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, ...
PTreads -- 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:

```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(&mutex)) {           /*  Error condition */           } else {           /* critical section */           if (pthread_mutex_unlock(&mtexvar)) {             /* 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"

```
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(&full)

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

\[
\begin{align*}
P0 & \quad P1 \\
\text{wait}(S) & \quad \text{wait}(Q) \\
\text{wait}(Q) & \quad \text{wait}(S) \\
\ldots & \\
\text{signal}(S) & \quad \text{signal}(Q) \\
\text{signal}(Q) & \quad \text{signal}(S)
\end{align*}
\]

□ 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:
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  \text{wait}(S); \\
  \ldots \text{critical section} \ldots \\
  \text{wait}(S);
\end{align*}
  \]
□ To help "fix" these issues, language designers have added constructs to languages
Monitors

- Monitors -- a 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
Monitors (page 2)

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 -- 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

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

```c
#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);
  ```