[537] Semaphores

Chapter 31
Tyler Harter
10/20/14

Producer/Consumer Problem

Producers generate data (like pipe writers).

Consumers grab data and process it (like pipe readers).

Producer/consumer problems are frequent in systems.

Producer/Consumer Problem

Producers generate data (like pipe writers).

Consumers grab data and process it (like pipe readers).

Producer/consumer problems are frequent in systems.

- examples?
- what primitives did we use?

wait(cond_t *cv, mutex_t *lock)

- assumes the lock is held when wait() is called
- puts caller to sleep + releases the lock (atomically)
- when awoken, reacquires lock before returning

signal(cond_t *cv)

- wake a single waiting thread (if >= 1 thread is waiting)
- if there is no waiting thread, just return, doing nothing

broadcast(cond_t *cv)

- wake **all** waiting threads (if >= 1 thread is waiting)
- if there are no waiting thread, just return, doing nothing

Example: Bounded Buffer

```
void *consumer(void *arg) {
void *producer(void *arg) {
   for (int i=0; i<loops; i++) {
                                           while(1) {
       Mutex_lock(&m);
                                               Mutex_lock(&m);
                                               while(numfull == 0)
       while(numfull == max)
           Cond_wait(&empty, &m);
                                                   Cond_wait(&fill, &m);
       do_fill(i);
                                               int tmp = do_get();
       Cond_signal(&fill);
                                               Cond_signal(&empty);
       Mutex_unlock(&m);
                                               Mutex_unlock(&m);
                                               printf("%d\n", tmp);
```

Example: Bounded Buffer

```
void *producer(void *arg) {
                                        void *consumer(void *arg) {
   for (int i=0; i<loops; i++) {
                                           while(1) {
       Mutex_lock(&m);
                                               Mutex_lock(&m);
       while(numfull == max)
                                               while(numfull == 0)
           Cond_wait(&empty, &m); •
                                                   Cond_wait(&fill, &m);
       do_fill(i);
                                               int tmp = do_get();
                                               Cond_signal(&empty);
       Cond_signal(&fill);
       Mutex_unlock(&m);
                                               Mutex_unlock(&m);
                                               printf("%d\n", tmp);
```

Can we do producer/consumer with only locks (no CVs)?

Can we do producer/consumer with only locks (no CVs)?

Do you like CVs?

Can we do producer/consumer with only locks (no CVs)?

Do you like CVs? No!

Can we do producer/consumer with only locks (no CVs)?

Do you like CVs? No!

Why are CVs hard to use?

Can we do producer/consumer with only locks (no CVs)?

Do you like CVs? No!

Why are CVs hard to use?

What rules of thumb should we follow with CVs?

CV rules of thumb

Keep state in addition to CV's

Always do wait/signal with lock held

Whenever you acquire a lock, recheck state

Design Tip

If it's always recommended to use an abstraction the same way...

Design Tip

If it's always recommended to use an abstraction the same way...

...build a better abstraction over your first abstraction.

More Concurrency Abstractions

Linux Workqueues: list of function ptr's to call later.

Semaphores: today's topic.

Queue:

Queue:

A

wait()

Queue:

A

Queue:

АВ

wait()

Queue:

A

В

Queue:

В

signal()

Queue:

В

Queue:

signal()

Queue:

Queue:

signal()

Queue:

nothing to do!

signal()

Queue:

Queue:

C

wait()

Queue:

C

Queue:

C

If we weren't careful, C may sleep forever.

Thread Queue: Signal Queue:

Thread Queue: Signal Queue:

A

wait()

Thread Queue: Signal Queue:

A

Thread Queue: Signal Queue:

signal()

Thread Queue: Signal Queue:

Thread Queue: Signal Queue:

signal

signal()

Thread Queue: Signal Queue:

signal

Thread Queue: Signal Queue:

A

signal

wait()

Thread Queue: Signal Queue:

wait()

Thread Queue: Signal Queue:

signal was not lost do to some race condition!

wait()

Thread Queue: Signal Queue:

Actual Implementation

Use counter instead of Signal Queue

- all signals are the same

If the counter is positive, don't bother to queue a thread upon wait().

Actual Implementation

Use counter instead of Signal Queue

- all signals are the same

If the counter is positive, don't bother to queue a thread upon wait().

CV's don't keep extra state, so CV users must. Semaphores keep extra state, so users sometimes don't.

Actual Definition (see handout)

```
sem_init(sem_t *s, int initval) {
  s->value = initval
}
sem_wait(sem_t *s) {
  s->value -= 1
  wait if s->value < 0</pre>
sem_post(sem_t *s) {
  s->value += 1
  wake one waiting thread (if there are any)
```

Actual Definition (see handout)

```
sem_init(sem_t *s, int initval) {
  s->value = initval
                                  wait and post are atomic
sem_wait(sem_t *s) {
  s->value -= 1
  wait if s->value < 0</pre>
sem_post(sem_t *s) {
  s->value += 1
  wake one waiting thread (if there are any)
```

Actual Definition (see handout)

```
sem_init(sem_t *s, int initval) {
   s->value = initval
                               value = 4: 4 waiting signals
sem_wait(sem_t *s) {
                               value = -3: 3 waiting threads
   s->value -= 1
  wait if s->value < 0</pre>
sem_post(sem_t *s) {
  s->value += 1
  wake one waiting thread (if there are any)
```

Join example

Join is simpler with semaphores than CV's.

```
int done = 0;
mutex_t m = MUTEX_INIT;
cond_t c = COND_INIT;
void *child(void *arg) {
   printf("child\n");
   Mutex_lock(&m);
   done = 1;
   cond_signal(&c);
   Mutex_unlock(&m);
}
int main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
   pthread_t c;
   printf("parent: begin\n");
   Pthread_create(c, NULL, child, NULL);
   Mutex_lock(&m);
   while(done == 0)
       Cond_wait(&c, &m);
   Mutex_unlock(&m);
   printf("parent: end\n");
```

Join w/ CV

```
sem_t s;
void *child(void *arg) {
    printf("child\n");
    sem_post(&s);
}
int main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
    sem_init(&s, ?);
    pthread_t c;
    printf("parent: begin\n");
    Pthread_create(c, NULL, child, NULL);
    sem_wait(&s);
    printf("parent: end\n");
}
```

Join w/ Semaphore

```
Join w/ Semaphore
sem t s;
void *child(void *arg) {
  printf("child\n");
  sem_post(&s);
int main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
  sem_init(&s, ?);
  pthread_t c;
  printf("parent: begin\n");
  Pthread_create(c, NULL, child, NULL);
  sem_wait(&s);
  printf("parent: end\n");
```

```
Join w/ Semaphore
sem t s;
void *child(void *arg) {
  printf("child\n");
  sem_post(&s);
int main(int args.
                  char *argv[]) {
  sem_init(&s,(?); What is this int?
  pthread t c;
  printf("parent: begin\n");
  Pthread_create(c, NULL, child, NULL);
  sem_wait(&s);
  printf("parent: end\n");
```

```
Join w/ Semaphore
sem t s;
void *child(void *arg) {
  printf("child\n");
  sem_post(&s);
int main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
  sem_init(&s, ?);
  pthread_t c;
  printf("parent: begin\n");
  Pthread_create(c, NULL, child, NULL);
  sem_wait(&s);
  printf("parent: end\n");
```

```
Join w/ Semaphore
sem t s;
void *child(void *arg) {
  printf("child\n");
  sem_post(&s);
int main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
  sem_init(&s, 0);
  pthread_t c;
  printf("parent: begin\n");
  Pthread_create(c, NULL, child, NULL);
  sem_wait(&s);
  printf("parent: end\n");
```

```
Join w/ Semaphore
sem t s;
void *child(void *arg) {
  printf("child\n");
  sem_post(&s);
                                             Run it!
                                           (sem-join.c)
int main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
  sem_init(&s, 0);
  pthread_t c;
  printf("parent: begin\n");
  Pthread_create(c, NULL, child, NULL);
  sem_wait(&s);
  printf("parent: end\n");
```

Worksheet

Problem 1: building locks with semaphores

Problem 2: building semaphores with locks and CV's

Equivalence Claim

Semaphores are equally powerful to Locks+CVs.

- what does this mean?

Equivalence Claim

Semaphores are equally powerful to Locks+CVs.

- what does this mean?

Either may be more convenient, but that's not relevant.

Equivalence means we can build each over the other.

Proof Steps

Want to show we can do these three things:

Locks

Semaphores

CV's

Semaphores

Semaphores

Locks

CV's

Proof Steps

Want to show we can do these three things:

Locks

Semaphores

done! (problem 1)

CV's

Semaphores

Semaphores

Locks

CV's

done! (problem 2)

Building CV's over Semaphores

Possible, but really hard to do right.

CV's

Semaphores

Building CV's over Semaphores

Possible, but really hard to do right.

Read about Microsoft Research's attempts:

- http://research.microsoft.com/pubs/64242/ImplementingCVs.pdf

We won't go beyond our simple join example.

CV's

Semaphores

Bounded-Buffer w/ Semaphores

Write code.

R/W Lock w/ Semaphores

Worksheet, Problem 3.

Summary

Locks+CVs are good primitives, but not always convenient.

Possible to build other abstractions such as semaphores.

Advice: if you always use an abstraction the same way, build another abstraction over the first!