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Uniprocessor Performance Not Scaling
Power and heat lay waste to processor makers

  - 1.3GHz to 3.8GHz, 31 stage pipeline
  - “Prescott” in 02/04 was too hot. Needed 5.2GHz to beat 2.6GHz Athalon

- **Intel Pentium Core, (2006-)**
  - 1.06GHz to 3GHz, 14 stage pipeline
  - Based on mobile (Pentium M) micro-architecture
    - Power efficient

- **2% of electricity in the U.S. feeds computers**
  - Doubled in last 5 years
What about Moore’s law?

- Number of transistors double every 24 months
  - Not performance!
Architectural trends that favor multicore

- Power is a first class design constraint
  - Performance per watt the important metric
- Leakage power significant with small transistors
  - Chip dissipates power even when idle!
- Small transistors fail more frequently
  - Lower yield, or CPUs that fail?
- Wires are slow
  - Light in vacuum can travel ~1m in 1 cycle at 3GHz
  - Motivates multicore designs (simpler, lower-power cores)
- Quantum effects
- Motivates multicore designs (simpler, lower-power cores)
Multicores are here, and coming fast!

4 cores in 2007  16 cores in 2009  80 cores in 20??

AMD Quad Core  Sun Rock  Intel TeraFLOP

“[AMD] quad-core processors … are just the beginning….”
http://www.amd.com

“Intel has more than 15 multi-core related projects underway”
http://www.intel.com
Multicore programming will be in demand

- Hardware manufacturers betting big on multicore
- Software developers are needed
- Writing concurrent programs is not easy
- You will learn how to do it in this class
Concurrency Problem

- Order of thread execution is non-deterministic
  - Multiprocessing
    - A system may contain multiple processors ➔ cooperating threads/processes can execute simultaneously
  - Multi-programming
    - Thread/process execution can be interleaved because of time-slicing

- Operations often consist of multiple, visible steps
  - Example: \( x = x + 1 \) is not a single operation
    - read \( x \) from memory into a register
    - increment register
    - store register back to memory

- Goal:
  - Ensure that your concurrent program works under ALL possible interleaving
Questions

- Do the following either completely succeed or completely fail?
  - Writing an 8-bit byte to memory
    - A. Yes  B. No
  - Creating a file
    - A. Yes  B. No
  - Writing a 512-byte disk sector
    - A. Yes  B. No
int a = 1, b = 2;
main() {
    CreateThread(fn1, 4);
    CreateThread(fn2, 5);
}
fn1(int arg1) {
    if(a) b++;
}
fn2(int arg1) {
    a = arg1;
}

What are the values of a & b at the end of execution?
Sharing among theads increases performance, but can lead to problems!!

```java
int a = 1, b = 2;
main() {
    CreateThread(fn1, 4);
    CreateThread(fn2, 5);
}
fn1(int arg1) {
    if(a) b++;
}
fn2(int arg1) {
    a = 0;
}
```

What are the values of \( a \) & \( b \) at the end of execution?
Some More Examples

What are the possible values of $x$ in these cases?

- Thread1: $x = 1$; Thread2: $x = 2$;

- Initially $y = 10$;
  - Thread1: $x = y + 1$;
  - Thread2: $y = y * 2$;

- Initially $x = 0$;
  - Thread1: $x = x + 1$;
  - Thread2: $x = x + 2$;
A critical section is an abstraction
- Consists of a number of consecutive program instructions
- Usually, crit sec are mutually exclusive and can wait/signal
  - Later, we will talk about atomicity and isolation

Critical sections are used frequently in an OS to protect data structures (e.g., queues, shared variables, lists, …)

A critical section implementation must be:
- Correct: the system behaves as if only 1 thread can execute in the critical section at any given time
- Efficient: getting into and out of critical section must be fast. Critical sections should be as short as possible.
- Concurrency control: a good implementation allows maximum concurrency while preserving correctness
- Flexible: a good implementation must have as few restrictions as practically possible
The Need For Mutual Exclusion

- Running multiple processes/threads in parallel increases performance
- Some computer resources cannot be accessed by multiple threads at the same time
  - E.g., a printer can’t print two documents at once
- Mutual exclusion is the term to indicate that some resource can only be used by one thread at a time
  - Active thread excludes its peers
- For shared memory architectures, data structures are often mutually exclusive
  - Two threads adding to a linked list can corrupt the list
Imagine multiple chefs in the same kitchen
- Each chef follows a different recipe

Chef 1
- Grab butter, grab salt, do other stuff

Chef 2
- Grab salt, grab butter, do other stuff

What if Chef 1 grabs the butter and Chef 2 grabs the salt?
- Yell at each other (not a computer science solution)
- Chef 1 grabs salt from Chef 2 (preempt resource)
- Chefs all grab ingredients in the same order
  - Current best solution, but difficult as recipes get complex
  - Ingredient like cheese might be sans refrigeration for a while
The Need To Wait

- Very often, synchronization consists of one thread waiting for another to make a condition true
  - Master tells worker a request has arrived
  - Cleaning thread waits until all lanes are colored
- Until condition is true, thread can sleep
  - Ties synchronization to scheduling
- Mutual exclusion for data structure
  - Code can wait (await)
  - Another thread signals (notify)
Example 2: Traverse a singly-linked list

- Suppose we want to find an element in a singly linked list, and move it to the head

- Visual intuition:
Example 2: Traverse a singly-linked list

- Suppose we want to find an element in a singly linked list, and move it to the head
- Visual intuition:
lprev = NULL;
for(lptr = lhead; lptr; lptr = lptr->next) {
    if(lptr->val == target){
        // Already head?, break
        if(lprev == NULL) break;
        // Move cell to head
        lprev->next = lptr->next;
        lptr->next = lhead;
        lhead = lptr;
        break;
    }
}
lprev = lptr;

◆ Where is the critical section?
Even more real life, linked lists

Thread 1

// Move cell to head
lprev->next = lptr->next;
lpnext = lhead
lhead = lptr;

Thread 2

lprev->next = lptr->next;
lpnext = lhead;
lhead = lptr;

- A critical section often needs to be larger than it first appears
  - The 3 key lines are not enough of a critical section
Even more real life, linked lists

Thread 1

```c
if(lptr->val == target){
    elt = lptr;
    // Already head?, break
    if(lprev == NULL) break;
    // Move cell to head
    lprev->next = lptr->next;
    // lptr no longer in list
```
Safety and Liveness

- **Safety property**: “nothing bad happens”
  - holds in every finite execution prefix
    - Windows™ never crashes
    - a program never terminates with a wrong answer

- **Liveness property**: “something good eventually happens”
  - no partial execution is irremediable
    - Windows™ always reboots
    - a program eventually terminates

- Every property is a combination of a safety property and a liveness property - (Alpern and Schneider)
Safety and liveness for critical sections

- At most \( k \) threads are concurrently in the critical section
  - A. Safety
  - B. Liveness
  - C. Both

- A thread that wants to enter the critical section will eventually succeed
  - A. Safety
  - B. Liveness
  - C. Both

- Bounded waiting: If a thread \( i \) is in entry section, then there is a bound on the number of times that other threads are allowed to enter the critical section (only 1 thread is allowed in at a time) before thread \( i \)'s request is granted.
  - A. Safety
  - B. Liveness
  - C. Both