Quiz

1 Quiz

a) The AtomicBoolean uses the atomic version of getAndSet() implemented in hardware. If a processor runs getAndSet() it invalidates the cache on the other processors. Other processes that want to execute getAndSet() must wait as the bus can only be used by one process at a time. Running commands atomically in hardware is expensive since caches need to be invalidated. Hence it is crucial to the performance of a locking algorithm to reduce the usage of these atomic operations in hardware.

b) Mutual exclusion is possible using only read-write registers, assuming a sequentially consistent memory. The classic example is Peterson’s algorithm (for 2 processes only):

```java
boolean[] interested = {false, false};
int lockowner = 0;
const int myid; // 0 or 1

void lock() {
    interested[myid] = true;
    lockowner = 1 - myid;
    while (interested[1 - myid] && lockowner == 1 - myid);
}

void unlock() {
    interested[myid] = false;
}
```

This idea can also be generalized to an arbitrary amount of processors.

c) The extra test avoids getAndSet() operations and thus traffic on the bus while the lock is held. However, as all waiting processes are spinning on the same memory location an invalidation storm erasing each of their cache lines will occur upon lock release. Thus, all the processes execute getAndSet() at about the same time to acquire the lock and thrash the bus.

Basic

2 Spin Locks

a) We use the shared integer state to indicate the state of the lock. The lock is free if state is 0. The lock is in write mode if state is -1. And it is in read-mode if state is n, with n > 0.
b) Starvation is a problem. Example: if many processes constantly acquire and release the read-lock, then the state variable always remains bigger than 0. If one process wants to acquire the write-lock, it will never get the chance.

c) The basic idea behind this lock is a ticketing service as can be found in Swiss post offices.

i) The tail is the ticket which can be drawn by the next process. The head denotes the ticket which can acquire the lock. If we assume an integer consists of 32 bits, then we can use the first 16 bits for the head, and the last 16 bits for the tail.

ii) The process reads the value of the tail, and then increments the tail. This should of course happen in a secure way, i.e. no two processes have the same ticket.

iii) When its ticket equals the head.

iv) The process increments the head by one.

d) // the shared integer containing head|tail
AtomicInteger queue = new AtomicInteger(0);

// the ticket of this process
ThreadLocal<Integer> local = new ThreadLocal<Integer>();
// acquire the lock
void lock() {
    // 1. add this process to the queue
    local = add();
    // 2. wait until the lock is acquired
    while (head() != local);
}

// add this process to the queue
int add() {
    while (true)
        int value = queue.read();
        if (queue.compareAndSet(value, value + 1)) {
            return value & 0xFFFF;
        }
}

// returns the current head of the queue
int head() {
    int value = queue.read();
    return (value >> 16) & 0xFFFF;
}

// releases the lock
void unlock() {
    while (true)
        int value = queue.read();
        int head = (value >> 16) & 0xFFFF;
        int tail = value & 0xFFFF;
        int next = (head + 1) << 16 | tail;
        if (queue.compareAndSet(value, next)) {
            return;
        }
}

Advanced

3 ALock2

a) The author wants that two processes can acquire the lock simultaneously.

b) The lock is seriously flawed. An example shows how the lock will fail: Assume there are 
   $n$ processes, all processes try to acquire the lock. The first two processes ($p_1$, $p_2$) get the 
   lock, the others have to wait. Process $p_1$ keeps the lock a very long time, while $p_2$ releases 
   the lock almost immediately. Afterwards every second process ($p_4$, $p_6$, ...) acquires and 
   releases the lock. One half of all process are waiting on the lock ($p_3$, $p_5$, ...), the others 
   continue to work ($p_4$, $p_6$, ...). If the working process now starts to acquire the lock again, 
   then they wait in slots that are already in use.

   It is also not FIFO (first in, first out) anymore. If $p_1$ keeps the lock after $p_2$ has released 
   its lock, $p_4$ can acquire the lock before $p_3$.

c) One possible solution is to use an atomic integer to hand out ticket numbers to processes 
   requesting the lock and serve (unlock) the processes in the order of the ticket numbers so 
   that at most two of them are unlocked at any time.

   The algorithm for this solution is shown below. There is an array ticket and flag of 
   size capacity having a slot for each process. In ticket, each process stores its ticket 
   number in the corresponding slot. The process spins on its slot in the flag array to acquire
the lock. A process can rely on another process to set its flag if there is at least one that already holds a lock (remainingLocks < 2). Otherwise, it gets the lock for itself by setting its flag and decreasing remainingLocks. The unlock method unsets its flag, finds the next process (nextThreadID) waiting for the lock and sets that process’s flag. If there is no such process (nextThreadID = -1), it increments remainingLocks by one. We use aLock to protect these methods. FIFO property follows as aLock is a FIFO lock and processes are served in the order of their ticket numbers.

```java
class ALock2 implements Lock {
    protected Integer initialValue() {
        return 0;
    }
    AtomicInteger tail;
    int remainingLocks;
    int[] ticket;
    boolean[] flag
    ALock aLock;
    int size;

    ALock2(int capacity) {
        size = capacity;
        // number of locks that can be still acquired
        remainingLocks = 2;
        aLock = new ALock(size);
        tail = new AtomicInteger(0);
        ticket = new int[size];
        flag = new boolean[size];
        Arrays.fill(ticket, 0, size, -1);
        Arrays.fill(flag, 0, size, false);
    }

    public void lock() {
        // spin until slot becomes lockable
        int slot = tail.getAndIncrement() % size;
        i = ThreadID.get();
        aLock.lock();
        ticket[i] = slot;
        // if < 2 processes are holding the lock
        if(flag[i] == false && remainingLocks > 0) {
            remainingLocks--;
            flag[i] = true;
        }
        aLock.unlock();
        while (! flag[i]) {};
    }

    public void unlock() {
        i = ThreadID.get();
        aLock.lock();
        ticket[i] = -1;
        flag[i] = false;
        int min = tail.get(), nextThreadID = -1;
        for(int id = 0; id < size; id++) {
            if( ticket[id] != -1 && ticket[id] < min && flag[id] == false) {
                min = ticket[id];
                nextThreadID = id;
            }
        }
        if (nextThreadID != -1) {
            flag[id] = true;
        } else {
            // nonone waiting for the lock
            remainingLocks++;
        }
        aLock.unlock();
    }
}
```
4 MCS Queue Lock

a) There is more than one solution, but we can solve this problem without using RMW registers or other locks. It is important to set and read the flags in the right order: The unlock method first sets locked, then reads aborted. The abort method on the other hand first sets aborted, then reads locked. This way if unlock and abort run in parallel, one of them must already have written its flag before the other can read it. In the worst case unlock is called twice for some process, but that is not a problem. Unlocking an already unlocked lock results in no action.

```java
public boolean lock(){
    ... insert qnode in queue ... 
    qnode.aborted = false;  
    qnode.next = null; 
    if(pred != null) { 
        qnode.locked = true;  
        pred.next = qnode; 
        while (qnode.locked && ! isAbort()) {};
        if (!is_abort()) { 
            qnode.locked = true;  
            // if predecessor unlocked meanwhile 
            if(! qnode.locked) { 
                unlock();  
            }  
            return false;
        }  
    } 
    return true; 
}

c}  
```

b) The solution of a) does not yet work for multiple aborted nodes in the queue. Making the unlock method recursive will help.

```java
public void unlock(){
    unlock( qnode ); 
}
private void unlock( QNode qnode ){ 
    // as before... 
    if( ... missing successor ... )
        return;
    ... wait for missing successor ...

    qnode.next.locked = false; 
    if (qnode.next.aborted){
        if( ... qnode.next misses successor ... ){
            if( ... really no successor ... )
                return;
        }
    else{
        ... wait for missing successor ...
    }
    qnode.next.locked = false; 
}
```

if ( qnode.next.aborted ) {
    // wait for successor of qnode.next
    if ( ... ) { ... } else { ... }
    unlock( qnode.next );
}

c) There are four combinations of values the locked and aborted flag can have. We can easily encode these combinations in an integer. We would not need too worry about the order in which we read and write to the flags, as we could do this atomically. So the algorithm would get easier. We could also ensure that unlock is called only once. Depending on the benchmark this could increase the performance. On the other hand, a CAS operation is quite expensive and could decrease performance.

d) - There could be problems with caches: spinning on a value that “belongs” to another process can introduce additional load on the bus, and thus slow down the entire application.
   + The implementation is much easier: when releasing the lock one has only to set its own locked flag to false.
   + Also aborting is easier: a blocked process could read the state of its predecessor. If the predecessor is aborted, then the successor can just remove the node from the queue, and continue reading values from its predecessor’s predecessor.