Concurrency: Threads, Processes, Race Conditions, Mutual Exclusion

Madhavan Mukund, S P Suresh

Programming Language Concepts Lecture 13, 28 February 2023

- Multiprocessing
 - Single processor executes several computations "in parallel"
 - Time-slicing to share access

- Multiprocessing
 - Single processor executes several computations "in parallel"
 - Time-slicing to share access
- Logically parallel actions within a single application
 - Clicking Stop terminates a download in a browser
 - User-interface is running in parallel with network access

- Multiprocessing
 - Single processor executes several computations "in parallel"
 - Time-slicing to share access
- Logically parallel actions within a single application
 - Clicking Stop terminates a download in a browser
 - User-interface is running in parallel with network access

Process

- Private set of local variables
- Time-slicing involves saving the state of one process and loading the suspended state of another

- Multiprocessing
 - Single processor executes several computations "in parallel"
 - Time-slicing to share access
- Logically parallel actions within a single application
 - Clicking Stop terminates a download in a browser
 - User-interface is running in parallel with network access

Process

- Private set of local variables
- Time-slicing involves saving the state of one process and loading the suspended state of another

Threads

- Operated on same local variables
- Communicate via "shared memory"
- Context switches are easier

- Multiprocessing
 - Single processor executes several computations "in parallel"
 - Time-slicing to share access
- Logically parallel actions within a single application
 - Clicking Stop terminates a download in a browser
 - User-interface is running in parallel with network access

Process

- Private set of local variables
- Time-slicing involves saving the state of one process and loading the suspended state of another

Threads

- Operated on same local variables
- Communicate via "shared memory"
- Context switches are easier
- Henceforth, we use process and thread interchangeably



Shared variables

- Browser example: download thread and user-interface thread run in parallel
 - Shared boolean variable terminate indicates whether download should be interrupted
 - terminate is initially false
 - Clicking Stop sets it to true
 - Download thread checks the value of this variable periodically and aborts if it is set to true

Shared variables

- Browser example: download thread and user-interface thread run in parallel
 - Shared boolean variable terminate indicates whether download should be interrupted
 - terminate is initially false
 - Clicking Stop sets it to true
 - Download thread checks the value of this variable periodically and aborts if it is set to true
- Watch out for race conditions
 - Shared variables must be updated consistently

■ Have a class extend Thread

```
public class Parallel extends Thread{
  private int id;

  public Parallel(int i){ id = i; }
}
```

- Have a class extend Thread
- Define a function run() where execution can begin in parallel

- Have a class extend Thread
- Define a function run() where execution can begin in parallel
- Invoking p[i].start() initiates
 p[i].run() in a separate thread

```
public class Parallel extends Thread{
 private int id;
 public Parallel(int i){ id = i; }
 public void run(){
   for (int j = 0; j < 100; j++){
     System.out.println("My id is "+id);
     trv{
       sleep(1000);
                            // Sleep for 1000 ms
     catch(InterruptedException e){}
public class TestParallel {
 public static void main(String[] args){
   Parallel p[] = new Parallel[5];
   for (int i = 0; i < 5; i++){
      p[i] = new Parallel(i);
      p[i].start(); // Start p[i].run()
                      // in concurrent thread
```

- Have a class extend Thread
- Define a function run() where execution can begin in parallel
- Invoking p[i].start() initiates
 p[i].run() in a separate thread
 - Directly calling p[i].run() does not execute in separate thread!

```
public class Parallel extends Thread{
 private int id;
 public Parallel(int i){ id = i; }
 public void run(){
   for (int j = 0; j < 100; j++){
     System.out.println("My id is "+id);
     trv{
       sleep(1000);
                            // Sleep for 1000 ms
      catch(InterruptedException e){}
public class TestParallel {
 public static void main(String[] args){
   Parallel p[] = new Parallel[5];
   for (int i = 0; i < 5; i++){
      p[i] = new Parallel(i);
      p[i].start(); // Start p[i].run()
                      // in concurrent thread
```

- Have a class extend Thread
- Define a function run() where execution can begin in parallel
- Invoking p[i].start() initiates
 p[i].run() in a separate thread
 - Directly calling p[i].run() does not execute in separate thread!
- sleep(t) suspends thread for t milliseconds
 - Static function use Thread.sleep() if current class does not extend Thread
 - Throws InterruptedException later

```
public class Parallel extends Thread{
 private int id;
 public Parallel(int i){ id = i; }
 public void run(){
   for (int j = 0; j < 100; j++){
     System.out.println("My id is "+id);
     trv{
       sleep(1000);
                            // Sleep for 1000 ms
      catch(InterruptedException e){}
public class TestParallel {
 public static void main(String[] args){
   Parallel p[] = new Parallel[5];
   for (int i = 0; i < 5; i++){
      p[i] = new Parallel(i);
      p[i].start(); // Start p[i].run()
                      // in concurrent thread
```

- Have a class extend Thread
- Define a function run() where execution can begin in parallel
- Invoking p[i].start() initiates
 p[i].run() in a separate thread
 - Directly calling p[i].run() does not execute in separate thread!
- sleep(t) suspends thread for t milliseconds
 - Static function use Thread.sleep() if current class does not extend Thread
 - Throws InterruptedException later

Typical output

```
My id is 0
My id is 37
My id is 2
Mv id is 1
My id is 4
My id is 0
My id is 2
My id is 3
Mv id is 4
My id is 1
Mv id is 0
Mv id is 3
My id is 1
My id is 2
My id is 4
My id is 0
```

Java threads . . .

- Cannot always extend Thread
 - Single inheritance

Java threads . . .

- Cannot always extend Thread
 - Single inheritance
- Instead, implement Runnable

```
public class Parallel implements Runnable{
    // only the line above has changed
    private int id;
    public Parallel(int i){ ... } // Constructor
    public void run(){ ... }
```

Java threads . . .

- Cannot always extend Thread
 - Single inheritance
- Instead, implement Runnable
- To use Runnable class, explicitly create a Thread and start() it

```
public class Parallel implements Runnable{
 // only the line above has changed
 private int id:
 public Parallel(int i){ ... } // Constructor
 public void run(){ ... }
public class TestParallel {
 public static void main(String[] args){
   Parallel p[] = new Parallel[5]; '
   Thread t[] = new Thread[5]:
   for (int i = 0; i < 5; i++){
      p[i] = new Parallel(i);
      t[i] = new Thread(p[i]);
            // Make a thread t[i] from p[i]
      t[i].start(); // Start off p[i].run()
                     // Note: t[i].start(),
                     // not p[i].start()
```

Summary

- Common to have logically parallel actions with a single application
 - Download from one webpage while browsing another
- Threads are lightweight processes with shared variables that can run in parallel
- Use Thread class or Runnable interface to create parallel threads in Java

Threads and shared variables

- Threads are lightweight processes with shared variables that can run in parallel
- Browser example: download thread and user-interface thread run in parallel
 - Shared boolean variable terminate indicates whether download should be interrupted
 - terminate is initially false
 - Clicking Stop sets it to true
 - Download thread checks the value of this variable periodically and aborts if it is set to true
- Watch out for race conditions
 - Shared variables must be updated consistently

Maintaining data consistency

double accounts [100] describes 100 bank accounts

Maintaining data consistency

- double accounts [100] describes 100 bank accounts
- Two functions that operate on accounts: transfer() and audit()

```
boolean transfer (double amount.
                  int source,
                  int target){
  if (accounts[source] < amount){</pre>
    return false;
  accounts[source] -= amount;
  accounts[target] += amount;
  return true:
double audit(){
  // total balance across all accounts
  double balance = 0.00:
  for (int i = 0; i < 100; i++){
    balance += accounts[i]:
  return balance:
```

Maintaining data consistency

- double accounts[100] describes 100
 bank accounts
- Two functions that operate on accounts: transfer() and audit()
- What are the possibilities when we execute the following?

```
boolean transfer (double amount.
                  int source,
                  int target){
  if (accounts[source] < amount){</pre>
    return false;
  accounts[source] -= amount;
  accounts[target] += amount;
  return true:
double audit(){
  // total balance across all accounts
  double balance = 0.00:
  for (int i = 0; i < 100; i++){
    balance += accounts[i]:
  return balance:
```

Maintaining data consistency . . .

What are the possibilities when we execute the following?

audit() can report an overall total that is 500 more or less than the actual assets

```
boolean transfer (double amount.
                  int source,
                  int target){
  if (accounts[source] < amount){</pre>
    return false;
  accounts[source] -= amount;
  accounts[target] += amount;
  return true:
double audit(){
  // total balance across all accounts
  double balance = 0.00:
  for (int i = 0; i < 100; i++){
    balance += accounts[i]:
  return balance:
```

Maintaining data consistency . . .

What are the possibilities when we execute the following?

- audit() can report an overall total that is 500 more or less than the actual assets
 - Depends on how actions of transfer are interleaved with actions of audit

```
boolean transfer (double amount.
                  int source,
                  int target){
  if (accounts[source] < amount){</pre>
    return false;
  accounts[source] -= amount;
  accounts[target] += amount;
  return true:
double audit(){
  // total balance across all accounts
  double balance = 0.00:
  for (int i = 0; i < 100; i++){
    balance += accounts[i]:
  return balance:
```

Maintaining data consistency . . .

What are the possibilities when we execute the following?

- audit() can report an overall total that is 500 more or less than the actual assets
 - Depends on how actions of transfer are interleaved with actions of audit
 - Can even report an error if transfer happens atomically

```
boolean transfer (double amount.
                  int source,
                  int target){
  if (accounts[source] < amount){</pre>
    return false;
  accounts[source] -= amount;
  accounts[target] += amount;
  return true:
double audit(){
  // total balance across all accounts
  double balance = 0.00:
  for (int i = 0; i < 100; i++){
    balance += accounts[i]:
  return balance:
```

Atomicity of updates

■ Two threads increment a shared variable n

Atomicity of updates

■ Two threads increment a shared variable n

■ Expect n to increase by 2 . . .

Atomicity of updates

■ Two threads increment a shared variable n

- Expect n to increase by 2 . . .
- ...but, time-slicing may order execution as follows

```
Thread 1: m = n;
Thread 1: m++;
Thread 2: k = n;  // k gets the original value of n
Thread 2: k++;
Thread 1: n = m;
Thread 2: n = k;  // Same value as that set by Thread 1
```

- Race condition concurrent update of shared variables, unpredictable outcome
 - Executing transfer() and audit() concurrently can cause audit() to report more or less than the actual assets

```
boolean transfer (double amount.
                  int source,
                  int target){
  if (accounts[source] < amount){</pre>
    return false;
  accounts[source] -= amount;
  accounts[target] += amount;
  return true:
double audit(){
  // total balance across all accounts
  double balance = 0.00:
  for (int i = 0; i < 100; i++){
    balance += accounts[i]:
  return balance:
```

- Race condition concurrent update of shared variables, unpredictable outcome
 - Executing transfer() and audit()
 concurrently can cause audit() to
 report more or less than the actual assets
- Avoid this by insisting that transfer() and audit() do not interleave

```
boolean transfer (double amount.
                  int source,
                  int target){
  if (accounts[source] < amount){</pre>
    return false;
  accounts[source] -= amount;
  accounts[target] += amount;
  return true;
double audit(){
  // total balance across all accounts
  double balance = 0.00:
  for (int i = 0; i < 100; i++){
    balance += accounts[i]:
  return balance:
```

- Race condition concurrent update of shared variables, unpredictable outcome
 - Executing transfer() and audit()
 concurrently can cause audit() to
 report more or less than the actual assets
- Avoid this by insisting that transfer() and audit() do not interleave
- Never simultaneously have current control point of one thread within transfer() and another thread within audit()

```
boolean transfer (double amount.
                  int source,
                  int target){
  if (accounts[source] < amount){</pre>
    return false;
  accounts[source] -= amount;
  accounts[target] += amount;
  return true;
double audit(){
  // total balance across all accounts
  double balance = 0.00:
  for (int i = 0; i < 100; i++){
    balance += accounts[i]:
  return balance:
```

- Race condition concurrent update of shared variables, unpredictable outcome
 - Executing transfer() and audit() concurrently can cause audit() to report more or less than the actual assets
- Avoid this by insisting that transfer() and audit() do not interleave
- Never simultaneously have current control point of one thread within transfer() and another thread within audit()
- Mutually exclusive access to critical regions of code

```
boolean transfer (double amount.
                  int source,
                  int target){
  if (accounts[source] < amount){</pre>
    return false;
  accounts[source] -= amount;
  accounts[target] += amount;
  return true;
double audit(){
  // total balance across all accounts
  double balance = 0.00:
  for (int i = 0; i < 100; i++){
    balance += accounts[i]:
  return balance:
```

Summary

- Concurrent update of a shared variable can lead to data inconsistencey
 - Race condition
- Control behaviour of threads to regulate concurrent updates
 - Critical sections sections of code where shared variables are updated
 - Mutual exclusion at most one thread at a time can be in a critical section

Mutual exclusion for two processes

■ First attempt

```
Thread 1
...
while (turn != 1) {
    // "Busy" wait
}
// Enter critical section
    ...
// Leave critical section
turn = 2;
...

Thread 2
...
while (turn != 2) {
    // "Busy" wait
}
// Enter critical section
...
// Leave critical section
turn = 1;
...
```

Mutual exclusion for two processes

■ First attempt

■ Shared variable turn — no assumption about initial value, atomic update

Mutual exclusion for two processes

■ First attempt

- Shared variable turn no assumption about initial value, atomic update
- Mutually exclusive access is guaranteed . . .

Mutual exclusion for two processes

First attempt

```
Thread 1
...

while (turn != 1){
    // "Busy" wait
}

// Enter critical section
    ...

// Leave critical section
turn = 2,
...

Thread 2
...

while (turn != 2){
    // "Busy" wait
}

// Enter critical section
...

// Leave critical section
turn = 1;
...
```

- Shared variable turn no assumption about initial value, atomic update
- Mutually exclusive access is guaranteed . . .
- ... but one thread is locked out permanently if other thread shuts down
 - Starvation!

Mutual exclusion for two processes . . .

Second attempt

```
Thread 1 ...

request_1 = true; request_2 = true;
while (request_2){ while (request_1) // "Busy" wait
}

// Enter critical section // Enter critical section
...

// Leave critical section request_1 = false; request_2 = false;
...
```

Mutual exclusion for two processes . . .

Second attempt

```
Thread 1 ...

request_1 = true; request_2 = true;
while (request_2){ while (request_1) // "Busy" wait }
}

// Enter critical section // Enter critical section ...

// Leave critical section request_1 = false; request_2 = false; ...
```

■ Mutually exclusive access is guaranteed . . .

Mutual exclusion for two processes . . .

Second attempt

```
Thread 1 ...

request_1 = true; request_2 = true;
while (request_2){ while (request_1) // "Busy" wait }

// Enter critical section // Enter critical section ...

// Leave critical section // Leave critical section request_1 = false; request_2 = false; ...
```

- Mutually exclusive access is guaranteed . . .
- ... but if both threads try simultaneously, they block each other
 - Deadlock!

Peterson's algorithm

```
Thread 1
                                          Thread 2
        request_1 = true;
                                          request_2 = true;
Init
        turn = 2:
                                          turn = 1:
                                                                     turn is 1 pr 2
                                          while (request_1 &&
        while (request_2 &&
                                                 turn != 2){
               turn !=1){
          // "Busy" wait
                                            // "Busv" wait
           Enter critical section
                                             Enter critical section
Lnt
          Leave critical section
                                          // Leave critical section
        request_1 = false;
                                          request_2 = false;
```

Combines the previous two approaches

Proning Peterson's Aborithm convect

Ruord "control" point of threads (where they are in woods) and values of reg-1, reg-2, turn Never cret_1, crit-2

Peterson's algorithm

```
Thread 1
                                  Thread 2
request_1 = true;
                                  request_2 = true;
turn = 2:
                                  turn = 1:
while (request_2 &&
                                  while (request_1 &&
      turn != 1){
                                         turn != 2){
  // "Busy" wait
                                    // "Busv" wait
  Enter critical section
                                     Enter critical section
// Leave critical section
                                  // Leave critical section
request_1 = false;
                                  request_2 = false;
```

- Combines the previous two approaches
- If both try simultaneously, turn decides who goes through

Peterson's algorithm

```
Thread 1
                                   Thread 2
request_1 = true;
                                   request_2 = true;
turn = 2:
                                   turn = 1:
while (request_2 &&
                                   while (request_1 &&
      turn != 1){
                                          turn != 2){
  // "Busy" wait
                                     // "Busv" wait
// Enter critical section
                                      Enter critical section
// Leave critical section
                                   // Leave critical section
request_1 = false;
                                  request_2 = false;
```

- Combines the previous two approaches
- If both try simultaneously, turn decides who goes through
- If only one is alive, request for that process is stuck at false and turn is irrelevant

■ Generalizing Peterson's solution to more than two processes is not trivial

- Generalizing Peterson's solution to more than two processes is not trivial
- \blacksquare For *n* process mutual exclusion other solutions exist

- Generalizing Peterson's solution to more than two processes is not trivial
- \blacksquare For *n* process mutual exclusion other solutions exist
- Lamport's Bakery Algorithm
 - Each new process picks up a token (increments a counter) that is larger than all waiting processes
 - Lowest token number gets served next
 - Still need to break ties token counter is not atomic

- Generalizing Peterson's solution to more than two processes is not trivial
- \blacksquare For *n* process mutual exclusion other solutions exist
- Lamport's Bakery Algorithm
 - Each new process picks up a token (increments a counter) that is larger than all waiting processes
 - Lowest token number gets served next
 - Still need to break ties token counter is not atomic
- Need specific clever solutions for different situations

- Generalizing Peterson's solution to more than two processes is not trivial
- \blacksquare For *n* process mutual exclusion other solutions exist
- Lamport's Bakery Algorithm
 - Each new process picks up a token (increments a counter) that is larger than all waiting processes
 - Lowest token number gets served next
 - Still need to break ties token counter is not atomic
- Need specific clever solutions for different situations
- Need to argue correctness in each case

- Generalizing Peterson's solution to more than two processes is not trivial
- \blacksquare For *n* process mutual exclusion other solutions exist
- Lamport's Bakery Algorithm
 - Each new process picks up a token (increments a counter) that is larger than all waiting processes
 - Lowest token number gets served next
 - Still need to break ties token counter is not atomic
- Need specific clever solutions for different situations
- Need to argue correctness in each case
- Instead, provide higher level support in programming language for synchronization

Summary

- We can construct protocols that guarantee mutual exclusion to critical sections
 - Watch out for starvation and deadlock
- These protocols cleverly use regular variables
 - No assumptions about initial values, atomicity of updates
- Difficult to generalize such protocols to arbitrary situations
- Look to programming language for features that control synchronization