Lecture 4: IPC & Threads

CSE 120: Principles of Operating Systems
Alex C. Snoeren

HW 1 Due NOW
Announcements

- Homework #1 due now
- Project 0 due tonight
- Project groups
  - Please send project group info to Kaise
  - Project 1 will start on Tuesday
A process contains everything needed for execution
- An address space (defining all the code and data pages)
- OS resources (e.g., open files) and accounting information
- Execution state (PC, SP, regs, etc.)
- Each of these resources is exclusive to the process

Yet sometimes processes may wish to cooperate
- But how to communicate? Each process is an island
- The OS needs to intervene to bridge the gap
- OS provides system calls to support Inter-Process Communication (IPC)
Inter-Process Communication

- So far, processes have limited ability to pass data
  - Parents get one chance to pass everything at fork()
  - But what if the child wants to talk back?
  - And, what about processes with different ancestry?

- OS provides generic mechanisms to communicate
  - **Shared Memory**: multiple processes can read/write same physical portion of memory; *implicit* channel
    - System call to declare shared region
    - No OS mediation required once memory is mapped
  - **Message Passing**: *explicit* communication channel provided through send()/receive() system calls
    - A system call is required

- IPC is, in general, expensive due to the need for system calls
  - Although many OSes have various forms of *lightweight* IPC
Also recall our Web server example that forks off copies of itself to handle multiple simultaneous requests
  - Or any parallel program that executes on a multiprocessor

To execute these programs we need to
  - Create several processes that execute in parallel
  - Cause each to map to the same address space to share data
    » They are all part of the same computation
  - Have the OS schedule these processes in parallel (logically or physically)

This situation is very inefficient
  - **Space**: PCB, page tables, etc.
  - **Time**: create data structures, fork and copy addr space, etc.
What is similar in these cooperating processes?
- They all share the same code and data (address space)
- They all share the same privileges
- They all share the same resources (files, sockets, etc.)

What don’t they share?
- Each has its own execution state: PC, SP, and registers

Key idea: Why don’t we separate the concept of a process from its execution state?
- Process: address space, privileges, resources, etc.
- Execution state: PC, SP, registers

Exec state also called thread of control, or thread
Threads

- Modern OSes (OS X, XP, modern Unix) separate the concepts of processes and threads
  - The **thread** defines a sequential execution stream within a process (PC, SP, registers)
  - The **process** defines the address space and general process attributes (everything but threads of execution)

- A thread is bound to a single process
  - Processes, however, can have multiple threads
  - Each process has at least one thread

- Threads become the unit of scheduling
  - Processes are now the **containers** in which threads execute
  - Processes become static, threads are the dynamic entities
  - Each CPU runs one thread at a time
Threads in a Process

- Stack (T1)
- Stack (T2)
- Stack (T3)
- Heap
- Static Data
- Code

Thread 1
Thread 2
Thread 3
PC (T1)
PC (T2)
PC (T3)
One Thread per Process
One Address Space
(MSDOS)

Many Threads per Process
One Address Space
(Java VM)

One Thread per Process
Many Address Spaces
(Early Unix)

Many Threads per Process
Many Address Spaces
(Solaris, Linux, XP, OS X)
Separating threads and processes makes it easier to support parallel applications
- Creating concurrency does not require creating new processes
- Low-overhead sharing between threads in same process

Concurrency (multithreading) can be very useful
- Improving program structure
- Handling concurrent events (e.g., Web requests)
- Taking advantage of multiple CPUs
- Overlapping I/O with computation

But, brings a whole new meaning to Spaghetti Code
- Forcing OS students to learn about synchronization…
Using fork() to create new processes to handle requests in parallel is overkill for such a simple task.

Recall our forking Web server:

```c
while (1) {
    int sock = accept();
    if ((child_pid = fork()) == 0) {
        Handle client request
        Close socket and exit
    } else {
        Close socket
    }
}
```
Instead, we can create a new thread for each request

```c
web_server() {
    while (1) {
        int sock = accept();
        thread_fork(handle_request, sock);
    }
}
```

```c
handle_request(int sock) {
    Process request
    close(sock);
}
```
Scheduling Threads

- No longer just scheduling processes, but threads
  - Kernel scheduler used to pick among PCBs
  - Now what?

- We have basically two options
  - Kernel explicitly selects among threads in a process
  - Hide threads from the kernel, and have a user-level scheduler inside each multi-threaded process

- Why do we care?
  - Think about the overhead of switching between threads
  - Who decides which thread in a process should go first?
  - What about blocking system calls?
Kernel-Level Threads

- OS now manages threads and processes
  - All thread operations are implemented in the kernel
  - The OS schedules all of the threads in the system
- OS-managed threads are called kernel-level threads or lightweight processes
  - XP: threads
  - Solaris: lightweight processes (LWP)
- Scheduler deals in threads
  - PCBs are no longer scheduled
  - If a thread blocks, another thread in the same process can run
Kernel Thread Limitations

- Kernel-level threads make concurrency much cheaper than processes
  - Much less state to allocate and initialize

- However, for fine-grained concurrency, kernel-level threads still suffer from too much overhead
  - Thread operations still require system calls
    » Ideally, want thread operations to be as fast as a procedure call
  - Kernel-level threads have to be general to support the needs of all programmers, languages, runtimes, etc.

- For such fine-grained concurrency, need even “cheaper” threads
To make threads cheap and fast, they need to be implemented at user level

- **User-level threads** are managed entirely by a run-time system (a.k.a. user-level thread library)

- **Invisible to kernel**
  - A thread represented *inside* process by a PC, registers, stack, and small thread control block (TCB)
  - Creating a new thread, switching, and synchronizing threads are done via user-level **procedure call**
  - User-level thread operations **100x faster** than kernel threads
User Thread Limitations

- But, user-level threads are not a perfect solution
  - As with everything else, they are a tradeoff
- User-level threads are invisible to the OS
  - They are not well integrated with the OS
- As a result, the OS can make poor decisions
  - Scheduling a process with idle threads
  - Blocking a process whose thread initiated an I/O, even though the process has other threads that can execute
  - Unscheduling a process with a thread holding a lock
- Solving this requires communication between the kernel and the user-level thread manager
Kernel vs. User Threads

- Kernel-level threads
  - Integrated with OS (informed scheduling)
  - Slow to create, manipulate, synchronize

- User-level threads
  - Fast to create, manipulate, synchronize
  - Not integrated with OS (uninformed scheduling)

- Understanding the differences between kernel and user-level threads is important
  - For programming (correctness, performance)
  - For test-taking
Another possibility is to use both kernel and user-level threads
- Can associate a user-level thread with a kernel-level thread
- Or, multiplex user-level threads on top of kernel-level threads

Java Virtual Machine (JVM)
- Java threads are user-level threads
- On older Unix, only one “kernel thread” per process
  » Multiplex all Java threads on this one kernel thread
- On XP, modern Unix
  » Can multiplex Java threads on multiple kernel threads
  » Can have more Java threads than kernel threads
  » Why?
Multiplexing user-level threads on a single kernel thread for each process

Multiplexing user-level threads on multiple kernel threads for each process
Implementing Threads

- Implementing threads has a number of issues
  - Interface
  - Context switch
  - Preemptive vs. non-preemptive
  - Scheduling
  - Synchronization (next lecture)

- Focus on user-level threads
  - Kernel-level threads are similar to original process management and implementation in the OS
  - What you will be dealing with in Nachos
  - Not only will you be using threads in Nachos, you will be implementing more thread functionality
Thread Interface

- thread_fork(procedure_t)
  - Create a new thread of control
  - Also thread_create(), thread_setstate()
- thread_stop()
  - Stop the calling thread; also thread_block
- thread_start(thread_t)
  - Start the given thread
- thread_yield()
  - Voluntarily give up the processor
- thread_exit()
  - Terminate the calling thread; also thread_destroy
The thread scheduler determines when a thread runs
- It uses queues to keep track of what threads are doing
  - Just like the OS and processes
  - But it is implemented at user-level in a library
- Run queue: Threads currently running (usually one)
- Ready queue: Threads ready to run
- Are there wait queues?
  - How would you implement thread_sleep(time)?
Threads voluntarily give up the CPU with thread_yield

What is the output of running these two threads?

Ping Thread

```c
while (1) {
    printf("ping\n");
    thread_yield();
}
```

Pong Thread

```c
while (1) {
    printf("pong\n");
    thread_yield();
}
```
thread_yield()

- Wait a second. How does thread_yield() work?
- The semantics of thread_yield are that it gives up the CPU to another thread
  - In other words, it context switches to another thread
- So what does it mean for thread_yield to return?
  - It means that another thread called thread_yield!
- Execution trace of ping/pong
  - printf("ping\n");
  - thread_yield();
  - printf("pong\n");
  - thread_yield();
  - ...
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Implementing `thread_yield()`

```c
thread_yield() {
    thread_t old_thread = current_thread;
    current_thread = get_next_thread();
    append_to_queue(ready_queue, old_thread);
    context_switch(old_thread, current_thread);
    return;
}
```

- The magic step is invoking `context_switch()`
- Why do we need to call `append_to_queue()`?
The context switch routine does all of the magic
- Saves context of the currently running thread (old_thread)
  » Push all machine state onto its stack (not its TCB)
- Restores context of the next thread
  » Pop all machine state from the next thread’s stack
- The next thread becomes the current thread
- Return to caller as new thread

Java Nachos does something different
- Built on Nachos threads, so just suspend/resumes
- Real hardware only has one thread of control, so switch cannot be implemented using procedure calls
Non-preemptive threads have to voluntarily give up CPU
- A long-running thread will take over the machine
- Only voluntary calls to thread_yield(), thread_stop(), or thread_exit() causes a context switch

Preemptive scheduling causes involuntary context switch
- Need to regain control of processor asynchronously
- Use timer interrupt
- Timer interrupt handler forces current thread to “call” thread_yield
  » How do you do this?
- Nachos is preemptive
The operating system as a large multithreaded program
- Each process executes as a thread within the OS

Multithreading is also very useful for applications
- Efficient multithreading requires fast primitives
- Processes are too heavyweight

Solution is to separate threads from processes
- Kernel-level threads much better, but still significant overhead
- User-level threads even better, but not well integrated with OS

Now, how do we get our threads to correctly cooperate with each other?
- Synchronization…
Next time…

- Read Chapter 6.1—6.6