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Updates

• Memory heaps
  - Normal new/delete ops go to the process heap
  - Internal mutex, slow delete

• Private heap doesn’t need to mutex
  - Benchmark with 12 threads on a 6-core system

```c
#define ITER 1e7
DWORD __stdcall HeapThread (...) {
    HANDLE heap = HeapCreate
        (HEAP_NO_SERIALIZE,
         4 * 1024 * sizeof(DWORD), 0);
    DWORD **arr = new (DWORD *) [ITER];
    for (int i = 0; i < ITER; i++)
        arr[i] = new DWORD [1];
    for (int i = 0; i < ITER; i++)
        delete arr[i];
}
```

3.3M/s

```c
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    for (int i = 0; i < ITER; i++)
        arr[i] = new DWORD [1];
    for (int i = 0; i < ITER; i++)
        delete arr[i];
}
```

36M/s
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DWORD __stdcall HeapThread (...) {
    HANDLE heap = HeapCreate
        (HEAP_NO_SERIALIZE,
         4 * 1024 * sizeof(DWORD), 0);
    DWORD **arr = new (DWORD *) [ITER];
    for (int i = 0; i < ITER; i++)
        arr[i] = new DWORD [1];
    for (int i = 0; i < ITER; i++)
        HeapDestroy (heap);
}
```

3.3M/s
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Messages

- Messages are discrete chunks of information exchanged between processes
  - This form of IPC is often used between different hosts
- Where used
  - Pipes (one-to-one)
  - Mailslots (one-to-many among hosts in the active directory domain)
  - Sockets (TCP/IP)

- In general form, message consists of fixed header and some payload
- Header may specify
  - Version and protocol #
  - Message length, type, various attributes
  - Status and error conditions
- Already studied enough in homework #1
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Reader-Writer (RW)

• RW is another famous synchronization problem
• Assume a shared object that is accessed by M readers and K writers in parallel
• Example: suppose hw#1 restricted robot MOVE commands to only adjacent rooms
  - This requires construction of a global graph G as new edges are being discovered from the threads (writer portion)
  - To make a move, each thread has to plot a route to the new location along the shortest path in G (reader portion)
• Any number of readers may read concurrently
  - However, writers need exclusive access to the object (i.e., must mutex against all readers and other writers)
Reader-Writer

• **Q:** based on your intuition, do readers or writers usually access the object more frequently?

• First stab at the problem:
  - **RW 1.0**

```cpp
Reader::GoRead () {
    mutexRcount.Lock();
    // first reader blocks writers
    if (readerCount == 0)
        semaW.Wait();
    readerCount ++;
    mutexRcount.Unlock();
    // read object
    mutexRcount.Lock();
    readerCount--;
    // last reader unblocks writers
    if (readerCount == 0)
        semaW.Release();
    mutexRcount.Unlock();
}
```

```cpp
Writer::GoWrite () {
    semaW.Wait();
    // write object
    semaW.Release();
}
```

• Infinite stream of readers?
  - Writers never get access

• RW 1.0 gives readers priority and starves writers
Another policy is to let the OS load-balance the order in which readers and writers enter the critical section

- RW 1.1

Reader::GoRead () {
  semaWriterPending.Wait();
  semaWriterPending.Release();
  mutexRcount.Lock();
  // first reader blocks writers
  if (readerCount == 0)
    semaW.Wait();
  readerCount ++;
  mutexRcount.Unlock();

  // read object
  mutexRcount.Lock();
  readerCount--;
  // last reader unblocks writers
  if (readerCount == 0)
    semaW.Release();
  mutexRcount.Unlock();
}

Writer::GoWrite () {
  semaWriterPending.Wait();
  semaW.Wait();
  // write object
  semaW.Release();
  semaWriterPending.Release();
}

- Serves readers/writers in FIFO order if kernel mutex is fair
- What if 100x more readers than writers?
Final policy: writers have absolute priority
- Given a pending writer, no reader may enter
- RW 1.2

```cpp
Reader::GoRead () {
    semaWriterPending.Wait();
    semaWriterPending.Release();
    mutexRcount.Lock();
    // first reader blocks writers
    if (readerCount++ == 0)
        semaW.Wait();
    mutexRcount.Unlock();

    // read object
    mutexRcount.Lock();
    // last reader unblocks writers
    if (--readerCount == 0)
        semaW.Release();
    mutexRcount.Unlock();
}

Writer::GoWrite () {
    mutexWcount.Lock();
    if (writerCount++ == 0)
        semaWriterPending.Wait();
    mutexWcount.Unlock();

    semaW.Wait();
    // write object
    semaW.Release();

    mutexWcount.Lock();
    if (--writerCount == 0)
        semaWriterPending.Release();
    mutexWcount.Unlock();
}
```

Works fine except first writer still must compete

OS chooses between one writer and M readers
Reader-Writer

• To ensure priority for the first writer, need to prevent readers from competing for `semaWriterPending`

  - RW 1.3

  ```cpp
  Reader::GoRead () {
    mutexDontCompete.Lock();
    semaWriterPending.Wait();
    mutexRcount.Lock();
    // first reader blocks writers
    if (readerCount++ == 0)
      semaW.Wait();
    mutexRcount.Unlock();
    semaWriterPending.Release();
    mutexDontCompete.Unlock();
  }

  Reader::GoRead () {
    mutexDontCompete.Lock();
    semaWriterPending.Wait();
    mutexRcount.Lock();
    // first reader blocks writers
    if (readerCount++ == 0)
      semaW.Wait();
    mutexRcount.Unlock();
    semaWriterPending.Release();
    mutexDontCompete.Unlock();
  }

  Writer::GoWrite () {
    mutexWcount.Lock();
    if (writerCount++ == 0)
      semaWriterPending.Wait();
    mutexWcount.Unlock();
    semaW.Wait();
    // write object
    semaW.Release();
    mutexWcount.Lock();
    if (--writerCount == 0)
      semaWriterPending.Release();
    mutexWcount.Unlock();
  }

  Writer::GoWrite () {
    mutexWcount.Lock();
    if (writerCount++ == 0)
      semaWriterPending.Wait();
    mutexWcount.Unlock();
    semaW.Wait();
    // write object
    semaW.Release();
    mutexWcount.Lock();
    if (--writerCount == 0)
      semaWriterPending.Release();
    mutexWcount.Unlock();
  }

  • Textbook solution
    - Works even if semaphore is unfair
• What about the next solution that eliminates one lock and rearranges some of the lines

- RW 1.4

```cpp
Reader::GoRead () {
    mutexRcount.Lock();
    semaWriterPending.Wait();
    if (readerCount++ == 0)
    // first reader blocks writers
        semaW.Wait();
    semaWriterPending.Release();
    // pending writer gets unblocked here
    mutexRcount.Unlock();
    // read object
    mutexRcount.Lock();
    // last reader unblocks writers
    if (--readerCount == 0)
        semaW.Release();
    mutexRcount.Unlock();
}
```

```cpp
Writer::GoWrite () {
    mutexWcount.Lock();
    if (writerCount++ == 0)
        semaWriterPending.Wait();
    mutexWcount.Unlock();
    semaW.Wait();
    // write object
    semaW.Release();
    mutexWcount.Lock();
    if (--writerCount == 0)
        semaWriterPending.Release();
    mutexWcount.Unlock();
}
```

• Find a problem at home
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Windows APIs

- GetCurrentProcess() and GetCurrentProcessId()
  - Return a handle and PID, respectively
- EnumProcesses(), OpenProcess()
  - Enumerates PIDs in the system, opens access to them
- TerminateProcess() kills another process by its handle
  - ExitProcess() voluntarily quits (similar to C-style exit())
- GetProcessTimes()
  - Time spent on the CPU (both in kernel-mode and user-mode)
- Available resources
  - GlobalMemoryStatus(): physical RAM, virtual memory
  - GetActiveProcessorCount(): how many CPUs
- CPU utilization: see cpu.cpp in sample project
• **WaitForSingleObject**
  - Always makes a kernel-mode transition and is pretty slow
  - Mutexes, semaphores, events all rely on this API

• **A faster mutex is CRITICAL_SECTION (CS)**
  - Busy-spins in user mode on interlocked exchange for a fixed number of CPU cycles
  - If unsuccessful, gives up and locks a kernel mutex

• **While kernel objects (i.e., mutexes, semaphores, events) can be used between processes, CS works only between threads** **within** a process

```c
CRITICAL_SECTION cs;
InitializeCriticalSection (&cs);
// mutex.Lock()
EnterCriticalSection (&cs);
// mutex.Unlock()
LeaveCriticalSection (&cs);
```
Performance

- Condition variables in Windows
  - In performance, similar to CS (i.e., spins in user mode)
  - Secret (monitor) mutex is explicit pointer to some CS
- PC 3.0 that actually works in Windows

```cpp
pcQueue::push (Item x) {
    EnterCriticalSection (&cs);
    while ( Q.isFull () )
        SleepConditionVariable (&cvNotFull, &cs, ...);
    Q.add (x);
    LeaveCriticalSection (&cs);
    WakeConditionVariable (&cvNotEmpty);
}
```

- Slim RW locks
  - AcquireSRWLockShared (reader)
  - AcquireSRWLockExclusive (writer)
Performance

- **Example 1:** compute $\pi$ in a Monte Carlo simulation
  - Generate $N$ random points in $1 \times 1$ square and compute the fraction of them that falls into unit circle at the origin
  - Probability to hit the red circle?
- This probability is the visible area of the circle divided by the area of the square (i.e., 1)
  - Quarter of a circle gives us $\pi/4$

```c
DWORD WINAPI ThreadPi (LONG *hitCircle) {
    for (int i=0; i < ITER; i++) {
        // uniform in [0,1]
        x = rand.Uniform(); y = rand.Uniform();
        if (x*x + y*y < 1)
            IncrementSync (hitCircle);
    }
}

main () {
    // run N ThreadPi() threads
    // wait to finish
    double pi =
        4*hitCircle/ITER/nThreads;
}
```
**Performance**

- Six-core AMD Phenom II X6, 2.8 GHz
- Two modes of operation
  - No affinity set (threads run on the next available core)
  - Each thread is permanently bound to one of the 6 cores
- Total k threads
- The basic kernel Mutex
  - $\pi \approx 3.13$
  - CPU $\approx 16\%$
  - Requires 2 kernel-mode switches per increment
  - Runs almost twice as slow with 20K threads

```c
IncrementSync (LONG *hitCircle) {
    WaitForSingleObject (mutex, INFINITE);
    (*hitCircle) ++;
    ReleaseMutex (mutex);
}
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>k = 60</th>
<th>k = 20K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No affinity</td>
<td>384K/s</td>
<td>278K/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affinity</td>
<td>447K/s</td>
<td>220K/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance

- AtomicSwap
  - $\pi \approx 3.1405$
  - CPU = 100% (locks up the computer)
  - Unable to start more than 7K threads since the CPU is constantly busy
- AtomicSwap and yield
  - When cannot obtain mutex, yield to other threads if they are ready to run
  - $\pi \approx 3.1412$
  - CPU = 100%, but computer much more responsive

```c
LONG taken = 0; // shared flag
IncrementSync (LONG *hitCircle) {
    while (InterlockedExchange (&taken, 1)
        == 1)
        ;
    (*hitCircle) ++;
    taken = 0;
}
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>k = 60</th>
<th>k = 20K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No affinity</td>
<td>448K/s</td>
<td>485K/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affinity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No affinity
  - Affinity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>k = 60</th>
<th>k = 20K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No affinity</td>
<td>6.8M/s</td>
<td>12M/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affinity</td>
<td>6.8M/s</td>
<td>11.9M/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Performance**

- **CRITICAL_SECTION**
  - $\pi \approx 3.1417$
  - CPU = 36%
- **Interlocked increment**
  - $\pi \approx 3.1416$
  - CPU = 100%
  - Fastest method so far
- **No sync (dumb approach)**
  - CPU = 100%
  - Some of the concurrent updates are lost due to cache sync problems

```c
CRITICAL_SECTION cs;
IncrementSync (LONG *hitCircle) {
    EnterCriticalSection (&cs);
    (*hitCircle) ++;
    LeaveCriticalSection(&cs);
}
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k = 60</th>
<th>k = 20K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No affinity</td>
<td>Affinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9M/s</td>
<td>15.9M/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```c
IncrementSync (LONG *hitCircle) {
    InterLockedIncrement (hitCircle);
}
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k = 60</th>
<th>k = 20K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No affinity</td>
<td>Affinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.4M/s</td>
<td>19.2M/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```c
IncrementSync (LONG *hitCircle) {
    (*hitCircle)++;
}
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k = 60</th>
<th>k = 20K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No affinity</td>
<td>Affinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.5M/s</td>
<td>19.9M/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\pi \approx 1.21$  $\pi \approx 1.03$  $\pi \approx 0.96$  $\pi \approx 1.33$
Performance

- No sync (correct approach)
  - $\pi \approx 3.1415$
  - 202M/s, 100% CPU, bottlenecked by rand.Uniform()

- Lessons
  - Kernel mutex is slow, should be avoided
  - CRITICAL_SECTION is the best general mutex
  - Interlocked operations are best for 1-line critical sections
  - Affinity mask makes a big difference in some cases

- If you can write code only using local variables and synchronize rarely, it can be 1000x faster than kernel mutex and 10x faster than Interlocked

```
DWORD WINAPI ThreadPi (LONG *hitCircle) {
    LONG counter = 0;
    for (int i=0; i < ITER; i++) {
        // uniform in [0,1]
        x = rand.Uniform(); y = rand.Uniform();
        if (x*x + y*y < 1)
            counter ++;
    }
    InterlockedAdd (hitCircle, counter);
}
```
**Performance**

- **Example 2:** unbounded producer-consumer

- **Producer batch = 1**
  - $Q.size() \leq 1$

- **Producer batch = 10**
  - $Q.size() \to \infty$

- **PC 1.1**
  - Busy spins to enter
  - CPU is high, mostly spent in the kernel
  - Worst method in our comparison

```java
int batch;  // PC 1.1
while (true) {
    while (true) {
        WaitForSingleObject(mutex, INFINITE);
        if (Q.size() > 0) {
            x = Q.pop();
            break;
        }
        ReleaseMutex (mutex);
    }
    ReleaseMutex (mutex);
    // now produce
    WaitForSingleObject(mutex, INFINITE);
    for (int i=0; i < batch; i++)
        Q.add (i+x);
    ReleaseMutex (mutex);
}
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$k = 600$</th>
<th>$k = 20K$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>batch=1</td>
<td>batch=10</td>
<td>batch=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660/sec</td>
<td>187K/sec</td>
<td>worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>worse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance

- PC 1.2 sleeps on semaphore
  - CPU = 20%
- PC 1.4 releases semaphore in bulk
  - Speed-up by 40% over PC 1.2 with batch=10
  - CPU = 20%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k</th>
<th>batch=1</th>
<th>batch=10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>275K/s</td>
<td>223K/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20K</td>
<td>130K/s</td>
<td>112K/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PC 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k</th>
<th>batch=1</th>
<th>batch=10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>275K/s</td>
<td>223K/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20K</td>
<td>182K/s</td>
<td>151K/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PC 1.4 (hw1)
Performance

- **PC 2.1**
  - Adds WaitAll
  - CPU = 100%
  - Horrible performance
  - PC 3.2-3.3 similar
- **Back to 1.4**
  - Over 450% faster than 1.4 for batch=10
  - CPU = 100%

### Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k = 600</th>
<th>k = 20K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>batch=1</td>
<td>batch=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>batch=1</td>
<td>batch=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27K/s</td>
<td>27K/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worse</td>
<td>worse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PC 2.1

```c
HANDLE arr[] = {sema, mutex}; // PC 2.1
while (true) {
    WaitForMultipleObjects(2, arr, true, INFINITE);
    x = Q.pop();
    ReleaseMutex (mutex);
    WaitForSingleObject(mutex, INFINITE);
    for (int i=0; i < batch; i++)
        Q.add (i+x);
    ReleaseMutex (mutex); ReleaseSemaphore(sema,batch,NULL);
}
```

```c
int batch; // PC 1.4 with CS
while (true) {
    WaitForSingleObject(sema, INFINITE);
    EnterCriticalSection (&cs);
    x = Q.pop();
    LeaveCriticalSection (&cs);
    EnterCriticalSection (&cs);
    for (int i=0; i < batch; i++)
        Q.add (i+x);
    LeaveCriticalSection (&cs);
    ReleaseSemaphore(sema,batch,NULL);
}
```

### Performance Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k = 600</th>
<th>k = 20K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>batch=1</td>
<td>batch=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>batch=1</td>
<td>batch=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361K/s</td>
<td>850K/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280K/s</td>
<td>1.1M/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wrap-up

- PC 3.0
  - CPU = 100%
  - Breaks down when Q is persistently small

- PC 3.1
  - Uses kernel events, runs at 450K/s

- PC 3.4
  - CPU = 30%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k = 600</th>
<th>k = 20K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>batch=1</td>
<td>batch=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205K/s</td>
<td>5.9M/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78K/s</td>
<td>7.1M/sec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k = 600</th>
<th>k = 20K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>batch=1</td>
<td>batch=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22M/s</td>
<td>5.9M/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5M/s</td>
<td>7.5M/sec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>