Threads (Chapter 11)

- Process -- Program, Memory (text, data, bss, heap, stack), execution
  - stack - directly linked to execution
  - function call frame, on the stack
- CPU -- execution "engine"
- Early computers: one CPU, memory ...
  - Shared computing, multiple processes on one CPU
  - Typical use: round robin, quantum
- Mid 1970s -- Big Iron (cray 1) down to microprocessors (intel 8080)
- Idea at that point: Elephant (one big CPU) vs army of ants (microprocessors)
- Parallel Computing -- army of ants, each ant ran "sequential"
- Now: One "box", multiple CPUs (10s/box), one big memory
  - Possibility of having multiple execution points inside one process
- Concurrency -- multiple execution points inside one process
  - But, not new, used in 1980 (and possibly earlier)
- At UW: simulate 4096 CPUs on a single CPU?
  - Multiple threads of control in one process
  - Multiple stacks (one for each thread of control)
  - Round-robin the threads
What is the difference between these ideas?

☐ Nelson’s definitions -- may not be accepted industry wide, but ...

☐ Concurrency -- Multiple threads of control in a single process

☐ Parallel -- A collection of processes, running on a collection of CPUs, cooperating to solve a single problem. CPUs geographically close (e.g. same room or building.)

☐ Distributed -- A collection of CPUs, most likely geographically distributed, providing services for a variety of uses. e.g. google

Note: Concurrency can be used without multiple CPUs. Parallel and Distributed can’t work on a single CPU.

☐ Concurrency can be very useful with a GUI, one thread per visual element.

Threads -- concurrency mechanism

☐ Note: threads can be useful in the parallel and distributed processes.

☐ Early Threads:
   ☐ User space (OS didn’t know anything about them)

☐ Now:
   ☐ Thread packages, language features, OS support
Basic Thread Ideas

- Single process, multiple threads (stack and execution)
- Can simplify code for asynchronous code (e.g. GUI)
- Threads can share global or heap memory. (Typically not stack)
  - Process can share memory, but it is more difficult. (ch 15 & 17)
- With multiple CPUs available, "clock" time can be reduced.
- Interactive programs can "spawn CPU intensive tasks on a thread" and come back to user quickly.
- Threads are useful even on a uniprocessor.
  - Simulation example
  - GUI example
  - Issue of blocked vs running threads
    - With OS support, blocked threads don’t block other threads

Thread consists of:

- Stack (local variables in functions, call sequence)
- CPU registers (PC, status, ...)
- "Thread Local Storage" -- Global to thread, Local in process
  - errno -- two threads calling a system call at the same time
- Shares the rest of the process ... pid, CWD, files, heap, ...
PTThreads -- POSIX threads

A thread library defined by the POSIX group (POSIX.1-2001)

- Various implementations have been done.
- Need a thread ID ... but may be a struct ... so
  - int pthread_equal (pthread_t tid1, pthread_t pid2);
    - compare two threads, return non-zero => equal, 0 is not equal
- pthread_t pthread_self(void);
  - Gets the current thread id.

Thread Creation

- Program after execxx() starts as a single thread program.
- Threaded program then starts threads
  - int pthread_create(pthread_t *thread, const pthread_attr_t *attr,
    void *(start_routine) (void *), void *arg);
    - thread -- pointer to a pthread_t variable
    - attr -- May be NULL (more later)
    - start_routine -- pointer to thread’s "main" function
    - arg -- pointer passed to the start routine
  - See pth-id.c: a program to print the "thread id"
Thread Termination & Joining

- Any thread calling exit(3) or _exit(2) exits the process and kills all threads
- A default action signal that terminates will terminate the entire process
- Single thread "exit" terminates only calling thread
  - void pthread_exit (void *rval_ptr)
    - may return a pointer
  - "start routine" can just return and return value is pthread_exit parameter
- "Joining a thread"
  - Similar to a wait(), but for a thread
    - int pthread_join(pthread_t thread, void **retval);
      - Calling thread blocks if "thread" is still running
      - After "thread" returns, calls pthread_exit() or is canceled, returns from join
        - PTHREAD_CANCELED is a possible return value
    - return value is 0 for success, non-zero is an error number
      - EDEADLK - mutual joins or join calling thread
      - EINVAL - thread already joined or process waiting to join
      - ESRCH - no thread with that ID
    - Do not return pointers to local variables ... "automatic variable mis-use"
    - Joined thread reclaims the resources of the thread
Other Calls

- **int pthread_cancel(pthread_t thread);**
  - Causes thread to terminate as if it did pthread_exit(PTHREAD_CANCELED)

- **void pthread_cleanup_push(void (*routine)(void *), void *arg);**
  - schedules a thread to be run at pthread_exit or pthread_cancel time
  - adds "routine" to a stack of routines for the calling thread

- **void pthread_cleanup_pop(int execute);**
  - pops the top routine off the thread’s cleanup stack, not run if execute is 0

- **int pthread_detach(pthread_t thread);**
  - sets the thread to be "un-joinable" and automatically reclaims resources at thread exit
  - pthread_join() on this thread will return an error
Thread Synchronization

Race conditions happen even easier in threads
□ Consider pth-race.c
□ What happens?
□ Why does that happen?
□ What about "read only" variables?
□ How can you fix it?
□ Critical section -- section of code that must happen "atomically" -- no interruption of the process
□ Software -- Peterson’s solution
  □ Turn based approach -- but works only for two threads
□ Hardware assist approaches:
  □ Mutex -- Mutual Exclusion
  □ int mutex = 0;
    while (test_and_set(&mutex) == 1) /* spin */;
    critical-section;
  mutex = 0;
□ Problem -- busy wait.
□ Solution -- have the OS block the thread until it can enter the critical section.
Mutex -- solution for mutual access to a shared variable

Mutex -- a lock to block access to a critical section

- one thread in the critical section at a time
- all access to shared variable covered by a mutex

- Pthreads -- need to initialize it:
  ```c
  int pthread_mutex_init(pthread_mutex_t * mutex, const pthread_mutexattr_t * attr);
  ```
  - `pthread_mutexattr_t *` may be NULL for standard attributes

- When done, the mutex may be destroyed
  ```c
  int pthread_mutex_destroy(pthread_mutex_t *mutex);
  ```
  - no need to destroy if calling exit

- Entry to critical section -- lock, block if held
  ```c
  int pthread_mutex_lock(pthread_mutex_t *mutex);
  ```
  - return value 0 if successful, should check

- Non-blocking try to lock
  ```c
  int pthread_mutex_trylock(pthread_mutex_t *mutex);
  ```
  - Error if locked, errno is EBUSY

- Exit to critical section -- unlock and let others in
  ```c
  int pthread_mutex_unlock(pthread_mutex_t *mutex);
  ```
Static initialization of a mutex

```c
pthread_mutex_t mutex = PTHREAD_MUTEX_INITIALIZER;
```

Typical code outline:

```c
if (pthread_mutex_lock(&mutexvar)) {
    /* Error condition */
} else {
    /* critical section */
    if (pthread_mutex_unlock(&mutexvar)) {
        /* error condition */
    }
}
```

Critical section should be

- as short as possible
- have no loops unless absolutely necessary
- never block in the critical section

See pth-mutex.c
Mutex issues

- Deadlock -- circular waiting
  - `dsh`: child blocked writing to pipe, parent waiting on child
  - `mutex`: tries to lock a mutex already held
- Multiple mutexes:
  - `A` holds `M1`, tries for `M2` (blocked)
  - `B` holds `M2`, tries for `M1` (blocked)
- Longer chains of holding and waiting with circular wait are possible

Avoid deadlocks with a mutex lock ordering

- Can't order? Use `pthread_mutex_trylock` and don't block
Problem: Readers and Writers

- Shared Data Structure ... e.g. Balanced Binary Tree
- Reader threads -- doing lookups in the tree
- Writer threads -- doing inserts into the tree

Problems?
- race without mutex protection
- problem here?
  - two readers can share at the same time with no race
  - writers need exclusive access, can’t share with readers

Solution?
- A new kind of a lock: A read-write lock
- Two kinds of locking:
  - read_lock -- I promise to only read
  - write_lock -- I will modify data, need exclusive access
- read_lock: allows locking if lock is read locked
  - blocks if write lock held
  - typically blocks if thread waiting to write lock
- write_lock: blocks until all locks (both read and write) are unlocked
Pthread reader-writer locks

- **reader/writer lock initialization**
  
  ```c
  int pthread_rwlock_init(pthread_rwlock_t * lock, const pthread_rwlockattr_t * attr);
  pthread_rwlock_t lock = PTHREAD_RWLOCK_INITIALIZER;
  ```

- **reader/writer lock destruction**
  
  ```c
  int pthread_rwlock_destroy(pthread_rwlock_t *lock);
  ```

- **reader/writer locks/unlock routines**
  
  ```c
  int pthread_rwlock_rdlock(pthread_rwlock_t *lock);
  int pthread_rwlock_wrlock(pthread_rwlock_t *lock);
  int pthread_rwlock_unlock(pthread_rwlock_t *lock);
  int pthread_rwlock_tryrdlock(pthread_rwlock_t *lock);
  int pthread_rwlock_trywrlock(pthread_rwlock_t *lock);
  ```

  0 return if OK, error number on failure

- **Read man pages for full information**
Bounded Buffer Problem

- multiple "producers", produce item, add it to shared queue
- multiple "consumers", grab an item from the shared queue and "consume it"
- shared queue has a shared size N
- How does this get synchronized?

Semaphores

- A more robust tool
- Core implementation: A semaphore is an integer variable S with atomic operations
  
  ```
  wait(S) { while (S <= 0) /* wait */;  S--;  }
  signal(S) { S++; }
  ```

- Original names by E.W. Dijkstra were P() and V() ... proberen and verhogen

- Kinds of semaphores: Binary (0,1) and Counting (0,1,2,3,...,n)

- Issue: busy waiting

- Can provide Mutex (e.g. binary semaphore is essentially a mutex)

- Can provide other synchronization solutions, wait for another process
  
  ```
  t1:  S1;
  t2:  wait(S);
  signal(S);
  S2;
  ```
Semaphore implementations

- Issue of busy waiting ...
- Instead of busy waiting, a process could block (give up the CPU)
- Consider the following implementation, each function "atomic"

```c
typedef struct {  int value; struct process *list; } semaphore;

void wait (semaphore *S) {
  S->value--;
  if (S->value < 0) {
    add process to S->list;
    block()
  }
}

void signal (semaphore *S) {
  S->value++;
  if (S->value <= 0) {
    remove a process P from S->list;
    wakeup(P);
  }
}
```
Solution of bounded buffer problem:

Queue of size N:
Semaphore  empty = N, Semaphore  full = 0, Semaphore  mutex = 1

producer:
    while true
        produce item
        wait(&empty)
        wait(&mutex)
        wait(&mutex)
        Add item to Queue
        signal(&mutex)
        signal(&mutex)
        signal(&full)

Consumer:
    while true
        wait(&full)
        wait(&mutex)
        wait(&mutex)
        delete item from Queue
        signal(&mutex)
        signal(&mutex)
        signal(&empty)
Issues with semaphores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P0</th>
<th>P1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wait(S)</td>
<td>wait(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wait(Q)</td>
<td>wait(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signal(S)</td>
<td>signal(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signal(Q)</td>
<td>signal(S)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

□ Issue?
□ Deadlock ... P0 gets S and waits on Q, P1 gets Q and waits on S
□ Easy to get with semaphores if not careful
□ Programs have to be written correctly
□ Programmers have to write correct synchronization code
□ Consider:
  
  ```
  wait(S);
  ...
  critical section ...
  ...
  wait(S);
  ```

□ To help "fix" these issues, language designers have added constructs to languages
Monitors

- Monitors -- an object-based synchronization construct
  
  ```javascript
  monitor name {
    // shared variable definitions
    function f1(args) { .... with access to shared vars and arguments only.... } 
    function f2(args) { .... with access to shared vars and arguments only.... }
  
  ... 
  
  initialization (...) { .... }
  }
  ```

- Functions in the monitor all run with mutual exclusion
- Shared vars may be accessed only by functions in the monitor
- Programmer does not need to code mutual exclusion
- Needs something more for full synchronization, e.g., bounded buffer
  - Need to wait in a method for some condition to be true
  - Don’t want to block other threads from entering
condition variables -- "condition x;"

Operations:
- `x.wait()` -- blocks the process in the monitor
- `x.signal()` -- restarts one process blocked
  - no blocked processes? no-op
- `x.broadcast()` -- restarts all processes blocked

Issues:
- call to `x.signal()` -- who runs?
  - caller waits
  - signaled waits
- compromise for Concurrent Pascal: signaler must exit

A number of languages have implemented monitors

Path Pascal -- a slightly different approach
- Object, functions, specification of order/number of operations
  - path 1:(a,b) , n:(a;b) end
    - 1:(a,b) -- a and b need mutual exclusion
    - n:(a;b) -- an a must run before b, at most n more as than bs
Condition variables and Pthreads

Pthreads have condition variables ... but monitors!

- Functions for condition variables in Pthreads
  
  ```c
  int pthread_cond_init(pthread_cond_t * restrict cond, const pthread_condattr_t * restrict attr);
  or declaration init: pthread_cond_t cond = PTHREAD_COND_INITIALIZER;
  int pthread_cond_destroy(pthread_cond_t *cond);
  int pthread_cond_broadcast(pthread_cond_t *cond);
  int pthread_cond_signal(pthread_cond_t *cond); // May be implemented as broadcast!
  int pthread_cond_wait(pthread_cond_t * restrict cond, pthread_mutex_t * restrict mutex);
  int pthread_cond_timedwait(pthread_cond_t * restrict cond, pthread_mutex_t * restrict mutex,
                             const struct timespec * restrict abstime);
  ```

- Use?

  - Must be used in conjunction with mutexes
    
    ```c
    pthread_mutex_lock(&mutex)
    while (something requires us to wait) {
        pthread_cond_wait (&condvar,&mutex);
    }
    critical section
    pthread_mutex_unlock(&mutex)
    ```
Condition variables and Pthreads (page 2)

- **wait code again**
  ```c
  pthread_mutex_lock(&mutex)
  while (something requires us to wait) {
    pthread_cond_wait (&condvar,&mutex);
  }
  critical section
  pthread_mutex_unlock(&mutex)
  ```

- **While needed due to possibility signal is implemented as broadcast**

- **Signal/Broadcast code**
  ```c
  pthread_mutex_lock(&mutex)
  critical section
  pthread_cond_signal(&condvar)
  pthread_mutex_unlock(&mutex)
  ```

- **want to signal and exit (like required for in some languages)**

- **Best implementations**
  - "implement a monitor in C, mymonitor.h/.c"
  - Other parts of program just call the functions"
Dining philosophers -- another classic synchronization problem

- 5 philosophers
- jobs: eat & think (over and over, ....)
- seated at a round table
- one plate in front of each philosopher
- one fork in between plates
- philosopher needs two forks to eat

How do you synchronize access to the forks?

- status [5] -- THINKING, HUNGRY, EATING
- condition [f] -- to wait for all forks
- check_forks(p) -- if hungry(p) and +/- not eating then set status to EATING, signal(p)
- pickupForks(p) -- monitor routine
  - status[p] = HUNGRY, check_forks(p), if status[p] != EATING, wait(p)
- putdownForks(p) -- another monitor routine
  - status[p] = THINKING, check_forks(-), check_forks(+)
Banking Example

- Customer Accounts and transactions (customer/account the thread)
  - Deposits -- simple
  - Check/Withdrawals -- simple
  - Transfers --- ?
    - Synchronize from and to accounts
  - Rendezvous
    - Implemented as part of several languages, Ada is one of them
    - How to implement in Pthreads?
Barriers -- multi-thread synchronization

All thread need to wait for slowest thread?
- Use a "barrier" -- all threads have to stop at same time until all are stopped
- Implementation with a condition variable (and mutex)?
- Pthread version:
  ```c
  int pthread_barrier_init(pthread_barrier_t * restrict barrier, const pthread_barrierattr_t * restrict attr,
                          unsigned int count);
  int pthread_barrier_destroy(pthread_barrier_t *barrier);
  int pthread_barrier_wait(pthread_barrier_t *barrier);
  ```
  - 0 return -> successful
  ```c
  int pthread_barrier_destroy(pthread_barrier_t *barrier);
  ```
- 0 return -> successful
- 0 => successful for all but one, one gets PTHREAD_BARRIER_SERIAL_THREAD
- "thread may be used to update shared data."

Parallel version across multiple machines
- Issues of speed across a barrier -- as few barriers as possible!
- Tree -- across multiple machines / or even on a GPU ...
- Sequential is BAD
Amdahl’s Law

- Sequential part of a problem dictates limit on speed up
- $p$ -- fraction of work that can be parallelized
- $T = (1-p)T + pT$ -- total time
- Now add parallelization ...
  - $s$ is a speed up factor on the parallel code

$T’ = (1-p)T + pT/s$
Thread Attributes -- for use at thread creation time

```c
int pthread_attr_init(pthread_attr_t *attr);
int pthread_attr_destroy(pthread_attr_t *attr);
```

Attributes you can get and set

- `pthread_attr_getdetachstate(3)` thread detach state
- `pthread_attr_getguardsize(3)` thread guard size
- `pthread_attr_getinheritsched(3)` inherit scheduler attribute
- `pthread_attr_getschedparam(3)` thread scheduling parameter
- `pthread_attr_getschedpolicy(3)` thread scheduling policy
- `pthread_attr_getscope(3)` thread contention scope
- `pthread_attr_getstack(3)` thread stack
- `pthread_attr_getstacksize(3)` thread stack size
- `pthread_attr_getstackaddr(3)` thread stack address

Mutex & read/write lock attributes

- control how locks work -- not covered here
Reentrancy (aka thread safe)
- multiple threads can call same function at the same time
- is it safe to do it?
  - Yes -> thread safe!
- What would make it un-safe?
  - return a pointer to a single static struct
  - second call changes static struct
- System functions? Are they thread safe?
  - Not all -- see Figure 12.9 -- not guaranteed to be thread safe
  - Things like getpwent(), getgrgid() ....
- How do you use them?
  - critical section with mutexes()
- How about your code? Can it be thread safe?
- How about access to errno?
Thread specific data

- can’t use thread ID and an array ...
- local variables in thread_main() are "thread specific" .... but
  - errno needs to have one variable per thread
  - (GCC did some compiler tricks ... but not portable)
- Idea of a "key" -- for accessing the data
  - int pthread_key_create(pthread_key_t *key, void (*destructor)(void *));
  - int pthread_key_delete(pthread_key_t key);
  - Creates and destroys a key
  - Only want to do this once, not for every thread
    - int pthread_once(pthread_once_t *once_control, void (*init_routine)(void));
    - allows first thread to call init_routine and not others
- Access to thread specific data:
  - void *pthread_getspecific(pthread_key_t key);
  - int pthread_setspecific(pthread_key_t key, const void *value);
  - set first, then get. get before set gets NULL
Errno? no longer a variable but a define to call a function

#define errno (*__errno())

Similar to windows GetLastError()!

Cancel Options

Can control how a thread can be canceled -- read section 12.7

Final two issues: signals and forks

Each thread has its own signal mask (pthread_sigmask())

sigaction is still for the entire process

Signals are delivered to a single thread

hardware issue -> delivered to thread that caused it

No thread caused the signal -> delivered to an arbitrary thread!

Control can be had with the per thread signal mask and sigwait(2)

e.g. one thread can catch all the generic signals

Note: read about Linux, signals and threads at the end of 12.8
Forking with threads:

- `fork(2)` - creates a new process with ONE thread running
  - What about all the mutexes, r/w locks and cond variables?
- `fork()/exec()` -> no problems ... memory image destroyed
- `fork()` and continue execution
  - Don’t use locks/threads ... no problem
  - Start threads, using locks ... big problem!
    - If you do this ... read how to do it
    - can use `pthread_atfork()` to help clean up locks.

I/O in threads

- reads/writes -- use "file pointer"
- can interfere with each other
- Solution?

```c
    ssize_t pread(int d, void *buf, size_t nbytes, off_t offset);
    ssize_t pwrite(int d, const void *buf, size_t nbytes, off_t offset);
```