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Review: Too Much Milk Solution #3
Here is a possible two-note solution:

Thread A
leave note A;
while (note B) {
X
if (noNote A) {
Y
do nothing;
}
if (noMilk) {
\X
buy milk;
\Y
}
if (noMilk) {
\X
buy milk;
\Y
}
remove note A;
}
remove note B;

Thread B
leave note B;
while (note A) {
X
if (noNote A) {
Y
buy milk;
}

Does this work? Yes. Both can guarantee that:
– It is safe to buy, or
– Other will buy, ok to quit

Solution #3 works, but it’s really unsatisfactory
– Really complex – even for this simple of an example
  » Hard to convince yourself that this really works
– A’s code is different from B’s – what if lots of threads?
  » Code would have to be slightly different for each thread
– While A is waiting, it is consuming CPU time
  » This is called “busy-waiting”

Recall: What is a Lock?
• Lock: prevents someone from doing something
  – Lock before entering critical section and
    before accessing shared data
  – Unlock when leaving, after accessing shared data
  – Wait if locked
    » Important idea: all synchronization involves waiting

• For example: fix the milk problem by putting a key on the refrigerator
  – Lock it and take key if you are going to go buy milk
  – Fixes too much: roommate angry if only wants OJ

Recall: Too Much Milk: Solution #4
• Suppose we have some sort of implementation of a lock
  – lock.Acquire() – wait until lock is free, then grab
  – lock.Release() – Unlock, waking up anyone waiting
  – These must be atomic operations – if two threads are waiting
    for the lock and both see it’s free, only one succeeds to grab
    the lock

• Then, our milk problem is easy:
milklock.Acquire();
if (nomilk)
  buy milk;
milklock.Release();

• Once again, section of code between Acquire() and
  Release() called a “Critical Section”

• Of course, you can make this even simpler: suppose you
  are out of ice cream instead of milk
  – Skip the test since you always need more ice cream ;-)
Recall: Implement Locks by Disabling Interrupts

- Key idea: maintain a lock variable and impose mutual exclusion only during operations on that variable

```c
int value = FREE;

Acquire() {
    disable interrupts;
    if (value == BUSY) {
        put thread on wait queue;
        Go to sleep();
        // Enable interrupts?
    } else {
        value = BUSY;
    }
    enable interrupts;
}

Release() {
    disable interrupts;
    if (anyone on wait queue) {
        take thread off wait queue
        Place on ready queue;
    } else {
        value = FREE;
    }
    enable interrupts;
}
```

- Note – Can easily have many locks
  – Use an array of values, for instance!

Recall: How to Re-enable After Sleep()?

- In scheduler, since interrupts are disabled when you call sleep:
  - Responsibility of the next thread to re-enable ints
  - When the sleeping thread wakes up, returns to acquire and re-enables interrupts

---

In-Kernel Lock: Simulation

```
INIT
int value = 0;

Acquire() {
    disable interrupts;
    if (value == 1) {
        put thread on wait queue;
        Go to sleep();
        //??
    } else {
        value = 1;
    }
    enable interrupts;
}

Release() {
    disable interrupts;
    if anyone on wait queue {
        take thread off wait queue
        Place on ready queue;
    } else {
        value = 0;
    }
    enable interrupts;
}
```

---

In-Kernel Lock: Simulation

```
INIT
int value = 0;

Acquire() {
    disable interrupts;
    if (value == 1) {
        put thread on wait queue;
        Go to sleep();
        //??
    } else {
        value = 1;
    }
    enable interrupts;
}

Release() {
    disable interrupts;
    if anyone on wait queue {
        take thread off wait queue
        Place on ready queue;
    } else {
        value = 0;
    }
    enable interrupts;
}
enum LockStatus { Acquire, Release };

struct Lock {
    int value;
    LockStatus lockStatus;
    list<Thread*> waitQueue;
};

void lock_acquire() {
    disable_interrupts();
    if (value == 1) {
        put_thread_on_wait_queue();
        go_to_sleep();
    } else {
        value = 1;
    }
    enable_interrupts();
}

void lock_release() {
    disable_interrupts();
    if (anyone_on_wait_queue()) {
        take_thread_off_wait_queue();
        Place_on_ready_queue();
    } else {
        value = 0;
    }
    enable_interrupts();
}

lock_acquire();
...critical section...
lock_release();
Recall: Multithreaded Server

- **Bounded** pool of worker threads
  - Allocated in **advance**: no thread creation overhead
  - **Queue** of pending requests

Simple Performance Model

- Given that the overhead of a critical section is $X$
  - User->Kernel Context Switch
  - Acquire Lock
  - Kernel->User Context Switch
  - <perform exclusive work>
  - User->Kernel Context Switch
  - Release Lock
  - Kernel->User Context Switch

- Even if everything else is infinitely fast, with any number of threads and cores
- What is the maximum rate of operations that involve this overhead?

Highly Contended Case – in a picture

- Time = $pX$ sec
- Rate = $1/X$ ops/sec, regardless of # cores

Back to system performance

More Practical Motivation

Back to Jeff Dean’s "Numbers everyone should know"

- $X = 1\text{ms} \Rightarrow 1,000 \text{ ops/sec}$
Uncontended Many-Lock Case

What if sys overhead is Y, even when the lock is free?
What if the OS can only handle one lock operation at a time?

A Better Lock Implementation

- Interrupt-based solution works for single core, but costly
  - Kernel crossings/system calls required for users
  - Disruption of interrupt handling (by disabling interrupts)
- Doesn't work well on multi-core machines
  - Disable intr on all cores?
- Solution: Utilize hardware support for **atomic operations**
  - Operations work on memory which is *shared* between cores and doesn't require system calls

Basic cost of a system call

- Min System call ~ 25x cost of function call
- Scheduling could be many times more
- Streamline system processing as much as possible
- Other optimizations seek to process as much of the call in user space as possible (eg, Linux vDSO)

Recall: Examples of Read-Modify-Write

- `testiset (address) { /* most architectures */
  result = M[address]; // return result from "address" and
  M[address] = 1; // set value at "address" to 1
  return result;
}
- `swap (address, register) { /* x86 */
  temp = M[address]; // swap register’s value to
  M[address] = register; // value at “address”
  register = temp;
}
- `compare&swap (address, reg1, reg2) { /* 68000 */
  if (reg1 == M[address]) { // If memory still == reg1,
    M[address] = reg2; // then put reg2 => memory
    return success;
  } else {
    // Otherwise do not change memory
    return failure;
  }
}
- `load-linked&store-conditional (&address) { /* R4000, alpha */
  loop:
    ll r1, M[address];
    movi r2, 1; // Can do arbitrary computation
    sc r2, M[address];
    beqz r2, loop;
  }

Recall: Implementing Locks with test&set

- Our first (simple!) cut at using atomic operations for locking:

  ```cpp
  int value = 0; // Free
  Acquire() {
    while (test&set(value)); // while busy
  }
  Release() {
    value = 0;
  }
  ```

- Simple explanation:
  - If lock is free, test&set reads 0 and sets value=1, so lock is now busy. It returns 0 so while exits.
  - If lock is busy, test&set reads 1 and sets value=1 (no change). It returns 1, so while loop continues.
  - When we set value = 0, someone else can get lock.

- Busy-Waiting: thread consumes cycles while waiting
  - This is not a good implementation for single core
  - For multiprocessors: every test&set() is a write, which makes value ping-pong around in cache (using lots of network BW)

Problem: Busy-Waiting for Lock

- Positives for this solution
  - Machine can receive interrupts
  - User code can use this lock
  - Works on a multiprocessor

- Negatives
  - This is very inefficient as thread will consume cycles waiting
  - Waiting thread may take cycles away from thread holding lock (no one wins!)
  - Priority Inversion: If busy-waiting thread has higher priority than thread holding lock ⇒ no progress!
  - Priority Inversion problem with original Martian rover

- Looking forward: For semaphores and monitors, waiting thread may wait for an arbitrary long time!
  - Thus even if busy-waiting was OK for locks, definitely not ok for other primitives
  - Homework/exam solutions should avoid busy-waiting!

Multiprocessor Spin Locks: test&test&set

- A better solution for multiprocessors:

  ```cpp
  int mylock = 0; // Free
  Acquire() {
    do {
      while (mylock); // Wait until might be free
    } while (test&set(&mylock)); // exit if get lock
  }
  Release() {
    mylock = 0;
  }
  ```

- Simple explanation:
  - Wait until lock might be free (only reading – stays in cache)
  - Then, try to grab lock with test&set
  - Repeat if fail to actually get lock

- Still have issues with this solution:
  - Busy-Waiting: thread still consumes cycles while waiting
    » However, it does not impact other processors!

Better Locks using test&set

- Can we build test&set locks without busy-waiting?
  - Can’t entirely, but can minimize!
  - Idea: only busy-wait to atomically check lock value

  ```cpp
  int guard = 0;
  int value = FREE;
  ```

  ```cpp
  Acquire() {
    // Short busy-wait time
    while (test&set(guard));
    if (value == BUSY) {
      put thread on wait queue;
      go to sleep() & guard = 0;
    } else {
      value = BUSY;
      guard = 0;
    }
  }
  ```

  ```cpp
  Release() {
    // Short busy-wait time
    while (test&set(guard));
    if anyone on wait queue {
      take thread off wait queue
      Place on ready queue;
    } else {
      value = FREE;
    }
  }
  ```

- Note: sleep has to be sure to reset the guard variable
  - Why can’t we do it just before or just after the sleep?
Recall: Locks using Interrupts vs. test&set

Compare to “disable interrupt” solution

```
int value = FREE;

Acquire() {
    disable interrupts;
    if (value == BUSY) {
        put thread on wait queue;
    Go to sleep();
    }
    value = BUSY;
}

Release() {
    enable interrupts;
}
```

Basically we replaced:
- disable interrupts → while (test&set(guard));
- enable interrupts → guard = 0;

Recap: Locks using interrupts

```
int value = 0;

Acquire() {
    disable interrupts;
    if (value == 1) {
        put thread on wait queue;
    Go to sleep() & guard = 0;
    }
    value = 1;
    guard = 0;
}

Release() {
    enable interrupts;
    if (anyone on wait queue) {
        take thread off wait queue;
    Place on ready queue;
    }
    value = 0;
    guard = 0;
}
```

If one thread in critical section, no other activity (including OS) can run!

Recap: Locks using test & set

```
int guard = 0;
int value = 0;

Acquire() {
    while(test&set(value));
}

Release() {
    value = 0;
}
```

Threads waiting to enter critical section busy-wait

Producer-Consumer with a Bounded Buffer

- Problem Definition
  - Producer(s) put things into a shared buffer
  - Consumer(s) take them out
  - Need synchronization to coordinate producer/consumer

- Don’t want producer and consumer to have to work in lockstep, so put a fixed-size buffer between them
  - Need to synchronize access to this buffer
  - Producer needs to wait if buffer is full
  - Consumer needs to wait if buffer is empty

- Example 1: GCC compiler
  - `cpp | cc1 | cc2 | as | ld`

- Example 2: Coke machine
  - Producer can put limited number of Cokes in machine
  - Consumer can’t take Cokes out if machine is empty

- Others: Web servers, Routers, ….
Circular Buffer Data Structure (sequential case)

```c
typedef struct buf {
    int write_index;
    int read_index;
    <type> *entries[BUFSIZE];
} buf_t;
```

- Insert: write & bump write ptr (enqueue)
- Remove: read & bump read ptr (dequeue)
- How to tell if Full (on insert) Empty (on remove)?
- And what do you do if it is?
- What needs to be atomic?

Circular Buffer – first cut

```c
mutex buf_lock = <initially unlocked>

Producer(item) {
    acquire(&buf_lock);
    while (buffer full) {}; // Wait for a free slot
    enqueue(item);
    release(&buf_lock);
}

Consumer() {
    acquire(&buf_lock);
    while (buffer empty) {}; // Wait for arrival
    item = dequeue();
    release(&buf_lock);
    return item
}
```

Will we ever come out of the wait loop?

Circular Buffer – 2nd cut

```c
mutex buf_lock = <initially unlocked>

Producer(item) {
    acquire(&buf_lock);
    while (buffer full) {unlock(&buf_lock); lock(&buf_lock);} 
    enqueue(item);
    release(&buf_lock);
}

Consumer() {
    acquire(&buf_lock);
    while (buffer empty) {unlock(&buf_lock); lock(&buf_lock);} 
    item = dequeue();
    release(&buf_lock);
    return item
}
```

Higher-level Primitives than Locks

- Goal of last couple of lectures:
  - What is right abstraction for synchronizing threads that share memory?
  - Want as high a level primitive as possible
- Good primitives and practices important!
  - Since execution is not entirely sequential, really hard to find bugs, since they happen rarely
  - UNIX is pretty stable now, but up until about mid-80s (10 years after started), systems running UNIX would crash every week or so – concurrency bugs
- Synchronization is a way of coordinating multiple concurrent activities that are using shared state
  - This lecture and the next presents a some ways of structuring sharing
Semaphores

- Semaphores are a kind of generalized lock
  - First defined by Dijkstra in late 60s
  - Main synchronization primitive used in original UNIX
- Definition: a Semaphore has a non-negative integer value and supports the following two operations:
  - P(): an atomic operation that waits for semaphore to become positive, then decrements it by 1
    » Think of this as the wait() operation
  - V(): an atomic operation that increments the semaphore by 1, waking up a waiting P, if any
    » This of this as the signal() operation
- Note that P() stands for "proberen" (to test) and V() stands for "verhogen" (to increment) in Dutch

Semaphores Like Integers Except

- Semaphores are like integers, except
  - No negative values
  - Only operations allowed are P and V – can’t read or write value, except to set it initially
  - Operations must be atomic
    » Two P’s together can’t decrement value below zero
    » Similarly, thread going to sleep in P won’t miss wakeup from V – even if they both happen at same time
- Semaphore from railway analogy
  - Here is a semaphore initialized to 2 for resource control:

Two Uses of Semaphores

Mutual Exclusion (initial value = 1)
- Also called “Binary Semaphore”.
- Can be used for mutual exclusion:
  - semaphore.P();
    // Critical section goes here
  - semaphore.V();

Scheduling Constraints (initial value = 0)
- Allow thread 1 to wait for a signal from thread 2
  - thread 2 schedules thread 1 when a given event occurs
- Example: suppose you had to implement ThreadJoin which must wait for thread to terminate:
  - Initial value of semaphore = 0
  - ThreadJoin {
      semaphore.P();
    }
  - ThreadFinish {
      semaphore.V();
    }

Revisit Bounded Buffer: Correctness constraints for solution

- Correctness Constraints:
  - Consumer must wait for producer to fill buffers, if none full (scheduling constraint)
  - Producer must wait for consumer to empty buffers, if all full (scheduling constraint)
  - Only one thread can manipulate buffer queue at a time (mutual exclusion)
- Remember why we need mutual exclusion
  - Because computers are stupid
  - Imagine if in real life: the delivery person is filling the machine and somebody comes up and tries to stick their money into the machine
- General rule of thumb:
  Use a separate semaphore for each constraint
  - Semaphore fullBuffers; // consumer’s constraint
  - Semaphore emptyBuffers; // producer’s constraint
  - Semaphore mutex; // mutual exclusion
Full Solution to Bounded Buffer

```plaintext
Semaphore fullSlots = 0;       // Initially, no coke
Semaphore emptySlots = bufsize; // Initially, num empty slots
Semaphore mutex = 1;           // No one using machine

Producer(item) {
    emptySlots.P();            // Wait until space
    mutex.P();                 // Wait until machine free
    Enqueue(item);
    mutex.V();
    fullSlots.V();             // Tell consumers there is
    // more coke
}

Consumer() {
    fullSlots.P();            // Check if there's a coke
    mutex.P();                // Wait until machine free
    item = Dequeue();
    mutex.V();                // Tell producer need more
    emptySlots.V();           // return item;
}
```

Discussion about Solution

- Why asymmetry?
  - Producer does: `emptyBuffer.P(), fullBuffer.V()`
  - Consumer does: `fullBuffer.P(), emptyBuffer.V()`

- Is order of P's important?
- Is order of V's important?
- What if we have 2 producers or 2 consumers?

Condition Variables

- How do we change the consumer() routine to wait until something is on the queue?
  - Could do this by keeping a count of the number of things on the queue (with semaphores), but error prone
- **Condition Variable**: a queue of threads waiting for something **inside** a critical section
  - Key idea: allow sleeping inside critical section by atomically releasing lock at time we go to sleep
  - Contrast to semaphores: Can't wait inside critical section
- Operations:
  - `Wait(&lock)`: Atomically release lock and go to sleep.
    Re-acquire lock later, before returning.
  - `Signal()`: Wake up one waiter, if any
  - `Broadcast()`: Wake up all waiters
- Rule: Must hold lock when doing condition variable ops!

Semaphores are good but...Monitors are better!

- Semaphores are a huge step up; just think of trying to do the bounded buffer with only loads and stores
- Problem is that semaphores are dual purpose:
  - They are used for both mutex and scheduling constraints
  - Example: the fact that flipping of P's in bounded buffer gives deadlock is not immediately obvious. How do you prove correctness to someone?
- Cleaner idea: Use **locks** for mutual exclusion and **condition variables** for scheduling constraints
- Definition: **Monitor**: a lock and zero or more condition variables for managing concurrent access to shared data
  - Some languages like Java provide this natively
  - Most others use actual locks and condition variables
- A "Monitor" is a paradigm for concurrent programming!
  - Some languages support monitors explicitly
**Monitor with Condition Variables**

- **Lock**: the lock provides mutual exclusion to shared data
  - Always acquire before accessing shared data
  - Always release after finishing with shared data
  - Lock initially free
- **Condition Variable**: a queue of threads waiting for something inside a critical section
  - Key idea: make it possible to go to sleep inside critical section by atomically releasing lock at time we go to sleep
  - Contrast to semaphores: Can't wait inside critical section

**Synchronized Buffer (with condition variable)**

Here is an (infinite) synchronized queue:

```c
lock buf_lock; // Initially unlocked
condition buf_CV; // Initially empty
queue queue;

Producer(item) {
    acquire(&buf_lock); // Get Lock
    enqueue(&queue,item); // Add item
    cond_signal(&buf_CV); // Signal any waiters
    release(&buf_lock); // Release Lock
}

Consumer() {
    acquire(&buf_lock); // Get Lock
    while (isEmpty(&queue)) {
        cond_wait(&buf_CV,&buf_lock); // If empty, sleep
        item = dequeue(&queue); // Get next item
        release(&buf_lock); // Release Lock
    }
    return(item);
}
```

**Mesa vs. Hoare monitors**

- Need to be careful about precise definition of signal and wait. Consider a piece of our dequeue code:
  ```c
  while (isEmpty(&queue)) {
      cond_wait(&buf_CV,&buf_lock); // If nothing, sleep
  }
  item = dequeue(&queue); // Get next item
  ```
  - Why didn't we do this?
  ```c
  if (isEmpty(&queue)) {
      cond_wait(&buf_CV,&buf_lock); // If nothing, sleep
  }
  item = dequeue(&queue); // Get next item
  ```
  - Answer: depends on the type of scheduling
  - Mesa-style: Named after Xerox-Park Mesa Operating System
    » Most OSes use Mesa Scheduling!
  - Hoare-style: Named after British logician Tony Hoare

**Hoare monitors**

- Signaler gives up lock, CPU to waiter; waiter runs immediately
- Then, Waiter gives up lock, processor back to signaler when it exits critical section or if it waits again

```c
acquire(&buf_lock);
... if (isEmpty(&queue)) {
    cond_wait(&buf_CV,&buf_lock);
    cond_wait(&buf_CV,&buf_lock);
...
    release(&buf_lock);
...
release(&buf_lock);
```

- On first glance, this seems like good semantics
  - Waiter gets to run immediately, condition is still correct!
- Most textbooks talk about Hoare scheduling
  - However, hard to do, not really necessary!
  - Forces a lot of context switching (inefficient!)
**Mesa monitors**

- Signaler keeps lock and processor
- Waiter placed on ready queue with no special priority

- Practically, need to check condition again after wait
  - By the time the waiter gets scheduled, condition may be false again – so, just check again with the "while" loop
- Most real operating systems do this!
  - More efficient, easier to implement
  - Signaler’s cache state, etc still good

```c
acquire(&buf_lock);
...
while (isEmpty(&queue)) {
  cond_wait(&buf_CV,&buf_lock);
}
...
lock.Release();
```

**Circular Buffer – 3rd cut (Monitors, pthread-like)**

```c
lock buf_lock = <initially unlocked>
condition producer_CV = <initially empty>
condition consumer_CV = <initially empty>

Producer(item) {
  acquire(&buf_lock);
  while (buffer full) { cond_wait(&producer_CV, &buf_lock); } enqueue(item);
  cond_signal(&consumer_CV);
  release(&buf_lock);
}

Consumer() {
  acquire(buf_lock);
  while (buffer empty) { cond_wait(&consumer_CV, &buf_lock); }
  item = dequeue();
  cond_signal(&producer_CV);
  release(buf_lock);
  return item
}
```

**Again: Why the while Loop?**

- MESA semantics
- For most operating systems, when a thread is woken up by signal(), it is simply put on the ready queue
- It may or may not reacquire the lock immediately!
  - Another thread could be scheduled first and "sneak in" to empty the queue
  - Need a loop to re-check condition on wakeup

**Readers/ Writers Problem**

- Motivation: Consider a shared database
  - Two classes of users:
    - Readers – never modify database
    - Writers – read and modify database
  - Is using a single lock on the whole database sufficient?
    - Like to have many readers at the same time
    - Only one writer at a time
Basic Readers/Writers Solution

• Correctness Constraints:
  – Readers can access database when no writers
  – Writers can access database when no readers or writers
  – Only one thread manipulates state variables at a time
• Basic structure of a solution:
  – Reader()
    Wait until no writers
    Access database
    Check out – wake up a waiting writer
  – Writer()
    Wait until no active readers or writers
    Access database
    Check out – wake up waiting readers or writer
  – State variables (Protected by a lock called "lock"):
    » int AR: Number of active readers; initially = 0
    » int WR: Number of waiting readers; initially = 0
    » int AW: Number of active writers; initially = 0
    » int WW: Number of waiting writers; initially = 0
    » Condition okToRead = NIL
    » Condition okToWrite = NIL

Code for a Reader

Reader() {
  // First check self into system
  acquire(&lock);
  while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
    WR++; // No. Writers exist
    cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
    WR--; // No longer waiting
  }
  AR++; // Now we are active!
  release(&lock);
  // Perform actual read-only access
  AccessDatabase(ReadOnly);
  // Now, check out of system
  acquire(&lock);
  if (AR == 0 && WW > 0) // No other active readers
    cond_signal(&okToWrite);// Wake up one writer
  release(&lock);
}

Code for a Writer

Writer() {
  // First check self into system
  acquire(&lock);
  while ((AW + AR) > 0) { // Is it safe to write?
    WW++; // No. Active users exist
    cond_wait(&okToWrite,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
    WW--; // No longer waiting
  }
  AW++; // Now we are active!
  release(&lock);
  // Perform actual read/write access
  AccessDatabase(ReadWrite);
  // Now, check out of system
  acquire(&lock);
  if (AR == 0 && WW > 0) // No other active readers
    cond_signal(&okToWrite);// Wake up one writer
  else if (WR > 0) { // Otherwise, wake reader
    cond_broadcast(&okToRead); // Wake all readers
  }
  release(&lock);
}

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

• Use an example to simulate the solution

• Consider the following sequence of operators:
  – R1, R2, W1, R3

• Initially: AR = 0, WR = 0, AW = 0, WW = 0
Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- R1 comes along (no waiting threads)
- AR = 0, WR = 0, AW = 0, WW = 0

```c
Reader() {
    acquire(&lock);
    while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
        WR++; // No. Writers exist
        cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock);// Sleep on cond var
        WR--; // No longer waiting
    }
    AR++; // Now we are active!
    release(&lock);
    AccessDBase(ReadOnly);acquire(&lock);
    AR--;if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
        cond_signal(&okToWrite);
    release(&lock);
}
```

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- AR = 1, WR = 0, AW = 0, WW = 0

```c
Reader() {
    acquire(&lock);
    while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
        WR++; // No. Writers exist
        cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock);// Sleep on cond var
        WR--; // No longer waiting
    }
    AR++; // Now we are active!
    release(&lock);
    AccessDBase(ReadOnly);acquire(&lock);
    AR--;if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
        cond_signal(&okToWrite);
    release(&lock);
}
```
Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

• R1 accessing dbase (no other threads)
• AR = 1, WR = 0, AW = 0, WW = 0

Reader()
{
    acquire(&lock);
    while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
        WR++;
        // No. Writers exist
        cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
        WR--; // No longer waiting
    }
    AR++; // Now we are active!
    release(&lock);

    AccessDBase(ReadOnly);
    acquire(&lock);
    AR--;
    if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
    
        cond_signal(&okToWrite);
        release(&lock);
}

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

• R2 comes along (R1 accessing dbase)
• AR = 1, WR = 0, AW = 0, WW = 0

Reader()
{
    acquire(&lock);
    while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
        WR++;
        // No. Writers exist
        cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
        WR--; // No longer waiting
    }
    AR++; // Now we are active!
    release(&lock);

    AccessDBase(ReadOnly);
    acquire(&lock);
    AR--;
    if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
    
        cond_signal(&okToWrite);
        release(&lock);
}

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

• R2 comes along (R1 accessing dbase)
• AR = 1, WR = 0, AW = 0, WW = 0

Reader()
{
    acquire(&lock);
    while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
        WR++;
        // No. Writers exist
        cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
        WR--; // No longer waiting
    }
    AR++; // Now we are active!
    release(&lock);

    AccessDBase(ReadOnly);
    acquire(&lock);
    AR--;
    if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
    
        cond_signal(&okToWrite);
        release(&lock);
}

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

• R2 comes along (R1 accessing dbase)
• AR = 2, WR = 0, AW = 0, WW = 0

Reader()
{
    acquire(&lock);
    while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
        WR++;
        // No. Writers exist
        cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
        WR--; // No longer waiting
    }
    AR++; // Now we are active!
    release(&lock);

    AccessDBase(ReadOnly);
    acquire(&lock);
    AR--;
    if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
    
        cond_signal(&okToWrite);
        release(&lock);
}
Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- R2 comes along (R1 accessing dbase)
  - AR = 2, WR = 0, AW = 0, WW = 0

Reader()

```c
acquire(&lock);
while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
    WR++; // No. Writers exist
    cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock);// Sleep on cond var
    WR--; // No longer waiting
}  
AR++; // Now we are active!
release(&lock);
AccessDBase(ReadOnly);
acquire(&lock);
AR--;if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
    cond_signal(&okToWrite);
release(&lock);
```

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- R1 and R2 accessing dbase
  - AR = 2, WR = 0, AW = 0, WW = 0

Reader()

```c
acquire(&lock);
while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
    WR++; // No. Writers exist
    cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock);// Sleep on cond var
    WR--; // No longer waiting
}  
AR++; // Now we are active!
release(&lock);
AccessDBase(ReadOnly);
acquire(&lock);
AR--;if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
    cond_signal(&okToWrite);
release(&lock);
```

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- W1 comes along (R1 and R2 are still accessing dbase)
  - AR = 2, WR = 0, AW = 0, WW = 0

Writer()

```c
acquire(&lock);
while ((AW + AR) > 0) { // Is it safe to write?
    WW++; // No. Active users exist
    cond_wait(&okToWrite,&lock);// Sleep on cond var
    WW--; // No longer waiting
} 
AW++;  
release(&lock);
AccessDBase(ReadWrite);
acquire(&lock);
AW--;if (WW > 0){
    cond_signal(&okToWrite);
} else if (WR > 0) {
    cond_broadcast(&okToRead);
}  
release(&lock);
```

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- W1 comes along (R1 and R2 are still accessing dbase)
  - AR = 2, WR = 0, AW = 0, WW = 0

Writer()

```c
acquire(&lock);
while ((AW + AR) > 0) { // Is it safe to write?
    WW++; // No. Active users exist
    cond_wait(&okToWrite,&lock);// Sleep on cond var
    WW--; // No longer waiting
} 
AW++;  
release(&lock);
AccessDBase(ReadWrite);
acquire(&lock);
AW--;if (WW > 0){
    cond_signal(&okToWrite);
} else if (WR > 0) {
    cond_broadcast(&okToRead);
}  
release(&lock);
```
Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- W1 comes along (R1 and R2 are still accessing database)
- AR = 2, WR = 0, AW = 0, WW = 1

```c
Writer() {
    acquire(&lock);
    while ((AW + AR) > 0) { // Is it safe to write?
        WW++; // No. Active users exist
        cond_wait(&okToWrite,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
        WW--; // No longer waiting
    }
    AW++;
    release(&lock);
    AccessDBase(ReadWrite);
    acquire(&lock);
    if (WW > 0) {cond_signal(&okToWrite);} else if (WR > 0) {cond_broadcast(&okToRead);} release(&lock);
}
```

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- R3 comes along (R1 and R2 accessing database, W1 waiting)
- AR = 2, WR = 0, AW = 0, WW = 1

```c
Reader() {
    acquire(&lock);
    while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
        WR++; // No. Writers exist
        cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
        WR--; // No longer waiting
    }
    AR++; // Now we are active!
    release(&lock);
    AccessDBase(ReadOnly);
    acquire(&lock);
    if (AR == 0 && WW > 0) {cond_signal(&okToWrite);} release(&lock);
}
```

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- R3 comes along (R1 and R2 accessing database, W1 waiting)
- AR = 2, WR = 0, AW = 0, WW = 1

```c
Reader() {
    acquire(&lock);
    while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
        WR++; // No. Writers exist
        cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
        WR--; // No longer waiting
    }
    AR++; // Now we are active!
    release(&lock);
    AccessDBase(ReadOnly);
    lock.Acquire();
    if (AR == 0 && WW > 0) {okToWrite.signal();}
    lock.Release();
}
```
Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

• R3 comes along (R1, R2 accessing dbase, W1 waiting)

    Reader() {
        lock.Acquire();
        while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
            WR++; // No. Writers exist
            cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock);// Sleep on cond var
            WR--; // No longer waiting
        }
        AR++; // Now we are active!
        lock.release();
        AccessDBase(ReadOnly);lock.Acquire();
        AR--;if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
            okToWrite.signal();
        lock.Release();
    }

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

• R1 and R2 accessing dbase, W1 and R3 waiting

    Reader() {
        acquire(&lock);
        while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
            WR++; // No. Writers exist
            cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock);// Sleep on cond var
            WR--; // No longer waiting
        }
        AR++; // Now we are active!
        release(&lock);
        AccessDBase(ReadOnly);
        acquire(&lock);
        AR--;if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
            okToWrite.signal();
        release(&lock);
    }

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

• R2 finishes (R1 accessing dbase, W1 and R3 waiting)

    Reader() {
        acquire(&lock);
        while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
            WR++; // No. Writers exist
            cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock);// Sleep on cond var
            WR--; // No longer waiting
        }
        AR++; // Now we are active!
        release(&lock);
        AccessDBase(ReadOnly);
        acquire(&lock);
        AR--;if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
            okToWrite.signal();
        release(&lock);
    }

Status:
• R1 and R2 still reading
• W1 and R3 waiting on okToWrite and okToRead, respectively

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

• R2 finishes (R1 accessing dbase, W1 and R3 waiting)

    Reader() {
        acquire(&lock);
        while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
            WR++; // No. Writers exist
            cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock);// Sleep on cond var
            WR--; // No longer waiting
        }
        AR++; // Now we are active!
        release(&lock);
        AccessDBase(ReadOnly);
        acquire(&lock);
        AR--;if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
            okToWrite.signal();
        release(&lock);
    }

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

• R2 finishes (R1 accessing dbase, W1 and R3 waiting)

    Reader() {
        acquire(&lock);
        while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
            WR++; // No. Writers exist
            cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock);// Sleep on cond var
            WR--; // No longer waiting
        }
        AR++; // Now we are active!
        release(&lock);
        AccessDBase(ReadOnly);
        acquire(&lock);
        AR--;if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
            okToWrite.signal();
        release(&lock);
    }
Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

• R2 finishes (R1 accessing dbase, W1 and R3 waiting)
• AR = 1, WR = 1, AW = 0, WW = 1

Reader()
acquire(&lock);
while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
  WR++; // No. Writers exist
  cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock);// Sleep on cond var
  WR--; // No longer waiting
}
AR++; // Now we are active!
release(&lock);
AccessDBase(ReadOnly);

acquire(&lock);
AR--; if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
  cond_signal(&okToWrite);
release(&lock);

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

• R2 finishes (R1 accessing dbase, W1 and R3 waiting)
• AR = 1, WR = 1, AW = 0, WW = 1

Reader()
acquire(&lock);
while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
  WR++; // No. Writers exist
  cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock);// Sleep on cond var
  WR--; // No longer waiting
}
AR++; // Now we are active!
release(&lock);
AccessDBase(ReadOnly);

acquire(&lock);
AR--; if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
  cond_signal(&okToWrite);
release(&lock);

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

• R1 finishes (W1 and R3 waiting)
• AR = 1, WR = 1, AW = 0, WW = 1

Reader()
acquire(&lock);
while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
  WR++; // No. Writers exist
  cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock);// Sleep on cond var
  WR--; // No longer waiting
}
AR++; // Now we are active!
release(&lock);
AccessDBase(ReadOnly);

acquire(&lock);
AR--; if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
  cond_signal(&okToWrite);
release(&lock);

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

• R1 finishes (W1, R3 waiting)
• AR = 0, WR = 1, AW = 0, WW = 1

Reader()
acquire(&lock);
while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
  WR++; // No. Writers exist
  cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock);// Sleep on cond var
  WR--; // No longer waiting
}
AR++; // Now we are active!
release(&lock);
AccessDBase(ReadOnly);

acquire(&lock);
AR--; if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
  cond_signal(&okToWrite);
release(&lock);
Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- R1 finishes (W1, R3 waiting)
- AR = 0, WR = 1, AW = 0, WW = 1

Reader()

```c
acquire(&lock);
while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
    WR++; // No. Writers exist
    cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
    WR--; // No longer waiting
}  
AR++; // Now we are active!
release(&lock);
AccessDBase(ReadOnly);
acquire(&lock);
AR--;if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
cond_signal(&okToWrite);
release(&lock);
```

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- W1 gets signal (R3 still waiting)
- AR = 0, WR = 1, AW = 0, WW = 1

Writer()

```c
acquire(&lock);
while ((AW + AR) > 0) { // Is it safe to write?
    WW++; // No. Active users exist
    cond_wait(&okToWrite,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
    WW--; // No longer waiting
}  
AW++;release(&lock);
AccessDBase(ReadWrite);
acquire(&lock);
AW--;if (WW > 0){
    cond_signal(&okToWrite);
} else if (WR > 0) {
    cond_broadcast(&okToRead);
} release(&lock);
```

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- W1 gets signal (R3 still waiting)
- AR = 0, WR = 1, AW = 0, WW = 0

Writer()

```c
acquire(&lock);
while ((AW + AR) > 0) { // Is it safe to write?
    WW++; // No. Active users exist
    cond_wait(&okToWrite,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
    WW--; // No longer waiting
}  
AW++;release(&lock);
AccessDBase(ReadWrite);
acquire(&lock);
AW--;if (WW > 0){
    cond_signal(&okToWrite);
} else if (WR > 0) {
    cond_broadcast(&okToRead);
} release(&lock);
```
Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- W1 gets signal (R3 still waiting)
- AR = 0, WR = 1, AW = 1, WW = 0

Writer() {
    acquire(&lock);
    while ((AW + AR) > 0) {
        // Is it safe to write?
        WW++; // No. Active users exist
        cond_wait(&okToWrite,&lock);// Sleep on cond var
        WW--; // No longer waiting
    }
    AW++;release(&lock);
    AccessDBase(ReadWrite);
    acquire(&lock);
    AW--;if (WW > 0){cond_signal(&okToWrite);} else if (WR > 0) {cond_broadcast(&okToRead);}release(&lock);
}

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- W1 accessing dbase (R3 still waiting)
- AR = 0, WR = 1, AW = 1, WW = 0

Writer() {
    acquire(&lock);
    while ((AW + AR) > 0) {
        // Is it safe to write?
        WW++; // No. Active users exist
        cond_wait(&okToWrite,&lock);// Sleep on cond var
        WW--; // No longer waiting
    }
    AW++;release(&lock);
    AccessDBase(ReadWrite);
    acquire(&lock);
    AW--;if (WW > 0){cond_signal(&okToWrite);} else if (WR > 0) {cond_broadcast(&okToRead);}release(&lock);
}

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- W1 finishes (R3 still waiting)
- AR = 0, WR = 1, AW = 0, WW = 0

Writer() {
    acquire(&lock);
    while ((AW + AR) > 0) {
        // Is it safe to write?
        WW++; // No. Active users exist
        okToWrite.wait(&lock);// Sleep on cond var
        WW--; // No Longer waiting
    }
    AW++;release(&lock);
    AccessDBase(ReadWrite);
    acquire(&lock);
    AW--;if (WW > 0){cond_signal(&okToWrite);} else if (WR > 0) {cond_broadcast(&okToRead);}release(&lock);
}

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- W1 finishes (R3 still waiting)
- AR = 0, WR = 1, AW = 0, WW = 0

Writer() {
    acquire(&lock);
    while ((AW + AR) > 0) {
        // Is it safe to write?
        WW++; // No. Active users exist
        okToWrite.wait(&lock);// Sleep on cond var
        WW--; // No Longer waiting
    }
    AW++;release(&lock);
    AccessDBase(ReadWrite);
    acquire(&lock);
    AW--;if (WW > 0){cond_signal(&okToWrite);} else if (WR > 0) {cond_broadcast(&okToRead);}release(&lock);
Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- W1 finishes (R3 still waiting)
  - AR = 0, WR = 1, AW = 0, WW = 0

Writer() {
    acquire(&lock);
    while ((AW + AR) > 0) { // Is it safe to write?
        WW++; // No. Active users exist
        cond_wait(&okToWrite,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
        WW--; // No longer waiting
    }
    AW++;
    release(&lock);

    AccessDBase(ReadWrite);
    acquire(&lock);
    if (WW > 0) { cond_signal(&okToWrite); }
    else if (WR > 0) { cond_broadcast(&okToRead); }
    release(&lock);}

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- R3 gets signal (no waiting threads)
  - AR = 0, WR = 1, AW = 0, WW = 0

Reader() {
    acquire(&lock);
    while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
        WR++; // No. Writers exist
        cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
        WR--; // No longer waiting
    }
    AR++; // Now we are active!
    release(&lock);

    AccessDBase(ReadOnly);
    acquire(&lock);
    if (AR == 0 && WW > 0) { cond_signal(&okToWrite); }
    release(&lock);}

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- W1 signaling readers (R3 still waiting)
  - AR = 0, WR = 1, AW = 0, WW = 0

Writer() {
    acquire(&lock);
    while ((AW + AR) > 0) { // Is it safe to write?
        WW++; // No. Active users exist
        cond_wait(&okToWrite,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
        WW--; // No longer waiting
    }
    AW++;
    release(&lock);

    AccessDBase(ReadWrite);
    acquire(&lock);
    if (WW > 0) { cond_signal(&okToWrite); }
    else if (WR > 0) { cond_broadcast(&okToRead); }
    release(&lock);}

Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

- R3 gets signal (no waiting threads)
  - AR = 0, WR = 0, AW = 0, WW = 0

Reader() {
    acquire(&lock);
    while ((AW + WW) > 0) { // Is it safe to read?
        WR++; // No. Writers exist
        cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
        WR--; // No longer waiting
    }
    AR++; // Now we are active!
    release(&lock);

    AccessDBase(ReadOnly);
    acquire(&lock);
    if (AR == 0 && WW > 0) { cond_signal(&okToWrite); }
    release(&lock);}
Simulation of Readers/Writers Solution

• AR = 1, WR = 0, AW = 0, WW = 0

Reader()

acquire(&lock);

while ((AW + WW) > 0) {
    WR++;  // No. Writers exist
    cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
    WR--;  // No longer waiting
}

AR++; // Now we are active!
release(&lock);

AccessDBase(ReadOnly);

acquire(&lock);

AR--; if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
    cond_signal(&okToWrite);
release(&lock);

Questions

• Can readers starve? Consider Reader() entry code:

```c
while ((AW + WW) > 0) {
    WR++;  // No. Writers exist
    cond_wait(&okToRead,&lock); // Sleep on cond var
    WR--;  // No longer waiting
}
```

• What if we erase the condition check in Reader exit?

```c
AR--; // Now we are active!
if (AR == 0 && WW > 0)
    cond_signal(&okToWrite);
release(&lock);
```

• Further, what if we turn the signal() into broadcast()

```c
AR--; // No longer active
cond_broadcast(&okToWrite); // Wake up sleepers
```

• Finally, what if we use only one condition variable (call it “okContinue”) instead of two separate ones?
  – Both readers and writers sleep on this variable
  – Must use broadcast() instead of signal()
What if we turn okToWrite and okToRead into okContinue (i.e. use only one condition variable instead of two)?

Consider this scenario:
- R1 arrives
- W1, R2 arrive while R1 still reading → W1 and R2 wait for R1 to finish
- Assume R1's signal is delivered to R2 (not W1)

Need to change to broadcast()!

Must broadcast() to sort things out!
Construction of Monitors from Semaphores (con't)

• Problem with previous try:
  – P and V are commutative – result is the same no matter what order they occur
  – Condition variables are NOT commutative
• Does this fix the problem?
  Wait(Lock lock) {
    lock.Release();
    semaphore.P();
    lock.Acquire();
  }
  Signal() {
    if semaphore queue is not empty
      semaphore.V();
  }
  – Not legal to look at contents of semaphore queue
  – There is a race condition – signaler can slip in after lock release and before waiter executes semaphore.P()
• It is actually possible to do this correctly
  – Complex solution for Hoare scheduling in book
  – Can you come up with simpler Mesa-scheduled solution?

Monitor Conclusion

• Monitors represent the logic of the program
  – Wait if necessary
  – Signal when change something so any waiting threads can proceed
• Basic structure of monitor-based program:
  lock
  while (need to wait) {
    condvar.wait();
  }
  unlock
  do something so no need to wait
  lock
  condvar.signal();
  unlock

C-Language Support for Synchronization

• C language: Pretty straightforward synchronization
  – Just make sure you know all the code paths out of a critical section
    int Rtn() {
      lock.acquire();
      ...if (exception) {
        lock.release();
        return errReturnCode;
      }
      ...
      lock.release();
      return OK;
    }
  – Watch out for setjmp/longjmp!
    » Can cause a non-local jump out of procedure
    » In example, procedure E calls longjmp, popping stack back to procedure B
    » If Procedure C had lock.acquire, problem!

C++ Language Support for Synchronization

• Languages with exceptions like C++
  – Languages that support exceptions are problematic (easy to make a non-local exit without releasing lock)
  – Consider:
    void Rtn() {
      lock.acquire();
      ...
      DoFoo();
      ...
      lock.release();
    }
    void DoFoo() {
      ...
      if (exception) throw errException;
      ...
    }
  – Notice that an exception in DoFoo() will exit without releasing the lock!
C++ Language Support for Synchronization (con’t)

• Must catch all exceptions in critical sections
  – Catch exceptions, release lock, and re-throw exception:
    ```
    void Rtn() {
      lock.acquire();
      try {
        ...DoFoo();
      } catch (...) { // catch exception
        lock.release(); // release lock
        throw; // re-throw the exception
      }
      lock.release();
    }
    void DoFoo() {
      ...if (exception) throw errException;
    }
      » Can deallocate/free lock regardless of exit method
    ```

Java Language Support for Synchronization

• Java has explicit support for threads and thread synchronization
  • Bank Account example:
    ```
    class Account {
      private int balance;
      public Account (int initialBalance) {
        balance = initialBalance;
      }
      public synchronized int getBalance() {
        return balance;
      }
      public synchronized void deposit(int amount) {
        balance += amount;
      }
    }
    – Every object has an associated lock which gets automatically acquired and released on entry and exit from a synchronized method.
    ```

Java Language Support for Synchronization (con’t)

• Java also has synchronized statements:
  ```
  synchronized (object) {
    ...
  }
  – Since every Java object has an associated lock, this type of statement acquires and releases the object’s lock on entry and exit of the body
  – Works properly even with exceptions:
    synchronized (object) {
      ...DoFoo();
      ...
    }
    void DoFoo() {
      throw errException;
    }
  ```

Java Language Support for Synchronization (con’t 2)

• In addition to a lock, every object has a single condition variable associated with it
  – How to wait inside a synchronization method of block:
    » void wait(long timeout); // Wait for timeout
    » void wait(long timeout, int nanoseconds); //variant
    » void wait();
  – How to signal in a synchronized method or block:
    » void notify(); // wakes up oldest waiter
    » void notifyAll(); // like broadcast, wakes everyone
  – Condition variables can wait for a bounded length of time. This is useful for handling exception cases:
    t1 = time.now();
    while (!ATMRequest()) {
      wait (CHECKPERIOD);
      t2 = time.now();
      if (t2 - t1 > LONG_TIME) checkMachine();
    }
  – Not all Java VMs equivalent!
    » Different scheduling policies, not necessarily preemptive!
Summary (1/2)

• Important concept: Atomic Operations
  – An operation that runs to completion or not at all
  – These are the primitives on which to construct various synchronization primitives

• Talked about hardware atomicity primitives:
  – Disabling of Interrupts, test&set, swap, compare&swap, load-locked & store-conditional

• Showed several constructions of Locks
  – Must be very careful not to waste/tie up machine resources
    » Shouldn’t disable interrupts for long
    » Shouldn’t spin wait for long
  – Key idea: Separate lock variable, use hardware mechanisms to protect modifications of that variable

Summary (2/2)

• Semaphores: Like integers with restricted interface
  – Two operations:
    » P(): Wait if zero; decrement when becomes non-zero
    » V(): Increment and wake a sleeping task (if exists)
    » Can initialize value to any non-negative value
  – Use separate semaphore for each constraint

• Monitors: A lock plus one or more condition variables
  – Always acquire lock before accessing shared data
  – Use condition variables to wait inside critical section
    » Three Operations: Wait(), Signal(), and Broadcast()

• Monitors represent the logic of the program
  – Wait if necessary
  – Signal when change something so any waiting threads can proceed