# CSCE 313-200 Introduction to Computer Systems Spring 2024

### Synchronization II

Dmitri Loguinov
Texas A&M University

February 7, 2024

## **Chapter 5: Roadmap**

- 5.1 Concurrency
  Appendix A.1
- 5.2 Hardware mutex
- 5.3 Semaphores
- 5.4 Monitors
- 5.5 Messages
- 5.6 Reader-Writer

## <u>Mutex</u>

- Where to get mutex functionality?
- Two options
  - Make the kernel do it
  - Implement in user space
- Techniques are similar with a few exceptions
  - Some may require privileged instructions
- Next, we'll review classical algorithms and hardware support

- For now, assume
  - Each C line is atomic
  - No caching
- Use global variables for simplicity of explanation
- Mutex v1.0: naïve

```
bool taken = false
Mutex.Lock () {
    while (taken == true)
    ;
    taken = true // we own mutex
}
// -----
Mutex.Unlock () {
    taken = false
}
```

Any problems?

#### Main issue:

- Read followed by write is not an atomic operation!
- Two threads arrive simultaneously to mutex
  - Both check and see that taken is false
  - Both proceed inside
- Result
  - Failed mutual exclusion
- Can we do better?

- Mutex v2.0: Strict alternation
  - Do not enter until access is granted by other threads

Problems?

#### **Drawbacks of Mutex 2.0**

- Threads forced to own mutex even if not needed
  - Wait time can be arbitrarily high

#### Classroom analogy

- No mutex: ask question as soon as ready
  - Keep talking concurrently with instructor and other students asking their questions

- Mutex 2.0: only person holding a token can ask question
  - When question asked, token is passed to next person
- Correct mutex: raise your hand if you have a question
  - Instructor finishes sentence, selects the order in which raised hands are polled

- Mutex v3.0
  - Consider just two threads

- Only one thread can enter
  - But deadlock possible if both want it at same time

#### Mutex v3.1

- Need to break ties
- Dekker's algorithm (1965)
   for two threads

```
bool want [2] = {false,false}
int turn = 0 // break ties
Mutex.Lock (i){
    i = 1-i  // other threadID
    want [i] = true
   while (want [j] == true)
        if (turn == j)
            want [i] = false
            while (turn == j)
                 ; // do nothing
            want [i] = true
Mutex.Unlock (i) {
    turn = 1-i
    want [i] = false
```

## <u>Mutex</u>

- Mutex 3.1 guarantees that only one thread enters
  - Deterministically avoids deadlock and inconsistency
- Only competing threads are given access to mutex
  - Efficient

#### **Drawbacks**

- Pretty complex
- Lack of fairness: one thread may enter multiple times while the other is waiting

#### Mutex v3.2

Petersen's algorithm
 (1981) for two threads

- Fair, efficient, consistent

#### Mutex v3.2 without contention

false want[0]

0 turn true want[1]

#### Mutex v3.2 with contention

```
bool want [2] = {false,false}
int turn // break ties
Mutex.Lock(0) {
    want [0] = true
    turn = 1
    while (want [1] == true
        && turn == 1)
    ;
    // owns mutex
}
// ------
Mutex.Unlock (0) {
    want [0] = false
}
```

true want[0] 1 turn false want[1]

#### Mutex v3.2 avoiding starvation

true want[0]

0 turn true

want[1]

## <u>Mutex</u>

- Mutex v3.2 with reversed order of want and turn
  - Allows both threads to enter

true want[0]

1 turn true want[1]

## **Mutex Summary**

## Mutex v3.2 on modern computers

- Compiler optimization A
  - Compiler sees that the loop does not change any variables
  - Removes it from code
- Compiler optimization B
  - Variables may be kept in registers for loop duration or order of operations changed

#### CPU cache coherency

- Shared variables stored in L1/L2 caches of different cores
- CPU memory fetch
  - Hardware may reorder read/write operations
  - Major problem for all algorithms:

```
// intended sequence
write want[i]
read want[j]
read turn
```

```
// actual sequence
read want[j]
read turn
write want[i]
```