

Spin Locks

- Busy waiting (*spinning*) is injurious on mono-processors!
- On *multi-processors*, spinning may be faster than context switch
- If process holding lock is descheduled, spinning wastes CPU time
- Locks with *bounded spin* may be provided by OS.

Caveats of Low-level Sharing

- Consider `var x,y : int; x := 1; y := 2`
- *x* and *y* may not be assigned as expected:
 - The *compiler* may reorder the assignments
 - The *processor* may reorder the store instructions
 - The *memory system* may reorder the write operations
 - The *compiler/processor* may keep values in registers
- Proper ordering must be ensured by *synchronization instructions*

Java low-level memory model

- Access to variables (except long and double) is *atomic*
- Monitor entry/exit synchronize memory operations
- Access to `volatile` variables is always synchronized

Critical Regions with Shared Variables

Test-and-Set Solution

- Let $TS(\text{var } X) = \langle \text{var } r; (r, X) := (X, 1); \text{return } r \rangle$
- var** lock : int := 0;

<pre>process P₁ loop while TS(lock) = 1 do skip; critical section₁; lock := 0; noncritical section₁ end loop</pre>	<pre>process P₂ loop while TS(lock) = 1 do skip; critical section₂; lock := 0; noncritical section₂ end loop</pre>
---	---

Critical Regions with Shared Variables

Non-spinning Test-and-Set Solution

- Let $TS(\text{var } X) = \langle \text{var } r; (r, X) := (X, 1); \text{return } r \rangle$
- var** lock : int := 0; s : semaphore := 0;

<pre>process P₁ loop while TS(lock) = 1 do P(s); critical section₁; lock := 0; V(s) noncritical section₁ end loop</pre>	<pre>process P₂ loop while TS(lock) = 1 do P(s); critical section₂; lock := 0; V(s); noncritical section₂ end loop</pre>
--	---
- Uses at least one semaphore operation for each entry/exit
- Semaphore should be binary

Critical Regions with Shared Variables

Non-spinning Test-and-Set Attempt

- Let $TS(\text{var } X) = \langle \text{var } r; (r, X) := (X, 1); \text{return } r \rangle$
- $\text{var lock : int := 0; s : semaphore := 0; waiting : bool := false;}$

<pre>process P₁ loop while TS(lock) = 1 do {waiting := true; P(s)}; critical section₁; lock := 0; if waiting then {waiting := false; V(s)}; noncritical section₁ end loop</pre>	<pre>process P₂ loop while TS(lock) = 1 do {waiting := true; P(s)}; critical section₂; lock := 0; if waiting then {waiting := false; V(s)}; noncritical section₂ end loop</pre>
--	--
- Suffers from *race conditions*

Futex (Fast user-space mutual exclusion)

Idea

- Combine user-space atomic operations with OS-based blocking
- Atomic test and wait using *read-check-modify* principle

Data Type

- $\text{type futex} = \text{struct } \{ \underbrace{\text{val : int}}_{\text{userspace}}; \underbrace{\text{queue : condition_queue}}_{\text{kernelspace}} \}$
- Fields related by hash-table based *mapping*

Kernel operations

- $\text{wait_if_eq}(\text{var } f : \text{futex}, \text{old} : \text{int}) \triangleq \langle \text{if } f.\text{val} = \text{old} \text{ then wait}(f.\text{queue}) \rangle$
- $\text{wake}(\text{var } f : \text{futex}, n : \text{int}) \triangleq \langle \text{for } 1..n \text{ do signal}(f.\text{queue}) \rangle$

Futex Example: Critical Region

- Let $TS(\text{var } X) = \langle \text{var } r; (r, X) := (X, 1); \text{return } r \rangle$
 $INC(\text{var } x : \text{int}) = \langle x := x + 1; \text{return } x \rangle$
 $DEC(\text{var } x : \text{int}) = \langle x := x - 1; \text{return } x \rangle$
- var** f : futex; waiting : int := 0;
f.val := 0;
process P₁
 loop
 while TS(f.val) = 1 **do**
 {INC(waiting) ;
 wait_if_eq(f,1);
 DEC(waiting); }
 critical section₁;
 f.val := 0;
 if waiting > 0 **then** wake(f,1);
 noncritical section₁
 end loop
process P₂
 loop
 while TS(f.val) = 1 **do**
 {INC(waiting) ;
 wait_if_eq(f,1);
 DEC(waiting); }
 critical section₂;
 f.val := 0;
 if waiting > 0 **then** wake(f,1);
 noncritical section₂
 end loop