CS111, Lecture 19
Preemption and Implementing Locks

😷 masks recommended
Topic 3: Multithreading - How can we have concurrency within a single process? How does the operating system support this?
assign5: implement your own version of thread, mutex and condition_variable!
Learning Goals

• Compare tradeoffs between various approaches to scheduling
• Learn about the assign5 infrastructure and how to implement a dispatcher with *preemption*
• See how our understanding of thread dispatching/scheduling allows us to implement locks
Plan For Today

• Recap and continuing: Scheduling
• Preemption and Interrupts
• Implementing Locks

```
cp -r /afs/ir/class/cs111/lecture-code/lect19 .
```
Plan For Today

• Recap and continuing: Scheduling
• Preemption and Interrupts
• Implementing Locks

`cp -r /afs/ir/class/cs111/lecture-code/lect19 .`
Key Question: How does the operating system decide which thread to run next? (e.g. many ready threads). Assume just 1 core.

We discussed 2 main designs so far:

1. **First-come-first-serve (FIFO / FCFS):** keep threads in ready queue, add threads to the back, run thread from front until completion or blocking.

2. **Round Robin:** run thread for one time slice, then add to back of queue if wants more time
How do we decide whether a scheduling algorithm is good?

• Minimize response time (time to useful result)
  • e.g. keystroke \(\rightarrow\) key appearing, or “make” \(\rightarrow\) program compiled
  • Assume useful result is when the thread blocks or completes

• Use resources efficiently
  • keep cores + disks busy
  • low overhead (minimize context switches)

• Fairness (e.g. with many users, or even many jobs for one user)
Comparing FCFS/RR: Scenario 1

Ready Queue

C 2ms  B 1ms  A 100ms
Comparing FCFS/RR: Scenario 1

- Ready Queue:
  - C: 2ms
  - B: 1ms
  - A: 100ms

- FIFO:
  - Time: 100 101 103
  - Average: 101.3
Comparing FCFS/RR: Scenario 1

Is RR *always* better than FCFS?

**Ready Queue**

- **C** 2ms
- **B** 1ms
- **A** 100ms

**FIFO**

- **A**
- **B**
- **C**

- **Avg:** 101.3

**Round Robin**

- **A**
- **B**
- **C**
- **A**
- **C**

- **Avg:** 36.7

**Time**

- **2** 5 100 101 103
Comparing FCFS/RR: Scenario 2

Ready Queue

C
10ms

B
10ms

A
10ms
Comparing FCFS/RR: Scenario 2

Ready Queue

C 10ms  B 10ms  A 10ms

FIFO

A  B  C  A  B  C

Avg: 20

time 10 20 30

Round Robin

A  B  C  A  B  C  ...

A  B  C  A  B  C

Avg: 29

time 28 29 30
What’s the optimal approach if we want to minimize average response time?
What would it look like if we optimized for completion time? (time to finish, or time to block).

Idea - SRPT: pick the thread that will finish the most quickly and run it to completion. This is the optimal solution for minimizing average response time.
Evaluating SRPT

Ready Queue

C 2ms  B 1ms  A 100ms

FIFO

A B C

Avg: 101.3

time  100 101 103

Round Robin

A B C A C A

Avg: 36.7

time  2 5 103
Evaluating SRPT

Ready Queue

C: 2ms
B: 1ms
A: 100ms

FIFO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Avg: 101.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Round Robin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Avg: 36.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

time: 2 5

SRPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Avg: 35.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

time: 1 3
Evaluating SRPT

Ready Queue

C 10ms  B 10ms  A 10ms

FIFO

A  B  C  time  10  20  30  Avg: 20

Round Robin

A  B  C  A  B  C  ...  A  B  C  A  B  C  Avg: 29
Evaluating SRPT

Ready Queue

C 10ms  B 10ms  A 10ms

FIFO

A  B  C

Avg: 20

time 10 20 30

Round Robin

A B C A B C ...

Avg: 29

time 28 29 30

SRPT

A  B  C

Avg: 20

time 10 20 30
Shortest Remaining Processing Time

**SRPT:** pick the thread that will finish the most quickly and run it to completion. This is the optimal solution for minimizing average response time.

What are some problems/challenges with the SRPT approach?

**Problem #1:** how do we know which one will finish most quickly? (we must be able to predict the future...)

**Problem #2:** if we have many short-running threads and one long-running one, the long one will not get to run (“starvation”)

How can we get close to SRPT but without having to predict the future or neglect certain threads?
Priority-Based Scheduling

**Goal:** we want to get close to SRPT, but without having to predict the future, and without neglecting certain threads.

**Key Idea:** can use past performance to predict future performance.

- Behavior tends to be consistent
- If a thread runs for a long time without blocking, it’s likely to continue running
Goal: we want to get close to SRPT, but without having to predict the future, and without neglecting certain threads.

Idea: let’s make threads have priorities that adjust over time as they run. We’ll have 1 ready queue for each priority, and always run highest-priority threads.

• Overall idea: threads that aren't using much CPU time stay in the higher-priority queues, threads that are migrate to lower-priority queues.
• After blocking, thread starts in highest priority queue
• If a thread reaches the end of its time slice without blocking it moves to the next lower queue.

Problem: could still neglect long-running threads!
Idea: let’s make threads have priorities that adjust over time as they run. We’ll have 1 ready queue for each priority, and always run highest-priority threads.

Problem: could still neglect long-running threads!

Let’s keep track of recent CPU usage per thread. If a thread hasn’t run in a long time, its priority goes up. And if it has run a lot recently, priority goes down.

- No more neglecting threads: a thread that hasn’t run in a long time will get its priority increased
- If there are many equally-long threads that want to run, the priorities even out over time, at a kind of “equilibrium”
Key Question: How does the operating system decide which thread to run next? (e.g. many ready threads). Assume just 1 core.

We discussed 4 main designs:

1. First-come-first-serve (FIFO / FCFS): keep threads in ready queue, add threads to the back, run thread from front until completion or blocking.

2. Round Robin: run thread for one time slice, then add to back of queue if wants more time

3. Shortest Remaining Processing Time (SRPT): pick the thread that will complete or block the soonest and run it to completion.

4. Priority-Based Scheduling: threads have priorities, and we have one ready queue per priority. Threads adjust priorities based on time slice usage, or based on recent CPU usage (4.4 BSD Unix)
Plan For Today

• Recap and continuing: Scheduling
• Preemption and Interrupts
• Implementing Locks

```
cp -r /afs/ir/class/cs111/lecture-code/lect19 .
```
Preemption and Interrupts

On assign5, you’ll implement a **dispatcher and scheduler** using the Round Robin approach.

- **Preemptive**: threads can be kicked off in favor of others (after time slice)

To implement this, we’ve provided a **timer** implementation that lets you run code every X microseconds.

- Fires a timer interrupt at specified interval

**Idea**: we can use the timer handler to trigger a context switch!
(For simplicity, on assign5 we’ll always do a context switch when the timer fires)
void timer_interrupt_handler() {
    cout << "Timer interrupt occurred!" << endl;
}

int main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
    // specify microsecond interval and function to call
    timer_init(500000, timer_interrupt_handler);
    while (true) {} 
}
Demo: context-switch-preemption-buggy.cc
Interrupts

When the timer handler is called, it’s called with (all) interrupts disabled. Why? To avoid a timer handler interrupting a timer handler.

When the timer handler finishes, interrupts are re-enabled.

```c
// within timer code

// (omitted) timer disables interrupts here
your_timer_handler();
// (omitted) timer re-enables interrupts here
```

Interrupt state is shared (not per-thread).
Interrupts

When the timer handler is called, it’s called with (all) interrupts **disabled**. Why? To avoid a timer handler interrupting a timer handler. When the timer handler finishes, interrupts are **re-enabled**.

// within timer code

// (omitted) timer disables interrupts here
your_timer_handler();
// (omitted) timer re-enables interrupts here

**Problem:** because we context switch in the middle of the timer handler, when we start executing another thread **for the first time**, we will have interrupts **disabled** and the timer won’t be heard anymore!
Enabling Interrupts

Solution: manually enable interrupts when a thread is first run.

```c
void other_func() {
    intr_enable(true);
    while (true) {
        cout << "Other thread here! Hello." << endl;
    }
}
```

On assign5: when a program creates a thread and gives you the function that thread should run, you will run that thread initially by enabling interrupts first and then running their specified function.
Disabling/Enabling Interrupts

The assignment starter code provides the following to enable or disable interrupts:

```c
void intr_enable(bool on);
```
What about when we switch to a thread that we’ve already run before? Do we need to enable interrupts there too?

No – if a thread is paused that means when it was previously running, the timer handler was called and it context-switched to another thread. Therefore, when that thread resumes, it will resume at the end of the timer handler, where interrupts are re-enabled.
Interrupts

On assign5, there are other places where interrupts can cause complications.

• E.g. we could be in the middle of adding to the ready queue, but then the timer fires and we go to remove something from the ready queue!

• This sounds like a race condition problem we can solve with mutexes!....right?

• Not in this case – because we are the OS, and we implement mutexes! And they rely on the thread dispatching code in this assignment.

• Therefore, the mechanism for avoiding race conditions is to enable/disable interrupts when we don’t want to be interrupted (e.g. by timer).

• Interrupts are a shared state – not per-thread.

• We’re assuming a single-core machine, where disabling interrupts is sufficient to guarantee no other thread will run.
Plan For Today

• Recap and continuing: Scheduling
• Preemption and Interrupts
• Implementing Locks

`cp -r /afs/ir/class/cs111/lecture-code/lect19 .`
Implementing Locks

Now that we understand how thread dispatching/scheduling works, we can write our own mutex implementation! Mutexes need to block threads (functionality the dispatcher / scheduler provides).

What does the design of a lock look like? What state does it need?

• Track whether it is locked / unlocked
• The lock “owner” (if any) – perhaps combine with first bullet
• A list of threads waiting to get this lock
Implementing Locks

Now that we understand how thread dispatching/scheduling works, we can write our own `mutex` implementation! Mutexes need to block threads (functionality the dispatcher / scheduler provides).

What does the design of a lock look like? What state does it need?

- Track whether it is locked / unlocked
- The lock “owner” (if any) – perhaps combine with first bullet
- A list of threads waiting to get this lock

We can keep a queue of threads (for fairness). (Hint: C++ has a built-in `queue` data structure)
Lock

1. If this lock is unlocked, mark it as locked by the current thread
2. Otherwise, add the current thread to the back of the waiting queue

// Instance variables
int locked = 0;
ThreadQueue q;

void Lock::lock() {
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();  // block/switch to next ready thread
    }
}
Unlock

1. If no-one is waiting for this lock, mark it as unlocked
2. Otherwise, keep it locked, but unblock the next waiting thread

// Instance variables
int locked = 0;
ThreadQueue q;

void Lock::unlock() {
    if (q.empty()) {
        locked = 0;
    } else {
        unblockThread(q.remove()); // add to ready queue
    }
}
// Instance variables
int locked = 0;
ThreadQueue q;

void Lock::lock() {
  if (!locked) {
    locked = 1;
  } else {
    q.add(currentThread);
    // block/switch to next
    // ready thread
    blockThread();
  }
}

void Lock::unlock() {
  if (!q.empty()) {
    locked = 0;
  } else {
    // add to ready queue
    unblockThread(q.remove());
  }
}

Can you think of an example race condition that could occur if we do not disable interrupts here and two threads lock a single mutex at the same time?
Mutex

// Instance variables
int locked = 0;
ThreadQueue q;

void Lock::lock() {
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        // block/switch to next
        // ready thread
        blockThread();
    }
}

void Lock::unlock() {
    if (q.empty()) {
        locked = 0;
    } else {
        // add to ready queue
        unblockThread(q.remove());
    }
}

Can you think of an example race condition that could occur if we do not disable interrupts here and two threads lock a single mutex at the same time?

Example: thread 1 is in the middle of getting ownership, but then the timer fires, we switch to thread 2, and it locks the mutex. Then thread 1 resumes and also gets the mutex.
Lock

// Instance variables
int locked = 0;
ThreadQueue q;

void Lock::lock() {
    intr_enable(false);
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        intr_enable(true); // ??
        blockThread(); // block/swit
    }
}
// Instance variables
int locked = 0;
ThreadQueue q;

void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread(); // block/switch to next ready thread
    }
}
// Instance variables
int locked = 0;
ThreadQueue q;

void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread(); // block/switch to next ready thread
    }
}
Unlock

1. If no-one is waiting for this lock, mark it as unlocked
2. Otherwise, keep it locked, but unblock the next waiting thread

// Instance variables
int locked = 0;
ThreadQueue q;

void Lock::unlock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (q.empty()) {
        locked = 0;
    } else {
        unblockThread(q.remove()); // add to ready queue
    }
}
// Instance variables
int locked = 0;
ThreadQueue q;

void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread(); // block/switch to next ready thread
    }
}
// Instance variables
int locked = 0;
ThreadQueue q;

void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread(); // block/switch to next ready thread
    }
}
Enabling/Disabling Interrupts

Thread #1
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}

Thread #2
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
Enabling/Disabling Interrupts

Thread #1
void Lock::lock() {
  IntrGuard guard;
  if (!locked) {
    locked = 1;
  } else {
    q.add(currentThread);
    blockThread();
  }
}

Thread #2
void Lock::lock() {
  IntrGuard guard;
  if (!locked) {
    locked = 1;
  } else {
    q.add(currentThread);
    blockThread();
  }
}
Thread #1

```cpp
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
```

Thread #2

```cpp
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
```
Enabling/Disabling Interrupts

Thread #1
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}

Thread #2
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
Enabling/Disabling Interrupts

Thread #1
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}

Thread #2
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
Thread #1
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}

Thread #2
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
Enabling/Disabling Interrupts

Thread #1
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}

Thread #2
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
Enabling/Disabling Interrupts

Thread #1

```cpp
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
```

Thread #2

```cpp
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
```
Enabling/Disabling Interrupts

Thread #1
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}

Thread #2
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
Thread #1
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}

Thread #2
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
Enabling/Disabling Interrupts

Thread #1
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}

Thread #2
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
Enabling/Disabling Interrupts

Thread #1

```cpp
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
```

(assume thread 1 reenables interrupts when resumed and disables them when paused)

Thread #2 (blocked)

```cpp
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
```
Enabling/Disabling Interrupts

Thread #1

```c
void Lock::unlock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (q.empty()) {
        locked = 0;
    } else {
        unblockThread(q.remove());
    }
}
```

(assume thread 1 reenables interrupts when resumed and disables them when paused)

Thread #2 (blocked)

```c
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
```
Enabling/Disabling Interrupts

Thread #1
void Lock::unlock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (q.empty()) {
        locked = 0;
    } else {
        unblockThread(q.remove());
    }
}

(assume thread 1 reenables interrupts when resumed and disables them when paused)

Thread #2 (blocked)
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
Enabling/Disabling Interrupts

Thread #1
void Lock::unlock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (q.empty()) {
        locked = 0;
    } else {
        unblockThread(q.remove());
    }
}

(assume thread 1 reenables interrupts when resumed and disables them when paused)

Thread #2
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
Enabling/Disabling Interrupts

**Thread #1**

```c
void Lock::unlock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (q.empty()) {
        locked = 0;
    } else {
        unblockThread(q.remove());
    }
}
```

(assume thread 1 reenables interrupts when resumed and disables them when paused)

**Thread #2**

```c
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
```
Enabling/Disabling Interrupts

Thread #1
void Lock::unlock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (q.empty()) {
        locked = 0;
    } else {
        unblockThread(q.remove());
    }
}

(assume thread 1 reenables interrupts when resumed and disables them when paused)

Thread #2
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
Enabling/Disabling Interrupts

**Thread #1**

```cpp
void Lock::unlock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (q.empty()) {
        locked = 0;
    } else {
        unblockThread(q.remove());
    }
}

(assume thread 1 reenables interrupts when resumed and disables them when paused)
```

**Thread #2**

```cpp
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
```
Thread #1
void Lock::unlock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (q.empty()) {
        locked = 0;
    } else {
        unblockThread(q.remove());
    }
}

(assume thread 1 reenables interrupts when resumed and disables them when paused)

Thread #2
void Lock::lock() {
    IntrGuard guard;
    if (!locked) {
        locked = 1;
    } else {
        q.add(currentThread);
        blockThread();
    }
}
Plan For Today

- Recap and continuing: Scheduling
- Preemption and Interrupts
- Implementing Locks

Lecture 19 takeaway: To implement preemption and locks, we must make sure to correctly enable and disable interrupts. Locks consist of a waiting queue and redispatching to make threads sleep.

Next time: Virtual Memory