cse

User-level Uniprocessor Mutual Exclusion

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

cse

Mutual Exclusion Overheads

- Locking implemented by:
  - interrupt disabling and enabling
    - not suitable for user-level
  - Hardware primitives (test and set)
    - not always available, not efficiently implemented
  - System calls
    - high overheads
- Trade-off between granularity of locking and locking overhead
  - Fine granularity
    - more potential parallelism
    - more locks and thus overhead

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

cse

Can we avoid locking?

- Yes
  - in some cases
- Lock-free data structures
  - Need hardware help
    - compare-and-swap()
    - exchange()
    - test_and_set()

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

cse

Background: Atomic Compare and Swap

```
bool compare_swap(addr, val, new)
{
   if (*addr == val) {
   *addr = new;
   return true;
   }
   return false
}
```

`addr` = memory address
`val` = expected value
`new` = value to replace
`r` = success or failure

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

cse

CAS Example

- Lock-free atomic increment

```
atomic_inc(int *addr)
{
   do {
        old = *addr;
        new = old + 1;
   } while (!compare_and_swap(addr, old, new));
}
```

- Lock-free does not preclude starvation
- Tricky to implement more complex structures

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

cse

Lock-free the solution?

- Can avoid locking by using lock-free data structures
  - Still need short atomic sequences
    - compare-and-swap,etc,..
    - not always provided by hardware
    - may be slow to execute
- Observe: Lock-based data structure also need mutual exclusion to implement the lock primitive themselves.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

cse

How do we provide efficient atomic sequences?

- Interrupt disabling?
- Syscalls?
- Processor Instructions?

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

cse

The problem

```
add:
lw  r0, (r1)
add r0, r0, 1
sw  r0, (r1)
```

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

cse

Optimistic Approach

- Assume the critical code runs atomically
  - *Atomic Sequence*
- If an interrupt occurs, OS recovers such that atomicity is preserved
- Two basic mechanisms
  - Rollback
    - Only single memory location update
    - Guarantee progress???
  - Rollforward

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

cse

How does the OS know what is an atomic sequence?

- Designated sequences
  - Match well know sequences surrounding PC
    - Matching takes time
    - sequence may occur outside an atomic sequences
      - Rollback might break code
      - Rollforward okay
    - Sequences can be inlined
    - No overhead added to each sequence, overhead only on interruption

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

cse

- Static Registration
  - All sequences are registered at program startup
    - No direct overhead to sequences themselves
    - Limited number of sequences
      - Reasonable to identify on interrupt
      - No inlining

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

cse

- Dynamic Registration
  - Share a variable between kernel and user-level, set it while in an atomic sequence
  - Can inline, even synthesize sequences at runtime
  - Adds direct overhead to each sequence

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

How to roll forward?

- Problem: How to regain control after rolling forward to end of sequence
- Code re-writing
  - Re-write instruction after sequence to call back to interrupt handler
    - Cache issues – need to flush the instruction cache??

- Cloning
  - Two copies of each sequence
    - normal copy
    - modified copy that call back into interrupt handler
    - On interrupt, map PC in normal sequence into PC in modified
    - Mapping can be time consuming
      - Inlining???
    - Difficulties with PC relative offsets
      - Instruction encoding may change in clone.

- Computed Jump
  - Every sequence uses a computed jump at the end
    - Normal sequence simply jmp to next instruction
    - Interrupted sequence jumps to interrupt handler
    - Adds a jump to every sequence

- Controlled fault
  - Dummy instruction at end of each sequences
    - NOP for normal case
    - Fault for interrupt case
      - Example is read from (in)accessible page
  - Still adds an extra instruction

Limiting Duration of Roll forward

- Watchdog
- Restriction on code so termination can be inspected for

Implementations - Dynamic Registration Scheme With Jump

destAddr ← *addressOf*(theEnd)
inAS ← TRUE
⟨atomic sequence . . .⟩
inAS ← FALSE
jump *destAddr*

```
theEnd:
        * lda  r4, inAS          # load address of inAS
        * lda  r1, theEnd        # load address of theEnd into r1
        * stl  zero, (r4)        # inAS <- TRUE (0 = TRUE)
          lda  r3, sharedCounter # load address of sharedCounter
          ldl  r2, (r3)          # load value of sharedCounter
          addl r2, 1, r2         # increment counter
          stl  r2, (r3)          # store back new value
        * stl  r1, (r4)          # reset inAS to FALSE (not 0 = FALSE)
        * jmp  (r1)              # jump to address stored in r1
  theEnd:
```

Implementations - Dynamic Registration Scheme With Fault

```
                destAddr ← addressOf(theEnd)
                inAS ← TRUE
                ⟨atomic sequence . . .⟩
theEnd:         inAS ← ∗falseOrFault
```

Implementations – Hybrid registration – a hint-based approach

```
                destAddr ← addressOf(theEnd)
                inAS ← TRUE
                ⟨atomic sequence . . .⟩
                jump destAddr
        theEnd:


        * lda   r1, theEnd          # load address of theEnd into r1
          lda   r3, sharedCounter   # load address of sharedCounter
          ldl   r2, (r3)            # load value of sharedCounter
          addl  r2, 1, r2           # increment counter
          stl   r2, (r3)            # store back new value
        * jmp   (r1)                # jump to address stored in r1
theEnd:
```

Results

Technique	DEC Alpha NULL	DEC Alpha LIFO	DEC Alpha FIFO	HP PA-RISC 1.1 NULL	HP PA-RISC 1.1 LIFO	HP PA-RISC 1.1 FIFO
sigprocmask	1682	3045	3363	1787	3578	3590
Dyn/Fault	13	27	24	12	24	27
Dyn/Jump	9	16	13	11	21	27
Hyb/Jump	6	5	6	5	8	12
DI	4	3	4	4	5	12
CIPL	4	5	6	14	24	29
splx	44	89	88	30	63	73
PALcode	≥ 13	≥ 13	≥ 13	n/a	n/a	n/a
LL/STC	n/a	≥ 118	≥ 118	n/a	n/a	n/a

Table 1: Overheads of Different Atomicity Schemes in Cycles

Benchmark Legend

- Sigprocmask – syscall based approach
- DI – disable all interrupts
- CIPL – set interrupt priority level
- SPLx – same as CIPL with function call
- PALcode – special Alpha processor call
- LL/SC – load link store conditional

Interrupt Delay

- Whenever an interrupt occurs, we need to check for atomic sequence.
  - Hyb/Jump
    - does r1 point to instruction after a jump
    - sequence <= 32 instructions
    - no backward jumps/branches
    - forward jump/branch targets within sequence
- Cost
  - 73 + N * 25 cycles (N is length of sequence)
  - Only if we pre-empt in the small atomic sequence.