# **CSE113: Parallel Programming** Feb 3, 2023



### Announcements

- We are starting to grade HW 1, expect grades by the time HW 2 is due (potentially sooner)
  - Ask about issues early
  - If you believe you were wrongly deducted points, please let us know; performance issues can be tricky to grade at this scale!
- Homework 2 was released on Monday
  - Hoping to get through all material to get through all of it by today!
  - If you have questions about the throughput output of the autograder, please let us know
- Ask for help in office hours or piazza if needed

What happens when two atomic store operations write to the same location at the same time with different values?

This is a data conflict and should be avoided

○ It is undefined behavior and the memory location is allowed to contain any possible value

 $\bigcirc$  The value from one of the threads will be stored in the location

○ Each thread will store their value in their cache and they will be able to read this value later on

What does a C++ RMW operation return?

 $\bigcirc$  a boolean indicating whether it succeeded or not

 $\bigcirc$  the value after the modification

 $\bigcirc$  the value before the modification

○ nothing, however it is guaranteed that the modification occurred atomically (indivisibly) in memory

What is the difference between an atomic exchange and an atomic compare and swap?

Discuss a few trade-offs between RMW mutexes and the simpler load/store mutexes (e.g. peterson's lock).

# Review

# Peterson's 2 threaded mutex

```
void lock() {
    int j = thread_id == 0 ? 1 : 0;
    flag[thread_id].store(1);
    victim.store(thread_id);
    while (victim.load() == thread_id
        && flag[j] == 1);
```

j is the other thread Mark ourself as interested volunteer to be the victim in case of a tie

Spin only if: there was a tie in wanting the lock, and I won the volunteer raffle to spin

void unlock() { int i = thread\_id; flag[i].store(0);

mark ourselves as uninterested

# RMWs for mutexes

# CAS lock



Check if the mutex is free, if so, take it.

compare the mutex to free (false), if so, replace it with taken (true). Spin while the thread isn't able to take the mutex.

### CAS lock



Unlock is simple! Just store false back

# Schedule

- Fairness of RMW locks
- Optimization of RMW locks
- RW mutexes

# Starvation

• Are these RMW locks fair?

Is this mutex starvation Free?

# void lock() { while (atomic\_exchange(&flag, true) == true);

# void unlock() { flag.store(false); }

	mutex request				
core 0					-
	mutex				
core 1	request	 	 	 	

Is this mutex starvation Free?

# void lock() { while (atomic\_exchange(&flag, true) == true);

# void unlock() { flag.store(false); }



Is this mutex starvation Free?

# void lock() { while (atomic\_exchange(&flag, true) == true);

}

void unlock() {

flag.store(false);



Is this mutex starvation Free?

# void lock() { while (atomic\_exchange(&flag, true) == true);

}

void unlock() {

flag.store(false);



Is this mutex starvation Free?

# void lock() { while (atomic\_exchange(&flag, true) == true);

}

void unlock() {

flag.store(false);



Is this mutex starvation Free?

# void lock() { while (atomic\_exchange(&flag, true) == true);

}

void unlock() {

flag.store(false);



Is this mutex starvation Free?

# void lock() { while (atomic\_exchange(&flag, true) == true);

}

void unlock() {

flag.store(false);



# How about in practice?

Code demo

# How can we make this more fair?

- Use a different atomic instruction:
  - int atomic\_fetch\_add(atomic\_int \*a, int v);

We've seen this one before!

# How can we make this more fair?

- Use a different atomic instruction:
  - int atomic\_fetch\_add(atomic\_int \*a, int v);

*We've seen this one before! intuition: take a ticket* 



like at Zoccoli's!



# Ticket lock

};

```
class Mutex {
public:
 Mutex() {
    counter = 0;
    currently_serving = 0;
  }
  void lock() {
   int my_number = atomic_fetch_add(&counter, 1);
    while (currently_serving.load() != my_number);
  }
  void unlock() {
    int tmp = currently_serving.load();
    tmp += 1;
    currently_serving.store(tmp);
private:
  atomic_int counter;
  atomic_int currently_serving;
```

- Ticket lock: instead of 1 bit, we need an integer for the counter.
- The mutex also needs to track of which ticket is currently being served

# Ticket lock

```
class Mutex {
public:
   Mutex() {
      counter = 0;
      currently_serving = 0;
   }
```

```
void lock() {
```

```
int my_number = atomic_fetch_add(&counter, 1);
while (currently_serving.load() != my_number);
}
```

```
void unlock() {
    int tmp = currently_serving.load();
    tmp += 1;
    currently_serving.store(tmp);
}
```

```
private:
```

```
atomic_int counter;
atomic_int currently_serving;
};
```

- Ticket lock: instead of 1 bit, we need an integer for the counter.
- The mutex also needs to track of which ticket is currently being served

Get a unique number

Spin while your number isn't being served

To release, increment the number that's currently being served.

```
void lock() {
    int my_number = atomic_fetch_add(&counter, 1);
    while (currently_serving.load() != my_number);
}
void unlock() {
    int tmp = currently_serving.load();
    tmp += 1;
    currently_serving.store(tmp);
}
```



```
void lock() {
    int my_number = atomic_fetch_add(&counter, 1);
    while (currently_serving.load() != my_number);
}
void unlock() {
    int tmp = currently_serving.load();
    tmp += 1;
    currently_serving.store(tmp);
}
```







currently\_serving is 0



Is this mutex starvation Free?



currently\_serving is 0

currently\_serving is 1





currently\_serving is 0



my\_number is 2, counter is now 3



Is this mutex starvation Free?



currently serving is 0





Is this mutex starvation Free?

currently serving is 0





# Fair but at what cost?

• Example

# Schedule

- Fairness of RMW locks
- Optimization of RMW locks
- RW mutexes

# Optimizations: relaxed peeking

- Relaxed Peeking
  - the Writes in RMWs cost extra; rather than always modify, we can do a simple check first

```
void lock() {
   bool e = false;
   int acquired = false;
   while (acquired == false) {
      acquired = atomic_compare_exchange_strong(&flag, &e, true);
      e = false;
   }
}
bool try_lock() {
   bool e = false;
   return atomic_compare_exchange_strong(&flag, &e, true);
}
```

# Optimizations: relaxed peeking

- Relaxed Peeking
  - the Writes in RMWs cost extra; rather than always modify, we can do a simple check first

```
void lock() {
  bool e = false;
  bool acquired = false;
  while (!acquired) {
    while (flag.load() == true);
    e = false;
    acquired = atomic_compare_exchange_strong(&flag, &e, true);
  }
}
```
# Optimizations: relaxed peeking

- What about the load in the loop? Remember the memory fence? Do we need to flush our caches every time we peek?
- We only need to flush when we actually acquire the mutex

```
void lock() {
   bool e = false;
   bool acquired = false;
   while (!acquired) {
     while (flag.load() == true);
     e = false;
     acquired = atomic_compare_exchange_strong(&flag, &e, true);
   }
}
```

# Optimizations: relaxed peeking

- What about the load in the loop? Remember the memory fence? Do we need to flush our caches every time we peek?
- We only need to flush when we actually acquire the mutex

```
void lock(int thread_id) {
   bool e = false;
   bool acquired = false;
   while (!acquired) {
     while (flag.load(memory_order_relaxed) == true);
     e = false;
     acquired = atomic_compare_exchange_strong(&flag, &e, true);
   }
}
```



C1 memory operations have **not** yet been performed and cache is invalidated

## Relaxed atomics

- Enter expert mode!
  - explicit atomics with relaxed semantics
  - Beware! they do not provide a memory fence!
  - Only use when a memory fence is issued later before leaving your mutex implementation. Good for "peeking" before you actually execute your RMW.

- Even using relaxed peeking, two issues remain:
  - Loads still cause bus traffic (even if its not as bad as RMWs)
  - In non-parallel systems, concurrent threads can get in the way of progress

- Even using relaxed peeking, two issues remain:
  - Loads still cause bus traffic (even if its not as bad as RMWs)
  - In non-parallel systems, concurrent threads can get in the way of progress

- Even using relaxed peeking, two issues remain:
  - Loads still cause bus traffic (even if its not as bad as RMWs)
  - In non-parallel systems, concurrent threads can get in the way of progress

- Even using relaxed peeking, two issues remain:
  - Loads still cause bus traffic (even if its not as bad as RMWs)
  - In non-parallel systems, concurrent threads can get in the way of progress



- Even using relaxed peeking, two issues remain:
  - Loads still cause bus traffic (even if its not as bad as RMWs)
  - In non-parallel systems, concurrent threads can get in the way of progress



- Two issues remain:
  - Loads still cause bus traffic (even if its not as bad as RMWs)
  - In non-parallel systems, concurrent threads can get in the way of progress



- Two issues remain:
  - Loads still cause bus traffic (even if its not as bad as RMWs)
  - In non-parallel systems, concurrent threads can get in the way of progress



- Two issues remain:
  - Loads still cause bus traffic (even if its not as bad as RMWs)
  - In non-parallel systems, concurrent threads can get in the way of progress



- Two issues remain:
  - Loads still cause bus traffic (even if its not as bad as RMWs)
  - In non-parallel systems, concurrent threads can get in the way of progress



- Two issues remain:
  - Loads still cause bus traffic (even if its not as bad as RMWs)
  - In non-parallel systems, concurrent threads can get in the way of progress



- C++
  - this\_thread::yield();
- Hints to the operating system that we should take a break while other threads (potentially the threads that have the mutex) get scheduled.

where do we put it?

- C++
  - this\_thread::yield();
- Hints to the operating system that we should take a break while other threads (potentially the threads that have the mutex) get scheduled.

```
void lock(int thread_id) {
   bool e = false;
   bool acquired = false;
   while (!acquired) {
     while (flag.load(memory_order_relaxed) == true);
     e = false;
     acquired = atomic_compare_exchange_strong(&flag, &e, true);
   }
}
```

```
void lock(int thread_id) {
  bool e = false;
  bool acquired = false;
 while (!acquired) {
    while (flag.load(memory_order_relaxed) == true) {
      this_thread::yield();
    e = false;
    acquired = atomic_compare_exchange_strong(&flag, &e, true);
```

# Demo

• Example in terminal

- Other backoff strategies: sleeping
  - this\_thread::sleep\_for(10ms);
  - Finer control over sleep time
- Exponential backoff:
  - Every time the thread wakes up, sleep for 2x as long
- Tuned sleep time:
  - Keep track of a sleep time.
  - Every time you spin, increase the sleep time (remember for next spin)
  - If you acquire, reduce the sleep time

# Optimizations: when to use them

- Spinning is useful for short waits on non-oversubscribed systems
- Sleeping is useful for regular tasks
  - tasks occur at set frequencies
  - critical sections take roughly the same time
  - In these cases, sleep times can be tuned
- Yielding is useful for oversubscribed systems, with irregular tasks
  - On modern systems, yield is usually sufficient!

# Optimizations: when to use them

- When to use what optimization?
  - Start with C++ mutex, then
  - microbenchmark
  - profile
- Sometimes we want our own custom backoff strategies.
  - We can optimize around existing mutexes!

try\_lock

- another common mutex API method: try\_lock()
- one-shot mutex attempt (implementation defined)
- You can then implement your own sleep/yield strategy around this

```
void lock() {
 bool e = false;
 bool acquired = false;
 while (!acquired) {
    while (flag.load(memory_order_relaxed) == true) {
      this_thread::yield();
    e = false;
    acquired = atomic_compare_exchange_strong(&flag, &e, true);
  }
}
bool try_lock() {
 bool e = false;
 return atomic_compare_exchange_strong(&flag, &e, true);
}
```

try\_lock

- straightforward with CAS and exchange mutex
- What about ticket lock?

```
class Mutex {
public:
  Mutex() {
    counter = 0;
    currently_serving = 0;
  }
  void lock() {
    int my_number = atomic_fetch_add(&counter, 1);
    while (currently_serving.load() != my_number);
  void unlock() {
    int tmp = currently_serving.load();
    tmp += 1;
    currently_serving.store(tmp);
private:
  atomic_int counter;
  atomic_int currently_serving;
```

### Example: UI refresh

- Screen refreshes operate at ~60 FPS.
- Assume a situation where there is mutex for the screen buffer. It can be updated by one thread, once per frame.
- We know that the sleep will be ~16ms

### Example: UI refresh

void lock\_refresh\_rate(mutex m) {
 while (m.try\_lock() == false) {
 this\_thread::sleep\_for(16ms);
 }

try\_lock

- C++ provides a try\_lock for their mutex operation
- We have now covered the entire C++ mutex object

# Schedule

- Fairness of RMW locks
- Optimization of RMW locks
- RW mutexes

Global variable: int tylers\_account



Global variable: int tylers\_account

But what happens more frequently than either of those things?



Global variable: int tylers\_account

But what happens more frequently than either of those things?

void buy\_coffee() {
 tylers\_account--;
}

void get\_paid() {
 tylers\_account++;
}

which of these operations can safely be executed concurrently?

Remember the definition of a data-conflict: at least one write

int check\_balance() {
 return tylers\_account;
}

Different actors accessing it concurrently Credit monitors Accountants Personal

Global variable: int tylers\_account

But what happens more frequently than either of those things?



void get\_paid() {
 tylers\_account++;
}

int check\_balance() {
 return tylers\_account;
}

No reason why this function can't be called concurrently. It only needs to be protected if another thread calls one of the other functions.

- different lock and unlock functions:
  - Functions that only read can perform a "read" lock
  - Functions that might write can perform a regular lock
  - regular locks ensures that the writer has exclusive access (from other reader and writers)
  - but multiple reader threads can hold the lock in reader state

```
class rw_mutex {
  public:
    void reader_lock();
    void reader_unlock();
    void lock();
    void unlock();
};
```

Global variable: int tylers\_account



void get\_paid() {
 tylers\_account++;
}

int check\_balance() { return tylers\_account; }

Global variable: int tylers\_account

```
void buy_coffee() {
    m.lock();
    tylers_account--;
    m.unlock();
}
```

void get\_paid() {
 m.lock();
 tylers\_account++;
 m.unlock();

int check\_balance() {
 return tylers\_account;
}
## Reader-Writer Mutex

Global variable: int tylers\_account

```
void buy_coffee() {
    m.lock();
    tylers_account--;
    m.unlock();
}
```

void get\_paid() {
 m.lock();
 tylers\_account++;
 m.unlock();

```
int check_balance() {
    m.reader_lock();
    int t = tylers_account;
    m.reader_unlock();
    return t;
}
```

- Primitives that we built the previous mutexes with:
  - atomic load, atomic store, atomic RMW
- We have a new tool!
  - Regular mutex!

- We will use a mutex internally.
- We will keep track of how many readers are currently "holding" the mutex.
- We will keep track of if a writer is holding the mutex.

```
class rw_mutex {
 public:
  rw_mutex() {
    num_readers = 0;
    writer = false;
  }
  void reader_lock();
  void reader_unlock();
  void lock();
  void unlock();
 private:
 mutex internal_mutex;
  int num_readers;
  bool writer;
};
```

• Reader locks

```
void reader_lock() {
  bool acquired = false;
  while (!acquired) {
    internal_mutex.lock();
    if (!writer) {
      acquired = true;
      num_readers++;
    internal_mutex.unlock();
void reader_unlock() {
  internal_mutex.lock();
  num_readers--;
  internal_mutex.unlock();
```

• Regular locks

```
void lock() {
  bool acquired = false;
  while (!acquired) {
    internal_mutex.lock();
    if (!writer && num_readers == 0) {
      acquired = true;
      writer = true;
    internal_mutex.unlock();
}
void unlock() {
  internal_mutex.lock();
  writer = false;
  internal_mutex.unlock();
}
```









```
void lock() {
   bool acquired = false;
   while (!acquired) {
      internal_mutex.lock();
      if (!writer && num_readers == 0) {
         acquired = true;
         writer = true;
         }
      internal_mutex.unlock();
   }
}
void unlock() {
   internal_mutex.lock();
   writer = false;
   internal_mutex.unlock();
}
```



writer = true num\_readers = 0





```
void lock() {
   bool acquired = false;
   while (!acquired) {
      internal_mutex.lock();
      if (!writer && num_readers == 0) {
         acquired = true;
         writer = true;
         }
      internal_mutex.unlock();
   }
}
void unlock() {
   internal_mutex.lock();
   writer = false;
   internal_mutex.unlock();
}
```





```
void reader_lock() {
   bool acquired = false;
   while (!acquired) {
      internal_mutex.lock();
      if (!writer) {
         acquired = true;
         num_readers++;
      }
      internal_mutex.unlock();
   }
}
void reader_unlock() {
   internal_mutex.lock();
   num_readers--;
   internal_mutex.unlock();
}
```

#### reset!







```
void reader_lock() {
   bool acquired = false;
   while (!acquired) {
      internal_mutex.lock();
      if (!writer) {
         acquired = true;
         num_readers++;
      }
      internal_mutex.unlock();
   }
}
void reader_unlock() {
   internal_mutex.lock();
   num_readers--;
   internal_mutex.unlock();
}
```















```
void lock() {
   bool acquired = false;
   while (!acquired) {
      internal_mutex.lock();
      if (!writer && num_readers == 0) {
        acquired = true;
        writer = true;
      }
      internal_mutex.unlock();
   }
}
void unlock() {
   internal_mutex.lock();
   writer = false;
   internal_mutex.unlock();
}
```



```
void reader_lock() {
   bool acquired = false;
   while (!acquired) {
      internal_mutex.lock();
      if (!writer) {
         acquired = true;
         num_readers++;
      }
      internal_mutex.unlock();
   }
}
void reader_unlock() {
   internal_mutex.lock();
   num_readers--;
   internal_mutex.unlock();
}
```













```
void lock() {
   bool acquired = false;
   while (!acquired) {
      internal_mutex.lock();
      if (!writer && num_readers == 0) {
         acquired = true;
         writer = true;
      }
      internal_mutex.unlock();
   }
}
void unlock() {
   internal_mutex.lock();
   writer = false;
   internal_mutex.unlock();
}
```

# Reader Writer lock

- This implementation potentially starves writers
  - The common case is to have lots of readers!
- Think about ways how an implementation might be more fair to writers.

### How this looks in C++

#include <shared\_mutex>
using namespace std;

shared\_mutex m;

m.lock\_shared() // reader lock
m.unlock\_shared() // reader unlock
m.lock() // regular lock
m.unlock() // regular unlock

## Next week

- Planning on last mutex lecture
  - More specialized examples
  - Optimistic vs. pessimistic concurrency
- Work on HW 2! You now have everything you need to complete it!
  - Parts of next lectures might help with part 2.