UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN-MADISON Computer Sciences Department

CS 537 Introduction to Operating Systems Andrea C. Arpaci-Dusseau Remzi H. Arpaci-Dusseau

Synchronization

Questions answered in this lecture:

Why is synchronization necessary?

- What are race conditions, critical sections, and atomic operations?
- How to protect critical sections with atomic loads and stores?

Cooperation requires Synchronization

Example:

Two threads share account balance in memory Each runs common code, deposit() void deposit (int amount) { balance = balance + amount; } Compile to sequence of assembly instructions load R1, balance add R1, amount store R1, balance Which variables are shared? Which private?

Concurrent Execution

What happens if 2 threads deposit concurrently? Assume any interleaving of instructions is possible Make no assumptions about scheduler

Initial balance: \$100 Thread 1:deposit(10) Thread

Thread 1:deposit(10) Thread 2:deposit(20) Load R1, balance

Load R1, balance

Add R1, amount

Add R1, amount

Store R1, balance

Store R1, balance

What is the final balance?

Definitions Race condition: Result depends upon ordering of execution • Non-deterministic bug, very difficult to find Critical section: Required Properties • Mutual exclusion • Only one thread in critical section at a time • Progress (deadlock-free) • If several simultaneous requests, must allow one to proceed • Must not depend on threads outside critical section • Bounded (starvation-free) • Must eventually allow each waiting thread to enter Desirable Properties • Efficient • Don't consume substantial resources while waiting • Do not busy wait (I.e., spin wait)

- Fair
 - Don't make some processes wait longer than others



• Special hw instructions

- Compare&Swap

– Test&Set

Critical Section: Attempt #1

```
Code uses a single shared lock variable
Boolean lock = false; // shared variable
Void deposit(int amount) {
  while (lock) /* wait */ ;
  lock = true;
```

balance += amount; // critical section

lock = false;

}

Why doesn't this work? Which principle is violated?

Attempt #2

```
Each thread has its own lock; lock indexed by tid (0, 1)
Boolean lock[2] = {false, false}; // shared
Void deposit(int amount) {
    lock[tid] = true;
    while (lock[1-tid]) /* wait */;
    balance += amount; // critical section
    lock[tid] = false;
}
Why doesn't this work? Which principle is violated?
```

Attempt #3

Turn variable determines which thread can enter Int turn = 0; // shared Void deposit(int amount) { while (turn == 1-tid) /* wait */ ;

balance += amount; // critical section

turn = 1-tid;

}

Why doesn't this work? Which principle is violated?

Peterson's Algorithm: Solution for Two Threads

```
Combine approaches 2 and 3: Separate locks and turn variable
Int turn = 0; // shared
Boolean lock[2] = {false, false};
Void deposit(int amount) {
    lock[tid] = true;
    turn = 1-tid;
    while (lock[1-tid] && turn == 1-tid) /* wait */;
    balance += amount; // critical section
```

```
lock[tid] = false;
```

```
}
```

Peterson's Algorithm: Intuition

Mutual exclusion: Enter critical section if and only if

- Other thread does not want to enter
- Other thread wants to enter, but your turn

Progress: Both threads cannot wait forever at while() loop

- Completes if other process does not want to enter
- Other process (matching turn) will eventually finish Bouded waiting

Each process waits at most one critical section

Lamport's Bakery Algorithm for N Threads

Bakery algorithm intuition

Each thread picks next highest ticket (may have ties)

```
Enter critical section when have lowest ticket
```

```
Choosing[tid] = true;
Number[tid] = Max(number[0]..number[n-1]) + 1;
Choosing[tid] = false;
For (j = 0; j < n; j++) {
  while (choosing[j]);
  while (number[j] && ((number[j],j) < (number[tid],tid)));
}
Balance += amount;
Number[tid] = 0;
```