Name: Solutions

Instructions:

This is a closed book, closed notes exam. No electronic devices, including calculators, are allowed. You have 120 minutes. There are 6 problems and 10 pages to this exam.

Good Luck!
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1. (15 points) Banker’s Algorithm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Total Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A  B  C</td>
<td>A  B  C</td>
<td>A  B  C</td>
<td>A  B  C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>0  1  0</td>
<td>3  5  2</td>
<td>3  4  2</td>
<td>Avail: 1  1  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>2  1  2</td>
<td>5  2  4</td>
<td>3  1  2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>2  1  2</td>
<td>2  3  4</td>
<td>0  2  2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>1  2  2</td>
<td>1  3  2</td>
<td>0  1  0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows four processes, P0 through P3. Each process needs a number of resources (of types A, B, and C) to complete. If a process obtains all the resources it needs, it will be able to finish and return its resources back to the system. The Allocation column shows how many of each resource is currently allocated for each process. The Max column shows the total number of each resource the process needs to be able to finish. The "Total Resources" box shows the total number of each resource the Operating System has. In other words, this is the number of resources that the OS had available before it allocated any of its resources to any processes.

Part A: Using the definitions of the Banker’s Algorithm we went over in class, fill in the Need column in the above diagram.

Part B: Show that the system is in a safe state by demonstrating an order in which the processes may complete.

P3 -> P2 -> P0 -> P1 or
P3 -> P2 -> P1 -> P0

Part C: If a request from process P2 arrives for (0, 1, 1) can the request be granted immediately? If it can, show the system is in a safe state by demonstrating an order in which the processes may complete.

If we grant the request to P2, we have the following:

Avail: 1 0 1
P2 Need: 0 1 1
The other process have the same needs as shown above. No other processes can get the resources it needs to complete, so the system is not in a safe state, and the request should not be granted.

Part D: If a request from process P1 arrives for (1, 0, 2) can the request be granted immediately? If it can, show the system is in a safe state by demonstrating an order in which the processes may complete. For this problem, assume that system is in the same state as it was before the request in Part B came in (i.e., the state of the system is as shown in the diagram above).

If we grant the request to P1, we have the following:

Avail: 0 1 0
P1 Need: 2 1 0
The other process have the same needs as shown above.

P3 -> P2 -> P0 -> P1 can complete in this order, so the system is in a safe state, so the request can be granted.
2. (15 points) You run the following code shown below and you see you get the incorrect answer of \( \text{counter} = 2 \).

```c
#include <stdio.h>
#include <pthread.h>

static volatile int counter = 0;

void * mythread(void *arg) {
    int i;
    for (i = 0; i < 2; i++) {
        counter = counter + 1;
    }
    return NULL;
}

int main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
    pthread_t p1, p2;
    pthread_create(&p1, NULL, mythread, NULL);
    pthread_create(&p2, NULL, mythread, NULL);

    // join waits for the threads to finish
    pthread_join(p1, NULL);
    pthread_join(p2, NULL);
    printf("main: done with both (counter = %d)\n", counter);
    return 0;
}
```

To investigate, you disassemble the thread and you get the following assembly code:

```assembly
00000000000400647 <mythread>: Cycle
400647: b8 00 00 00 00 00 1 mov $0x0,%eax # holds i
40064c: eb 12 2 jmp 400660 <mythread+0x19>
40064e: 8b 15 f8 09 20 00 5 11 mov 0x2009f8(%rip),%edx # Read 60104c <counter>
400654: 83 c2 01 6 12 add $0x1,%edx # Modify
400657: 89 15 ef 09 20 00 7 13 mov %edx,0x2009ef(%rip) # Write 60104c <counter>
40065d: 83 c0 01 8 add $0x1,%eax
400660: 83 f8 01 3 9 cmp $0x1,%eax
400663: 7e e9 4 10 jle 40064e <mythread+0x7>
400665: b8 00 00 00 00 mov $0x0,%eax
40066a: c3 retq
```

You noticed that when you got the incorrect answer \( \text{counter} = 2 \), you saw the following interleaving of threads.

T1 --> T2 (finished) → T1 (finished).

The first time T1 ran, how many assembly instructions did T1 execute before being switched to T2? 11 or 12

An incorrect result happens when the Read/Modify/Write steps don't happen atomically. To get a count of 2, the T1, needs to read the value of the counter as 2 in memory (which happens in cycle 11), but gets a context switch to T2 before the counter is written back out to memory (which happens in cycle 13), which finishes and switches back to T1. Then T1 finished, overwriting the value of the counter written by T2.
The above code is an example of which of the following (circle all that apply)

A. Deterministic computation
B. Race condition (output depends on the order in which the threads run)
C. Mutual exclusion
D. Indeterminate program (different output from run to run with the same inputs)

Fix the example code below using semaphores. Assume all functions return without errors (i.e., your code does not have to check for errors).

```c
#include <stdio.h>
#include <pthread.h>
#include <semaphore.h>

// Here are the pthread semaphore functions to use:
// int sem_init(sem_t *sem, int pshared, unsigned int value); # use 0 for pshared param
// int sem_post(sem_t *sem);
// int sem_wait(sem_t *sem);

sem_t mutex; // global
static volatile int counter = 0;
void * mythread(void *arg) {
    int i;
    for (i = 0; i < 2; i++) {
        // Critical section
        sem_wait(&mutex);
        counter = counter + 1;
        sem_post(&mutex);
    }
    return NULL;
}
int main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
    pthread_t p1, p2;
    sem_init(&mutex, 0, 1); // lock in initially unlocked
    pthread_create(&p1, NULL, mythread, NULL);
    pthread_create(&p2, NULL, mythread, NULL);
    pthread_join(p1, NULL);
    pthread_join(p2, NULL);
    printf("main: done with both (counter = %d)\n", counter);
    return 0;
}
```

Here are some common mistakes when answering this question:

1. Calling `sem_init()` from the inside thread function. `sem_init()` initializes the semaphore and is called exactly once before the semaphore is used. If it is called inside the thread function, it will get called each time a new thread is created.
2. The `sem_t mutex` declaration inside of the `main()` function. For this problem, the mutex declaration needs to be a global. If it is declared inside of `main()`, it is allocated on the stack frame of `main()`, and is local to that function. The threads will not have access to the mutex.
3. Incorrect semaphore initialization. Since it being used as a lock, the semaphore must start out unlocked. This means the initial state of the semaphore should be 1.
3. (16 points) Wait for me! We have seen examples of using synchronization primitives to allow one thread to wait for another. For this problem, will use a lock and a condition variable to implement two functions, \texttt{wait()} and \texttt{work()}. When called, the \texttt{wait()} function will not return until other threads have called \texttt{work()} at least three times. In other words, the \texttt{wait()} function should wait until the \texttt{work()} function has been called three or more times first. There is also a global variable, \texttt{status}, which you may also use if you find it helpful. You may assume that there is only one thread who calls \texttt{wait()}, and you do not care which threads call \texttt{work()}, only that it has been called at least 3 times before returning.

```c
#include <stdio.h>
#include <pthread.h>

// Variables you can use in your implementation. Do not declare any other variables.
static volatile int status;
pthread_mutex_t lock = PTHREAD_MUTEX_INITIALIZER;
pthread_cond_t cond = PTHREAD_COND_INITIALIZER;

// Called once before \texttt{wait()} and \texttt{work()} are called
void init() {
    // Note, your lock and condition variable have already been initialized (see above).
    // The only thing you need to do here is to set the initial state of \texttt{status}.
    status = 0;
}

// Return only if \texttt{work()} has been called at least three times. Should sleep if not able // to return (i.e., no busy waiting).
void wait() {
    pthread_mutex_lock(&lock); // critical section
    while (status < 3) {       // condition we should wait on
        pthread_cond_wait(&cond, &lock);
    }
    pthread_mutex_unlock(&lock);
}

// Called to signify that a thread has done work
void work() {
    pthread_mutex_lock(&lock); // critical section
    status += 1;
    if (status == 3) {        // only signal when \texttt{wait()} should return
        pthread_cond_signal(&cond);
    }
    pthread_mutex_unlock(&lock);
}
4. (16 points) Below is a partial implementation of the producer consumer (bounded buffer) problem. Please help me finish it.

```c
int buffer[MAX];
int fill_ptr = 0, use_ptr = 0, count = 0;
cond_t empty, fill;
mutex_t mutex;

void put(int value) {
    buffer[fill_ptr] = value;
    fill_ptr = (fill_ptr + 1) % MAX;
    count++;
}

int get() {
    int tmp = buffer[use_ptr];
    use_ptr = (use_ptr + 1) % MAX;
    count--;
    return tmp;
}

void *producer(void *arg) {
    for (int i = 0; i < loops; i++) {
        pthread_mutex_lock(&mutex);
        while (count == MAX) {
            pthread_cond_wait(&empty, &mutex);
        }
        put(i);
        pthread_cond_signal(&fill);
        pthread_mutex_unlock(&mutex);
    }
}

void *consumer(void *arg) {
    for (int i = 0; i < loops; i++) {
        pthread_mutex_lock(&mutex);
        while (count == 0) {
            pthread_cond_wait(&fill, &mutex);
        }
        int tmp = get();
        pthread_cond_signal(&empty);
        pthread_mutex_unlock(&mutex);
        printf("%d
", tmp);
    }
}
```
5. (14 points) In class, we talked about several different hardware instructions used to build locks. For this question, we'll discuss two instructions, the load-linked instruction and the store-conditional instruction, which are used together to implement locks in some hardware architectures, such as arm. The load-linked instruction operates much like a typical load instruction and simply fetches a value from memory and places it in a register. The key difference comes with the store-conditional instruction, which only succeeds (and updates the value stored at the address just load-linked from) if no intervening store to the address has taken place. In the case of success, the store-conditional returns 1 and updates the value at ptr to value; if it fails, the value at ptr is not updated and a 0 is returned. The C pseudo code for these instructions are shown below.

```c
int LoadLinked(int *ptr) {
    return *ptr;
}

int StoreConditional(int *ptr, int value) {
    if (no one has updated *ptr since the LoadLinked to this address) {
        *ptr = value;
        return 1; // success!
    } else {
        return 0; // failed to update
    }
}
```

Given the two functions above, where each function executes atomically with respect to itself, finish the implementation of the lock using these functions.

```c
typedef struct __lock_t {
    int flag;
} lock_t;

void init(lock_t *lock) {
    lock->flag = 0; // 0 indicates that lock is available, 1 that it is held
}

void unlock(lock_t *lock) {
    lock->flag = 0;
}

// Finish the implementation of lock
void lock(lock_t *lock) {
    while(1) {
        while (LoadLinked(&lock->flag) == 1) // spin until the lock is free
            ;
        // Lock is now free, try to acquire the lock by setting flag to 1 with StoreConditional
        if (StoreConditional(&lock->flag, 1) == 1) // success no one else has tried to get the lock
            return;
        // else we failed to get the lock, try again
    }
}
```
6. (24 points) Multiple choice, fill in the blanks, and short answer.

(A) Approximate counters, a lock based concurrent data structure, trades off less counter accuracy for better execution time. (be as specific as you can)

(B) The following code compiles with no errors or warnings, but when you run the thread code below your return value is giving you an unexpected (i.e., wrong) answer. What is the problem with the following code and how would you fix it? You don’t have to code up your fix, just explain how you would fix it.

typedef struct __myarg_t {
    int a;
    int b;
} myarg_t;

typedef struct __myret_t {
    int x;
    int y;
} myret_t;

void *mythread(void *arg) {
    int val1, val2; // local vars allocated on the stack, local to each thread
    myret_t ret; // mutual exclusion is not needed for these variables
    myarg_t *m = (myarg_t *) arg;
    // some code (not shown) to compute val1 and val2
    ret.x = val1;
    ret.y = val2;
    return (void *) &ret;
}

What is wrong with the above code: The variable ret is a local variable allocated on the heap of the thread function.

How do we fix it? We can malloc space for the ret variable (and remember to free it when we are done), or (the horror!) use a global variable for the return structure.

(C) Give an example of where a spinlock lock would be preferable to a lock with sleep queues and why.

If we never hold on to the lock for very long, and there is not a lot of contention for the lock, a spinlock is often faster, as we don’t need a context switch, which can have considerable overhead.
(D) You have the following code:

```c
// This function executes atomically
int FetchAndAdd(int *ptr) {
    int old = *ptr;
    *ptr = old + 1;
    return old;
}

typedef struct __lock_t {
    int ticket;
    int turn;
} lock_t;

void lock_init(lock_t *lock) {
    lock->ticket = 0;
    lock->turn = 0;
}

void lock(lock_t *lock) {
    int myturn = FetchAndAdd(&lock->ticket);
    while (lock->turn != myturn) ; // spin
}

void unlock(lock_t *lock) {
    lock->turn = lock->turn + 1; // Only the thread that has the lock calls this
    // so no mutual exclusion needed here.
}

Does this code guarantee mutual exclusion? Yes, as long as FetchAndAdd is atomic.

Does this code implement locking fairly? Yes, each thread gets the lock in the order that it called lock().

Does this code have good performance on a single processor system? No, it's still a spinlock.

(E) The solution to the Dining Philosophers problem avoids deadlock by eliminating which condition(s) that are necessary for deadlock to hold? (circle all that apply)

A. Mutual exclusion
B. Hold and wait
C. No preemption
D. Circular wait // we have one philosopher acquire the forks in a different order, breaking the cycle.
(F) Why is it a good idea to recheck the condition that caused a thread to call `pthread_cond_wait()` when that thread is woken up with a `pthread_cond_signal()`?

Most systems use Mesa semantics, which does not provide any guarantees that the state of the world hasn't changed since `signal()` was called.

(G) For any problem you can solve with semaphores, you can also solve using condition variables (with a corresponding lock for the condition variables).

TRUE

Explain why or why not: Have a look at the book's implementation of a semaphore. It uses condition variables and locks.

(H) Last question! Unless you are hopping around this quiz. In that case, keep on going, you can do it!

What was the one concept in this section of the course (concurrency) that made the most sense to you?

What was the one concept in concurrency that was the most confusing and you wished we spent more time going over?