

Synchronization Hardware

- Many systems provide hardware support for critical section code
- Uniprocessors could disable interrupts
 - Currently running code would execute without preemption
 - Generally too inefficient on multiprocessor systems
 - Operating systems using this not broadly scalable
- Modern machines provide special atomic hardware instructions
 - Atomic = non-interruptable
 - 1. Either test memory word and set value
 - 2. Or swap contents of two memory words



Solution to Critical-section Problem Using Locks

do {
 acquire lock
 critical section
 release lock
 remainder section
} while (TRUE);





TestAndndSet Instruction

Definition:

```
boolean TestAndSet (boolean *target)
{
    boolean rv = *target;
    *target = TRUE;
    return rv:
}
```





Solution using TestAndSet

- Shared boolean variable lock., initialized to false.
- Solution:

```
do {
    while ( TestAndSet (&lock ))
    ; // do nothing
    // critical section
    lock = FALSE;
```

// remainder section

} while (TRUE);



Bounded-waiting Mutual Exclusion with TestandSet()

do { waiting[i] = TRUE; key = TRUE; while (waiting[i] && key) key = TestAndSet(&lock); waiting[i] = FALSE; // critical section i = (i + 1) % n;while ((j != i) && !waiting[j])i = (i + 1) % n;if (i == i)lock = FALSE; else waiting[j] = FALSE; // remainder section

} while (TRUE);





Software Solutions

- Mutex Lock
 - short for mutual exclusion
 - software tool to solve critical section problem
 - acquire () acquires the lock
 - release () releases the lock

```
acquire ()
{
  while (!available); /* busy wait */
  available = false;
}
release () {available = true;}
do{ // solution to critical section
  acquire ();
   enter critical section
  release ();
   remainder section
} while (true);
```



Operating System Concepts – 9th Edition



Mutex Lock

- Mutex Lock
 - acquire/release are atomic
 - often implemented using one of the hardware mechanisms
 - requires busy waiting
 - spinlock
 - any other process trying to enter critical section must wait ("spins")
 - disadvantage: wastes CPU cycles
 - advantage: no context switch





Semaphore

- Synchronization tool that does not require busy waiting
- Semaphore S integer variable
- Two standard operations modify S: wait() and signal()
 - Originally called P() and V()
- Less complicated
- Can only be accessed via two indivisible (atomic) operations
 - wait (S) { // originally P Dutch proberen "to test" while S <= 0 ; // no-op
 - , // IIC
 - S--;
 - signal (S) { // originally V Dutch verhogen "to increment"
 S++;



Semaphore as General Synchronization Tool

- Counting semaphore integer value can range over an unrestricted domain
- Binary semaphore integer value can range only between 0 and 1;
 - Also known as mutex locks
- Can implement a counting semaphore S as a binary semaphore

```
    Provides mutual exclusion
        Semaphore mutex; // initialized to 1
        do {
        wait (mutex);
        // Critical Section
        signal (mutex);
        // remainder section
        } while (TRUE);
```



Semaphore Implementation with no Busy waiting

With each semaphore there is an associated waiting queue. Each entry in a waiting queue has two data items:

- value (of type integer)
- pointer to next record in the list

semaphore data structure in C

```
typedef struct semaphore
{
    int value;
    struct process *list;
};
```



Semaphore Implementation with no Busy waiting (Cont.)

```
Implementation of wait:
   wait(semaphore *S) {
                S->value--:
                if (S->value < 0) {
                           add this process to S->list;
                           block();
                 }
Implementation of signal:
      signal(semaphore *S) {
                S->value++;
                if (S->value <= 0) {
                           remove a process P from S->list;
                           wakeup(P);
                }
```

Operating System Concepts – 9th Edition

Silberschatz, Galvin and Gagne ©2009



Deadlock and Starvation

- Deadlock two or more processes are waiting indefinitely for an event that can be caused by only one of the waiting processes
- Let S and Q be two semaphores initialized to 1



- Starvation indefinite blocking. A process may never be removed from the semaphore queue in which it is suspended
- Priority Inversion Scheduling problem when lower-priority process holds a lock needed by higher-priority process

