Disciplina Sistemas de Computação



Motivation: too much milk problem



Motivation: too much milk problem

- People need to coordenate
 - You love milk, but don't want too much



| Time | Person A | Person B |
|------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 3:00 | Look in Fridge. Out of milk | |
| 3:05 | Leave for store | |
| 3:10 | Arrive at store | Look in Fridge. Out of milk |
| 3:15 | Buy milk | Leave for store |
| 3:20 | Arrive home, put milk away | Arrive at store |
| 3:25 | | Buy milk |
| 3:30 | | Arrive home, put milk away |

Motivation: too much milk problem



Synchronization Terminology

- Synchronization: use of atomic operations to ensure cooperation between threads
- Atomic Operation: an operation that always runs to completion or not at all!
 - It is indivisible: it cannot be stopped in the middle and state cannot be modified by someone else in the middle!
 - Fundamental building block if no atomic operations, then have no way for threads to work together!
- On most machines, memory references and assignments (i.e. loads and stores) of words are atomic!

Synchronization Terminology

- Mutual Exclusion: ensure that only one thread does a particular activity at a time and excludes other threads from doing it at that time
- Critical Section: piece of code that only one thread can execute at a time
- Lock: mechanism to prevent another process from doing something
 - Lock before entering a critical section, or before accessing shared data.
 - Unlock when leaving a critical section or when access to shared data is complete
 - Wait if locked
 - => All synchronization involves waiting.

Too Much Milk Problem: conditions and correctness properties

- What are the wished conditions we want to achieve?
 - Neither "too much milk" nor "no milk"
- What are the correctness properties for this problem?
 - Only one person buys milk at a time.
 - Someone buys milk if you need it.



Too Much Milk Problem: Possible solution?

- Restrict ourselves to atomic loads and stores as building blocks.
 - Leave a note (a version of lock)
 - Remove note (a version of unlock)
 - Do not buy any milk if there is note (wait)





Too Much Milk: Solution 1



Thread A

ļ

if (noMilk & NoNote) {
 leave Note;
 buy milk;
 remove note;



Thread B

}

if (noMilk & NoNote) {
 leave Note;
 buy milk;
 remove note;

Does this work?

Too Much Milk: Solution 2

 How about using labeled notes so we can leave a note before checking the milk?



Thread A

leave note A
if (noNote B) {
 if (noMilk){
 buy milk;
 }
}

remove note;

Does this work?

Thread B

leave note B
if (noNote A) {
 if (noMilk){
 buy milk;
 }
}
remove note;



Too Much Milk: Solution 3

Thread A

```
leave note A
X: while (Note B) {
      do nothing;
   if (noMilk){
      buy milk;
   }
   remove note A;
       Does this work?
```



Thread B



leave note B
Y: if (noNote A) {
 if (noMilk){
 buy milk;
 }
 }
 remove note B;

Correctness of Solution 3

At point Y, either there is a note A or not.

1. If there is no note A, it is safe for thread B to check and buy milk, if needed. (Thread A has not started yet).

2. If there is a note A, then thread A is checking and buying milk as needed or is waiting for B to quit, so B quits by removing note B.

At point X, either there is a note B or not.

1. If there is not a note B, it is safe for A to buy since B has either not started or quit.

2. If there is a note B, A waits until there is no longer a note B, and either finds milk that B bought or buys it if needed.

 Thus, thread B buys milk (which thread A finds) or not, but either way it removes note B. Since thread A loops, it waits for B to buy milk or not, and then if B did not buy, it buys the milk.

Is Solution 3 a good solution?

- It is too complicated it was hard to convince ourselves this solution works.
- It is asymmetrical thread A and B are different. Thus, adding more threads would require different code for each new thread and modifications to existing threads.

 A is busy waiting - A is consuming CPU resources despite the fact that it is not doing any useful work.

=> This solution relies on loads and stores being atomic.

Language Support for Synchronization

- Have your programming language provide atomic routines for synchronization?
- Locks: one process holds a lock at a time, does its critical section releases lock.
- Semaphores: more general version of locks.
- Monitors: connects shared data to synchronization primitives.

=> All of these require some hardware support, and waiting.

Locks

- Locks: provide mutual exclusion to shared data with two "atomic" routines:
 - Lock.Acquire wait until lock is free, then grab it.
 - Lock.Release unlock, and wake up any thread waiting in Acquire.
- Rules for using a lock:
 - Always acquire the lock before accessing shared data.
 - Always release the lock after finishing with shared data.
 - Lock is initially free.

Implementing Too Much Milk with Locks

Thread A

Lock.Acquire(); if (noMilk){ buy milk; } Lock.Release(); Lock.Acquire(); if (noMilk){ buy milk; } Lock.Release();

Thread B

- This solution is clean and symmetric.
- How do we make Lock.Acquire and Lock.Release atomic?

Hardware Support for Synchronization

- Implementing high level primitives requires low-level hardware support
- What we have and what we want

| | Concurrent programs | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Low-level atomic operations (hardware) | load/store | interrupt disable test&set |
| High-level atomic operations (software) | lock monitors | semaphore send & receive |

Summary

- Communication among threads is typically done through shared variables.
- Critical sections identify pieces of code that cannot be executed in parallel by multiple threads, typically code that accesses and/or modifies the values of shared variables.
- Synchronization primitives are required to ensure that only one thread executes in a critical section at a time.
 - Achieving synchronization directly with loads and stores is tricky and error-prone
 - Solution: use high-level primitives such as locks, semaphores, monitors