Synchronization

Coherency protocols guarantee that a reading processor (thread) sees the most current update to shared data.

Coherency protocols do not:

 make sure that only one thread accesses shared data or a shared hardware or software resource at a time

Critical sections order thread access to shared data

force threads to start executing particular sections of code together
 Barriers force threads to start executing particular sections of code together

Spring 2006 CSE 471 - Synchronization

Barriers

Barrier synchronization

- a barrier: point in a program which all threads must reach before any thread can cross
 - threads reach the barrier & then wait until all other threads arrive
 - all threads are released at once & begin executing code beyond the barrier
- · example implementation of a barrier:
 - set a lock-protected counter to the number of processors
 - each thread (assuming 1/processor) decrements it
 - when the counter value becomes 0, all threads have crossed the barrier
- · code that implements a barrier is a critical section
- useful for:
 - · programs that execute in phases
 - · synchronizing after a parallel loop

Spring 2006 CSE 471 - Synchronization

Acquiring a Lock

Atomic exchange instruction: swap a value in a register & a value in memory in one operation

- set the register to 1
- swap the register value & the lock value in memory
- new register value determines whether got the lock

AcquireLock:

```
li R3, #1 /* create lock value swap R3, 0(R4) /* exchange register & lock bnez R3, AcquireLock /* have to try again */
```

· also known as atomic read-modify-write a location in memory

Other examples

- test & set: tests the value in a memory location & sets it to 1
- fetch & increment/decrement: returns the value of a memory location + 1

Critical Sections

A critical section

- · a sequence of code that only one thread can execute at a time
- · provides mutual exclusion
 - a thread has exclusive access to the code & the data that it accesses
 - · guarantees that only one thread can update the data at a time
- · to execute a critical section, a thread
 - · acquires a lock that guards it
 - executes its code
 - · releases the lock

The effect is to synchronize or order the access of threads wrt their accessing shared data

Spring 2006 CSE 471 - Synchronization

Locking

Locking facilitates access to a critical section.

Locking protocol:

- · synchronization variable or lock
 - · 0: lock is available
 - 1: lock is unavailable because another thread holds it
- · a thread obtains the lock before it can enter a critical section
 - · sets the lock to 1
- · thread releases the lock before it leaves the critical section
 - · clears the lock

Spring 2006 CSE 471 - Synchronization 4

Releasing a Lock

Store a 0 in the lock

 Spring 2006
 CSE 471 - Synchronization
 5
 Spring 2006
 CSE 471 - Synchronization
 6

Load-linked & Store Conditional

Performance problem with atomic read-modify-write:

- · 2 memory operations in one
- · must hold the bus until both operations complete

Pair of instructions appears atomic

- avoids need for uninterruptible memory read & write
- · load-locked & store-conditional
 - · load-locked returns the original (lock) value in memory
 - if the contents of lock memory has not changed when the storeconditional is executed, the processor still has the lock
 - · store-conditional returns a 1 if successful

Spring 2006 CSE 471 - Synchronization

Load-linked & Store Conditional

Implemented with special processor registers: lock-flag register & lock-address register

- load-locked sets lock-address register to lock's memory address & lock-flag register to 1
- · store-conditional returns lock-flag register value in the store register
- lock-flag register is cleared if the lock is written by another processor
- · lock-flag register cleared if context switch or interrupt

Spring 2006 CSE 471 - Synchronization 8

Synchronization APIs

User-level software synchronization library routines constructed with atomic hardware primitives

- · spin locks
 - · busywaiting until obtain the lock
 - contention with atomic exchange causes invalidations (for the write) & coherency misses (for the rereads)
 - · avoid if separate reading the lock & testing it
 - spinning done in the cache rather than over the bus

```
        getLk:
        li
        R2, #1

        spinLoop:
        11
        R1, lockVariable

        blbs
        R1, spinLoop

        sc
        R2, lockVariable

        beqz
        R2, getLk

        .... (critical section)

        st
        R0, lockVariable
```

- blocking locks
 - · block the thread after a certain number of spins

Spring 2006 CSE 471 - Synchronization

Synchronization Performance

An example overall synchronization/coherence strategy:

- design cache coherency protocol for little interprocessor contention for locks (the common case)
- add techniques to avoid performance loss if there is contention for a lock & still provide low latency if no contention

Have a race condition for acquiring a lock when it is unlocked

- O(p²) bus transactions for p contending processors (write-invalidate)
- exponential back-off software solution
 - · each processor retries at a different time
- successive retries done an exponentially increasing time later
- queuing locks hardware solution
 - lock is passed from unlocking processor to waiting processor
 - · also addresses fairness

Spring 2006 CSE 471 - Synchronization 10

Atomic Exchange in Practice

Alpha

· load-locked, store-conditional

UltraSPARCs (V9 architecture)

· several primitives

compare & swap, test & set, etc.

Pentium Pro

· compare & swap

Spring 2006 CSE 471 - Synchronization 11