Atomic Operations in Hardware

- Previously, we introduced multi-core parallelism & cache coherence
  - Today we'll look at **instruction support for synchronization**.
  - And some pitfalls of parallelization.
  - And solve a few mysteries.



Intel Core i7

A simple piece of code

```
unsigned counter = 0;

void *do_stuff(void * arg) {
  for (int i = 0 ; i < 200000000 ; ++ i) {
     counter ++;
  }
  return arg;
}
```

adds one to counter

How long does this program take? .516s

How can we make it faster?

A simple piece of code

```
unsigned counter = 0;

void *do_stuff(void * arg) {
  for (int i = 0 ; i < 200000000 ; ++ i) {
     counter ++;
  }
  return arg;
}
```

adds one to counter

How long does this program take? Time for 200000000 iterations

How can we make it faster? Run iterations in *parallel*

Exploiting a multi-core processor

```
unsigned counter = 0;

void *do_stuff(void * arg) {
   for (int i = 0 ; i < 200000000 ; ++ i) {
      counter ++;
   }
   return arg;
}
```

Split for-loop across multiple threads running on separate cores



How much faster?

.564 = (slower)

How much faster?

- We're expecting a speedup of 2
- OK, perhaps a little less because of Amdahl's Law
  - overhead for forking and joining multiple threads
- But its actually slower!! Why??
- Here's the mental picture that we have – two processors, shared memory



This mental picture is wrong!

- We've forgotten about caches!
  - The memory may be shared, but each processor has its own L1 cache
  - As each processor updates `counter`, it bounces between L1 caches



The code is not only slow, its WRONG!

- Since the variable `counter` is *shared*, we can get a data race
- Increment operation: `counter++` MIPS equivalent:

```
lw   $t0, counter
addi $t0, $t0, 1
sw   $t0, counter
```

- A data race occurs when data is accessed and manipulated by multiple processors, and the outcome depends on the sequence or timing of these events.

Sequence 1

Processor 1	Processor 2
`lw $t0, counter`	
`addi $t0, $t0, 1`	
`sw $t0, counter`	
	`lw $t0, counter`
	`addi $t0, $t0, 1`
	`sw $t0, counter`

`counter` increases by 2

Sequence 2

Processor 1	Processor 2
`lw $t0, counter`	
	`lw $t0, counter`
`addi $t0, $t0, 1`	
	`addi $t0, $t0, 1`
`sw $t0, counter`	
	`sw $t0, counter`

`counter` increases by 1 !!

What is the minimum value at the end of the program?



Atomic operations

- You can show that if the sequence is particularly nasty, the final value of `counter` may be as little as 2, instead of 200000000.

- To fix this, we must do the load-add-store in a *single* step
  - We call this an atomic operation
  - We're saying: "Do this, and don't allow other processors to interleave memory accesses while doing this."

- "Atomic" in this context means "as if it were a single operation"
  - either we succeed in completing the operation with no interruptions or we fail to even begin the operation (because someone else was doing an atomic operation)
  - Furthermore, it should be "isolated" from other threads.

- x86 provides a "lock" prefix that tells the hardware:
  "don't let anyone read/write the value until I'm done with it"
  - Not the default case (because it is slower!)

What if we want to generalize beyond increments?

- The lock prefix only works for individual x86 instructions.
- What if we want to execute an arbitrary region of code without interference?
  - Consider a red-black tree used by multiple threads.

What if we want to generalize beyond increments?

- The lock prefix only works for individual x86 instructions.
- What if we want to execute an arbitrary region of code without interference?
  - Consider a red-black tree used by multiple threads.

- Best mainstream solution: **Locks**
  - Implements **mutual exclusion**
    - You can't have it if I have it, I can't have it if you have it



What if we want to generalize beyond increments?

- The lock prefix only works for individual x86 instructions.
- What if we want to execute an arbitrary region of code without interference?
  - Consider a red-black tree used by multiple threads.

- Best mainstream solution: **Locks**
  - Implement "mutual exclusion"
    - You can't have it if I have, I can't have it if you have it



when lock = 0, set lock = 1, continue

lock = 0

Lock acquire code

High-level version

```
unsigned lock = 0;

while (1) {
    if (lock == 0) {
        lock = 1;
        break;
    }
}
```

MIPS version

- What problem do you see with this?

Race condition in lock-acquire

```
spin:  lw    $t0, 0($a0)
       bne   $t0, 0, spin
       li    $t1, 1
       sw    $t1, 0($a0)
```



No mutual exclusion

Doing “lock acquire” atomically

- Make sure no one gets between load and store
- Common primitive: **compare-and-swap (old, new, addr)**
  - If the value in memory matches “old”, write “new” into memory

```
temp = *addr;
if (temp == old) {
        *addr = new;
} else {
        old = temp;
}
```

- x86 calls it CMPXCHG (compare-exchange)
  - Use the lock prefix to guarantee it’s atomicity

Using CAS to implement locks

- Acquiring the lock:

```
lock_acquire:
     li   $t0, 0    # old
     li   $t1, 1    # new
     cas $t0, $t1, lock
     beq $t0, $t1, lock_acquire  # failed, try again
```

- Releasing the lock:

```
     sw   $0, lock
```

Conclusions

- When parallel threads access the same data, potential for data races
  - Even true on uniprocessors due to context switching
- We can prevent data races by enforcing mutual exclusion
  - Allowing only one thread to access the data at a time
  - For the duration of a critical section
- Mutual exclusion can be enforced by locks
  - Programmer allocates a variable to "protect" shared data
  - Program must perform: 0 → 1 transition before data access
  - 1 → 0 transition after
- Locks can be implemented with atomic operations
  - (hardware instructions that enforce mutual exclusion on 1 data item)
  - compare-and-swap
    - If address holds "old", replace with "new"