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
Concurrent, Parallel and Distributed

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, ...
PThreads -- 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 cancelled, 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

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:
  
  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
  
  int pthread_mutex_destroy(pthread_mutex_t *mutex);

- no need to destroy if calling exit

- Entry to critical section -- lock, block if held
  
  int pthread_mutex_lock(pthread_mutex_t *mutex);

- return value 0 if successful, should check

- Non-blocking try to lock
  
  int pthread_mutex_trylock(pthread_mutex_t *mutex);

- Error if locked, errno is EBUSY

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

    pthread_mutex_t mutex = PTHREAD_MUTEX_INITIALIZER;

Typical code outline:

    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
  - ush: 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)
Add item to Queue
signal(&mutex)
signal(&empty)
signal(&full)

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

P0     P1
wait(S) wait(Q)
wait(Q) wait(S)

... signal(S) signal(Q) signal(Q) signal(S)

□ 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
  - 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
  - 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
  - pthread_mutex_lock(&mutex)
  - while (something requires us to wait) {
    - pthread_cond_wait (&condvar,&mutex);
  }
  - critical section
  - pthread_mutex_unlock(&mutex)
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 inbetween 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/Withdrawls -- 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);
```

☐ 0 return -> successful

```c
int pthread_barrier_destroy(pthread_barrier_t *barrier);
```

☐ 0 return -> successful

```c
int pthread_barrier_wait(pthread_barrier_t *barrier);
```

☐ 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

☐ Sequential is BAD
<< not complete >>

<< not complete yet ... come back later for more content >>