

Solution: a lock (a/k/a mutex)

```
class BasicLock {  
public:  
    virtual void lock() =0;  
    virtual void unlock() =0;  
};
```

Using a lock

```
class Counter {
public:
    int get_and_inc()
    {
        lock_.lock();
        int old = count_;
        count_ = old + 1;
        lock_.unlock();
        return old;
    }

private:
    int count_ = 0;
    Lock lock_;
};
```

Using a lockRAAI-style

```
class Counter {  
public:  
    int get_and_inc()  
    {  
        lock_.lock();  
        int old = count_;  
        count_ = old + 1;  
        lock_.unlock();  
        return old;  
    }  
  
private:  
    int count_ = 0;  
    Lock lock_;  
};
```

```
class Counter {  
public:  
    int get_and_inc()  
    {  
        auto guard = lock_.acquire();  
        int old = count_;  
        count_ = old + 1;  
        return old;  
        // ~Guard() unlocks lock_here  
    }  
  
private:  
    int count_ = 0;  
    Lock lock_;  
};
```

Base class for RAll-style lock

```
class GuardedLockBase : public BasicLock {
public:
    Guard acquire() { return Guard{*this}; }

    class Guard {
        BasicLock& lock_;

    public:
        Guard(BasicLock& lock) : lock_{lock} { lock_.lock(); }
        virtual ~Guard() { lock_.unlock(); }
    };
    :
};
```

How to implement the lock?

Two-thread solutions first, then n -thread solutions

Base class for RAll-style lock

```
class GuardedLockBase : public BasicLock {
    :
    // i() is this thread:
    thread::id i() const
    {
        return this_thread::get_id();
    }

    // j() is the other thread:
    thread::id j() const
    {
        return i().other_thread();
    }
    :
};
```

An attempt

```
class LockOne : public GuardedLockBase {
    bool flag_[2] = {};
public:
    virtual void lock() override
    {
        flag_[i()] = true;
        while (flag_[j()]) {}
    }
    virtual void unlock() override { }
};
```

Theorem

LockOne satisfies mutual exclusion.

Theorem

LockOne satisfies mutual exclusion. **Proof by contradiction:**

- Assume CS_A overlaps CS_B

Theorem

LockOne satisfies mutual exclusion. **Proof by contradiction:**

- Assume CS_A overlaps CS_B
- Consider each thread's last read and write in *lock()* before entering its CS. For *A* to enter, it first writes true to its flag, and then needs to read false from the other's:
 - ▶ $\text{write}_A(\text{flag}[A] = \text{true}) \rightarrow \text{read}_A(\text{flag}[B] == \text{false}) \rightarrow CS_A$

Theorem

LockOne satisfies mutual exclusion. **Proof by contradiction:**

- Assume CS_A overlaps CS_B
- Consider each thread's last read and write in *lock()* before entering its CS. For *A* to enter, it first writes true to its flag, and then needs to read false from the other's:
 - ▶ $\text{write}_A(\text{flag}[A] = \text{true}) \rightarrow \text{read}_A(\text{flag}[B] == \text{false}) \rightarrow CS_A$

And by symmetry:

- ▶ $\text{write}_B(\text{flag}[B] = \text{true}) \rightarrow \text{read}_B(\text{flag}[A] == \text{false}) \rightarrow CS_B$

Theorem

LockOne satisfies mutual exclusion. **Proof by contradiction:**

- Assume CS_A overlaps CS_B
- Consider each thread's last read and write in $lock()$ before entering its CS. For A to enter, it first writes true to its flag, and then needs to read false from the other's:
 - ▶ $write_A(flag[A] = true) \rightarrow read_A(flag[B] == false) \rightarrow CS_A$

And by symmetry:

- ▶ $write_B(flag[B] = true) \rightarrow read_B(flag[A] == false) \rightarrow CS_B$

Note, also, that if A sees B 's flag as false, that must happen before B writes its flag, and by symmetry for B seeing A 's flag:

- ▶ $read_A(flag[B] == false) \rightarrow write_B(flag[B] = true)$
- ▶ $read_B(flag[A] == false) \rightarrow write_A(flag[A] = true)$

Theorem

LockOne satisfies mutual exclusion. **Proof by contradiction:**

- Assume CS_A overlaps CS_B
- Consider each thread's last read and write in $lock()$ before entering its CS. For A to enter, it first writes true to its flag, and then needs to read false from the other's:
 - ▶ $write_A(flag[A] = true) \rightarrow read_A(flag[B] == false) \rightarrow CS_A$

And by symmetry:

- ▶ $write_B(flag[B] = true) \rightarrow read_B(flag[A] == false) \rightarrow CS_B$

Note, also, that if A sees B 's flag as false, that must happen before B writes its flag, and by symmetry for B seeing A 's flag:

- ▶ $read_A(flag[B] == false) \rightarrow write_B(flag[B] = true)$
- ▶ $read_B(flag[A] == false) \rightarrow write_A(flag[A] = true)$

These events form a cycle, which is a contradiction. □

Two other properties

Deadlock-free:

- One ill-behaved thread does not prevent other threads from locking other locks
- System as a whole makes progress

Two other properties

Deadlock-free:

- One ill-behaved thread does not prevent other threads from locking other locks
- System as a whole makes progress

Starvation-free

- Every locking thread eventually returns
- Every thread makes progress

Two other properties

Deadlock-free:

- One ill-behaved thread does not prevent other threads from locking other locks
- System as a whole makes progress
- Does LockOne enjoy deadlock freedom?

Starvation-free

- Every locking thread eventually returns
- Every thread makes progress
- Does LockOne enjoy starvation freedom?

Deadlock case for LockOne

```
flag_[0] = true;
```

```
while (flag_[1]) {}
```

```
flag_[1] = true;
```

```
while (flag_[0]) {}
```

(But sequentially it's fine.)

Another attempt

```
class LockTwo : public GuardedLockBase {
    int waiting_;
public:
    virtual void lock() override
    {
        waiting_ = i();
        while (waiting_ == i()) {}
    }
    virtual void unlock() override {}
}
```

LockTwo claims

- Satisfies mutual exclusion
- Not deadlock-free
 - ▶ Sequential execution deadlocks
 - ▶ Concurrent execution does not (Why?)

Peterson's algorithm

```
class PetersonLock : public GuardedLockBase {
    bool flag_[2];
    int waiting_;
public:
    virtual void lock() override
    {
        flag_[i()] = true;
        waiting_ = i();
        while (flag_[j()] && waiting_ == i()) {}
    }

    virtual void unlock() override
    {
        flag_[i()] = false;
    }
};
```

Peterson's Lock properties

- Mutual exclusion
 - ▶ By contradiction...
- Deadlock freedom
 - ▶ Only one thread at a time can be waiting
- Starvation freedom
 - ▶ If A finishes and tries to re-enter while B is waiting, B gets in first

Filter algorithm for n threads

```
template <int N>
class FilterLock : public GuardedLockBase {
    int level_[N] = {0};
    int waiting_[N];

    bool exists_competition(int level)
    {
        for (auto k : thread::all_ids())
            if (k != i() && level_[k] >= level)
                return true;
        return false;
    }
    :
};
```

```

template <int N>
class FilterLock : public GuardedLockBase {
    :
public:
    virtual void lock() override
        for (int level = 1; level < N; ++level) {
            level_[i()] = level;
            waiting_[level] = i();
            while (exists_competition(level) && waiting_[level] == i())
                { }
        }
    }

    virtual void unlock() override
        level_[i()] = 0;
    }
};

```

Filter lock properties

- Mutual exclusion
 - ▶ By induction, one thread gets stuck in each level...
- Deadlock freedom
 - ▶ Like Peterson—only one thread can wait per level
- Starvation freedom
 - ▶ Like Peterson—every thread advances if any does

© ⓘ ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons “Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported” license.

These slides are derived from the companion slides for *The Art of Multiprocessor Programming*, by Maurice Herlihy and Nir Shavit. Its original license reads:

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 2.5 License.

- **You are free:**
 - ▶ *to Share* — to copy, distribute and transmit the work
 - ▶ *to Remix* — to adapt the work
- **Under the following conditions:**
 - ▶ **Attribution.** *You must attribute the work to “The Art of Multiprocessor Programming” (but not in any way that suggests that the authors of that work or this endorse you or your use of the work).*
 - ▶ **Share Alike.** *If you alter, transform, or build upon this work, you may distribute the resulting work onnly under the same, similar or a compatible licese.*
- *For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work. The best way to do this is with a link to*
 - ▶ <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/>.
- *Any of the above conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.*
- *Nothing in this license impairs or restricts the author’s moral rights.*