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Announcements

• P4-Buffer Overflow is due today
  • Due Tuesday, April 16th

• C practice assignment
  • Due Friday, April 19th

• P5-Cache project
  • Due Friday, April 26th

• Prelim2
  • Thursday, May 2nd, 7:30pm
IT TOOK A LOT OF WORK, BUT THIS LATEST LINUX PATCH ENABLES SUPPORT FOR MACHINES WITH 4,096 CPUs, UP FROM THE OLD LIMIT OF 1,024.

DO YOU HAVE SUPPORT FOR SMOOTH FULL-SCREEN FLASH VIDEO YET?

NO, BUT WHO USES THAT?
Big Picture: Multicore and Parallelism
Big Picture: Multicore and Parallelism

Why do I need *four* computing cores on my phone?!
Big Picture: Multicore and Parallelism

Why do I need *eight* computing cores on my phone?!
Big Picture: Multicore and Parallelism

Why do I need *sixteen* computing cores on my phone?!
Pitfall: Amdahl’s Law

Execution time after improvement =
\[
\frac{\text{affected execution time}}{\text{amount of improvement}} + \text{execution time unaffected}
\]

\[
T_{\text{improved}} = \frac{T_{\text{affected}}}{\text{improvement factor}} + T_{\text{unaffected}}
\]
Pitfall: Amdahl’s Law
Improving an aspect of a computer and expecting a proportional improvement in overall performance

\[ T_{\text{improved}} = \frac{T_{\text{affected}}}{\text{improvement factor}} + T_{\text{unaffected}} \]

Example: multiply accounts for 80s out of 100s

- Multiply can be parallelized
- How much improvement do we need in the multiply performance to get 5x overall improvement?
  - (a) 2x  (b) 10x  (c) 100x  (d) 1000x  (e) not possible
Pitfall: Amdahl’s Law
Improving an aspect of a computer and expecting a proportional improvement in overall performance

\[
T_{\text{improved}} = \frac{T_{\text{affected}}}{\text{improvement factor}} + T_{\text{unaffected}}
\]

Example: multiply accounts for 80s out of 100s

• Multiply can be parallelized
• How much improvement do we need in the multiply performance to get 5× overall improvement?

\[
20 = \frac{80}{n} + 20 \quad – \text{Can’t be done!}
\]
Scaling Example

Workload: sum of 10 scalars, and 10 × 10 matrix sum
  • Speed up from 10 to 100 processors?

Single processor: Time = (10 + 100) × t_{add}

10 processors
  • Time = 100/10 × t_{add} + 10 × t_{add} = 20 × t_{add}
  • Speedup = 110/20 = 5.5

100 processors
  • Time = 100/100 × t_{add} + 10 × t_{add} = 11 × t_{add}
  • Speedup = 110/11 = 10

Assumes load can be balanced across processors
Scaling Example

What if matrix size is 100 × 100?

Single processor: Time = (10 + 10000) × t_{add}

10 processors
- Time = 10 × t_{add} + 10000/10 × t_{add} = 1010 × t_{add}
- Speedup = 10010/1010 = 9.9

100 processors
- Time = 10 × t_{add} + 10000/100 × t_{add} = 110 × t_{add}
- Speedup = 10010/110 = 91

Assuming load balanced
Takeaway

Unfortunately, we cannot obtain unlimited scaling (speedup) by adding unlimited parallel resources, eventual performance is dominated by a component needing to be executed sequentially. Amdahl's Law is a caution about this diminishing return.
Performance Improvement 101

seconds / program = instructions / program \times cycles / instruction \times seconds / cycle

2 Classic Goals of Architects:
↓ Clock period (↑ Clock frequency)
↓ Cycles per Instruction (↑ IPC)
Clock frequencies have stalled

**Darling** of performance improvement for decades

Why is this no longer the strategy?

**Hitting Limits:**

- Pipeline depth
- Clock frequency
- Moore’s Law & Technology Scaling
- Power
Improving IPC via ILP

Exploiting Intra-instruction parallelism:
• Pipelining (decode A while fetching B)

Exploiting Instruction Level Parallelism (ILP):
• Multiple issue pipeline (2-wide, 4-wide, etc.)
• Statically detected by compiler (VLIW)
• Dynamically detected by HW
Dynamically Scheduled (OoO)
Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP)

Pipelining: execute multiple instructions in parallel
Q: How to get more instruction level parallelism?
A: Deeper pipeline

- E.g. 250MHz 1-stage; 500Mhz 2-stage; 1GHz 4-stage; 4GHz 16-stage

Pipeline depth limited by...

- max clock speed (less work per stage ⇒ shorter clock cycle)
- min unit of work
- dependencies, hazards / forwarding logic
Instruction-Level Parallelism (ILP)

Pipelining: execute multiple instructions in parallel

Q: How to get more instruction level parallelism?
A: Multiple issue pipeline

- Start multiple instructions per clock cycle in duplicate stages

ALU/Br

LW/SW
Multiple issue pipeline

Static multiple issue
  aka Very Long Instruction Word
  Decisions made by compiler

Dynamic multiple issue
  Decisions made on the fly

Cost: More execute hardware
  Reading/writing register files: more ports
Static Multiple Issue

a.k.a. Very Long Instruction Word (VLIW)

Compiler groups instructions to be issued together
  • Packages them into “issue slots”

How does HW detect and resolve hazards?
  It doesn’t. 😊 Compiler must avoid hazards

Example: Static Dual-Issue 32-bit RISC-V
  • Instructions come in pairs (64-bit aligned)
    - One ALU/branch instruction (or nop)
    - One load/store instruction (or nop)
RISC-V with Static Dual Issue

Two-issue packets
  • One ALU/branch instruction
  • One load/store instruction
  • 64-bit aligned
    - ALU/branch, then load/store
    - Pad an unused instruction with nop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Instruction type</th>
<th>Pipeline Stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>ALU/branch</td>
<td>IF ID EX MEM WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n + 4</td>
<td>Load/store</td>
<td>IF ID EX MEM WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n + 8</td>
<td>ALU/branch</td>
<td>IF ID EX MEM WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n + 12</td>
<td>Load/store</td>
<td>IF ID EX MEM WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n + 16</td>
<td>ALU/branch</td>
<td>IF ID EX MEM WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n + 20</td>
<td>Load/store</td>
<td>IF ID EX MEM WB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scheduling Example

Schedule this for dual-issue RISC-V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALU/branch</th>
<th>Load/store</th>
<th>cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loop:</td>
<td>nop</td>
<td>lw t0, s1, 0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>addi s1, s1, -4</td>
<td>nop</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add t0, t0, s2</td>
<td>nop</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bne s1, zero, Loop</td>
<td>sw t0, s1, 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clicker Question: What is the IPC of this machine?
(A) 0.8  (B) 1.0  (C) 1.25  (D) 1.5  (E) 2.0
Scheduling Example

Schedule this for dual-issue RISC-V

Loop:

1. `lw t0, s1, 0`  # $t0=array element
2. `add t0, t0, s2`  # add scalar in $s2
3. `sw t0, s1, 0`  # store result
4. `addi s1, s1, –4`  # decrement pointer
5. `bne s1, zero, Loop`  # branch $s1!=0

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALU/branch</th>
<th>Load/store</th>
<th>cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loop:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nop</td>
<td><code>lw t0, s1, 0</code></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>addi s1, s1, –4</code></td>
<td><code>nop</code></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>Add t0, t0, s2</code></td>
<td><code>nop</code></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>bne s1, zero, Loop</code></td>
<td><code>sw t0, s1, 4</code></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\frac{5 \text{ instructions}}{4 \text{ cycles}} = \text{IPC} = 1.25
\]

\[
\frac{4 \text{ cycles}}{4 \text{ cycles}} = \text{CPI} = 0.8
\]
Techniques and Limits of Static Scheduling

Goal: larger instruction windows (to play with)
- Predication
- Loop unrolling
- Function in-lining
- Basic block modifications (superblocks, etc.)

Roadblocks
- Memory dependences (aliasing)
- Control dependences
Speculation

Reorder instructions

- To fill the issue slot with useful work
- Complicated: exceptions may occur
Optimizations to make it work

Move instructions to fill in nops
   Need to track hazards and dependencies

Loop unrolling
Scheduling Example

Compiler scheduling for dual-issue RISC-V...

Loop:  
- `lw t0, s1, 0`  # t0 = A[i]
- `lw t1, s1, 4`  # t1 = A[i+1]
- `add t0, t0, s2`  # add s2
- `add t1, t1, s2`  # add s2
- `sw t0, s1, -8`  # store A[i]
- `sw t1, s1, -4`  # store A[i+1]
- `addi s1, s1, +8`  # increment pointer
- `bne s1, s3, Loop`  # continue if s1!=end

ALU/branch slot
- Loop: `nop`  
- `add t0, t0, s2`
- `add t1, t1, s2`
- `addi s1, s1, +8`
- `bne s1, s3, Loop`

Load/store slot
- `lw t0, s1, 0`
- `lw t1, s1, 4`
- `nop`
- `sw t0, s1, 0`
- `sw t1, s1, 4`
- `nop`

8 cycles

6 cycles

\[
\frac{6 \text{ cycles}}{8 \text{ instructions}} = \text{CPI} = 0.75
\]
Scheduling Example

Compiler scheduling for dual-issue RISC-V...

Loop:

lw t0, s1, 0  # t0 = A[i]
lw t1, s1, 4  # t1 = A[i+1]
add t0, t0, s2  # add s2
add t1, t1, s2  # add s2
sw t0, s1, -8  # store A[i]
sw t1, s1, -4  # store A[i+1]
addi s1, s1, +8  # increment pointer
bne s1, s3, Loop  # continue if s1!=end

ALU/branch slot

Loop: nop

Load/store slot  cycle

lw t0, s1, 0  1
lw t1, s1, 4  2
nop 3
sw t0, s1, -8  4
sw t1, s1, -4  5

5 cycles = CPI = 0.625

8 cycles

5 cycles

8 instructions
Limits of Static Scheduling

Compiler scheduling for dual-issue RISC-V...

```
lw    t0, s1, 0          # load A
addi  t0, t0, +1        # increment A
sw    t0, s1, 0          # store A
lw    t0, s2, 0          # load B
addi  t0, t0, +1        # increment B
sw    t0, s2, 0          # store B
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALU/branch slot</th>
<th>Load/store slot</th>
<th>cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nop</td>
<td>lw    t0, s1, 0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nop</td>
<td>nop</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addi t0, t0, +1</td>
<td>nop</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nop</td>
<td>sw    t0, s1, 0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nop</td>
<td>lw    t0, s2, 0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nop</td>
<td>nop</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addi t0, t0, +1</td>
<td>nop</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nop</td>
<td>sw    t0, s2, 0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limits of Static Scheduling

Compiler scheduling for dual-issue RISC-V...

```
lw   t0, s1, 0  # load A
addi t0, t0, +1 # increment A
sw   t0, s1, 0  # store A
lw   t1, s2, 0  # load B
addi t1, t1, +1 # increment B
sw   t1, s2, 0  # store B
```

ALU/branch slot
- nop
- nop
- addi t0, t0, +1
- nop
- nop
- addi t1, t1, +1
- nop

Load/store slot
- lw   t0, s1, 0  # load A
- addi t0, t0, +1 # increment A
- sw   t0, s1, 0  # store A
- lw   t1, s2, 0  # load B
- addi t1, t1, +1 # increment B
- sw   t1, s2, 0  # store B

Cycle
1. lw   t0, s1, 0
2. nop
3. nop
4. sw   t0, s1, 0
5. lw   t1, s2, 0
6. nop
7. nop
8. sw   t1, s2, 0
Limits of Static Scheduling

Compiler scheduling for dual-issue RISC-V...

```
lw  t0, s1, 0    # load A
addi t0, t0, +1  # increment A
sw  t0, s1, 0    # store A
lw  t1, s2, 0    # load B
addi t1, t1, +1  # increment B
sw  t1, s2, 0    # store B
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALU/branch slot</th>
<th>Load/store slot</th>
<th>cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nop</td>
<td>lw  t0, s1, 0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nop</td>
<td>lw  t1, s2, 0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addi t0, t0, +1</td>
<td>nop</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addi t1, t1, +1</td>
<td>sw  t0, s1, 0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nop</td>
<td>sw  t1, s2, 0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problem: What if $s1$ and $s2$ are equal (aliasing)? Won’t work
Improving IPC via ILP

Exploiting Intra-instruction parallelism:
• Pipelining (decode A while fetching B)

Exploiting Instruction Level Parallelism (ILP):
Multiple issue pipeline (2-wide, 4-wide, etc.)
• Statically detected by compiler (VLIW)
• Dynamically detected by HW
Dynamically Scheduled (OoO)
Dynamic Multiple Issue

aka SuperScalar Processor (c.f. Intel)
- CPU chooses multiple instructions to issue each cycle
- Compiler can help, by reordering instructions….
- … but CPU resolves hazards

Even better: Speculation/Out-of-order Execution
- Execute instructions as early as possible
- Aggressive register renaming (indirection to the rescue!)
- Guess results of branches, loads, etc.
- Roll back if guesses were wrong
- Don’t commit results until all previous insns committed
Dynamic Multiple Issue

[Diagram showing the flow of instruction processing with nodes for instruction fetch and decode unit, reservation stations, functional units for integer and floating point operations, and load-store unit, ending with commit unit.]

In-order issue

Out-of-order execute

In-order commit
Effectiveness of OoO Superscalar

It was awesome, but then it stopped improving

Limiting factors?

- Programs dependencies
- Memory dependence detection → be conservative
  - e.g. Pointer Aliasing: A[0] += 1; B[0] *= 2;
- Hard to expose parallelism
  - Still limited by the fetch stream of the static program
- Structural limits
  - Memory delays and limited bandwidth
- Hard to keep pipelines full, especially with branches
Power Efficiency

Q: Does multiple issue / ILP cost much?
A: Yes.

→ Dynamic issue and speculation requires power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPU</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clock Rate</th>
<th>Pipeline Stages</th>
<th>Issue width</th>
<th>Out-of-order/Speculation</th>
<th>Cores</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i486</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>25MHz</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentium</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>66MHz</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentium Pro</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>200MHz</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 Willamette</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2000MHz</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UltraSparc III</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1950MHz</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 Prescott</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3600MHz</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>103W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those simpler cores did something very right.
Curve shows ‘Moore’s Law’: transistor count doubling every two years.
Why Multicore?

Moore’s law

- A law about transistors
- Smaller means more transistors per die
- And smaller means faster too

But: Power consumption growing too…
Power Wall

Power = capacitance * voltage^2 * frequency

In practice: Power ~ voltage^3

Reducing voltage helps (a lot)
... so does reducing clock speed
Better cooling helps

The power wall
- We can’t reduce voltage further
- We can’t remove more heat
Why Multicore?

Performance
Power

Single-Core
Overclocked +20%

Performance
Power

Single-Core

Performance
Power

Dual-Core
Underclocked -20%
### Power Efficiency

Q: Does multiple issue / ILP cost much?  
A: Yes.

→ Dynamic issue and speculation requires power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPU</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clock Rate</th>
<th>Pipeline Stages</th>
<th>Issue width</th>
<th>Out-of-order/Speculation</th>
<th>Cores</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i486</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>25MHz</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentium</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>66MHz</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentium Pro</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>200MHz</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 Willamette</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2000MHz</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UltraSparc III</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1950MHz</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 Prescott</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3600MHz</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>103W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2930MHz</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core i5 Nehal</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3300MHz</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core i5 Ivy Br</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3400MHz</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UltraSparc T1</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1200MHz</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Those simpler cores did something very right.*
Inside the Processor

AMD Barcelona Quad-Core: 4 processor cores
Inside the Processor

Intel Nehalem Hex-Core

4-wide pipeline
Exploiting Thread-Level parallelism

Hardware multithreading to improve utilization:
- Multiplexing multiple threads on single CPU
- Sacrifices latency for throughput
- Single thread cannot fully utilize CPU? Try more!
- Three types:
  - Course-grain (has preferred thread)
  - Fine-grain (round robin between threads)
  - Simultaneous (hyperthreading)
What is a thread?

Process: multiple threads, code, data and OS state
Threads: share code, data, files, **not** regs or stack
Standard Multithreading Picture

Time evolution of issue slots

- Color = thread, white = no instruction

4-wide
Super scalar

Switch to thread B on thread A
L2 miss

Switch threads every cycle

Insns from multiple threads coexist
# Hyperthreading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs:</th>
<th>Multi-Core vs. Multi-Issue vs. HT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Num. Pipelines:</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline Width:</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Hyperthreads
- HT = Multilssue + extra PCs and registers – dependency logic
- HT = MultiCore – redundant functional units + hazard avoidance

## Hyperthreads (Intel)
- Illusion of multiple cores on a single core
- Easy to keep HT pipelines full + share functional units
Example: All of the above

8 die (aka 8 sockets)
4 core per socket
2 HT per core

Note: a socket is a processor, where each processor may have multiple processing cores, so this is an example of a multiprocessor multicore hyperthreaded system.
Parallel Programming

Q: So let's just all use multicore from now on!
A: Software must be written as parallel program

Multicore difficulties

- Partitioning work
- Coordination & synchronization
- Communications overhead
- How do you write parallel programs?
  ... without knowing exact underlying architecture?
Work Partitioning

Partition work so all cores have something to do
Load Balancing

Need to partition so all cores are actually working
Amdahl’s Law

If tasks have a serial part and a parallel part…

Example:

  step 1: divide input data into $n$ pieces
  step 2: do work on each piece
  step 3: combine all results

Recall: Amdahl’s Law

As number of cores increases …

  • time to execute parallel part? goes to zero
  • time to execute serial part? Remains the same
  • Serial part eventually dominates
Amdahl’s Law
Parallelism is a necessity

Necessity, not luxury
Power wall

Not easy to get performance out of

Many solutions
  Pipelining
  Multi-issue
  Hyperthreading
  Multicore
Parallel Programming

Q: So let's just all use multicore from now on!
A: Software must be written as parallel program

Multicore difficulties

- Partitioning work
- Coordination & synchronization
- Communications overhead HW
- How do you write parallel programs?
  ... without knowing exact underlying architecture?

Your career…
Big Picture: Parallelism and Synchronization

How do I take advantage of parallelism?
How do I write (correct) parallel programs?

What primitives do I need to implement correct parallel programs?
Parallelism & Synchronization

Cache Coherency
• Processors cache *shared* data → they see different (incoherent) values for the *same* memory location

Synchronizing parallel programs
• Atomic Instructions
• HW support for synchronization

How to write parallel programs
• Threads and processes
• Critical sections, race conditions, and mutexes
Parallelism and Synchronization

Cache Coherency Problem: What happens when two or more processors cache *shared* data?
Parallelism and Synchronization

Cache Coherency Problem: What happens when two or more processors cache *shared* data?

i.e. the view of memory held by two different processors is through their individual caches.

As a result, processors can see different (incoherent) values to the *same* memory location.
Parallelism and Synchronization
Parallelism and Synchronization

Each processor core has its own L1 cache
Parallelism and Synchronization

Each processor core has its own L1 cache
Parallelism and Synchronization

Each processor core has its own L1 cache
Shared Memory Multiprocessors

Shared Memory Multiprocessor (SMP)

- Typical (today): 2 – 4 processor dies, 2 – 8 cores each
- HW provides *single physical address* space for all processors
Shared Memory Multiprocessors

Shared Memory Multiprocessor (SMP)

- Typical (today): 2 – 4 processor dies, 2 – 8 cores each
- HW provides *single physical address* space for all processors
Cache Coherency Problem

Thread A (on Core0)
for(int i = 0, i < 5; i++) {
    x = x + 1;
}

Thread B (on Core1)
for(int j = 0; j < 5; j++) {
    x = x + 1;
}

What will the value of x be after both loops finish?
Thread A (on Core0)
for(int i = 0, i < 5; i++) {
    x = x + 1;
}

Thread B (on Core1)
for(int j = 0; j < 5; j++) {
    x = x + 1;
}

What will the value of x be after both loops finish?
(x starts as 0)

a) 6
b) 8
c) 10
d) Could be any of the above
e) Couldn’t be any of the above

Clicker Question
Cache Coherency Problem

Thread A (on Core0)
for(int i = 0, i < 5; i++) {
    x = x + 1;
}

Thread B (on Core1)
for(int j = 0; j < 5; j++) {
    x = x + 1;
}

What will the value of x be after both loops finish?
(x starts as 0)

a) 6
b) 8
c) 10
d) Could be any of the above
e) Couldn’t be any of the above

Clicker Question
Cache Coherency Problem, WB

Thread A (on Core0)
for(int i = 0, i < 5; i++) {
    t0=0  LW t0, addr(x)
    t0=1  ADDIU t0, t0, 1
    x=1   SW t0, addr(x)
}

Thread B (on Core1)
for(int j = 0; j < 5; j++) {
    t0=0  LW t0, addr(x)
    t0=1  ADDIU t0, t0, 1
    x=1   SW t0, addr(x)
}

Problem!
Not just a problem for Write-Back Caches

Executing on a write-thru cache

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time step</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>CPU A's cache</th>
<th>CPU B's cache</th>
<th>Memory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CPU A reads X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CPU B reads X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CPU A writes 1 to X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram:

- **Core0**
  - **Cache**
  - **Interconnect**
  - **Memory**

- **Core1**
  - **Cache**
  - **Interconnect**
  - **Memory**

- **CoreN**
  - **Cache**
  - **Interconnect**
  - **Memory**

- **I/O**
Two issues

Coherence
- What values can be returned by a read
- Need a globally uniform (consistent) view of a single memory location
**Solution:** Cache Coherence Protocols

Consistency
- When a written value will be returned by a read
- Need a globally uniform (consistent) view of all memory locations relative to each other
**Solution:** Memory Consistency Models
Coherence Defined

Informal: Reads return most recently written value

Formal: For concurrent processes \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \)

- \( P \) writes \( X \) before \( P \) reads \( X \) (with no intervening writes)
  \[ \Rightarrow \text{read returns written value} \]
  - (preserve program order)
- \( P_1 \) writes \( X \) before \( P_2 \) reads \( X \)
  \[ \Rightarrow \text{read returns written value} \]
  - (coherent memory view, can’t read old value forever)
- \( P_1 \) writes \( X \) and \( P_2 \) writes \( X \)
  \[ \Rightarrow \text{all processors see writes in the same order} \]
  - all see the same final value for \( X \)
  - Aka write serialization
  - (else \( P_A \) can see \( P_2 \)’s write before \( P_1 \)’s and \( P_B \) can see the opposite; their final understanding of state is wrong)
Cache Coherence Protocols

Operations performed by caches in multiprocessors to ensure coherence

- Migration of data to local caches
  - Reduces bandwidth for shared memory
- Replication of read-shared data
  - Reduces contention for access

Snooping protocols

- Each cache monitors bus reads/writes
Snooping for Hardware Cache Coherence

- All caches monitor bus and all other caches
- Bus read: respond if you have dirty data
- Bus write: update/invalidate your copy of data
Invalidating Snooping Protocols

Cache gets **exclusive access** to a block when it is to be written

- Broadcasts an invalidate message on the bus
- Subsequent read in another cache misses
  - Owning cache supplies updated value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Step</th>
<th>CPU activity</th>
<th>Bus activity</th>
<th>CPU A’s cache</th>
<th>CPU B’s cache</th>
<th>Memory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CPU A reads X</td>
<td>Cache miss for X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CPU B reads X</td>
<td>Cache miss for X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CPU A writes 1 to X</td>
<td>Invalidate for X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CPU B read X</td>
<td>Cache miss for X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Writing

Write-back policies for bandwidth
Write-invalidate coherence policy
  • First invalidate all other copies of data
  • Then write it in cache line
  • Anybody else can read it
Permits one writer, multiple readers

In reality: many coherence protocols
  • Snooping doesn’t scale
  • Directory-based protocols
    - Caches and memory record sharing status of blocks in a directory
Hardware Cache Coherence

Coherence
- all copies have same data at all times

Coherence controller:
- Examines bus traffic (addresses and data)
- Executes coherence protocol
  - What to do with local copy when you see different things happening on bus

Three processor-initiated events
- Ld: load
- St: store
- WB: write-back

Two remote-initiated events
- LdMiss: read miss from another processor
- StMiss: write miss from another processor
VI Coherence Protocol

**VI (valid-invalid) protocol:**
- Two states (per block in cache)
  - V (valid): have block
  - I (invalid): don’t have block
  + Can implement with valid bit

**Protocol diagram (left)**
- If *you* load/store a block: transition to V
- If anyone *else* wants to read/write block:
  - Give it up: transition to I state
  - Write-back if your own copy is dirty
VI Protocol (Write-Back Cache)

Thread A
lw t0, r3, 0
ADDIU t0, t0, 1
sw t0, r3, 0

Thread B
lw t0, r3, 0
ADDIU t0, t0, 1
sw t0, r3, 0

lw by Thread B generates an “other load miss” event (LdMiss)
- Thread A responds by sending its dirty copy, transitioning to I
VI Coherence Question

Clicker Question:
Core A loads x into a register
Core B wants to load x into a register
What happens?

(A) they can both have a copy of X in their cache
(B) A keeps the copy
(C) B steals the copy from A, and this is an efficient thing to do
(D) B steals the copy from A, and this is a sad shame
(E) B waits until A kicks X out of its cache, then it can complete the load
**VI → MSI**

**VI protocol is inefficient**
- Only one cached copy allowed in entire system
- Multiple copies can’t exist even if read-only
  - Not a problem in example
  - Big problem in reality

**MSI (modified-shared-invalid)**
- Fixes problem: splits “V” state into two states
  - **M (modified)**: local dirty copy
  - **S (shared)**: local clean copy
- **Allows either**
  - Multiple read-only copies (S-state)  --OR--  
  - Single read/write copy (M-state)
MSI Protocol (Write-Back Cache)

Thread A

lw t0, r3, 0
ADDIU t0, t0, 1
sw t0, r3, 0

Thread B

lw t0, r3, 0
ADDIU t0, t0, 1
sw t0, r3, 0

lw by Thread B generates a “other load miss” event (LdMiss)
  • Thread A responds by sending its dirty copy, transitioning to S
sw by Thread B generates a “other store miss” event (StMiss)
  • Thread A responds by transitioning to I
Cache Coherence and Cache Misses

Coherence introduces two new kinds of cache misses

- **Upgrade miss**
  - On stores to read-only blocks
  - Delay to acquire write permission to read-only block
- **Coherence miss**
  - Miss to a block evicted by another processor’s requests

Making the cache larger...

- Doesn’t reduce these type of misses
- As cache grows large, these sorts of misses dominate

False sharing

- Two or more processors sharing parts of the same block
- But *not* the same bytes within that block (no actual sharing)
- Creates pathological “ping-pong” behavior
- Careful data placement may help, but is difficult
More Cache Coherence

In reality: many coherence protocols
  • Snooping: VI, MSI, MESI, MOESI, …
    - But Snooping doesn’t scale
  • Directory-based protocols
    - Caches & memory record blocks’ sharing status in directory
    - Nothing is free → directory protocols are slower!

Cache Coherency:
  • requires that reads return most recently written value
  • Is a hard problem!
Takeaway: Summary of cache coherence

Informally, Cache Coherency requires that reads return most recently written value

Cache coherence hard problem

Snooping protocols are one approach
Next Goal: Synchronization

Is cache coherency sufficient?

i.e. Is cache coherency (what values are read) sufficient to maintain consistency (when a written value will be returned to a read). Both coherency and consistency are required to maintain consistency in shared memory programs.
Are We Done Yet?

Thread A
lw t0, r3, 0
ADDIU t0, t0, 1
sw t0, x, 0
ADDIU t0, t0, 1
sw t0, x, 0

Thread B
lw t0, r3, 0
ADDIU t0, t0, 1
sw t0, x, 0

What just happened???
Is Cache Coherency Protocol Broken??
Is Cache Coherency Sufficient?

Thread A (on Core0)
for(int i = 0, i < 5; i++) {
    LW t0, addr(x)
    ADDIU t0, t0, 1
    SW t0, addr(x)
}

Thread B (on Core1)
for(int j = 0; j < 5; j++) {
    LW t0, addr(x)
    ADDIU t0, t0, 1
    SW t0, addr(x)
}

Very expensive and difficult to maintain consistency
Clicker Question

The Previous example shows us that

a) Caches can be incoherent even if there is a coherence protocol.
b) Cache coherence protocols are not rich enough to support multi-threaded programs
c) Coherent caches are not enough to guarantee expected program behavior.
d) Multithreading is just a really bad idea.
e) All of the above
Clicker Question

The Previous example shows us that

a) Caches can be incoherent even if there is a coherence protocol.
b) Cache coherence protocols are not rich enough to support multi-threaded programs
c) Coherent caches are not enough to guarantee expected program behavior.
d) Multithreading is just a really bad idea.
e) All of the above
Programming with Threads

Need it to exploit multiple processing units
  …to parallelize for multicore
  …to write servers that handle many clients

Problem: hard even for experienced programmers
  • Behavior can depend on subtle timing differences
  • Bugs may be impossible to reproduce

Needed: synchronization of threads
Programming with Threads

Within a thread: execution is sequential

Between threads?

• No ordering or timing guarantees
• Might even run on different cores at the same time

Problem: hard to program, hard to reason about

• Behavior can depend on subtle timing differences
• Bugs may be impossible to reproduce

Cache coherency is not sufficient…

Need explicit synchronization to make sense of concurrency!
Programming with Threads

Concurrency poses challenges for:

Correctness
• Threads accessing shared memory should not interfere with each other

Liveness
• Threads should not get stuck, should make forward progress

Efficiency
• Program should make good use of available computing resources (e.g., processors).

Fairness
• Resources apportioned fairly between threads
Example: Multi-Threaded Program

Apache web server

```c
void main() {
    setup();
    while (c = accept_connection()) {
        req = read_request(c);
        hits[req]++;
        send_response(c, req);
    }
    cleanup();
}
```
Example: web server

Each client request handled by a separate thread (in parallel)

• Some shared state: hit counter, ...

Thread 52
read hits
addiu
write hits

Thread 205
read hits
addiu
write hits

(look familiar?)

• Timing-dependent failure $\Rightarrow$ race condition
  • hard to reproduce $\Rightarrow$ hard to debug
Two threads, one counter

Possible result: lost update!

Timing-dependent failure \(\Rightarrow\) race condition

- Very hard to reproduce \(\Rightarrow\) Difficult to debug
Race conditions

Timing-dependent error involving access to shared state
Race conditions depend on how threads are scheduled
  • i.e. who wins “races” to update state

Challenges of Race Conditions
  • Races are intermittent, may occur rarely
  • Timing dependent = small changes can hide bug

Program is correct only if all possible schedules are safe
  • Number of possible schedules is huge
  • Imagine adversary who switches contexts at worst possible time
Critical Sections

What if we can designate parts of the execution as critical sections

- Rule: only one thread can be “inside” a critical section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thread 52</th>
<th>Thread 205</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSEnter()</td>
<td>CSEnter()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read hits</td>
<td>read hits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addi</td>
<td>addi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write hits</td>
<td>write hits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSExit()</td>
<td>CSExit()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical Sections

To eliminate races: use critical sections that only one thread can be in

- Contending threads must wait to enter

```
CSEnter();
Critical section
CSExit();
```

```
T1
```

```
CSEnter();
# wait
# wait
Critical section
CSExit();
```

```
T2
```
Mutual Exclusion Lock (Mutex)

Implement CSEnter and CSExit; ie. a critical section
Only one thread can hold the lock at a time
“I have the lock”

Mutual Exclusion Lock (mutex)
lock(m): wait till it becomes free, then lock it
unlock(m): unlock it

safe_increment() {
    pthread_mutex_lock(&m);
    hits = hits + 1;
    pthread_mutex_unlock(&m);
}
Mutexes

Only one thread can hold a given mutex at a time
Acquire (lock) mutex on entry to critical section
• Or block if another thread already holds it
Release (unlock) mutex on exit
• Allow **one** waiting thread (if any) to acquire & proceed

```c
pthread_mutex_init(&m);
pthread_mutex_lock(&m);

pthread_mutex_lock(&m);   // # wait
hits = hits+1;           // # wait

pthread_mutex_unlock(&m);   hits = hits+1;
pthread_mutex_unlock(&m);
```

T1

T2
Next Goal

How to implement mutex locks?
What are the hardware primitives?

Then, use these mutex locks to implement critical sections, and use critical sections to write parallel safe programs
Hardware Support for Synchronization

Atomic read & write memory operation
  - Between read & write: *no writes to that address*

Many atomic hardware primitives
  - test and set (x86)
  - atomic increment (x86)
  - bus lock prefix (x86)
  - compare and exchange (x86, ARM deprecated)
  - linked load / store conditional (pair of insns) (RISC-V, ARM, PowerPC, DEC Alpha, …)
Synchronization in RISC-V

Load Reserved: \( \text{LR. W rd, rs1} \)

“I want the value at address X. Also, start monitoring any writes to this address.”

Store Conditional: \( \text{SC. W rd, rs1, rs2} \)
\( \text{SC. W rd, rs2, (rs1)} \)

“If no one has changed the value at address X since the LR.W, perform this store and tell me it worked.”

• Data at location has not changed since the LR?
  - SUCCESS:
    • Performs the store (rs2 to the address, rs1 is the value)
    • Returns 0 in rd
  • Data at location has changed since the LR?
    - FAILURE:
      • Does not perform the store
      • Returns 1 in rd
Synchronization in RISC-V

Load Reserved: \( LR. W \, r d, \, r s 1 \)
Store Conditional: \( SC. W \, r d, \, r s 1, \, r s 2 \)
\( SC. W \, r d, \, r s 2, \, ( r s 1) \)

- Succeeds if location not changed since the LR
  - Returns 0 in rd
- Fails if location is changed
  - Returns 1 in rd

Any time a processor intervenes and modifies the value in memory between the LR and SC instruction, the SC returns 1 in rd, causing the code to try again. i.e. use this value 1 in rd to try again.
Load Reserved: \( \text{LR.W rd, rs1} \)

Store Conditional: \( \text{SC.W rd, rs1, rs2} \)
\( \text{SC.W rd, rs2, (rs1)} \)

- Succeeds if location not changed since the LR
  - Returns 1 in rd
- Fails if location is changed
  - Returns 0 in rd

Example: atomic incrementor

\[
\begin{align*}
i++ & \quad \text{atomic(i++)} \quad \downarrow \\
\text{LW t0, s0, 0} & \quad \text{try: LR.W t0, (s0)} \\
\text{ADDIU t0, t0, 1} & \quad \text{ADDIU t0, t0, 1} \\
\text{SW t0, s0, 0} & \quad \text{SC.W t0, t0, (s0)} \\
\text{BNEZ t0, try} & \quad \text{BNEZ t0, try}
\end{align*}
\]

Value in memory changed between LR and SC?

\( \Rightarrow \text{SC returns 0 in t0} \Rightarrow \text{retry} \)
# Atomic Increment in Action

**Load Reserved:**

- `LR. W rd, (rs1)`

**Store Conditional:**

- `SC. W rd, rs2, (rs1)`

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Thread A</th>
<th>Thread B</th>
<th>Thread A $t0</th>
<th>Thread B $t0</th>
<th>Mem [$s0]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>try: LR.W t0, (s0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>try: LR.W t0, (s0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ADDIU t0, t0, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADDIU t0, t0, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SC.W t0, t0, (s0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BNEZ t0, try</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC.W t0, t0, (s0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>BNEZ t0, try</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Atomic Increment in Action**

**Load Reserved:**
- LR. W rd, (rs1)

**Store Conditional:**
- SC. W rd, rs2, (rs1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Thread A Action</th>
<th>Thread B Action</th>
<th>Thread A $t0</th>
<th>Thread B $t0</th>
<th>Mem [$s0]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>try: LR.W t0, (s0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>try: LR.W t0, (s0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ADDIU t0, t0, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADDIU t0, t0, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SC.W t0, t0, (s0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BNEZ t0, try</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC.W t0, t0, (s0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>BNEZ t0, try</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Success!**

**Failure!**
Mutex from LR and SC

Load Reserved / Store Conditional

\[ m = 0; \quad \text{// m=0 means lock is free; otherwise, if m=1, then lock locked} \]

\[
\text{mutex_lock}(\text{int } \star \text{m}) \{
\quad \text{while(test\_and\_set(m))}{\}}
\]

\[
\text{int test\_and\_set(\text{int } \star \text{m}) } \{
\quad \begin{cases} 
\quad \text{old} = \star \text{m}; & \text{LR.W Atomic} \\
\quad \text{*m = 1; } & \text{SC.W} \\
\quad \end{cases} \\
\quad \text{return old;}
\}
\]
Mutex from LR and SC

Load Reserved / Store Conditional
m = 0; // m=0 means lock is free; otherwise, if m=1, then lock locked
mutex_lock(int *m) {
    while(test_and_set(m)){}
}

int test_and_set(int *m) {
try: LI t0, 1
    LR. W t1, (a0)
    SC. W t0, t0, (a0)
    MOVE a0, t1

}
Mutex from LR and SC

Load Reserved / Store Conditional

\[ m = 0; \quad // \text{m=0 means lock is free; otherwise, if m=1, then lock locked} \]

\[
\text{mutex_lock(int } *m) \{ \text{ }
\quad \text{while(test_and_set(m)){} }
\}
\]

\[
\text{int test_and_set(int } *m) \{ \text{ }
\quad \text{try: }
\quad \text{L}I \ t0, \ 1
\quad \text{L}R.W \ t1, \ (a0)
\quad \text{S}C.W \ t0, \ t0, \ (a0)
\quad \text{B}NEZ \ t0, \ \text{try}
\quad \text{M}OVE \ a0, \ t1
\}
\]
**Mutex from LR and SC**

Load Reserved / Store Conditional

\( m = 0; \) // m=0 means lock is free; otherwise, if m=1, then lock locked

```c
mutex_lock(int *m) {
    test_and_set:
    LI t0, 1
    LR.W t1, (a0)
    BNEZ t1, test_and_set
    SC.W t0, t0, (a0)
    BNEZ t0, test_and_set
}
```

```c
mutex_unlock(int *m) {
    *m = 0;
}
```
Mutex from LR and SC

Load Reserved / Store Conditional
m = 0; // m=0 means lock is free; otherwise, if m=1, then lock locked
mutex_lock(int *m) {
    test_and_set:
        LI t0, 1
        LR.W t1, (a0)
        BNEZ t1, test_and_set
        SC.W t0, t0, (a0)
        BNEZ t0, test_and_set
}

mutex_unlock(int *m) {
    SW zero, a0, 0
}

This is called a Spin lock
Aka spin waiting
Load Reserved / Store Conditional

\( m = 0; // m=0 \) means lock is free; otherwise, if \( m=1 \), then lock locked

```c
mutex_lock(int *m) {
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Step</th>
<th>Thread A</th>
<th>Thread B</th>
<th>Thread A t0</th>
<th>Thread A t1</th>
<th>Thread B t0</th>
<th>Thread B t1</th>
<th>Mem M[a0]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>try: LI t0, 1</td>
<td>try: LI t0, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LR.W t1, (a0)</td>
<td>LR.W t1, (a0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BNEZ t1, try</td>
<td>BNEZ t1, try</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC.W t0, t0, (a0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SC.W t0, t0, (a0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BNEZ t0, try</td>
<td>BNEZ t0, try</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mutex from LR and SC

**Load Reserved / Store Conditional**

```c
m = 0; // m=0 means lock is free; otherwise, if m=1, then lock locked
mutex_lock(int *m) {
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Step</th>
<th>Thread A</th>
<th>Thread B</th>
<th>Thread A t0</th>
<th>Thread A t1</th>
<th>Thread B t0</th>
<th>Thread B t1</th>
<th>Mem M[a0]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>try: LI t0, 1</td>
<td>try: LI t0, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LR.W t1, (a0)</td>
<td>LR.W t1, (a0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BNEZ t1, try</td>
<td>BNEZ t1, try</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC.W t0, t0, (a0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SC.W t0, t0, (a0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BNEZ t0, try</td>
<td>BNEZ t0, try</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Mutex from LR and SC

## Load Reserved / Store Conditional

\[ m = 0; \] // \( m=0 \) means lock is free; otherwise, if \( m=1 \), then lock locked

```c
mutex_lock(int *m) {
```

### Table: Thread Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Step</th>
<th>Thread A</th>
<th>Thread B</th>
<th>Thread A t0</th>
<th>Thread A t1</th>
<th>Thread B t0</th>
<th>Thread B t1</th>
<th>Mem M[a0]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>try: LI t0, 1</td>
<td>try: LI t0, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LR.W t1, (a0)</td>
<td>LR.W t1, (a0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BNEZ t1, try</td>
<td>BNEZ t1, try</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC.W t0, t0, (a0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SC.W t0, t0, (a0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BNEZ t0, try</td>
<td>BNEZ t0, try</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>try: LI t0, 1</td>
<td>Critical section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Failed to get mutex lock – try again**

- **Success grabbing mutex lock!**
  - Inside Critical section
Mutex from LR and SC

Load Reserved / Store Conditional

m = 0; // m=0 means lock is free; otherwise, if m=1, then lock locked
mutex_lock(int *m) {
    test_and_set:
        LI t0, 1
        LR.W t1, (a0)
        BNEZ t1, test_and_set
        SC.W t0, t0, (a0)
        BNEZ t0, test_and_set
}

mutex_unlock(int *m) {
    SW zero, a0, 0
}
Load Reserved / Store Conditional

\[ m = 0; \quad // \text{m}=0\text{ means lock is free; otherwise, if m}=1, \quad \text{then lock locked} \]

\[ \text{mutex_lock(int } *m) \{ \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Step</th>
<th>Thread A</th>
<th>Thread B</th>
<th>Thread A t0</th>
<th>Thread A t1</th>
<th>Thread B t0</th>
<th>Thread B t1</th>
<th>Mem M[a0]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>try: LI t0, 1</td>
<td>try: LI t0, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mutex from LR and SC

Load Reserved / Store Conditional

m = 0; // m=0 means lock is free; otherwise, if m=1, then lock locked

```c
mutex_lock(int *m) {
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Step</th>
<th>Thread A</th>
<th>Thread B</th>
<th>Thread A t0</th>
<th>Thread A t1</th>
<th>Thread B t0</th>
<th>Thread B t1</th>
<th>Mem M[a0]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>try: LI t0, 1</td>
<td>try: LI t0, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LR.W t1, (a0)</td>
<td>LR.W t1, (a0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BNEZ t1, try</td>
<td>BNEZ t1, try</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>try: LI t0, 1</td>
<td>try: LI t0, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LR.W t1, (a0)</td>
<td>LR.W t1, (a0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BNEZ t1, try</td>
<td>BNEZ t1, try</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>try: LI t0, 1</td>
<td>try: LI t0, 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LR.W t1, (a0)</td>
<td>LR.W t1, (a0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>BNEZ t1, try</td>
<td>BNEZ t1, try</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now we can write parallel and correct programs

Thread A
for(int i = 0, i < 5; i++) {
    for(int j = 0; j < 5; j++) {
        mutex_lock(m);
        x = x + 1;
        mutex_unlock(m);
    }
}

Thread B
for(int j = 0; j < 5; j++) {
    mutex_lock(m);
    x = x + 1;
    mutex_unlock(m);
}
Alternative Atomic Instructions

Other atomic hardware primitives
- test and set (x86)
- atomic increment (x86)
- bus lock prefix (x86)
- compare and exchange (x86, ARM deprecated)
- load reserved / store conditional
(RISC-V, ARM, PowerPC, DEC Alpha, …)
Synchronization

Synchronization techniques
clever code
  • must work despite adversarial scheduler/interrupts
  • used by: hackers
  • also: noobs
disable interrupts
  • used by: exception handler, scheduler, device drivers,
  ...
disable preemption
  • dangerous for user code, but okay for some kernel code

mutual exclusion locks (mutex)
  • general purpose, except for some interrupt-related cases
Summary

Need parallel abstractions, especially for multicore

Writing correct programs is hard
  Need to prevent data races

Need critical sections to prevent data races
  Mutex, mutual exclusion, implements critical section
  Mutex often implemented using a lock abstraction

Hardware provides synchronization primitives such as LR and SC (load reserved and store conditional) instructions to efficiently implement locks
Next Goal

How do we use synchronization primitives to build concurrency-safe data structure?
Producer/Consumer Example (1)

Access to shared data must be synchronized

• Goal: enforce datastructure invariants

// invariant:
// data is in A[h ... t-1]
char A[100];
int h = 0, t = 0;

// producer: add to list tail
void put(char c) {
    A[t] = c;
    t = (t+1)%n;
}

```c
head
\[
1 \quad 2 \quad 3
\]
tail
```
Producer/Consumer Example (1)

Access to shared data must be synchronized

- Goal: enforce datastructure invariants

```c
// invariant:
// data is in A[h ... t-1]
char A[100];
int h = 0, t = 0;

// producer: add to list tail
void put(char c) {
    A[t] = c;
    t = (t+1)%n;
}

// consumer: take from list head
char get() {  
    while (h == t) {  
    }  
    char c = A[h];  
    h = (h+1)%n;
    return c;
}
```

Producer/Consumer Example (1)

Access to shared data must be synchronized
• Goal: enforce datastructure invariants

// invariant:
// data is in A[h ... t-1]
char A[100];
int h = 0, t = 0;

// producer: add to list tail
void put(char c) {
    A[t] = c;
    t = (t+1)%n;
}

// consumer: take from list head
char get() {
    while (h == t) { }
    char c = A[h];
    h = (h+1)%n;
    return c;
}

What is wrong with code?
a) Will lose update to t and/or h
b) Invariant is not upheld
c) Will produce if full
d) Will consume if empty
e) All of the above
Producer/Consumer Example (1)

Access to shared data must be synchronized
- Goal: enforce datastructure invariants

// invariant:
// data is in A[h ... t-1]
char A[100];
int h = 0, t = 0;

// producer: add to list tail
void put(char c) {
  A[t] = c;
  t = (t+1)%n;
}

// consumer: take from list head
char get() {
  while (h == t) {
  }
  char c = A[h];
  h = (h+1)%n;
  return c;
}

What is wrong with the code?

Could miss an update to t or h
Breaks invariant: only produce if not full and only consume if not empty
→ Need to synchronize access to shared data
Producer/Consumer Example (1)

Access to **shared data** must be synchronized
- Goal: enforce data structure **invariants**

```c
// invariant:
// data is in A[h ... t-1]
char A[100];
int h = 0, t = 0;

// producer: add to list tail // consumer: take from list head
void put(char c) {
    A[t] = c; acquire-lock()
    t = (t+1)%n;
} 

char get() {
    while (h == t) { }
    char c = A[h];
    h = (h+1)%n;
    return c;
    release-lock()
```

Rule of thumb: all access and updates that can affect invariant become critical sections
Protecting an invariant Example (2)

// invariant: (protected by mutex m)
// data is in A[h ... t-1]
pthread_mutex_t *m = pthread_mutex_create();
char A[100];
int h = 0, t = 0;

// producer: add to list tail
void put(char c) {
    pthread_mutex_lock(m);
    A[t] = c;
    t = (t+1)%n;
    pthread_mutex_unlock(m);
}

// consumer: take from list head
char get() {
    pthread_mutex_lock(m);
    while(h == t) {}
    char c = A[h];
    h = (h+1)%n;
    pthread_mutex_unlock(m);
    return c;
}

Rule of thumb: all access and updates that can affect invariant become critical sections

Does this fix work?
Protecting an invariant Example (2)

// invariant: (protected by mutex m)
// data is in A[h ... t-1]
pthread_mutex_t *m = pthread_mutex_create();
char A[100];
int h = 0, t = 0;

// producer: add to list tail
void put(char c) {
    pthread_mutex_lock(m);
    A[t] = c;
    t = (t+1)%n;
    pthread_mutex_unlock(m);
}

// consumer: take from list head
char get() {
    pthread_mutex_lock(m);
    while(h == t) {} // BUG: Can't wait while holding lock
    char c = A[h];
    h = (h+1)%n;
    pthread_mutex_unlock(m);
    return c;
}

Rule of thumb: all access and updates that can affect invariant become critical sections
Guidelines for successful mutexing

Insufficient locking can cause races

• Skimping on mutexes? Just say no!

Poorly designed locking can cause deadlock

P1: lock(m1); lock(m2); C
P2: lock(m2); lock(m1); W

• know why you are using mutexes!
• acquire locks in a consistent order to avoid cycles
• use lock/unlock like braces (match them lexically)
  - lock(&m); …; unlock(&m)
  - watch out for return, goto, and function calls!
  - watch out for exception/error conditions!
Beyond mutexes Example (3)

Writers must check for full buffer & Readers must check for empty buffer
  • ideal: don’t busy wait… go to sleep instead

```c
char get() {
    acquire(L);
    char c = A[h];
    h = (h+1)%n;
    release(L);
    return c;
}
```

![Diagram showing head, last == head, and empty]
Beyond mutexes Example (3)

Writers must check for full buffer & Readers must check for empty buffer
  • ideal: don’t busy wait… go to sleep instead

```
char get() {
    acquire(L);
    while (h == t) {
        ;
    }
    char c = A[h];
    h = (h+1)%n;
    release(L);
    return c;
}
```

Cannot check condition while Holding the lock, BUT, empty condition may no longer hold in critical section

Dilemma: Have to check while holding lock,
Beyond mutexes Example (3)

Writers must check for full buffer
& Readers must check for empty buffer
  • ideal: don’t busy wait… go to sleep instead

```c
char get() {
    acquire(L);
    while (h == t) {}
    char c = A[h];
    h = (h+1)%n;
    release(L);
    return c;
}
```

Dilemma: Have to check while holding lock, but cannot wait while hold lock
Beyond mutexes Example (4)

Writers must check for full buffer
& Readers must check for empty buffer

- ideal: don’t busy wait... go to sleep instead

```c
char get() {
    do {
        acquire(L);
        empty = (h == t);
        if (!empty) {
            c = A[h];
            h = (h+1)%n;
        }
        release(L);
    } while (empty);
    return c;
}
```

Does this work?

a) Yes
b) No
Beyond mutexes Example (4)

Writers must check for full buffer & Readers must check for empty buffer

- ideal: don’t busy wait… go to sleep instead

```cpp
char get() {
    do {
        acquire(L);
        empty = (h == t);
        if (!empty) {
            c = A[h];
            h = (h+1)%n;
        }
        release(L);
    } while (empty);
    return c;
}
```

It works.  But, it is wasteful  Due to the spinning
Language-level Synchronization
Condition variables

Use [Hoare] a condition variable to wait for a condition to become true (without holding lock!)

wait(m, c):
• atomically release \( m \) and sleep, waiting for condition \( c \)
• wake up holding \( m \) sometime after \( c \) was signaled

signal(c): wake up one thread waiting on \( c \)
broadcast(c): wake up all threads waiting on \( c \)

POSIX (e.g., Linux): pthread_cond_wait, pthread_cond_signal, pthread_cond_broadcast
Using a condition variable Example (5)

wait(m, c) : release m, sleep until c, wake up holding m
signal(c) : wake up one thread waiting on c

```c
cond_t *not_full = ...;
cond_t *not_empty = ...;
mutex_t *m = ...;

void put(char c) {
    lock(m);
    while ((t-h) % n == 1)
        wait(m, not_full);
    A[t] = c;
    t = (t+1) % n;
    unlock(m);
    signal(not_empty);
}
char get() {
    lock(m);
    while (t == h)
        wait(m, not_empty);
    char c = A[h];
    h = (h+1) % n;
    unlock(m);
    signal(not_full);
    return c;
}
```
Monitors

A Monitor is a concurrency-safe data structure, with…

- one mutex
- some condition variables
- some operations

All operations on monitor acquire/release mutex

- one thread in the monitor at a time

Ring buffer was a monitor
Java, C#, etc., have built-in support for monitors
Java concurrency

Java objects can be monitors

- “synchronized” keyword locks/releases the mutex
- Has one (!) builtin condition variable
  - o.wait() = wait(o, o)
  - o.notify() = signal(o)
  - o.notifyAll() = broadcast(o)

- Java wait() can be called even when mutex is not held. Mutex not held when awoken by signal(). Useful?
Language-level Synchronization

Lots of synchronization variations…

Reader/writer locks
- Any number of threads can hold a read lock
- Only one thread can hold the writer lock

Semaphores
- N threads can hold lock at the same time

Monitors
- Concurrency-safe data structure with 1 mutex
- All operations on monitor acquire/release mutex
- One thread in the monitor at a time

Message-passing, sockets, queues, ring buffers, …
- transfer data and synchronize
Summary

Hardware Primitives: test-and-set, LR.W/SC.W, barrier, ...
… used to build …

Synchronization primitives: mutex, semaphore, ...
… used to build …

Language Constructs: monitors, signals, …