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OS Big Picture Goals

• OS is a layer of code between user programs and hardware.

• Goal: Make life easier for users and programmers.

• How can the OS do that?
Key OS Responsibilities

1. Simplifying abstractions for programs

2. Resource allocation and/or sharing

3. Hardware gatekeeping and protection
OS: Turn undesirable into desirable

- Turn undesirable inconveniences: reality
  - Complexity of hardware
  - Single processor
  - Limited memory
- Into desirable conveniences: illusions
  - Simple, easy-to-use resources
  - Multiple/unlimited number of processors
  - Large/unlimited amount of memory
Making Programs Run Faster

• In the “old days” (1980’s - 2005):
  – Algorithm too slow? Wait for HW to catch up.

• Modern CPUs exploit parallelism for speed:
  – Executes multiple instructions at once
  – Reorders instructions on the fly

• Today, can’t make a single core go much faster.
  – Limits on clock speed, heat, energy consumption

• Use extra transistors to put multiple CPU cores on the chip.

• Programmer’s job to speed-up computation
  – Humans bad at thinking in parallel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transistors ($10^3$)</th>
<th>Clock Speed (MHZ)</th>
<th>Power (W)</th>
<th>ILP (IPC)</th>
<th>Instruction Level Parallelism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

From Herb Sutter, Dr. Dobbs Journal
Parallel Abstraction

• To speed up a job, must divide it across multiple cores.

• A process contains both execution information and memory/resources.

• What if we want to separate the execution information to give us parallelism in our programs?
Which components of a process might we replicate to take advantage of multiple CPU cores?

A. The entire address space (memory – not duplicated)

B. Parts of the address space (memory - stack)

C. OS resources (open files, etc – not duplicated.)

D. Execution state (PC, registers, etc.)

E. More than one of these (which?)
Which components of a process might we replicate to take advantage of multiple CPU cores?

A. The entire address space (memory – not duplicated)

B. Parts of the address space (memory - stack)

C. OS resources (open files, etc – not duplicated.)

D. Execution state (PC, registers, etc.)

E. More than one of these (which?)

Don’t duplicate shared resources, duplicate resources where we need a private copy per thread: like execution state, and stack
Threads

• Modern OSes separate the concepts of processes and threads.
  – The process defines the address space and general process attributes (e.g., open files)
  – The thread defines a sequential execution stream within a process (PC, SP, registers)

• A thread is bound to a single process
  – Processes, however, can have multiple threads
  – Each process has at least one thread (e.g. main)
Processes versus Threads

- A process defines the address space, text, resources, etc.,
- A thread defines a single sequential execution stream within a process (PC, stack, registers).
- Threads extract the thread of control information from the process
- Threads are bound to a single process.
- Each process may have multiple threads of control within it.
  - The address space of a process is shared among all its threads
  - No system calls are required to cooperate among threads
This is the picture we’ve been using all along:

A process with a single thread, which has execution state (registers) and a stack.
We can add a thread to the process. New threads share all memory (VAS) with other threads.

New thread gets private registers, local stack.
A third thread added.

Note: they’re all executing the same program (shared instructions in text), though they may be at different points in the code.
Why Use Threads?

- Separating threads and processes makes it easier to support parallel applications:
  - Creating multiple paths of execution does not require creating new processes (less state to store, initialize – Light Weight Process)
  - Low-overhead sharing between threads in same process (threads share page tables, access same memory)

- Concurrency (multithreading) can be very useful
Concurrent?

• Several computations or threads of control are executing simultaneously, and potentially interacting with each other.

• We can multitask! Why does that help?
  – Taking advantage of multiple CPUs / cores
  – Overlapping I/O with computation
  – Improving program structure
Recall: Processes

Process 1
- Text
- Data
- Stack

Process 2
- Text
- Data
- Stack

Process n
- Text
- Data
- Stack

Kernel
- System Calls
  - fork
  - read
  - write
- System Management
  - Context Switching
  - Scheduling
Scheduling Threads

• We have basically two options
  1. Kernel explicitly selects among threads in a process
  2. Hide threads from the kernel, and have a user-level scheduler inside each multi-threaded process

• Why do we care?
  – Think about the overhead of switching between threads
  – Who decides which thread in a process should go first?
  – What about blocking system calls?
User-Level Threads

Library divides stack region

Threads are invisible to the kernel
Kernel-Level Threads

Kernel Context switching over threads

Each process has explicitly mapped regions for stacks
If you call `thread_create()` on a modern OS (Linux/Mac/Windows), which type of thread would you expect to receive? (Why? Which would you pick?)

A. Kernel threads

B. User threads

C. Some other sort of threads
Kernel vs. User Threads

• Kernel-level threads
  – Integrated with OS (informed scheduling)
  – Slower to create, manipulate, synchronize
    • Requires getting the OS involved, which means changing context (relatively expensive)

• User-level threads
  – Faster to create, manipulate, synchronize
  – Not integrated with OS (uninformed scheduling)
    • If one thread makes a syscall, all of them get blocked because the OS doesn’t distinguish.
Threads & Sharing

• Code (text) shared by all threads in process
• Global variables and static objects are shared
  – Stored in the static data segment, accessible by any thread
• Dynamic objects and other heap objects are shared
  – Allocated from heap with malloc/free or new/delete
• Local variables should not be shared
  – Refer to data on the stack
  – Each thread has its own stack
  – Never pass/share/store a pointer to a local variable on another thread’s stack!!
Threads & Sharing

- Local variables should not be shared
  - Refer to data on the stack
  - Each thread has its own stack
  - Never pass/share/store a pointer to a local variable on another thread’s stack

```
int *x;
```

Function B returns...

Thread 2 can dereference x to access Z.

Thread 1’s stack

- function B
- function A
- ...

Thread 2’s stack

- function D
- function C
- ...

Shared Heap
Threads & Sharing

• Local variables should not be shared
  – Refer to data on the stack
  – Each thread has its own stack
  – **Never pass/share/store a pointer to a local variable on another thread’s stack**
Threads & Sharing

- Local variables should not be shared
  - Refer to data on the stack
  - Each thread has its own stack
  - Never pass/share/store a pointer to a local variable on another thread’s stack

```
Thread 1’s stack
function B
function A
...

Thread 2’s stack
function D
function C
...

Shared data on heap!
int *x;
Z
Thread 2 can dereference x to access Z.
```
Thread-level Parallelism

• Speed up application by assigning portions to CPUs/cores that process in parallel

• Requires:
  – partitioning responsibilities (e.g., parallel algorithm)
  – managing their interaction

• Example: game of life (next lab)
If one CPU core can run a program at a rate of $X$, how quickly will the program run on two cores? Why?

A. Slower than one core ($<X$)
B. The same speed ($X$)
C. Faster than one core, but not double ($X-2X$)
D. Twice as fast ($2X$)
E. More than twice as fast ($>2X$)
Parallel Speedup

• Performance benefit of parallel threads depends on many factors:
  – algorithm divisibility
  – communication overhead
  – memory hierarchy and locality
  – implementation quality

• *For most programs*, more threads means more communication, diminishing returns.
Summary

• Physical limits to how much faster we can make a single core run.
  – Use transistors to provide more cores.
  – Parallelize applications to take advantage.

• OS abstraction: thread
  – Shares most of the address space with other threads in same process
  – Gets private execution context (registers) + stack

• Coordinating threads is challenging!
They’re all executing the same program (shared instructions in text), though they may be at different points in the code.
Kernel-Level Threads

Each process has explicitly mapped regions for stacks

Kernel Context switching over threads
Synchronization

• Synchronize: to (arrange events to) happen such that two events do not overwrite each other’s work.
• Thread synchronization
  – When one thread has to wait for another
  – Events in threads that occur “at the same time”
• Uses of synchronization
  – Prevent race conditions
  – Wait for resources to become available (only one thread has access at any time - deadlocks)
Synchronization: Too Much Milk (TMM)

What mechanisms do we need for two independent threads to communicate and get a consistent view (computer state)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your Roommate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Arrive home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>Look in fridge, no milk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Leave for the grocery store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>Arrive at the grocery store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Buy Milk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>Arrive home, put milk in fridge</td>
<td>Arrive Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Look in fridge, find milk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cold Coffee (nom)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How many cartons of milk can we have in this scenario? (Can we ensure this somehow?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your Roommate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Arrive home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>Look in fridge, no milk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Leave for the grocery store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>Arrive at the grocery store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Buy Milk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>Arrive home, put milk in fridge</td>
<td>Arrive Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Look in fridge, find milk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cold Coffee (nom)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. One carton (you)
B. Two cartons
C. No cartons
D. Something else
**Synchronization:**
Too Much Milk (TMM): One possible scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your Roommate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Arrive home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>Look in fridge, no milk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Leave for grocery</td>
<td>Arrive Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Look in fridge, no milk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>Arrive at grocery</td>
<td>Leave for grocery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Buy Milk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrive at grocery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>Arrive home, put milk in fridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrive home, put milk in fridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oh No!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What mechanisms do we need for two independent threads to communicate and get a consistent view (computer state)?
### Synchronization:

**Threads get scheduled in an arbitrary manner:**
bad things may happen: ...or nothing may happen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your Roommate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Arrive home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>Look in fridge, no milk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Leave for grocery</td>
<td>Arrive Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Look in fridge, no milk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>Arrive at grocery</td>
<td>Leave for grocery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Buy Milk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrive at grocery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>Arrive home, put milk in fridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrive home, put milk in fridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oh No!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What mechanisms do we need for two independent threads to communicate and get a consistent view (computer state)?
Synchronization Example

• Coordination required:
  – Which thread goes first?
  – Threads in different regions must work together to compute new value for boundary cells.
  – Threads might not run at the same speed (depends on the OS scheduler). Can’t let one region get too far ahead.
  – Context switches can happen at any time!
Thread Ordering
(Why threads require care. Humans aren’t good at reasoning about this.)

• As a programmer you have *no idea* when threads will run. The OS schedules them, and the schedule will vary across runs.

• It might decide to context switch from one thread to another *at any time*.

• Your code must be prepared for this!
  – Ask yourself: “*Would something bad happen if we context switched here?*”

• hard to debug this problem if it is not reproducible
Example: The Credit/Debit Problem

- Say you have $1000 in your bank account
  - You deposit $100
  - You also withdraw $100

- How much should be in your account?

- What if your deposit and withdrawal occur at the same time, at different ATMs?
Credit/Debit Problem: Race Condition

Thread \( T_0 \)

\[
\text{Credit (int a) \{ \\
\hspace{1em} \text{int b;} \\
\hspace{1em} \text{b = ReadBalance ();} \\
\hspace{1em} \text{b = b + a;} \\
\hspace{1em} \text{WriteBalance (b);} \\
\hspace{1em} \text{PrintReceipt (b);} \\
\}}
\]

Thread \( T_1 \)

\[
\text{Debit (int a) \{ \\
\hspace{1em} \text{int b;} \\
\hspace{1em} \text{b = ReadBalance ();} \\
\hspace{1em} \text{b = b - a;} \\
\hspace{1em} \text{WriteBalance (b);} \\
\hspace{1em} \text{PrintReceipt (b);} \\
\}}
\]
Credit/Debit Problem: Race Condition

Say $T_0$ runs first
Read $1000$ into $b$

**Thread $T_0$**

Credit (int $a$) {
    int $b$;
    
    $b = \text{ReadBalance}();$
    $b = b + a;$
    WriteBalance ($b$);
    
    PrintReceipt ($b$);
}

**Thread $T_1$**

Debit (int $a$) {
    int $b$;
    
    $b = \text{ReadBalance}();$
    $b = b - a;$
    WriteBalance ($b$);
    
    PrintReceipt ($b$);
Credit/Debit Problem: Race Condition

Thread T₀

Credit (int a) {
    int b;
    b = ReadBalance ();
    b = b + a;
    WriteBalance (b);
    PrintReceipt (b);
}

Thread T₁

Debit (int a) {
    int b;
    b = ReadBalance ();
    b = b - a;
    WriteBalance (b);
    PrintReceipt (b);
}

Say T₀ runs first
Read $1000 into b
Switch to T₁
Read $1000 into b
Debit by $100
Write $900

CONTEXT SWITCH
Credit/Debit Problem: Race Condition

Thread T₀
Credit (int a) {
    int b;
    b = ReadBalance ();
    b = b + a;
    WriteBalance (b);
    PrintReceipt (b);
}

Say T₀ runs first
Read $1000 into b
Switch to T₁
Read $1000 into b
Credit $100
Write $1100

Thread T₁
Debit (int a) {
    int b;
    b = ReadBalance ();
    b = b - a;
    WriteBalance (b);
    PrintReceipt (b);
}

Switch back to T₀
Read $1000 into b
Debit by $100
Write $900

Bank gave you $100!
What went wrong?
"Critical Section"

Thread $T_0$

Credit (int $a$) {
    int $b$;
    $b =$ ReadBalance ();
    $b =$ $b + a$;
    WriteBalance ($b$);
    PrintReceipt ($b$);
}

Thread $T_1$

Debit (int $a$) {
    int $b$;
    $b =$ ReadBalance ();
    $b =$ $b - a$;
    WriteBalance ($b$);
    PrintReceipt ($b$);
}

Bank gave you $100$!

What went wrong?

Danger Will Robinson!

Badness if context switch here!
To Avoid Race Conditions

1. Identify critical sections

2. Use synchronization to **enforce mutual exclusion**
   - **Only one thread active in a critical section**
Critical Section and Atomicity

• Sections of code executed by multiple threads
  – Access shared variables, often making local copy
  – Places where order of execution or thread interleaving will affect the outcome
  – Follows: read + modify + write of shared variable

• Must run atomically with respect to each other
  – Atomicity: runs as an entire instruction or not at all. Cannot be divided into smaller parts.
Which code region is a critical section?

Thread A

```cpp
main ()
{
 int a, b;

 a = getShared();
 b = 10;
 a = a + b;
 saveShared(a);

 a += 1

 return a;
}
```

Thread B

```cpp
main ()
{
 int a, b;

 a = getShared();
 b = 20;
 a = a - b;
 saveShared(a);

 a += 1

 return a;
}
```
Which values might the shared `s` variable hold after both threads finish?

Thread A
```
main ()
{
  int a,b;

  a = getShared();
  b = 10;
  a = a + b;
  saveShared(a);

  a += 1

  return a;
}
```

Thread B
```
main ()
{
  int a,b;

  a = getShared();
  b = 20;
  a = a - b;
  saveShared(a);

  a += 1

  return a;
}
```
If A runs first

Thread A

```c
main ()
{
    int a,b;
    a = getShared();
b = 10;
a = a + b;
saveShared(a);
    a += 1
    return a;
}
```

Thread B

```c
main ()
{
    int a,b;
a = getShared();
b = 20;
a = a - b;
saveShared(a);
a += 1
    return a;
}
```
B runs after A Completes

Thread A

main ()
{
    int a, b;
    a = getShared();
    b = 10;
    a = a + b;
    saveShared(a);
    a += 1
    return a;
}

Thread B

main ()
{
    int a, b;
    a = getShared();
    b = 20;
    a = a - b;
    saveShared(a);
    a += 1
    return a;
}

s = 50
s = 30;
What about interleaving?

One of the threads will overwrite the other’s changes.
Is there a race condition?

Suppose `count` is a global variable, multiple threads increment it:

```c
count++; 
```

A. Yes, there’s a race condition (`count++` is a critical section).
B. No, there’s no race condition (`count++` is not a critical section).
C. Cannot be determined

How about if compiler implements it as:

```assembly
movq (%rdx), %rax       // read count value
addq $1, %rax           // modify value
movq %rax, (%rdx)        // write count
```

How about if compiler implements it as:

```assembly
incq (%rdx)            // increment value
```
Atomicity

• The implementation of acquiring/releasing critical section must be atomic.
  – An atomic operation is one which executes as though it could not be interrupted
  – Code that executes “all or nothing”

• How do we make them atomic?
  – Atomic instructions (e.g., test-and-set, compare-and-swap)
  – Allows us to build “semaphore” OS abstraction
Four Rules for Mutual Exclusion

1. No two threads can be inside their critical sections at the same time (one of many but not more than one).

2. No thread outside its critical section may prevent others from entering their critical sections.

3. **No thread should have to wait forever** to enter its critical section. (Starvation)

4. No assumptions can be made about speeds or number of CPU’s.
Railroad Semaphore
- Help trains figure out which track to be on at any given time.
Railroad Semaphore
- Help trains figure out which track to be on at any given time.

O.S. Semaphore:
- Construct that the OS provides to processes.
- Make system calls to modify their value
Mutual Exclusion with Semaphores

mutex = 1;  //lock and unlock mutex atomically.

\[ T_0 \]
\[
\text{lock (mutex);} \\
< \text{critical section}> \\
\text{unlock (mutex);} \\
\]

\[ T_1 \]
\[
\text{lock (mutex);} \\
< \text{critical section}> \\
\text{unlock (mutex);} \\
\]

**Atomicity:** run the entire instruction without interruption.
Mutual Exclusion with Semaphores

\[
\text{mutex} = 1; //\text{unlocked.}
\]

\begin{align*}
\text{T}_0 & : \text{Wants to execute the critical section} \\
\text{T}_0 & : \text{Reads the value of mutex,} \\
& \quad \text{Changes the value of mutex} = 0 \text{ (acquires lock)} \\
& \quad \text{Enters critical section.}
\end{align*}

Atomicity: run the entire instruction without interruption.
Mutual Exclusion with Semaphores

mutex = 0; //locked.

\[
\begin{align*}
T_0 & : \text{Wants to execute the critical section} \\
& \text{Reads the value of mutex,} \\
& \text{Changes the value of mutex = 0 (acquires lock)} \\
& \text{Enters critical section.}
\end{align*}
\]

Atomicity: run the entire instruction without interruption.

Atomic Execution
Atomicity: run the entire instruction without interruption.

\( T_0 \): In the critical section
\( T_1 \): Wants to enter the critical section.

  Reads the value of mutex (mutex = 0)

  Cannot enter critical section.
  Blocked.
Mutual Exclusion with Semaphores

mutex = 0; //locked.

T₀
lock (mutex);
< critical section >
unlock (mutex);

T₁ (blocked)
lock (mutex);
< critical section >
unlock (mutex);

Atomicity: run the entire instruction without interruption.

T₀: Completes execution of critical section
Updates mutex value = 1. (release lock)
Mutual Exclusion with Semaphores

Atomic Execution

mutex = 1; //unlocked.

T₀
lock (mutex);
< critical section >
unlock (mutex);

T₁ (blocked)
lock (mutex);
< critical section >
unlock (mutex);

Atomicity: run the entire instruction without interruption.

T₀: Completes execution of critical section
Updates mutex value = 1. (release lock)
Mutual Exclusion with Semaphores

mutex = 1; //locked.

\textbf{T_0}
lock (mutex);
< critical section >
unlock (mutex);

\textbf{T_1}
lock (mutex);
< critical section >
unlock (mutex);

Atomicity: run the entire instruction without interruption.

\textbf{T_1}: Can now acquire lock atomically and
Enter the critical section
Mutual Exclusion with Semaphores

- Use a “mutex” semaphore initialized to 1
- Only one thread can enter critical section at a time.
- Simple, works for any number of threads

Atomicity: runs as an entire instruction or not at all.
Semaphores

- Semaphore: OS synchronization variable
  - Has integer value
  - List of waiting threads
- Works like a gate
- If $\text{sem} > 0$, gate is open
  - Value equals number of threads that can enter
- Else, gate is closed
  - Possibly with waiting threads
Semaphores

• Associated with each semaphore is a queue of waiting threads

• When wait() is called by a thread:
  – If semaphore is open, thread continues
  – If semaphore is closed, thread blocks on queue

• Then signal() opens the semaphore:
  – If a thread is waiting on the queue, the thread is unblocked
  – If no threads are waiting on the queue, the signal is remembered for the next thread
Semaphore Operations

sem  s = n;  // declare and initialize

wait (sem  s)  // Executes atomically(*)
    decrement s;
    if s < 0:
        block thread (and associate with s);

signal (sem  s)  // Executes atomically(*)
    increment s;
    if blocked threads:
        unblock (any) one of them;

(*) With help from special hardware instructions.
Semaphore Operations

```c
sem s = n;  // declare and initialize

wait (sem s)  // Executes atomically(*)
    decrement s;
    if s < 0:
        block thread (and associate with s);

signal (sem s)  // Executes atomically(*)
    increment s;
    if blocked threads:
        unblock (any) one of them;
```

Based on what you know about semaphores, should a process be able to check beforehand whether wait(s) will cause it to block?

A. Yes, it should be able to check.
B. No, it should not be able to check.
Semaphore Operations

```plaintext
sem s = n;  // declare and initialize

wait (sem s)  // Executes atomically(*)
    decrement s;
    if s < 0:
        block thread (and associate with s);

signal (sem s)  // Executes atomically(*)
    increment s;
    if blocked threads:
        unblock (any) one of them;
```

- No other operations allowed
- In particular, semaphore’s value can’t be tested!
  - No thread can tell the value of s
Synchronization: More than Mutexes

• “I want to block a thread until something specific happens.”
  – Condition variable: wait for a condition to be true

• “I want all my threads to sync up at the same point.”
  – Barrier: wait for everyone to catch up.
Barriers

- Used to coordinate threads, but also other forms of concurrent execution.

- Often found in simulations that have discrete rounds. (e.g., game of life)
shared barrier b;

init_barrier(&b, N);

create_threads(N, func);

void *func(void *arg) {
    while (...) {
        compute_sim_round()
        barrier_wait(&b)
    }
}

Barrier (0 waiting)
shared barrier b;

init_barrier(&b, N);

create_threads(N, func);

void *func(void *arg) {
    while (...) {
        compute_sim_round()
        barrier_wait(&b)
    }
}

shared barrier b;

init_barrier(&b, N);

create_threads(N, func);

void *func(void *arg) {
    while (...) {
        compute_sim_round()
        barrier_wait(&b)
    }
}
Barrier Example, N Threads

shared barrier b;
init_barrier(&b, N);
create_threads(N, func);
void *func(void *arg) {
    while (…) {
        compute_sim_round()
        barrier_wait(&b)
    }
}

Barrier allows threads to pass when N threads reach it.
Barrier Example, N Threads

shared barrier b;

init_barrier(&b, N);

create_threads(N, func);

void *func(void *arg) {
  while (...) {
    compute_sim_round()
    barrier_wait(&b)
  }
}

Threads compute next round, wait on barrier again, repeat...

Barrier (0 waiting)
Synchronization: More than Mutexes

• I want all my threads to sync up at the same point.
  – Barrier: wait for everyone to catch up.

• I want to block a thread until something specific happens.
  – Condition variable: wait for a condition to be true

• I want my threads to share a critical section when they’re reading, *but still safely write*.
  – Readers/writers lock: distinguish how lock is used
Synchronization: Beyond Mutexes
Message Passing

- Operating system mechanism for IPC
  - `send (destination, message_buffer)`
  - `receive (source, message_buffer)`

- Data transfer: in to and out of kernel message buffers
- Synchronization: can’t receive until message is sent
Summary

• We have no idea when OS will schedule or context switch our threads.
  – Code must be prepared, tough to reason about.

• Threads often must synchronize
  – To safely communicate / transfer data, without races

• Synchronization primitives help programmers
  – Kernel-level semaphores: limit # of threads that can do something, provides atomicity
  – User-level locks: built upon semaphore, provides mutual exclusion (usually part of thread library)
Additional Slides: Solution to the Race Condition
Solution with mutexes

Thread A

main ()
{
    int a, b;
    a = getShared();
    b = 10;
    a = a + b;
    saveShared(a);
    return a;
}

Thread B

main ()
{
    int a, b;
    a = getShared();
    b = 20;
    a = a - b;
    saveShared(a);
    return a;
}

shared memory

s = 40;
Using Locks

Thread A

```plaintext
main ()
{
  int a, b;
  a = getShared();
  b = 10;
  a = a + b;
  saveShared(a);
  return a;
}
```

Thread B

```plaintext
main ()
{
  int a, b;
  a = getShared();
  b = 20;
  a = a - b;
  saveShared(a);
  return a;
}
```
Using Locks

Thread A

```c
main ()
{
  int a, b;

  acquire(l);
  a = getShared();
  b = 10;
  a = a + b;
  saveShared(a);
  release(l);

  return a;
}
```

Thread B

```c
main ()
{
  int a, b;

  acquire(l);
  a = getShared();
  b = 20;
  a = a - b;
  saveShared(a);
  release(l);

  return a;
}
```

Lock Held by:
Nobody
Using Locks

Thread A

```c
main ()
{
    int a,b;

    acquire(l);
    a = getShared();
    b = 10;
    a = a + b;
    saveShared(a);
    release(l);

    return a;
}
```

Thread B

```c
main ()
{
    int a,b;

    acquire(l);
    a = getShared();
    b = 20;
    a = a - b;
    saveShared(a);
    release(l);

    return a;
}
```

`s = 40;
Lock l;
Lock held by:
    Thread A`
Using Locks

Thread A

```c
main ()
{
    int a, b;

    acquire(l);
    a = getShared();
    b = 10;
    a = a + b;
    saveShared(a);
    release(l);

    return a;
}
```

Thread B

```c
main ()
{
    int a, b;

    acquire(l);
    a = getShared();
    b = 20;
    a = a - b;
    saveShared(a);
    release(l);

    return a;
}
```

s = 40;
Lock 1;

Lock held by:
Thread A
Using Locks

Thread A

```
main ()
{
    int a, b;

    acquire(l);
    a = getShared();
    b = 10;
    a = a + b;
    saveShared(a);
    release(l);

    return a;
}
```

Thread B

```
main ()
{
    int a, b;

    acquire(l);
    a = getShared();
    b = 20;
    a = a - b;
    saveShared(a);
    release(l);

    return a;
}
```
Using Locks

Thread A

```c
main ()
{
    int a, b;

    acquire(l);
    a = getShared();
    b = 10;
    a = a + b;
    saveShared(a);
    release(l);

    return a;
}
```

Thread B

```c
main ()
{
    int a, b;

    acquire(l);
    a = getShared();
    b = 20;
    a = a - b;
    saveShared(a);
    release(l);

    return a;
}
```

Lock Held by: Nobody
Using Locks

Thread A

```c
main ()
{ int a,b;

    acquire(l);
    a = getShared();
    b = 10;
    a = a + b;
    saveShared(a);
    release(l);

    return a;
}
```

Thread B

```c
main ()
{ int a,b;

    acquire(l);
    a = getShared();
    b = 20;
    a = a - b;
    saveShared(a);
    release(l);

    return a;
}
```

Lock held by: Thread B

Shared memory

s = 40; Locked by Lock 1;
Using Locks

Thread A

```c
main ()
{ int a,b;

    acquire(l);
    a = getShared();
    b = 10;
    a = a + b;
    saveShared(a);
    release(l);

    return a;
}
```

Thread B

```c
main ()
{ int a,b;

    acquire(l);
    a = getShared();
    b = 20;
    a = a - b;
    saveShared(a);
    release(l);

    return a;
}
```

Lock Held by: Nobody
Using Locks

Thread A

```c
main ()
{
    int a,b;
    acquire(l);
    a = getShared();
    b = 10;
    a = a + b;
    saveShared(a);
    release(l);
    return a;
}
```

Thread B

```c
main ()
{
    int a,b;
    acquire(l);
    a = getShared();
    b = 20;
    a = a - b;
    saveShared(a);
    release(l);
    return a;
}
```

- No matter how we order threads or when we context switch, result will always be 30, like we expected (and probably wanted).