CONCURRENCE: INTRODUCTION

Shivaram Venkataraman
CS 537, Spring 2020
- Project 2b is out. Due Feb 24\textsuperscript{th}, 10:00pm
- Project 1b grades very soon

Shivaram upcoming travel
- No class on Feb 27. Guest lecture March 3
- Discussion
  - No discussion Feb 20, Feb 27
  - \textbf{Discussion on Tue Feb 25 at 5.30pm}
AGENDA / LEARNING OUTCOMES

Virtual memory: Summary
Concurrency
  What is the motivation for concurrent execution?
  What are some of the challenges?
RECAP
SWAPPING

OS goal: Support processes when not enough physical memory
- Single process with very large address space
- Multiple processes with combined address spaces

User code should be independent of amount of physical memory
- Correctness, if not performance
### PFN valid prot present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PFN</th>
<th>valid</th>
<th>prot</th>
<th>present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>r-x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>rw-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>rw-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>rw-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What if access vpn 0xb?**
PAGE REPLACEMENT POLICIES

**OPT**: Replace page not used for longest time in future
- Advantages: Guaranteed to minimize number of page faults
- Disadvantages: Requires that OS predict the future; Not practical

**FIFO**: Replace page that has been in memory the longest
- Advantages: Fair: All pages receive equal residency; Easy to implement
- Disadvantage: Some pages may always be needed

**LRU**: Least-recently-used: Replace page not used for longest time in past
- Advantages: With locality, LRU approximates OPT
- Disadvantages:
  - Harder to implement, must track which pages have been accessed
IMPLEMENTING LRU

Software Perfect LRU
- OS maintains ordered list of physical pages by reference time
- When page is referenced: Move page to front of list
- When need victim: Pick page at back of list
- Trade-off: Slow on memory reference, fast on replacement

Hardware Perfect LRU
- Associate timestamp register with each page
- When page is referenced: Store system clock in register
- When need victim: Scan through registers to find oldest clock
- Trade-off: Fast on memory reference, slow on replacement
  (especially as size of memory grows)
CLOCK ALGORITHM

Hardware
– Keep use (or reference) bit for each page frame
– When page is referenced: set use bit

Operating System
– Page Replacement:
  • Keep pointer to last examined page frame
  • Traverse pages in circular buffer
  • Clear use bits as we search
  • Stop when find page with already cleared use bit, replace this page
CLOCK: LOOK FOR A PAGE

Physical Mem:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use = 1, 1, 0, 1 at start

What should we evict?

Page 0 is accessed

What should we evict?
CLOCK EXTENSIONS

Replace multiple pages at once
  – Intuition: Expensive to run replacement algorithm and to write single block to disk
  – Find multiple victims each time and track free list

Use dirty bit to give preference to dirty pages
  – Intuition: More expensive to replace dirty pages
    Dirty pages must be written to disk, clean pages do not
  – Replace pages that have use bit and dirty bit cleared
Abstraction: Virtual address space with code, heap, stack

Address translation
- Contiguous memory: base, bounds, segmentation
- Using fixed sizes pages with page tables

Challenges with paging
- Extra memory references: avoid with TLB
- Page table size: avoid with multi-level paging, inverted page tables etc.

Larger address spaces: Swapping mechanisms, policies (LRU, Clock)
CONCURRENCY
MOTIVATION FOR CONCURRENCY

Performance (vs. VAX-11/780)

- 25%/year
- 52%/year
- 23%/year
- 12%/year
- 3.5%/year
MOTIVATION

CPU Trend: Same speed, but multiple cores
Goal: Write applications that fully utilize many cores

**Option 1:** Build apps from many communicating *processes*

- Example: Chrome (process per tab)
- Communicate via pipe() or similar

Pros?
- Don’t need new abstractions; good for security

Cons?
- Cumbersome programming
- High communication overheads
- Expensive context switching (why expensive?)
New abstraction: thread

Threads are like processes, except:

- multiple threads of same process share an address space

Divide large task across several cooperative threads
Communicate through shared address space
Multi-threaded programs tend to be structured as:

- **Producer/consumer**
  Multiple producer threads create data (or work) that is handled by one of the multiple consumer threads

- **Pipeline**
  Task is divided into series of subtasks, each of which is handled in series by a different thread

- **Defer work with background thread**
  One thread performs non-critical work in the background (when CPU idle)
What state do threads share?
Thread vs. Process

Multiple threads within a single process share:
- Process ID (PID)
- Address space: Code (instructions), Most data (heap)
- Open file descriptors
- Current working directory
- User and group id

Each thread has its own:
- Thread ID (TID)
- Set of registers, including Program counter and Stack pointer
- Stack for local variables and return addresses (in same address space)
OS SUPPORT: APPROACH 1

User-level threads: Many-to-one thread mapping

- Implemented by user-level runtime libraries
  Create, schedule, synchronize threads at user-level
- OS is not aware of user-level threads
  OS thinks each process contains only a single thread of control

Advantages
- Does not require OS support; Portable
- Lower overhead thread operations since no system call

Disadvantages?
- Cannot leverage multiprocessors
- Entire process blocks when one thread blocks
OS SUPPORT: APPROACH 2

Kernel-level threads: One-to-one thread mapping

- OS provides each user-level thread with a kernel thread
- Each kernel thread scheduled independently
- Thread operations (creation, scheduling, synchronization) performed by OS

Advantages

- Each kernel-level thread can run in parallel on a multiprocessor
- When one thread blocks, other threads from process can be scheduled

Disadvantages

- Higher overhead for thread operations
- OS must scale well with increasing number of threads
volatile int balance = 0;
int loops;

void *worker(void *arg) {
    int i;
    for (i = 0; i < loops; i++) {
        balance++;
    }
    pthread_exit(NULL);
}

int main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
    loops = atoi(argv[1]);
    pthread_t p1, p2;
    printf("Initial value : %d\n", balance);
    Pthread_create(&p1, NULL, worker, NULL);
    Pthread_create(&p2, NULL, worker, NULL);
    Pthread_join(p1, NULL);
    Pthread_join(p2, NULL);
    printf("Final value : %d\n", balance);
    return 0;
}

» ./threads 100000
Initial value : 0
Final value : 162901
balance = balance + 1;
balance at 0x9cd4

**State:**
0x9000: 100
%eax:
%rip = 0x195

0x195 mov 0x9000, %eax
0x19a add $0x1, %eax
0x19d mov %eax, 0x9000

**Thread 1**
%eax: %rip:

**Thread 2**
%eax: %rip:
balance = balance + 1;
balance at 0x9cd4

**State:**
0x9000: 100
%eax:
%rip = 0x195

0x195  mov 0x9000, %eax
0x19a  add $0x1, %eax
0x19d  mov %eax, 0x9000

Thread 1
%eax:
%rip:

Thread 2
%eax:
%rip:
Thread 1
mov 0x123, %eax
add %0x1, %eax
mov %eax, 0x123

Thread 2
mov 0x123, %eax
add %0x2, %eax
mov %eax, 0x123
Process A with threads TA1 and TA2 and process B with a thread TB1.

1. With respect to TA1 and TA2 which of the following are true?

2. Which of the following are true with respect to TA1 and TB1?
Concurrency leads to non-deterministic results
– Different results even with same inputs
– race conditions

Whether bug manifests depends on CPU schedule!

How to program: imagine scheduler is malicious?!
WHAT DO WE WANT?

Want 3 instructions to execute as an uninterruptable group
That is, we want them to be atomic

mov 0x123, %eax
add %0x1, %eax
mov %eax, 0x123

More general: Need mutual exclusion for critical sections
if thread A is in critical section C, thread B isn’t
(okay if other threads do unrelated work)
Build higher-level synchronization primitives in OS
Operations that ensure correct ordering of instructions across threads
Use help from hardware

Motivation: Build them once and get them right

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitors</th>
<th>Locks</th>
<th>Semaphores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Condition Variables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loads</th>
<th>Stores</th>
<th>Test&amp;Set</th>
<th>Disable Interrupts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal: Provide mutual exclusion (mutex)

Allocate and Initialize
- \texttt{Pthread_mutex_t mylock = PTHREAD_MUTEX_INITIALIZER;}

Acquire
- Acquire exclusion access to lock;
- Wait if lock is not available (some other process in critical section)
- Spin or block (relinquish CPU) while waiting
- \texttt{Pthread_mutex_lock(&mylock)};

Release
- Release exclusive access to lock; let another process enter critical section
- \texttt{Pthread_mutex_unlock(&mylock)};
LOCK IMPLEMENTATION GOALS

Correctness
- *Mutual exclusion*
  Only one thread in critical section at a time
- *Progress* (deadlock-free)
  If several simultaneous requests, must allow one to proceed
- *Bounded* (starvation-free)
  Must eventually allow each waiting thread to enter

Fairness: Each thread waits for same amount of time
Performance: CPU is not used unnecessarily
IMPLEMENTING SYNCHRONIZATION

**Atomic operation:** No other instructions can be interleaved

Approaches
- Disable interrupts
- Locks using loads/stores
- Using special hardware instructions
IMPLEMENTING LOCKS: W/ INTERRUPTS

Turn off interrupts for critical sections
- Prevent dispatcher from running another thread
- Code between interrupts executes atomically

```c
void acquire(lockT *l) {
    disableInterrupts();
}

void release(lockT *l) {
    enableInterrupts();
}
```

Disadvantages?
- Only works on uniprocessors
- Process can keep control of CPU for arbitrary length
- Cannot perform other necessary work
IMPLEMENTING LOCKS: W/ LOAD+STORE

Code uses a single **shared** lock variable

```c
// shared variable
boolean lock = false;
void acquire(Boolean *lock) {
    while (*lock) /* wait */ ;
    *lock = true;
}
void release(Boolean *lock) {
    *lock = false;
}
```

**Does this work?** What situation can cause this to not work?
RACE CONDITION WITH LOAD AND STORE

*lock == 0 initially

Thread 1
while(*lock == 1)

Thread 2
while(*lock == 1)
  *lock = 1

*lock = 1

Both threads grab lock!

Problem: Testing lock and setting lock are not atomic
NEXT STEPS

Project 2b: Out now

Next class: More about locks!

Reminder:
  No discussion today!
  Next discussion on Tue