Process Synchronization

- Concurrent access to shared data may result in data inconsistency
 - Multiple threads in a single process
- Maintaining data consistency requires mechanisms to ensure the orderly execution of cooperating processes



Background

Suppose that we wanted to provide a solution to the consumer-producer problem that fills all the buffers. We can do so by having an integer *count* that keeps track of the number of full buffers. Initially, *count* is set to 0. It is incremented by the producer after it produces a new buffer and is decremented by the consumer after it consumes a buffer.



Producer/Consumer

```
Producer: while (true) {
      /* produce an item and put in nextProduced */
  while (count == BUFFER SIZE)
   ; // do nothing
   buffer [in] = nextProduced;
   in = (in + 1) \% BUFFER SIZE;
   count++;
Consumer:while (1) {
  while (count == 0)
   ; // do nothing
   nextConsumed = buffer[out];
   out = (out + 1) % BUFFER SIZE;
   count--;
   /* consume the item in nextConsumed */
```



Race Condition

count++ could be implemented as register1 = count register1 = register1 + 1 count = register1

count-- could be implemented as register2 = count register2 = register2 - 1 count = register2

Consider this execution interleaving with "count = 5" initially:

```
T0: producer execute register1 = count {register1 = 5}
T1: producer execute register1 = register1 + 1 {register1 = 6}
T2: consumer execute register2 = count {register2 = 5}
T3: consumer execute register2 = register2 - 1 {register2 = 4}
T4: producer execute count = register1 {count = 6}
```

T5: consumer execute count = register2 {count = 4}

After concurrent execution, count can be 4, 5 or 6



Critical section

- Segment of code where threads are updating common variables is called a critical section
- Solution is to force only one thread inside the critical section at any one time
- Define a section before critical section, called *entry* section and a section at the end called *end* section. We can implement mechanisms in the entry section that ensures that only one thread is inside the critical section. End section can then tell someone in entry section to continue.



Solution to Critical-Section Problem

- Solution must satisfy three requirements:
 - 1. Mutual Exclusion If process Pi is executing in its critical section, then no other processes can be executing in their critical sections
 - 2. Progress If no process is executing in its critical section and there exist some processes that wish to enter their critical section, then only those processes that are not executing in their remainder section can participate in the decision on which will enter its critical section next and this selection cannot be postponed indefinitely
 - 3. Bounded Waiting A bound must exist on the number of times that other processes are allowed to enter their critical sections after a process has made a request to enter its critical section and before that request is granted
 - Assume that each process executes at a nonzero speed
 - No assumption concerning relative speed of the N processes



Classic s/w soln: Peterson's Solution

- Restricted to two processes
- Assume that the LOAD and STORE instructions are atomic; that is, cannot be interrupted (not true for modern processors)
- The two threads share two variables:
 - int turn;
 - Boolean flag[2]
- The variable turn indicates whose turn it is to enter the critical section.
- The flag array is used to indicate if a process is ready to enter the critical section. flag[i] = true implies that process P_i is ready!



Algorithm for Process Pi

```
do {
    flag[i] = TRUE;
    turn = j;
    while ( flag[j] && turn == j);
        CRITICAL SECTION
    flag[i] = FALSE;
        REMAINDER SECTION
} while (TRUE);
```

- 1) Mutual exclusion because only way thread enter critical section when flag[j] == FALSE or turn == TRUE
- 2) Only way to enter section is by flipping flag[] inside loop
- 3) turn = j allows the other thread to make progress



Synchronization Hardware

- Many systems provide hardware support for critical section code
- Uniprocessors could disable interrupts
 - Currently running code would execute without preemption
 - Generally too inefficient on multiprocessor systems
 - Have to wait for disable to propagate to all processors
 - Operating systems using this not broadly scalable
- Modern machines provide special atomic hardware instructions
 - Atomic = non-interruptable
 - Either test memory word and set value
 - Or swap contents of two memory words



Solution using TestAndSet

Definition of TestAndSet: boolean TestAndSet (boolean *target) { boolean rv = *target; *target = TRUE; return rv: Shared boolean variable *lock*., initialized to false. Solution: do { while (TestAndSet (&lock)) ; /* do nothing // critical section *lock* = FALSE; // remainder section } while (TRUE);



Solution using Swap

Definition of Swap:
 void Swap (boolean *a, boolean *b) {
 boolean temp = *a;
 *a = *b;
 *b = temp:
 }

Shared Boolean variable *lock* initialized to FALSE; Each process has a local Boolean variable *key*.

```
Solution:
```

```
do {
    key = TRUE;
    while ( key == TRUE)
        Swap (&lock, &key );
        // critical section
    lock = FALSE;
        // remainder section
} while ( TRUE);
```



Solution with Test And Set and bounded

wait

boolean waiting[n]; boolean lock; initialized to false
Pi can enter critical section iff waiting[i] == false or key == false
do {

```
waiting[i] = TRUE;
    key = TRUE;
    while (waiting[i] && key)
         key = TestAndSet (&lock);
    waiting[i] = FALSE;
    // critical section
    i = (i + 1) \% n;
    while ((j != i) && !waiting[j])
         i = (i + 1) \% n;
    if (i == i)
         lock = FALSE;
    else
         waiting[i] = FALSE;
    // remainder section
} while (TRUE);
```

