve the problem
Semaphore Summary

- Semaphores can be used to solve any of the traditional synchronization problems
- However, they have some drawbacks
  - They are essentially shared global variables
    - Can potentially be accessed anywhere in program
  - No connection between the semaphore and the data being controlled by the semaphore
  - Used both for critical sections (mutual exclusion) and coordination (scheduling)
  - No control or guarantee of proper usage
- Sometimes hard to use and prone to bugs
  - Another approach: Use programming language support

Monitors

- A monitor is a programming language construct that controls access to shared data
  - Synchronization code added by compiler, enforced at runtime
  - Why is this an advantage?
- A monitor is a module that encapsulates
  - Shared data structures
  - Procedures that operate on the shared data structures
  - Synchronization between concurrent threads that invoke the procedures
- A monitor protects its data from unstructured access
- It guarantees that threads accessing its data through its procedures interact only in legitimate ways
Monitor Semantics

- A monitor guarantees mutual exclusion
  - Only one thread can execute any monitor procedure at any time (the thread is “in the monitor”)
  - If a second thread invokes a monitor procedure when a first thread is already executing one, it blocks
    » So the monitor has to have a wait queue…
  - If a thread within a monitor blocks, another one can enter
- What are the implications in terms of parallelism in monitor?

Account Example

```c
Monitor account {
    double balance;
    double withdraw(amount) {
        balance = balance – amount;
        return balance;
    }
}
```

Threads block waiting to get into monitor:
- `withdraw(amount)`
- `return balance (and exit)`
- `balance = balance – amount`
- `return balance`

When first thread exits, another can enter. Which one is undefined.

- Hey, that was easy
- But what if a thread wants to wait inside the monitor?
  » Such as “mutex(empty)” by reader in bounded buffer?
Condition Variables

- Condition variables provide a mechanism to wait for events (a “rendezvous point”)
  - Resource available, no more writers, etc.
- Condition variables support three operations:
  - **Wait** – release monitor lock, wait for C/V to be signaled
    » So condition variables have wait queues, too
  - **Signal** – wakeup one waiting thread
  - **Broadcast** – wakeup all waiting threads
- Condition variables are not boolean objects
  - “if (condition_variable) then” … does not make sense
  - “if (num_resources == 0) then wait(resources_available)” does
  - An example will make this more clear

```
Monitor bounded_buffer {
    Resource buffer[N];
    // Variables for indexing buffer
    Condition not_full, not_empty;

    void put_resource (Resource R) {
        while (buffer array is full)
            wait(not_full);
        Add R to buffer array;
        signal(not_empty);
    }

    Resource get_resource() {
        while (buffer array is empty)
            wait(not_empty);
        Get resource R from buffer array;
        signal(not_full);
        return R;
    }
} // end monitor
```

- What happens if no threads are waiting when signal is called?
Monitor Queues

Monitor `bounded_buffer` {
  Condition not_full;
  ...other variables...
  Condition not_empty;
  void `put_resource()` {
    ...wait(not_full)...
    ...signal(not_empty)...
  }
  Resource `get_resource()` {
    ...
  }
}

Waiting to enter
Waiting on condition variables
Executing inside the monitor

Condition Vars != Semaphores

- Condition variables != semaphores
  - Although their operations have the same names, they have entirely different semantics (such is life, worse yet to come)
  - However, they each can be used to implement the other
- Access to the monitor is controlled by a lock
  - `wait()` blocks the calling thread, and gives up the lock
    » To call wait, the thread has to be in the monitor (hence has lock)
    » Semaphore::wait just blocks the thread on the queue
  - `signal()` causes a waiting thread to wake up
    » If there is no waiting thread, the signal is lost
    » Semaphore::signal increases the semaphore count, allowing future entry even if no thread is waiting
    » Condition variables have no history
Signal Semantics

- There are two flavors of monitors that differ in the scheduling semantics of signal()
  - Hoare monitors (original)
    - `signal()` immediately switches from the caller to a waiting thread
    - The condition that the waiter was anticipating is guaranteed to hold when waiter executes
    - Signaler must restore monitor invariants before signaling
  - Mesa monitors (Mesa, Java)
    - `signal()` places a waiter on the ready queue, but signaler continues inside monitor
    - Condition is not necessarily true when waiter runs again
      - Returning from `wait()` is only a hint that something changed
      - Must recheck conditional case

Hoare vs. Mesa Monitors

- Hoare
  - if (empty)
    - wait(condition);
- Mesa
  - while (empty)
    - wait(condition);
- Tradeoffs
  - Mesa monitors easier to use, more efficient
    - Fewer context switches, easy to support broadcast
  - Hoare monitors leave less to chance
    - Easier to reason about the program
Condition Vars & Locks

- Condition variables are also used without monitors in conjunction with **blocking** locks
  - This is what you are implementing in Project 1
- A monitor is “just like” a module whose state includes a condition variable and a lock
  - Difference is syntactic; with monitors, compiler adds the code
- It is “just as if” each procedure in the module calls acquire() on entry and release() on exit
  - But can be done anywhere in procedure, at finer granularity
- With condition variables, the module methods may wait and signal on independent conditions

Using Cond Vars & Locks

- Alternation of two threads (ping-pong)
- Each executes the following:

```c
Lock lock;
Condition cond;
void ping_pong () {
    acquire(lock);
    while (1) {
        printf("ping or pong\n");
        signal(cond, lock);
        wait(cond, lock);
    }
    release(lock);
}
```

- Must acquire lock before you can wait (similar to needing interrupts disabled to call Sleep in Nachos)
- Wait atomically releases lock and blocks until signal()
- Wait atomically acquires lock before it returns
Monitors and Java

- A lock and condition variable are in every Java object
  - No explicit classes for locks or condition variables
- Every object is/has a monitor
  - At most one thread can be inside an object’s monitor
  - A thread enters an object’s monitor by
    - Executing a method declared “synchronized”
    - Can mix synchronized/unsynchronized methods in same class
    - Executing the body of a “synchronized” statement
    - Supports finer-grained locking than an entire procedure
    - Identical to the Modula-2 “LOCK (m) DO” construct
- Every object can be treated as a condition variable
  - Object::notify() has similar semantics as Condition::signal()

Summary

- Semaphores
  - wait()/signal() implement blocking mutual exclusion
  - Also used as atomic counters (counting semaphores)
  - Can be inconvenient to use
- Monitors
  - Synchronizes execution within procedures that manipulate encapsulated data shared among procedures
    - Only one thread can execute within a monitor at a time
  - Relies upon high-level language support
- Condition variables
  - Used by threads as a synchronization point to wait for events
  - Inside monitors, or outside with locks
Next time...

- Read Chapter 2.5 (scheduling), 3 (deadlock)
- Homework #2 out
- We will discuss the project again next lecture
  - Look at problem #1, sync.h, sync.cc