Condition Synchronization
Synchronization

- Now that you have seen locks, is that all there is?

- No, but what is the "right" way to build a parallel program.
  - People are still trying to figure that out.

- Compromises:
  - between making it easy to modify shared variables AND
  - restricting when you can modify shared variables.
  - between really flexible primitives AND
  - simple primitives that are easy to reason about.
Beyond Locks

- **Synchronizing on a condition.**
  - When you start working on a synchronization problem, first define the mutual exclusion constraints, then ask “when does a thread wait”, and create a separate synchronization variable representing each constraint.

- **Bounded Buffer problem – producer puts things in a fixed sized buffer, consumer takes them out.**
  - What are the constraints for bounded buffer?
  - 1) only one thread can manipulate buffer queue at a time (*mutual exclusion*)
  - 2) consumer must wait for producer to fill buffers if none full (*scheduling constraint*)
  - 3) producer must wait for consumer to empty buffers if all full (*scheduling constraint*)
Beyond Locks

- Locks ensure mutual exclusion
- Bounded Buffer problem – producer puts things in a fixed sized buffer, consumer takes them out.
  - Synchronizing on a condition.

```cpp
Class BoundedBuffer{
  ...
  void* buffer[];
  Lock lock;
  int count = 0;
}

BoundedBuffer::Deposit(c){
  lock->acquire();
  while (count == n); // spin
  Add c to the buffer;
  count++;
  lock->release();
}

BoundedBuffer::Remove(c){
  lock->acquire();
  while (count == 0); // spin
  Remove c from buffer;
  count--;
  lock->release();
}
```

What is wrong with this?
Class BoundedBuffer{
    ...
    void* buffer[];
    Lock lock;
    int count = 0;
}

BoundedBuffer::Deposit(c){
    while (count == n); //spin
    lock.acquire();
    Add c to the buffer;
    count++;
    lock.release();
}

BoundedBuffer::Remove(c){
    while (count == 0); // spin
    lock.acquire();
    Remove c from buffer;
    count--;
    lock.release();
}

What is wrong with this?
Beyond Locks

```cpp
Class BoundedBuffer{
    ...  
    void* buffer[];
    Lock lock;
    int count = 0;
}

BoundedBuffer::Deposit(c){  
    if (count == n) sleep();
    lock->acquire();
    Add c to the buffer;
    count++;
    lock->release();
    if(count == 1) wakeup(remove);
}

BoundedBuffer::Remove(c){
    if (count == 0) sleep();
    lock->acquire();
    Remove c from buffer;
    count--;
    lock->release();
    if(count==n-1) wakeup(deposit);
}
```

What is wrong with this?
Beyond Locks

Class BoundedBuffer{
    ...
    void* buffer[];
    Lock lock;
    int count = 0;
}

BoundedBuffer::Deposit(c){
    lock.acquire();
    if (count == n) sleep();
    Add c to the buffer;
    count++;
    if(count == 1) wakeup(remove);
    lock.release();
}

BoundedBuffer::Remove(c){
    lock.acquire();
    if (count == 0) sleep();
    Remove c from buffer;
    count--;
    if(count==n-1) wakeup(deposit);
    lock.release();
}

What is wrong with this?
Beyond Locks

Class BoundedBuffer{
    ...  
    void* buffer[];
    Lock lock;
    int count = 0;
}

BoundedBuffer::Deposit(c){
    while(1) {
        lock->acquire();
        if(count == n) {
            lock->release();
            continue;
        }
        Add c to the buffer;
        count++;
        lock->release();
        break;
    }
}

BoundedBuffer::Remove(c){
    while(1) {
        lock->acquire();
        if (count == 0) {
            lock->release();
            continue;
        }
        Remove c from buffer;
        count--;
        lock->release();
        break;
    }
}

What is wrong with this?
Introducing Condition Variables

- **Correctness requirements for bounded buffer producer-consumer problem**
  - Only one thread manipulates the buffer at any time (mutual exclusion)
  - Consumer must wait for producer when the buffer is empty (scheduling/synchronization constraint)
  - Producer must wait for the consumer when the buffer is full (scheduling/synchronization constraint)

- **Solution: condition variables**
  - An abstraction that supports conditional synchronization
  - Condition variables are associated with a monitor lock
  - Enable threads to wait inside a critical section by releasing the monitor lock.
Condition Variables: Operations

- **Three operations**
  - **Wait()**
    - Release lock
    - Go to sleep
    - Reacquire lock upon return
    - Java Condition interface `await()` and `awaitUninterruptably()`
  - **Notify() (historically called Signal())**
    - Wake up a waiter, if any
    - Condition interface `signal()`
  - **NotifyAll() (historically called Broadcast())**
    - Wake up all the waiters
    - Condition interface `signalAll()`

- **Implementation**
  - Requires a per-condition variable queue to be maintained
  - Threads waiting for the condition wait for a `notify()`
Implementing Wait() and Notify()

Condition::Wait(lock){
    schedLock->acquire();
    lock->numWaiting++;
    lock->release();
    Put TCB on the waiting queue for the CV;
    schedLock->release();
    switch();
    lock->acquire();
}

Condition::Notify(lock){
    schedLock->acquire();
    if (lock->numWaiting > 0) {
        Move a TCB from waiting queue to ready queue;
        lock->numWaiting--;
    }
    schedLock->release();
}

Why do we need schedLock?
Using Condition Variables: An Example

- Coke machine as a shared buffer

- Two types of users
  - Producer: Restocks the coke machine
  - Consumer: Removes coke from the machine

- Requirements
  - Only a single person can access the machine at any time
  - If the machine is out of coke, wait until coke is restocked
  - If machine is full, wait for consumers to drink coke prior to restocking

- How will we implement this?
  - What is the class definition?
  - How many lock and condition variables do we need?
Coke Machine Example

Class CokeMachine{
    ...
    Storge for cokes (buffer)
    Lock lock;
    int count = 0;
    Condition notFull, notEmpty;
}

CokeMachine::Deposit(){
    lock→acquire();
    while (count == n) {
        notFull.wait(&lock); }
    Add coke to the machine;
    count++;
    notEmpty.notify();
    lock→release();
}

CokeMachine::Remove(){
    lock→acquire();
    while (count == 0) {
        notEmpty.wait(&lock); }
    Remove coke from to the machine;
    count--;
    notFull.notify();
    lock→release();
}
Word to the wise...

- Always wait and notify condition variables with the mutex held.
- Period.

- Fine print: There are cases where notification outside of a lock can be safe, but the code tends to be fragile, error-prone, and easy for another developer to break.
- In many cases you can lose notifications and hang (liveness)
- Moreover there is no clear advantage to breaking this convention. So just don’t do it.
**Condition variables created from locks**

```java
import java.util.concurrent.locks.ReentrantLock;
public static final aLock = new ReentrantLock();
public static ok = aLock.newCondition();
public static int count;
 aLock.lock();
try {
    while(count < 16){ok.awaitUninterruptably()}
} finally {
    aLock.unlock();
}
return 0;
```
Summary

- Non-deterministic order of thread execution ➔ concurrency problems
  - 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

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

- Define synchronization constructs and programming style for developing concurrent programs
  - Locks ➔ provide mutual exclusion
  - Condition variables ➔ provide conditional synchronization