n-way Mutual Exclusion

EECS 395 "Rust"

Jan. 21, 2016

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) {
        |evel[i()]| = |evel;
        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

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
- Fairness?
 - ▶ No—threads can overtake others

Idea: If thread A "starts before" B, then A enters CS before B.

Idea: If thread A "starts before" B, then A enters CS before B.

But what is "starts before"?

Divide *lock()* operation into two intervals:

- Doorway (D_A) , finite steps
- Waiting (W_A) , possibly unbounded

Divide lock() operation into two intervals:

- Doorway (D_A) , finite steps
- Waiting (W_A) , possibly unbounded

r-Bounded Waiting Guarantee: If $D_A^k \to D_B^j$ then $CS_A^k \to CS_B^{j+r}$.

Divide *lock()* operation into two intervals:

- Doorway (D_A) , finite steps
- Waiting (W_A) , possibly unbounded

r-Bounded Waiting Guarantee: If $D_A^k \to D_B^j$ then $CS_A^k \to CS_B^{j+r}$.

"If A enters the doorway for the kth time before B enters it for the j time, then A's kth critical section happens before B's (j + r)th critical section."

- Peterson's Algorithm (for 2) has r = 0 (first-come-first-served)
- Filter algorithm (for n) has $r = \infty$

- Peterson's Algorithm (for 2) has r = 0 (first-come-first-served)
- Filter algorithm (for n) has $r = \infty$
- Bakery algorithm (for n) has r = 0 (first-come-first-served)

Helper class: lexigraphically-ordered pairs

```
template <typename A, typename B>
struct LexPair {
  A X:
  By;
};
template <typename A, typename B>
bool operator>(const LexPair<A,B>& p,
               const LexPair<A,B>& q)
  return p.x > q.x || (p.x == q.x && p.y > q.y)
```

Bakery algorithm for *n* threads

```
template <int N>
class BakeryLock: public GuardedLockBase {
  bool flag_[N] = \{false\};
  int label [N] = \{0\};
  int max label = 0;
  bool someone is ahead()
     for (auto k: thread::all ids())
       if (flag_[k] \&\& LexPair\{label_[i()], i()\} > LexPair\{label_[k], k\})
          return true:
     return false:
```

```
template <int N>
class BakeryLock : public GuardedLockBase {
public:
  virtual void lock() override
     flag_[i()] = true;
     label_[i()] = ++max_label_;
     while (someone_is_ahead()) {}
  virtual void unlock() override
     flag_[i()] = false;
};
```

Bakery Y2³²K bug

Does overflow matter?

Bits	Does it?
16	quite
32	maybe
64	no

Bakery lock properties

- Mutual exclusion
 - Between any two (label[k], k) pairs, one will defer to the other...
- Deadlock freedom
 - ► Must be some least (label[k], k) pair
- Starvation freedom
 - No thread takes the same number twice
- First-come-first served (0-bounded waiting)
 - First through the door has lower label, goes first

Bakery lock properties

- Mutual exclusion
 - Between any two (label[k], k) pairs, one will defer to the other...
- Deadlock freedom
 - ► Must be some least (label[k], k) pair
- Starvation freedom
 - No thread takes the same number twice
- First-come-first served (0-bounded waiting)
 - ► First through the door has lower label, goes first
- Practical?
 - ▶ Have to read n variables to lock

"Registers" (shared memory locations)

Flavors:

- Multi-reader/single-writer (flag[])
- Multi-reader/multi-writer (waiting)
- (Not that interesting: SRMW and SRSW)

At least *n* MRSW (multi-reader/single-writer) registers are needed to solve deadlock-free mutual exclusion.

At least *n* MRMW (multi-reader/single-writer) registers are needed to solve deadlock-free mutual exclusion.

At least *n* MRMW (multi-reader/multi-writer) registers are needed to solve deadlock-free mutual exclusion.

At least *n* MRMW (multi-reader/multi-writer) registers are needed to solve deadlock-free mutual exclusion.

Proof sketch. For n=2, one register is insufficient because neither thread necessarily sees the other's write. Then by induction, the record of the first thread to enter always gets obliterated by the rest.

Summary

For deadlock-free mutual exclusion of *n* threads:

- Best known algorithm uses 2n MRSW registers.
- Lower bound for MRMW is n

Summary

For deadlock-free mutual exclusion of *n* threads:

- Best known algorithm uses 2n MRSW registers.
- Lower bound for MRMW is n

O(n) reads is too inefficient—we need something better, and we'll get it from the hardware

⊕ ⊕ ⊕ 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 Multiproces*sor *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.