Multicore Synchronization

a pragmatic introduction
Multicore Synchronization

This is a talk on mechanical sympathy of parallel systems on modern multicore systems.

Understanding both your workload and your environment allows for effective optimization.
Principles of Multicore
Cache Coherency

Cache coherency guarantees the eventual consistency of shared state.
# Cache Coherency

```c
int x = 443; (&x = 0x20c4)
```

### Thread 0

```c
x = x + 0010;
```

### Thread 1

```c
printf("%d\n", x);
```

---

## Core 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0x0000</td>
<td>backtrace.io...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0x0040</td>
<td>393929191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0x0080</td>
<td>asodkadoakdoak\0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0x00c0</td>
<td>3.141592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Core 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0x1000</td>
<td>ASDOKADO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0x1040</td>
<td>213091i491119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0x0080</td>
<td>asodkadoakdoak\0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0x10c0</td>
<td>9940191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Cache Coherency

Load x

\[ x = x + 10010; \]

## Thread 0

\[ x = x + 10010; \]

```c
x = x + 10010;
```

## Thread 1

```c
printf("%d\n", x);
```

### Core 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0x0000</td>
<td>backtrace.io...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0x0040</td>
<td>393929191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0x0080</td>
<td>asodkadoakdoak\0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0x20c0</td>
<td>1921919119443....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Core 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0x1000</td>
<td>ASDOKADO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0x1040</td>
<td>213091491119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0x0080</td>
<td>asodkadoakdoak\0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0x10c0</td>
<td>9940191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cache Coherency

Update the value of \( x \)

Thread 0

\[ x = x + 10010; \]

Thread 1

\( \text{printf("%d\n", x);} \)
Cache Coherency

Thread 1 loads x

Thread 0
x = x + 10010;

Thread 1
printf("%d\n", x);
Cache Coherency

MESI, MOESI and MESIF are common cache coherency protocols.

MESI: Modified, Exclusive, Shared, Invalid

MOESI: Modified, Owned, Exclusive, Shared, Invalid

MESIF: Modified, Exclusive, Shared, Forwarding
Cache Coherency

The **cache line** is the unit of coherency and can become an unnecessary source of contention.

```plaintext
Thread 0
for (;;) {
    array[0]++;
}

Thread 1
for (;;) {
    array[1]++;
}
```
Cache Coherency

**False sharing** occurs when logically disparate objects share the same cache line and contend on it.

```
struct {
    rwlock_t rwlock;
    int value;
} object;
```

**Thread 0**
```
for (;;) {
    read_lock(&object.rwlock);
    int v = atomic_read(&object.value);
    do_work(v);
    read_unlock(&object.rwlock);
}
```

**Thread 1**
```
for (;;) {
    read_lock(&object.rwlock);
    <short work>
    read_unlock(&object.rwlock);
}
```
False sharing occurs when logically disparate objects share the same cache line and contend on it.

---

**One Reader**

- 0
- 750,000,000
- 1,500,000,000
- 2,250,000,000
- 3,000,000,000

**False Sharing**

- 67,091,751
- 2,165,421,795
- 67,091,751
Cache Coherency

**Padding** can be used to mitigate false sharing.

```c
struct {
    rwlock_t rwlock;
    char pad[64 - sizeof(rwlock_t)];
    int value;
} object;
```
Padding can be used to mitigate false sharing.
Cache Coherency

Padding must consider access patterns and overall footprint of application.

Too much padding is bad.
Simultaneous Multithreading

SMT technology allows for throughput increases by allowing programs to better utilize processor resources.

Figure from “The Architecture of the Nehalem Processor and Nehalem-EP SMP Platforms” (Michael E. Thomadakis)
Atomic Operations

Atomic operations are typically implemented with the help of the cache coherency mechanism.
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Atomic operations are typically implemented with the help of the cache coherency mechanism.

```c
lock cmpxchg(target, compare, new):
    register = load_and_lock(target);
    if (register == compare)
        store(target, new);
    unlock(target);
    return register;
```
Atomic Operations

Atomic operations are typically implemented with the help of the cache coherency mechanism.

```c
lock cmpxchg(target, compare, new):
    register = load_and_lock(target);
    if (register == compare)
        store(target, new);
    unlock(target);
    return register;
```

Cache line locking typically only serializes accesses to the target cache line.
Atomic Operations

In the old commodity processor days, atomic operations were implemented with a bus lock.

```c
lock cmpxchg(target, compare, new):
    lock(memory_bus);
    register = load(target);
    if (register == compare)
        store(target, new);
    unlock(memory_bus);
    return register;
```

x86 will assert a bus lock if an atomic operation goes across a cache line boundary. Be careful!
Atomic Operations

Atomic operations are crucial to efficient synchronization primitives.
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Atomic operations are crucial to efficient synchronization primitives.

**COMPARE_AND_SWAP**(a, b, c): updates a to c if a is equal to b, atomically.
Atomic Operations

Atomic operations are crucial to efficient synchronization primitives.

**COMPARE_AND_SWAP(a, b, c):** updates a to c if a is equal to b, atomically.

**LOAD_LINKED(a)/STORE_CONDITIONAL(a, b):** Updates a to b if a was not modified between the load-linked (LL) and store-conditional (SC).
Topology

Most modern multicore systems are NUMA architectures: the throughput and latency of memory accesses varies.
Topology

The NUMA factor is a ratio that represents the relative cost of a remote memory access.

- Local wake-up: ~140ns
- Remote wake-up: ~289ns

Intel Xeon L5640 machine at 2.27 GHz (12x2)
Topology

NUMA effects can be pervasive and difficult to mitigate.

Sun x4600
Topology

Be wary of your operating system’s memory placement mechanisms.

First Touch: Allocate page on memory of first processor to touch it.

Interleave: Allocate pages round-robin across nodes.

More sophisticated schemes exist that do hierarchical allocation, page migration, replication and more.
NUMA-oblivious synchronization objects are not only susceptible to performance mismatch but starvation and even livelock under extreme load.
Fairness

Fair locks guarantee starvation-freedom.

```
CK_CC_INLINE static void ck_spinlock_ticket_lock(struct ck_spinlock_ticket *ticket)
{
    unsigned int request;

    request = ck_pr_faa_uint(&ticket->next, 1);

    while (ck_pr_load_uint(&ticket->position) != request)
        ck_pr_stall();

    return;
}
```
CK_CC_INLINE static void
ck_spinlock_ticket_lock(struct ck_spinlock_ticket *ticket)
{
    unsigned int request;

    request = ck_pr_faa_uint(&ticket->next, 1);

    while (ck_pr_load_uint(&ticket->position) != request)
        ck_pr_stall();

    return;
}
request = 0

CK_CC_INLINE static void
ck_spinlock_ticket_lock(struct ck_spinlock_ticket *ticket)
{
    unsigned int request;

    request = ck_pr_faa_uint(&ticket->next, 1);

    while (ck_pr_load_uint(&ticket->position) != request)
        ck_pr_stall();

    return;
}
Fairness

CK_CC_INLINE static void
ck_spinlock_ticket_unlock(struct ck_spinlock_ticket *ticket) {
    unsigned int update;
    update = ck_pr_load_uint(&ticket->position);
    ck_pr_store_uint(&ticket->position, update + 1);
    return;
}
Fairness

![Bar chart showing fairness distribution across different categories.]

Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E7- 4850  @ 2.00GHz @ 10x4
Fairness

Fair locks are not a silver bullet and may negatively impact throughput.

Fairness comes at the cost of increased sensitivity to preemption and other sources of jitter.
Fairness

MCS

Ticket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C0</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5E+06</td>
<td>5E+06</td>
<td>5E+06</td>
<td>5E+06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E+06</td>
<td>4E+06</td>
<td>4E+06</td>
<td>4E+06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E7- 4850 @ 2.00GHz @ 10x4
Distributed Locks

Array and queue-based locks provide lock scalability and fairness with distributing spinning and point-to-point wake-up.
Distributed Locks

The **MCS** lock was a seminal contribution to the area and introduced queue locks to the masses.
Distributed Locks

Thread 1

Thread 2

Thread 3

Thread 4
Distributed Locks
Distributed Locks
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Thread 3

Thread 4
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Thread 1
Thread 2
Thread 3
Thread 4
Distributed Locks

Similar mechanisms exist for read-write locks.
Distributed Locks

Big reader locks (brlocks) or Read-Mostly Locks (rmlocks) distribute read-side flags so that readers spin only on local memory.
Distributed Locks

![Graph showing comparison between Big Reader Lock and Centralized Read-Write Lock time vs cores]

Intel Xeon E5-2630L at 2.40 GHz
Limitations of Locks

Locks are not composable and are susceptible to priority inversion, livelock, starvation, deadlock and more.
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Locks are not composable and are susceptible to priority inversion, livelock, starvation, deadlock and more.

A delicate balance must be found between lock hierarchies, granularity and quality of service.
Limitations of Locks

Locks are not composable and are susceptible to priority inversion, livelock, starvation, deadlock and more.

A delicate balance must be found between lock hierarchies, granularity and quality of service.

A significant delay in one thread holding a synchronization object leads to significant delays for all other threads waiting on the same synchronization object.
Limitations of Locks

Intel Xeon E5-2630L at 2.40 GHz
Lock-less Synchronization
Lock-less Synchronization

With lock-based synchronization, it is sufficient to reason in terms of lock dependencies and critical sections.
Lock-less Synchronization

With lock-based synchronization, it is sufficient to reason in terms of lock dependencies and critical sections.

This model doesn’t work with lock-less synchronization where we must guarantee correctness in much more subtle ways.
Memory Models

These days, cache coherency helps implement the consistency model.

The memory model is specified by the runtime environment and defines the correct behavior of shared memory accesses.
Memory Models

```c
int x = 0;
int y = 0;

int r_0;
int r_1;

x = 1;
y = 1;
r_0 = y;
r_1 = x;

if (r_0 == 0 && r_1 == 0)
    abort();
```
Memory Models

```
int x = 0;
int y = 0;
```

Core 0
```
int r_0;
x = 1;
--------------------------------------
r_0 = y;
```

Core 1
```
int r_1;
y = 1;
--------------------------------------
r_1 = x;
```

\((r_0, r_1) = (1,1)\)
Memory Models

```c
int x = 0;
int y = 0;

Core 0
int r_0;
x = 1;
r_0 = y;

Core 1
int r_1;
y = 1;
r_1 = x;

(r_0, r_1) = (0, 1)
```
Memory Models

```c
int x = 0;
int y = 0;

int r_0;
x = 1;
r_0 = y;

int r_1;
y = 1;
r_1 = x;

(r_0, r_1) = (1,0)
```
Memory Models

This condition is possible and is an example of **store-to-load** re-ordering.

Core 0

```c
int r_0;
```

```
  r_0 = y;
  x = 1;
```

Core 1

```c
int r_1;
```

```
  r_1 = x;
  y = 1;
```

\[(r_0, r_1) = (0, 0)\]
This condition is possible and is an example of store-to-load re-ordering.

```c
int r_0;
r_0 = y;
x = 1;
int r_1;
r_1 = x;
y = 1;
```

Core 0
Core 1
(r_0, r_1) = (0,0)
Memory Models

Modern processors rely on a myriad of techniques to achieve high levels of instruction-level parallelism.
Memory Models

Modern processors rely on a myriad of techniques to achieve high levels of instruction-level parallelism.

\[
x = 1; \\
y = 1;
\]
Memory Models

Modern processors rely on a myriad of techniques to achieve high levels of instruction-level parallelism.

```
x = 1;
y = 1;
r_0 = y;
r_1 = x;
```
Memory Models

The processor memory model is specified with respect to loads, stores and atomic operations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TSO</th>
<th>RMO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Load to Load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load to Store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store to Store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store to Load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atomics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
<td><em><em>x86</em>, SPARC-TSO</em>*</td>
<td><strong>ARM, Power</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memory Models

Ordering guarantees are provided by serializing instructions such as memory fences.

```c
mutex_lock(&mutex);
x = x + 1;
mutex_unlock(&mutex);
```
Memory Models

Ordering guarantees are provided by serializing instructions such as memory fences.

```c
CK_CC_INLINE static void mutex_lock(struct mutex *lock) {
    while (ck_pr_fas_uint(&lock->value, true) == true);
    ck_pr_fence_memory();
    return;
}
```

*Simplified*
Memory Models

Serializing instructions are expensive because they disable some processor optimizations.

Atomic instructions are expensive because they either involve serialization (and locking) or are just plain old complex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Throughput (/ second)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lock cmpxchg</td>
<td>147,304,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cmpxchg</td>
<td>458,940,006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intel Core i7-3615QM at 2.30 GHz
Lock-less Synchronization

Non-blocking synchronization provides very specific progress guarantees and high levels of resilience at the cost of complexity on the fast path.

Lock-freedom provides system-wide progress guarantees.

Wait-freedom provides per-operation progress guarantees.
struct node {
    void *value;
    struct node *next;
};

void
stack_push(struct node **top, struct node *entry, void *value)
{
    entry->value = value;
    entry->next = *top;
    *top = entry;
    return;
}

struct node *
stack_pop(struct node **top)
{
    struct node *r;
    r = *top;
    *top = r->next;
    return r;
}
Lock-less Synchronization

```c
struct node {
    void *value;
    struct node *next;
};

void stack_push(struct node **top, struct node *entry,
                void *value)
{
    entry->value = value;

    do {
        entry->next = ck_pr_load_ptr(top);
    } while (ck_pr_cas_ptr(top, entry->next,
                           entry) == false);

    return;
}
```
Lock-less Synchronization

```c
struct node {
    void *value;
    struct node *next;
};

void
stack_push(struct node **top, struct node *entry,
    void *value)
{
    entry->value = value;
    do {
        entry->next = ck_pr_load_ptr(top);
    } while (ck_pr_cas_ptr(top, entry->next,
        entry) == false);
    return;
}

struct node *
stack_pop(struct node **top)
{
    struct node *r, *next;
    do {
        r = ck_pr_load_ptr(top);
        if (r == NULL)
            return NULL;
        next = ck_pr_load_ptr(&r->next);
    } while (ck_pr_cas_ptr(top, r, next) == false);
    return r;
}
```
Lock-less Synchronization

Non-blocking synchronization is not a silver bullet.
Lock-less Synchronization

Non-blocking synchronization is not a silver bullet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Intel Core i7-3615QM</th>
<th>IBM Power 730 Express</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spinlock_push</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lockfree_push</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinlock_pop</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lockfree_pop</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lock-less Synchronization

Non-blocking synchronization is not a silver bullet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Intel Core i7-3615QM</th>
<th>IBM Power 730 Express</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spinlock_push</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lockfree_push</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinlock_pop</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lockfree_pop</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost of complexity on the fast path will outweigh the benefits until sufficient levels of contention are reached.
Lock-less Synchronization

Non-blocking synchronization is not a silver bullet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Intel Core i7-3615QM</th>
<th>IBM Power 730 Express</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spinlock_push</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lockfree_push</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinlock_pop</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lockfree_pop</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost of complexity on the fast path will outweigh the benefits until sufficient levels of contention are reached.

Source: Nonblocking Algorithms and Scalable Multicore Programming, Samy Bahra
Lock-less Synchronization

Relaxing correctness constraints and constraining runtime requirements allows for many of the benefits without as much additional complexity and impact on the fast path.
#define EMPLOYEE_MAX 8

struct employee {
    const char *name;
    unsigned long long number;
};

struct directory {
    struct employee *employee[EMPLOYEE_MAX];
    rwlock_t rwlock;
};

bool employee_add(struct directory *, const char *,
                   unsigned long long);

void employee_delete(struct directory *, const char *);

unsigned long long employee_number_get(struct directory *,
                                       const char *);
Lock-less Synchronization

```c
unsigned long long employee_number_get(struct directory *d, const char *n) {
    struct employee *em;
    unsigned long number;
    size_t i;

    rwlock_read_lock(&d->rwlock);
    for (i = 0; i < EMPLOYEE_MAX; i++) {
        em = d->employee[i];
        if (em == NULL)
            continue;
        if (strcmp(em->name, n) != 0)
            continue;
        number = em->number;
        rwlock_read_unlock(&d->rwlock);
        return number;
    }
    rwlock_read_unlock(&d->rwlock);
    return 0;
}
```

The `rwlock_t` object provides correctness at cost of forward progress.
bool employee_add(struct directory *d, const char *n,
                     unsigned long long number)
{
    struct employee *em;
    size_t i;

    rwlock_write_lock(&d->rwlock);
    for (i = 0; i < EMPLOYEE_MAX; i++) {
        if (d->employee[i] != NULL)
            continue;

        em = xmalloc(sizeof *em);
        em->name = n;
        em->number = number;
        d->employee[i] = em;
        rwlock_write_unlock(&d->rwlock);
        return true;
    }
    rwlock_write_unlock(&d->rwlock);

    return false;
}
The `rwlock_t` object provides correctness at cost of forward progress.
Lock-less Synchronization

void
employee_delete(struct directory *d, const char *n)
{
    struct employee *em;
    size_t i;

    rwlock_write_lock(&d->rwlock);
    for (i = 0; i < EMPLOYEE_MAX; i++) {
        if (d->employee[i] == NULL)
            continue;

        if (strcmp(d->employee[i]->name, n) != 0)
            continue;

        em = d->employee[i];
        d->employee[i] = NULL;
        rwlock_write_unlock(&d->rwlock);
        free(em);
    }
    rwlock_write_unlock(&d->rwlock);
    return;
}
Lock-less Synchronization

If reachability and liveness are coupled, you also protect against a read-reclaim race.

Time

- $T_0$: employee_delete waits on readers
- $T_1$: `strcmp(em->name, ...`
- $T_2$: `number = em->number`
- $T_2$: employee_delete destroys object
Decoupling is sometimes necessary, but requires a safe memory reclamation scheme to guarantee that an object cannot be physically destroyed if there are active references to it.

```c
static struct employee *
employee_number_get(struct directory *d, const char *n,
    ck_brlock_reader_t *reader)
{
    ...
    ck_brlock_read_lock(&d->brlock, reader);
    for (i = 0; i < EMPLOYEE_MAX; i++) {
        em = d->employee[i];
        if (em == NULL)
            continue;
        if (strcmp(em->name, n) != 0)
            continue;
        ck_pr_inc_uint(&em->ref);
        ck_brlock_read_unlock(reader);
        return em;
    }
    ck_brlock_read_unlock(reader);
    ...
```

Lock-less Synchronization
Decoupling is sometimes necessary, but requires a safe memory reclamation scheme to guarantee that an object cannot be physically destroyed if there are active references to it.

```c
static void employee_delref(struct employee *em) {
    bool z;

    ck_pr_dec_uint_zero(&em->ref, &z);
    if (z == true) {
        free(em);
    }
    return;
}
```
Decoupling is sometimes necessary, but requires a safe memory reclamation scheme to guarantee that an object cannot be physically destroyed if there are active references to it.

```c
static void employee_delete(struct directory *d, const char *n)
{
    ...
    ck_brlock_write_lock(&d->brlock);
    for (i = 0; i < EMPLOYEE_MAX; i++) {
        if (d->employee[i] == NULL)
            continue;
        if (strcmp(d->employee[i]->name, n) != 0)
            continue;
        em = d->employee[i];
        d->employee[i] = NULL;
        ck_brlock_write_unlock(&d->brlock);
        employee_delref(em);
        return;
    }
    ck_brlock_write_unlock(&d->brlock);
    ...
```
Decoupling is sometimes necessary, but requires a safe memory reclamation scheme to guarantee that an object cannot be physically destroyed if there are active references to it.
Concurrent Data Structures

```c
static bool employee_add(struct directory *d, const char *n, unsigned long long number) {
    struct employee *em;
    size_t i;

    ck_rwlock_write_lock(&d->rwlock);
    for (i = 0; i < EMPLOYEE_MAX; i++) {
        if (d->employee[i] != NULL)
            continue;

        em = malloc(sizeof *em);
        em->name = n;
        em->number = number;
        ck_pr_fence_store();
        ck_pr_store_ptr(&d->employee[i], em);
        ck_rwlock_write_unlock(&d->rwlock);
        return true;
    }
    ck_rwlock_write_unlock(&d->rwlock);
    return false;
}
```
Concurrent Data Structures

```c
static void
employee_delete(struct directory *d, const char *n)
{
    struct employee *em;
    size_t i;

    ck_rwlock_write_lock(&d->rwlock);
    for (i = 0; i < EMPLOYEE_MAX; i++) {
        if (d->employee[i] == NULL)
            continue;
        if (strcmp(d->employee[i]->name, n) != 0)
            continue;
        em = d->employee[i];
        ck_pr_store_ptr(&d->employee[i], NULL);
    }
    ck_rwlock_write_unlock(&d->rwlock);
    return;
}
```

```c
static unsigned long long
employee_number_get(struct directory *d, const char *n)
{
    struct employee *em;
    unsigned long number;
    size_t i;

    for (i = 0; i < EMPLOYEE_MAX; i++) {
        em = ck_pr_load_ptr(&d->employee[i]);
        if (em == NULL)
            continue;
        if (strcmp(em->name, n) != 0)
            continue;
        number = em->number;
        return number;
    }
    return 0;
}
```
EXPERIMENT

Workload

• Uniform read-mostly workload
• Single writer attempts pessimistic add operation at fixed frequency
• Readers attempt to get the number of the first employee

Environment

• 12 cores across 2 sockets
• Intel Xeon E5-2630L at 2.40 GHz
• Linux 2.6.32

Machine (64GB)

NUMANode L#0 (P#0 32GB)
Socket L#0 + L3 L#0 (15MB)
L2 L#0 (256KB) + L1d L#0 (32KB) + L1i L#0 (32KB) + Core L#0 + PU L#0 (P#0)
Read Latency
No updates
Read Latency
No updates
Read Latency
Single writer

![Graph showing read latency for different lock mechanisms with varying numbers of processors. The graph compares Read-Write Lock, Big Reader Lock, Reference Counting, and Concurrently Readable scenarios. The x-axis represents the number of processors (1 to 10), and the y-axis represents time (in units unspecified). The graph illustrates how the latency changes with increasing processor count for each mechanism.]
Write Latency

Single writer

![Graph showing write latency for different locking mechanisms with varying number of processors. The graph compares Read-Write Lock, Big Reader Lock, Reference Counting, and Concurrently Readable scenarios.]
A **read-reclaim** race occurs if an object is destroyed while there are references or accesses to it.

```c
T0  free(em)
T1  strcmp(em->name, ...
T2  number = em->number
```
Safe Memory Reclamation

Techniques such as hazard pointers, quiescent-state-based reclamation and epoch-based reclamation protect against read-reclaim races.

```c
strcmp(em->name, ...

number = em->number
```
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Safe Memory Reclamation

Techniques such as hazard pointers, quiescent-state-based reclamation and epoch-based reclamation protect against read-reclaim races.

Schemes such as QSBR and EBR do so without affecting reader progress but without guaranteeing writer progress.

Schemes provide strong guarantees on forward progress but require heavy-weight instructions and retry logic for readers.
BLOCKING SMR SCHEMES

• Read-side critical sections

```c
smr_read_lock();
<protected section>
smr_read_unlock();
```

• Explicit Reclamation

```c
smr_synchronize();
```
QUIESCENT-STATE-BASED RECLAMATION

T₀
- logical delete
- synchronize
- destroy
- synchronize

T₁
- q
- read
- q
- read

T₂
- q
- read
- q
- read

Time
QUIESCENT-STATE-BASED RECLAMATION

Writer

employee_number_delete
  [...]  
    ck_pr_store_ptr(slot, NULL);
    qsbr_synchronize();
    free(em);
  [...]  

Readers

  [...]  
    for (;;) {
      em = employee_get(...);
      do_stuff(em);
      quiesce();
    }
  [...]  

T0

  ck_pr_store_ptr(slot, NULL);

  qsbr_synchronize();

  free(em);

T1

  em = employee_get(...);

  do_stuff(em);

  quiesce();

  em = employee_get(...);

  do_stuff(em);

T2

  em = employee_get(...);

  do_stuff(em);

  quiesce();

  em = employee_get(...);

  do_stuff(em);
QUIESCENT-STATE-BASED RECLAMATION

Writers

```c
static void
qsbr_synchronize(void)
{
    int i;
    uint64_t goal;

    ck_pr_fence_memory();
    goal = ck_pr_faa_64(&global.value, 1) + 1;

    for (i = 0; i < n_reader; i++) {
        uint64_t *c = &threads.readers[i].counter.value;

        while (ck_pr_load_64(c) < goal)
            ck_pr_stall();
    }

    return;
}
```

Readers

```c
static void
qsbr_quiesce(struct thread *th)
{
    uint64_t v;

    ck_pr_fence_memory();
    v = ck_pr_load_64(&global.value);
    ck_pr_store_64(&th->counter.value, v);
    ck_pr_fence_memory();
    return;
}

static void
qsbr_read_lock(struct thread *th)
{
    ck_pr_barrier(); /* Compiler barrier. */
    return;
}

static void
qsbr_read_unlock(struct thread *th)
{
    ck_pr_barrier(); /* Compiler barrier. */
    return;
}
```
Conclusion

There are no silver bullets in multicore synchronization, but a deep understanding of both your workload and your underlying environment may allow you to extract phenomenal performance and reliability increases.
The End
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http://concurrencykit.org

http://backtrace.io/

A lot of the content can be found on https://queue.acm.org/detail.cfm?id=2492433 - along with references.