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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 a 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
Using Semaphores

- 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

wait(S);
balance = get_balance(account);
balance = balance – amount;
wait(S);
wait(S);
put_balance(account, balance);
signal(S);
```
Semaphores in Nachos

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

signal (S) {
    Disable interrupts;
    thread = dequeue(S->q);
    thread_start(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
  - How can it sleep with interrupts disabled?
- Need to be able to reference current thread
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 reader
Semaphore w_or_r = 1;

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
}

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

// exclusive writer or reader
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?

- Why doesn’t a writer need to use `mutex`?
Bounded Buffer

- 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
Bounded Buffer (2)

- 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
  }
}

c 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;
  }
}
Bounded Buffer (4)

- Why need the mutex at all?
- Where are the critical sections?
- What happens if operations on mutex and full/empty are switched around?
  - The pattern of signal/wait on full/empty is a common construct often called an interlock

- 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
  - Use readers/writers and bounded buffer as examples for hw
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)
    - Note that I had to use comments in the code to distinguish
  - 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

Monitor `account` {
    double balance;

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

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

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

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

- Note: 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 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 Chapters 5 and 7