

3 5

**An Introduction to Programming
with Threads**

by Andrew D. Birrell

January 6, 1989

digital

Systems Research Center
130 Lytton Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94301

An Introduction to Programming with Threads

Andrew D. Birrell

This paper provides an introduction to writing concurrent programs with “threads”. A threads facility allows you to write programs with multiple simultaneous points of execution, synchronizing through shared memory. The paper describes the basic thread and synchronization primitives, then for each primitive provides a tutorial on how to use it. The tutorial sections provide advice on the best ways to use the primitives, give warnings about what can go wrong and offer hints about how to avoid these pitfalls. The paper is aimed at experienced programmers who want to acquire practical expertise in writing concurrent programs.

CR categories and Subject Descriptors: D.1.4 [**Programming Techniques**]: Concurrent Programming; D.3.3 [**Programming Languages**]: Language Constructs—*Concurrent programming structures*; D.4.1 [**Operating Systems**]: Process Management

General Terms: Design, Languages, Performance

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Threads, Concurrency, Multi-processing, Synchronization

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Why use concurrency?.....	2
The design of a thread facility	3
Using a Mutex: accessing shared data	7
Using a Condition variable: scheduling shared resources.....	14
Using Fork: working in parallel.....	22
Using Alert: diverting the flow of control	27
Additional techniques	28
Building your program	30
Concluding remarks.....	31
References.....	31
Appendix: other thread designs.....	33

© **Digital Equipment Corporation 1989**

This work may not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part for any commercial purpose. Permission to copy in whole or in part without payment of fee is granted for non-profit educational and research purposes provided that all such whole or partial copies include the following: a notice that such copying is by permission of the Systems Research Center of Digital Equipment Corporation in Palo Alto, California; an acknowledgement of the authors and individual contributors to the work; and all applicable portions of the copyright notice. Copying, reproducing, or republishing for any other purpose shall require a license with payment of fee to the Systems Research Center. All rights reserved.

INTRODUCTION

Many experimental operating systems, and some commercial ones, have recently included support for concurrent programming. The most popular mechanism for this is some provision for allowing multiple lightweight “threads” within a single address space, used from within a single program.¹

Programming with threads introduces new difficulties even for experienced programmers. Concurrent programming has techniques and pitfalls that do not occur in sequential programming. Many of the techniques are obvious, but some are obvious only with hindsight. Some of the pitfalls are comfortable (for example, deadlock is a pleasant sort of bug—your program stops with all the evidence intact), but some take the form of insidious performance penalties.

The purpose of this paper is to give you an introduction to the programming techniques that work well with threads, and to warn you about techniques or interactions that work out badly. It should provide the experienced sequential programmer with enough hints to be able to build a substantial multi-threaded program that works—correctly, efficiently, and with a minimum of surprises.

A “thread” is a straightforward concept: a single sequential flow of control. In a high-level language you normally program a thread using procedures, where the procedure calls follow the traditional stack discipline. Within a single thread, there is at any instant a single point of execution. The programmer need learn nothing new to use a single thread.

Having “multiple threads” in a program means that at any instant the program has multiple points of execution, one in each of its threads. The programmer can mostly view the threads as executing simultaneously, as if the computer were endowed with as many processors as there are threads. The programmer is required to decide when and where to create multiple threads, or to accept such decisions made for him by implementers of existing library packages or runtime systems. Additionally, the programmer must occasionally be aware that the computer might not in fact execute all his threads simultaneously.

Having the threads execute within a “single address space” means that the computer’s addressing hardware is configured so as to permit the threads to read and write the same memory locations. In a high-level language, this usually corresponds to the fact that the off-stack (global) variables are shared among all the threads of the program. Each thread executes on a separate call stack with its own separate local variables. The programmer is responsible for using the synchronization mechanisms of the thread facility to ensure that the shared memory is accessed in a manner that will give the correct answer.

Thread facilities are always advertised as being “lightweight”. This means that thread creation, existence, destruction and synchronization primitives are cheap enough that the programmer will use them for all his concurrency needs.

Please be aware that I am presenting you with a selective, biased and idiosyncratic collection of techniques. Selective, because an exhaustive survey would be premature, and would be too exhausting to serve as an introduction—I will be discussing only the most important thread primitives, omitting features such as per-thread context information. Biased, because I present examples, problems and solutions in the context of one

¹ Throughout this paper I use the word “process” only when I mean a single flow of control associated one-to-one with an address space, since this now seems to be the most common usage of that word.

particular set of choices of how to design a threads facility—the choices we made in the Topaz system at Digital's Systems Research Center (SRC). Idiosyncratic, because the techniques presented here derive from my personal experience of programming with threads over the last ten years—I have not attempted to represent colleagues who might have different opinions about which programming techniques are “good” or “important”. Nevertheless, I believe that an understanding of the ideas presented here will serve as a sound basis for programming with concurrent threads.

Throughout the paper I use examples written in Modula-2+ [12]. These should be readily understandable by anyone familiar with the Algol and Pascal family of languages. The examples are intended to illustrate points about concurrency and synchronization—don't try to use these actual algorithms in real programs.

Threads are not a tool for automatic parallel decomposition, where a compiler will take a visibly sequential program and generate object code to utilize multiple processors. That is an entirely different art, not one that I will discuss here.

WHY USE CONCURRENCY?

Life would be simpler if you didn't need to use concurrency. But there are a variety of forces pushing towards its use. The most recent is the advent of multi-processors. With these machines, there really are multiple simultaneous points of execution, and threads are an attractive tool for allowing a program to take advantage of the available hardware. The alternative, with most conventional operating systems, is to configure your program as multiple separate processes, running in separate address spaces. This tends to be expensive to set up, and the costs of communicating between address spaces are often high, even in the presence of shared segments. By using a lightweight multi-threading facility, the programmer can utilize the processors cheaply. This seems to work well in systems having up to about 10 processors, rather than 1000 processors.

A second area where threads are useful is in driving slow devices such as disks, networks, terminals and printers. In these cases an efficient program should be doing some other useful work while waiting for the device to produce its next event (such as the completion of a disk transfer or the receipt of a packet from the network). As we will see later, this can be programmed quite easily with threads by adopting an attitude that device requests are all sequential (i.e. they suspend execution of the invoking thread until the request completes), and that the program meanwhile does other work in other threads.

A third source of concurrency is human users. Humans are actually quite good at doing two or three things at a time, and seem to get offended if their computer cannot do as much. Again, threads are a convenient way of programming this. The typical arrangement of a modern window system is that each time the user invokes an action (by clicking a button with the mouse, for example), a separate thread is used to implement the action. If the user invokes multiple actions, multiple threads will perform them in parallel. (Note that the implementation of the window system probably also uses a thread to watch the mouse actions themselves, since the mouse is an example of a slow device.)

A final source of concurrency appears when building a distributed system. Here we frequently encounter shared network servers (such as a file server or a spooling print server), where the server is willing to service requests from multiple clients. Use of multiple threads allows the server to handle clients' requests in parallel, instead of artificially serializing them (or creating one server process per client, at great expense).

Sometimes you can deliberately add concurrency to your program in order to reduce the latency of operations (the elapsed time between calling a procedure and the procedure returning). Often, some of the work incurred by a procedure can be deferred, since it does not affect the result of the procedure. For example, when you add or remove something in a balanced tree you could happily return to the caller before re-balancing the tree. With threads you can achieve this easily: do the re-balancing in a separate thread. If the separate thread is scheduled at a lower priority, then the work can be done at a time when you are less busy (for example, when waiting for user input). Adding threads to defer work is a powerful technique, even on a uni-processor. Even if the same total work is done, reducing latency can improve the responsiveness of your program.

THE DESIGN OF A THREAD FACILITY

We can't discuss how to program with threads until we agree on the primitives provided by a multi-threading facility. The various systems that support threads offer quite similar facilities, but there is a lot of diversity in the details. In general, there are four major mechanisms: thread creation, mutual exclusion, waiting for events, and some arrangement for getting a thread out of an unwanted long-term wait. The discussions in the rest of the paper are organized around the particular primitives provided by the SRC thread facility [4], and I describe here their detailed semantics. In the appendix I describe the corresponding parts of the thread facilities provided by some other systems, and how they relate to the SRC facilities.

Thread creation

A thread is created by calling “Fork”, giving it a procedure and an argument record. The effect of “Fork” is to create a new thread, and start that thread executing asynchronously at an invocation of the given procedure with the given arguments. When the procedure returns, the thread dies. Usually, “Fork” returns to its caller a handle on the newly created thread. The handle can be presented to a “Join” procedure. “Join” waits for the given thread to terminate, and returns the result of the given thread's initial procedure. The SRC thread creation facilities are as follows.²

```

TYPE Thread;
TYPE Forkee = PROCEDURE(REFANY): REFANY;
PROCEDURE Fork(proc: Forkee; arg: REFANY): Thread;
PROCEDURE Join(thread: Thread): REFANY;

```

As a simple example of their use, the following program fragment executes the procedure calls “a(x)” and “b(y)” in parallel, and assigns the result of calling “a(x)” to the variable “q”.

²The type REFANY means a dynamically typed pointer to garbage-collected storage.

4 · An Introduction to Programming with Threads

```
VAR t: Thread;  
t := Fork(a, x);  
p := b(y);  
q := Join(t);
```

In practice, “Join” is not called very much at SRC, and some other thread facilities do not provide “Join” as a primitive. Most forked threads are permanent daemon threads, or have no results, or communicate their results by some synchronization arrangement other than “Join”. If a thread’s initial procedure has returned and there is no subsequent call of “Join”, the thread quietly evaporates.

Mutual exclusion

The simplest way that threads interact is through access to shared memory. In a high-level language, this is usually expressed as access to global variables. Since threads are running in parallel, the programmer must explicitly arrange to avoid errors arising when more than one thread is accessing the shared variables. The simplest tool for doing this is a primitive that offers mutual exclusion (sometimes called critical sections), specifying for a particular region of code that only one thread can execute there at any time. In the SRC design, this is achieved with the data type “Mutex” and the language’s “LOCK” construct.

```
TYPE Mutex;  
LOCK mutex DO ... statements ... END;
```

A mutex has two states: locked and unlocked, initially unlocked. The LOCK clause locks the mutex, then executes the contained statements, then unlocks the mutex. A thread executing inside the LOCK clause is said to “hold” the mutex. If another thread attempts to lock the mutex when it is already locked, the second thread blocks (enqueued on the mutex) until the mutex is unlocked.

The programmer can achieve mutual exclusion on a set of variables by associating them with a mutex, and accessing the variables only from a thread that holds the mutex (i.e., from a thread executing inside a LOCK clause that has locked the mutex). This is the basis of the notion of *monitors*, first described by Tony Hoare [9]. For example, in the following fragment the mutex “m” is associated with the global variable “head”; the LOCK clause provides mutual exclusion for adding the local variable “newElement” to a linked list whose head is “head”.

```
TYPE List = REF RECORD ch: CHAR; next: List END;  
VAR m: Thread.Mutex;  
VAR head: List;  
  
LOCK m DO  
    newElement^.next := head;  
    head := newElement;  
END;
```

The simplest sort of mutex is a global variable (as in the fragment above); in this case at most one thread is executing inside the LOCK clause at any instant.

But a mutex might instead be part of a data structure (for example a field of a record). In that case, the variables it protects would also be part of the data structure (for example, the remaining fields of the same record). To express this, the LOCK clause would begin with an expression selecting the mutex field of the record, and the correct description would be that at most one thread can execute with the mutex held. This latter feature is typically used to arrange that at most one thread can access the fields of a particular record, but multiple threads can access different records in parallel. We will examine this usage in more detail in a later section.

Condition variables

You can view a mutex as a simple kind of resource scheduling mechanism. The resource being scheduled is the shared memory accessed inside the LOCK clause, and the scheduling policy is one thread at a time. But often the programmer needs to express more complicated scheduling policies. This requires use of a mechanism that allows a thread to block until some event happens. In the SRC design, this is achieved with a condition variable.

```
TYPE Condition;
PROCEDURE Wait(m: Mutex; c: Condition);
PROCEDURE Signal(c: Condition);
PROCEDURE Broadcast(c: Condition);
```

A condition variable is always associated with a particular mutex, and with the data protected by that mutex. In general a monitor consists of some data, a mutex, and zero or more condition variables. Notice that a particular condition variable is always used in conjunction with the *same* mutex and its data. The “Wait” operation atomically unlocks the mutex and blocks the thread (enqueued on the condition variable)³. The “Signal” operation does nothing unless there is a thread blocked on the condition variable, in which case it awakens at least one such blocked thread (but possibly more than one). The “Broadcast” operation is like “Signal”, except that it awakens all the threads currently blocked on the condition variable. When a thread is awoken inside “Wait” after blocking, it re-locks the mutex, then returns. Note that the mutex might not be available, in which case the thread will block on the mutex until it is available.

The mutex associated with a condition variable protects the shared data that is used for the scheduling decision. If a thread wants the resource, it locks the mutex and examines the shared data. If the resource is available, the thread continues. If not, the thread unlocks the mutex and blocks, by calling “Wait”. Later, when some other thread makes the resource available it awakens the first thread by calling “Signal” or “Broadcast”. For example, the following fragment allows a thread to block until a linked list (whose head is “head”) is not empty, then remove the top element of the list.

```
VAR nonEmpty: Thread.Condition;
```

³This atomicity guarantee avoids the problem known in the literature as the “wake-up waiting” race [13].

6 · An Introduction to Programming with Threads

```
LOCK m DO
  WHILE head = NIL DO Thread.Wait(m, nonEmpty) END;
  topElement := head;
  head := head^.next;
END;
```

And the following fragment could be used by a thread adding an element to “head”.

```
LOCK m DO
  newElement^.next := head;
  head := newElement;
  Thread.Signal(nonEmpty);
END;
```

Alerts

The final aspect of the SRC thread facility is a mechanism for interrupting a particular thread, causing it to back out of some long-term wait or computation.

```
EXCEPTION Alerted;
PROCEDURE Alert(t: Thread);
PROCEDURE AlertWait(m: Mutex, c: Condition);
PROCEDURE TestAlert(): BOOLEAN;
```

The state of a thread includes a boolean known as “alert-pending”, initially false. A call of “AlertWait” behaves the same as “Wait”, except that if the thread’s alert-pending boolean is true, then instead of blocking on *c* it sets alert-pending to false, re-locks *m* and raises the exception “Alerted”. (Don’t worry about the semantics of Modula-2+ exceptions—think of them as a form of non-ignorable return code.) If you call “Alert(*t*)” when *t* is currently blocked on a condition variable inside a call of “AlertWait” then *t* is awoken, *t* re-locks the mutex *m* and then it raises the exception “Alerted”. If you call “Alert(*t*)” when *t* is not blocked in a call of “AlertWait”, all that happens is that its alert-pending boolean is set to true. The call “TestAlert” atomically tests and clears the thread’s alert-pending boolean.

For example, consider a “GetChar” routine, which blocks until a character is available on an interactive keyboard input stream. It seems attractive that if some other thread of the computation decides the input is no longer interesting (for example, the user clicked CANCEL with his mouse), then the thread should return from “GetChar”. If you happen to know the condition variable where “GetChar” blocks waiting for characters you could just signal it, but often that condition variable is hidden under one or more layers of abstraction. In this situation, the thread interpreting the CANCEL request can achieve its goal by calling “Thread.Alert(*t*)”, where “*t*” is the thread calling “GetChar”. For this to work, “GetChar” must contain something like the following fragment.

```

TRY
    WHILE empty DO Thread.AlertWait(m, nonEmpty) END;
    RETURN NextChar()
EXCEPT
    Thread.Alerted: RETURN EndOfFile
END;

```

Alerts are complicated, and their use produces complicated programs. We will discuss them in more detail later.

USING A MUTEX: ACCESSING SHARED DATA

The basic rule for using mutual exclusion is straightforward: in a multi-threaded program all shared mutable data must be protected by associating it with some mutex, and you must access the data only from a thread that is holding the associated mutex (i.e., from a thread executing within a LOCK clause that locked the mutex).

Unprotected data

The simplest bug related to mutexes occurs when you fail to protect some mutable data and then you access it without the benefits of synchronization. For example, consider the following code fragment. The global variable “table” represents a table that can be filled with REFANY values by calling “Insert”. The procedure works by inserting a non-NIL argument at index “i” of “table”, then incrementing “i”. The table is initially empty (all NIL).

```

VAR table: ARRAY [0..999] OF REFANY;
VAR i: [0..1000];

PROCEDURE Insert(r: REFANY);
BEGIN
    IF r # NIL THEN
1—         table[i] := r;
2—         i := i+1;
    END;
END Insert;

FOR i := 0 TO 999 DO table[i] := NIL END;
i := 0;

```

Now consider what might happen if thread A calls “Insert(x)” concurrently with thread B calling “Insert(y)”. If the order of execution happens to be that thread A executes (1), then thread B executes (1), then thread A executes (2) then thread B executes (2), confusion will result. Instead of the intended effect (that “x” and “y” are inserted into “table”, at separate indexes), the final state would be that “y” is correctly in the table, but “x” has been lost. Further, since (2) has been executed twice, an empty (NIL) slot has

been left orphaned in the table. Such errors would be prevented by enclosing (1) and (2) in a LOCK clause, as follows.

```

PROCEDURE Insert(r: REFANY);
BEGIN
  IF r # NIL THEN
    LOCK m DO
      table[i] := r;
      i := i+1;
    END;
  END;
END Insert;

```

The LOCK clause enforces serialization of the threads' actions, so that one thread executes the statements inside the LOCK clause, then the other thread executes them.

The effects of unsynchronized access to mutable data can be bizarre, since they will depend on the precise timing relationship between your threads. Also, in most environments the timing relationship is non-deterministic (because of real-time effects like page faults, or the use of real-time timer facilities, or because of actual asynchrony in a multi-processor system).

It would be a good idea for your language system to give you some help here, for example by syntax that prevents you accessing variables until you have locked the appropriate mutex. But most languages don't offer this yet. Meanwhile, you need programmer discipline and careful use of searching and browsing tools. Such problems will arise less often if you use very simple, coarse grain, locking. For example, use a single mutex to protect all the global state of an entire module. Unfortunately, this can cause other problems, described below. So the best advice is to make your use of mutexes be as simple as possible, but no simpler. If you are tempted to use more elaborate arrangements, be entirely sure that the benefits are worth the risks, not just that the program looks nicer.

Invariants

When the data protected by a mutex is at all complicated, many programmers find it convenient to think of the mutex as protecting the *invariant* of the associated data. An invariant is a boolean function of the data that is true whenever the mutex is not held. So any thread that locks the mutex knows that it starts out with the invariant true. Each thread has the responsibility to restore the invariant before releasing the mutex. This includes restoring the invariant before calling "Wait", since that unlocks the mutex.

For example, in the code fragment above (for inserting an element into a table), the invariant is that "i" is the index of the first NIL element in "table", and all elements beyond index "i" are NIL. Note that the variables mentioned in the invariant are accessed only with this mutex held. Note also that the invariant is not true after the first assignment statement but before the second one—it is only guaranteed when the mutex is not being held.

Frequently the invariants are simple enough that you barely think about them, but often your program will benefit from writing them down explicitly. And if they are too complicated to write down, you're probably doing something wrong. You might find it

best to write down your invariants informally, as in the previous paragraph, or you might prefer to use some formal specification language such as Larch [7], the language we used to specify the SRC threads facility [4]. It is also generally a good idea to make it clear (by writing it down in the program) which mutex protects which data items.

Cheating

The rule that you must use a mutex to protect every access to global variables is based on a concurrency model where the actions of the threads are arbitrarily interleaved. If the data being protected by a mutex is particularly simple (for example just one integer, or even just one boolean), programmers are often tempted to skip using the mutex, since it introduces significant overhead and they “know” that the variables will be accessed with atomic instructions and that instructions are not interleaved. Before you succumb to this temptation, you must carefully consider the hardware where your program will run. If your single integer variable is word aligned, and if you are running on a uni-processor, and if your compiler generates the obvious instruction sequences and doesn’t slave variables into registers, then you will probably get the correct answer. In other circumstances you might not get the correct answer; or worse, you might usually get the correct answer but very occasionally get the wrong answer. For machine independent correct code, you absolutely must use a synchronization technique approved by your programming language.⁴

One cheating technique I have found helpful is to use unsynchronized access as a *hint*. In this context by “hint” I mean a cheap way of getting information that is either correct or causes you to invoke a more expensive, correct, way of getting the information. For example, if you want to call an initialization procedure exactly once you might use code like the following.

```

IF NOT initDone THEN
  LOCK m DO
    IF NOT initDone THEN
      Initialize();
      initDone := TRUE;
    END;
  END;
END;
```

This code is correct if you can assume that “initDone” is initialized to FALSE, that reading it without a mutex will not cause a runtime error, and that reading it without a mutex when its value is FALSE will give you the value FALSE. It doesn’t matter if you occasionally might get FALSE instead of TRUE, since that will just cause you to lock the mutex and get the correct value. But I repeat: you should only do this after verifying that your programming language guarantees the validity of these assumptions.

⁴ There is indeed a strong argument that there should be a way for the programmer to take advantage of the atomicity of instructions, and so avoid the cost of a LOCK clause. However, it seems to be difficult to define such a feature in an efficient but machine-independent fashion.

Deadlocks involving only mutexes

The simplest cases of deadlock occur when a thread tries to lock a mutex that it already holds (although some systems explicitly allow a thread to continue unhindered if it does this). There are numerous more elaborate cases of deadlock involving mutexes, for example:

```
Thread A locks mutex M1;
thread B locks mutex M2;
thread A blocks trying to lock M2;
thread B blocks trying to lock M1.
```

The most effective rule for avoiding such deadlocks is to apply a partial order to the acquisition of mutexes in your program. In other words, arrange that for any pair of mutexes { M1, M2 }, each thread that needs to hold M1 and M2 simultaneously locks M1 and M2 in the same order (for example, M1 is always locked before M2). This rule completely avoids deadlocks involving only mutexes (though as we will see later, there are other potential deadlocks when your program uses condition variables).

There is a technique that sometimes makes it easier to achieve this partial order. In the example above, thread A probably wasn't trying to modify exactly the same set of data as thread B. Frequently, if you examine the algorithm carefully you can partition the data into smaller pieces protected by separate mutexes. For example, when thread B wanted to lock M1, it might actually be wanting access to data disjoint from the data that thread A was accessing under M1. In such a case you might protect this disjoint data with a separate mutex, M3, and avoid the deadlock. Note that this is just a technique to enable you to have a partial order on the mutexes (M1 before M2 before M3, in this example). But remember that the more you pursue this hint, the more complicated your locking becomes, and the more likely you are to have some unsynchronized access to shared data. Having your program deadlock is almost always a preferable risk to having your program give the wrong answer.

Poor performance through lock conflicts

Assuming that you have arranged your program to have enough mutexes that all the data is protected, and a fine enough granularity that it does not deadlock, the remaining mutex problems to worry about are all performance problems.

Whenever a thread is holding a mutex, it is potentially stopping another thread from making progress—if the other thread blocks on the mutex. If the first thread can use all the machine's resources, that is probably fine. But if the first thread, while holding the mutex, ceases to make progress (for example by blocking on another mutex, or by taking a page fault, or by waiting for an i/o device), then the total throughput of your program is degraded. The problem is worse on a multi-processor, where no single thread can utilize the entire machine; here if you cause another thread to block, it might mean that a processor goes idle. In general, to get good performance you must arrange that lock conflicts are rare events. The best way to reduce lock conflicts is to lock at a finer granularity; but this introduces complexity. There is no way out of this dilemma—it is a trade-off inherent in concurrent computation.

The most typical example where locking granularity is important is in a module that manages a set of objects, for example a set of open buffered files. The simplest strategy is to use a single mutex for all the operations: open, close, read, write, and so forth. But this would prevent multiple writes on separate files proceeding in parallel, for no good reason. So a better strategy is to use one lock for operations on the global list of open files, and one lock per open file for operations affecting only that file. This can be achieved by associating a mutex with the record representing each open file. The code might look something like the following.

```

TYPE File = REF RECORD m: Thread.Mutex; .... END;
VAR globalLock: Thread.Mutex;
VAR globalTable: ....;

PROCEDURE Open(name: String): File;
BEGIN
    LOCK globalLock DO
        .... (* access globalTable *)
    END;
END Open;

PROCEDURE Write(f: File, ....);
BEGIN
    LOCK f^.m DO
        .... (* access fields of f *)
    END;
END Write;

```

In even more complicated situations, you might protect different parts of a record with different mutexes. You might also have some immutable fields in the record that need no protection at all. In these situations, though, you must be careful about how the record is laid out in memory. If your language allows you to pack fields into records sufficiently tightly that they cannot be accessed by atomic operations on your computer's memory, and if you protect such packed fields with different mutexes, you might get the wrong answer. This is because the generated instructions for modifying such fields involve reading them, modifying them in a register (or on-stack), then writing them back. If two threads are doing this concurrently for two fields that occupy the same memory word, you might get the wrong result. You need to be especially conscious of this potential bug if you over-ride the language's default algorithm for laying out fields of records. Ideally, your programming language will prevent this bug, but it probably won't.

There is an interaction between mutexes and the thread scheduler that can produce particularly insidious performance problems. The scheduler is the part of the thread implementation (often part of the operating system) that decides which of the non-blocked threads should actually be given a processor to run on. Generally the scheduler makes its decision based on a *priority* associated with each thread. (Depending on the details of your system the priority might be fixed or dynamic, programmer assigned or computed by the scheduler. Often the algorithm for deciding who to run is not specified at all.) Lock conflicts can lead to a situation where some high priority thread never makes progress at

all, despite the fact that its high priority indicates that it is more urgent than the threads actually running.

This can happen, for example, in the following scenario on a uni-processor. Thread A is high priority, thread B is medium priority and thread C is low priority. The sequence of events is:

```
C is running (e.g. because A and B are blocked somewhere);
C locks mutex M;
B wakes up and pre-empts C
  (i.e. B runs instead of C since B has higher priority);
B embarks on some very long computation;
A wakes up and pre-empts B (since A has higher priority);
A tries to lock M;
A blocks, and so the processor is given back to B;
B continues its very long computation.
```

The net effect is that a high priority thread (A) is unable to make progress even though the processor is being used by a medium priority thread (B). This state is stable until there is processor time available for the low priority thread C to complete its work and unlock M.

The programmer can avoid this problem by arranging for C to raise its priority before locking M. But this can be quite inconvenient, since it involves considering for each mutex which other thread priorities might be involved. The real solution of this problem lies with the implementer of your threads facility. He must somehow communicate to the scheduler that since A is blocked on M, the thread holding M should be viewed as having at least as high a priority as A. Unfortunately, your implementer has probably failed to do this—we don't do it in the SRC implementation.

Releasing the mutex within a LOCK clause

There are times when you want to unlock the mutex in some region of program nested inside a LOCK clause. For example, you might want to unlock the mutex before calling down to a lower level abstraction that will block or execute for a long time (in order to avoid provoking delays for other threads that want to lock the mutex). The SRC system provides for this usage by offering the raw operations “Acquire(m)” and “Release(m)” in a lower-level, less-advertised, interface. You must exercise extra care if you take advantage of this. First, you must be sure that the operations are correctly bracketed, even in the presence of exceptions. Second, you must be prepared for the fact that the state of the monitor's data might have changed while you had the mutex unlocked. This can be tricky if you called “Release” explicitly (instead of just ending the LOCK clause) because you were imbedded in some flow control construct such as a conditional clause. Your program counter might now depend on the previous state of the monitor's data, implicitly making a decision that might no longer be valid. So SRC discourages this paradigm, to reduce the tendency to introduce quite subtle bugs.

One other use of separate calls of “Acquire(m)” and “Release(m)” sometimes arises in the vicinity of forking. You might be executing with a mutex held and want to fork a new thread to continue working on the protected data, while the original thread continues without further access to the data. In other words, you would like to transfer the holding

of the mutex to the newly forked thread, atomically. You can achieve this by locking the mutex with “Acquire(m)” instead of LOCK, and later calling “Release(m)” in the forked thread. This tactic is quite dangerous—it is difficult to verify the correct functioning of the mutex. Additionally, many thread facilities keep track of which thread is holding a mutex—in those systems this tactic probably will not work. I recommend that you don’t do this.

USING A CONDITION VARIABLE: SCHEDULING SHARED RESOURCES

A condition variable is used when the programmer wants to schedule the way in which multiple threads access some shared resource, and the simple one-at-a-time mutual exclusion provided by mutexes is not sufficient.

Consider the following example, where one or more producer threads are passing data to one or more consumers. The data is transferred through an unbounded buffer formed by a linked list whose head is the global variable “head”. If the linked list is empty, the consumer blocks on the condition variable “nonEmpty” until the producer generates some more data. The list and the condition variable are protected by the mutex “m”.

```

VAR m: Thread.Mutex;
VAR head: List;

PROCEDURE Consume(): List;
  VAR topElement: List;
BEGIN
  LOCK m DO
    WHILE head = NIL DO Thread.Wait(m, nonEmpty) END;
    topElement := head;
    head := head^.next;
  END;
  RETURN topElement
END Consume;

PROCEDURE Produce(newElement: List);
BEGIN
  LOCK m DO
    newElement^.next := head;
    head := newElement;
    Thread.Signal(nonEmpty);
  END;
END Produce;

```

This is fairly straightforward, but there are still some subtleties. Notice that when a consumer returns from the call of “Wait” his first action after re-locking the mutex is to check once more whether the linked list is empty. This is an example of the following general pattern, which I strongly recommend for all your uses of condition variables.

```

WHILE NOT expression DO Thread.Wait(m,c) END;

```


You might think that re-testing the expression is redundant: in the example above, the producer made the list non-empty before calling “Signal”. But the semantics of “Signal” do not guarantee that the awoken thread will be the next to lock the mutex. It is possible that some other consumer thread will intervene, lock the mutex, remove the list element and unlock the mutex, before the newly awoken thread can lock the mutex.⁵ A second reason for re-checking is local to the SRC design: we decided to permit the implementation of “Signal” to (rarely) awaken more than one thread, because this allowed us to generate more efficient code for the “Wait” and “Signal” primitives.

But the main reason for advocating use of this pattern is to make your program more obviously, and more robustly, correct. With this style it is immediately clear that the “expression” is true before the following statements are executed. Without it, this fact could be verified only by looking at all the places that might signal the condition variable. In other words, this programming convention allows you to verify correctness by local inspection, which is always preferable to global inspection.

A final advantage of this convention is that it allows for simple programming of calls to “Signal” or “Broadcast”—extra wake-ups are benign. Carefully coding to ensure that only the correct threads are awoken is now only a performance question, not a correctness one (but of course you must ensure that at least the correct threads are awoken).

Using “Broadcast”

The “Signal” primitive is useful if you know that at most one thread can usefully be awoken. “Broadcast” awakens all threads that have called “Wait”. If you always program in the recommended style of re-checking an expression after return from “Wait”, then the correctness of your program will be unaffected if you replace calls of “Signal” with calls of “Broadcast”.

One use of “Broadcast” is when you want to simplify your program by awakening multiple threads, even though you know that not all of them can make progress. This allows you to be less careful about separating different wait reasons into different condition variables. This use trades slightly poorer performance for greater simplicity. Another use of “Broadcast” is when you really need to awaken multiple threads, because the resource you have just made available can be used by multiple other threads.

A simple example where “Broadcast” is useful is in the scheduling policy known as shared/exclusive locking (or readers/writers locking). Most commonly this is used when you have some shared data being read and written by various threads: your algorithm will be correct (and perform better) if you allow multiple threads to read the data concurrently, but a thread modifying the data must do so when no other thread is accessing the data.

The following procedures implement this scheduling policy. Any thread wanting to read your data calls “AcquireShared”, then reads the data, then calls “ReleaseShared”. Similarly any thread wanting to modify the data calls “AcquireExclusive”, then modifies the data, then calls “ReleaseExclusive”. When the variable “i” is greater than zero, it counts the number of active readers. When it is negative there is an active writer. When it

⁵The condition variables described here are not the same as those originally described by Hoare [9]. Hoare’s design would indeed provide a sufficient guarantee to make this re-testing redundant. But the design given here appears to be preferable, since it permits a much simpler implementation, and the extra check is not usually expensive.

is zero, no thread is using the data. If a potential reader inside “AcquireShared” finds that “i” is less than zero, it must block until the writer calls “ReleaseExclusive”.

```

VAR i: INTEGER;
VAR m: Thread.Mutex;
VAR c: Thread.Condition;

PROCEDURE AcquireExclusive();
BEGIN
    LOCK m DO
        WHILE i # 0 DO Thread.Wait(m,c) END;
        i := -1;
    END;
END AcquireExclusive;

PROCEDURE AcquireShared();
BEGIN
    LOCK m DO
        WHILE i < 0 DO Thread.Wait(m,c) END;
        i := i+1;
    END;
END AcquireShared;

PROCEDURE ReleaseExclusive();
BEGIN
    LOCK m DO
        i := 0; Thread.Broadcast(c);
    END;
END ReleaseExclusive;

PROCEDURE ReleaseShared();
BEGIN
    LOCK m DO
        i := i-1;
        IF i = 0 THEN Thread.Signal(c) END;
    END;
END ReleaseShared;

```

Using “Broadcast” is convenient in “ReleaseExclusive”, because a terminating writer does not need to know how many readers are now able to proceed. But notice that you could re-code this example using just “Signal”, by adding a counter of how many readers are waiting, and calling “Signal” that many times in “ReleaseExclusive”. The “Broadcast” facility is just a convenience, taking advantage of information already available to the threads implementation. Notice that there is no reason to use “Broadcast” in “ReleaseShared”, because we know that at most one blocked writer can usefully make progress.

This particular encoding of shared/exclusive locking exemplifies many of the problems that can occur when using condition variables, as we will see in the following

sections. As we discuss these problems, I will present revised encodings of this locking paradigm.

Spurious wake-ups

If you keep your use of condition variables very simple, you might introduce the possibility of awakening threads that cannot make useful progress. This can happen if you use “Broadcast” when “Signal” would be sufficient, or if you have threads waiting on a single condition variable for multiple different reasons. For example, the shared/exclusive locking procedures shown earlier use just one condition variable for readers as well as writers. This means that when we call “Broadcast” in “ReleaseExclusive”, the effect will be to awaken both classes of blocked threads. But if a reader is first to lock the mutex, it will increment “i” and prevent an awoken potential writer from making progress until the reader later calls “ReleaseShared”. The cost of this is extra time spent in the thread scheduler, which is typically an expensive place to be. If your problem is such that these spurious wake-ups will be common, and unless your scheduler is unusually efficient, you should probably separate the blocked threads onto two condition variables—one for readers and one for writers. A terminating reader need only signal the writers’ condition variable; a terminating writer would signal one of them, depending on which was non-empty. With this change, the procedures would look as follows.

```

VAR i: INTEGER;
VAR m: Thread.Mutex;
VAR cR, cW: Thread.Condition;
VAR readWaiters: INTEGER;

PROCEDURE AcquireExclusive();
BEGIN
    LOCK m DO
        WHILE i # 0 DO Thread.Wait(m,cW) END;
        i := -1;
    END;
END AcquireExclusive;

PROCEDURE AcquireShared();
BEGIN
    LOCK m DO
        readWaiters := readWaiters+1;
        WHILE i < 0 DO Thread.Wait(m,cR) END;
        readWaiters := readWaiters-1;
        i := i+1;
    END;
END AcquireShared;

```

```

PROCEDURE ReleaseExclusive();
BEGIN
    LOCK m DO
        i := 0;
        IF readWaiters > 0 THEN
            Thread.Broadcast(cR);
        ELSE
            Thread.Signal(cW);
        END;
    END;
END ReleaseExclusive;

PROCEDURE ReleaseShared();
BEGIN
    LOCK m DO
        i := i-1;
        IF i = 0 THEN Thread.Signal(cW) END;
    END;
END ReleaseShared;

```

Spurious lock conflicts

The straightforward use of condition variables can lead to excessive scheduling overhead. In the reader/writer example, when a terminating reader inside “ReleaseShared” calls “Signal”, it still has the mutex locked. On a uni-processor this would often not be a problem, but on a multi-processor the effect is liable to be that a potential writer is awakened inside “Wait”, executes a few instructions, and then blocks trying to lock the mutex—because it is still held by the terminating reader, executing concurrently. A few microseconds later the terminating reader unlocks the mutex, allowing the writer to continue. This has cost us two extra re-schedule operations, which is a significant expense.

This is a common situation, and it has a simple solution. Since the terminating reader does not access the data protected by the mutex after the call of “Signal”, we can move that call to after the end of the lock clause, as follows. Notice that accessing “i” is still protected by the mutex.

```

PROCEDURE ReleaseShared();
    VAR doSignal: BOOLEAN;
BEGIN
    LOCK m DO
        i := i-1;
        doSignal := (i=0);
    END;
    IF doSignal THEN Thread.Signal(cW) END;
END ReleaseShared;

```

There is a more complicated case of spurious lock conflicts when a terminating writer calls “Broadcast”. First, it does so with the mutex held. But also, only one of the waiting

readers at a time can lock the mutex to re-check and increment “i”, so on a multi-processor other awoken readers are liable to block trying to lock the mutex (this is quite unlikely on a uni-processor). If necessary, we can correct this by awakening just one reader in “ReleaseExclusive” (by calling “Signal” instead of “Broadcast”), and having each reader in turn awaken the next, as follows.

```

PROCEDURE AcquireShared();
BEGIN
  LOCK m DO
    readWaiters := readWaiters+1;
    WHILE i < 0 DO Thread.Wait(m,cR) END;
    readWaiters := readWaiters-1;
    i := i+1;
  END;
  Thread.Signal(cR);
END AcquireShared;

```

Starvation

Whenever you have a program that is making scheduling decisions, you must worry about how fair these decisions are; in other words, are all threads equal or are some more favored? When you are using a mutex, this consideration is dealt with for you by the threads implementation—typically by a first-in-first-out rule for each priority level. Mostly, this is also true for condition variables. But sometimes the programmer must become involved. The most extreme form of unfairness is “starvation”, where some thread will *never* make progress. This can arise in our reader-writer locking example (of course). If the system is heavily loaded, so that there is always at least one thread wanting to be a reader, the existing code will starve writers. This would occur with the following pattern.

```

Thread A calls “AcquireShared”; i := 1;
Thread B calls “AcquireShared”; i := 2;
Thread A calls “ReleaseShared”; i := 1;
Thread C calls “AcquireShared”; i := 2;
Thread B calls “ReleaseShared”; i := 1;
etc.

```

Since there is always an active reader, there is never a moment when a writer can proceed; potential writers will always remain blocked, waiting for “i” to reduce to 0. If the load is such that this is really a problem, we need to make the code yet more complicated. For example, we could arrange that a new reader would defer inside “AcquireShared” if there was a blocked potential writer. We could do this by adding a counter for blocked writers, as follows.

```

VAR writeWaiters: INTEGER;

PROCEDURE AcquireShared();
BEGIN

```

```

LOCK m DO
  readWaiters := readWaiters+1;
  IF writeWaiters > 0 THEN
    Thread.Signal(cW);
    Thread.Wait(m,cR);
  END;
  WHILE i < 0 DO Thread.Wait(m,cR) END;
  readWaiters := readWaiters-1;
  i := i+1;
END;
Thread.Signal(cR);
END AcquireShared;

PROCEDURE AcquireExclusive();
BEGIN
  LOCK m DO
    writeWaiters := writeWaiters+1;
    WHILE i # 0 DO Thread.Wait(m,cW) END;
    writeWaiters := writeWaiters-1;
    i := -1;
  END;
END AcquireExclusive;

```

There is no limit to how complicated this can become, implementing ever more elaborate scheduling policies. The programmer must exercise restraint, and only add such features if they are really required by the actual load on the resource.

Complexity

As you can see, worrying about these spurious wake-ups, lock conflicts and starvation makes the program more complicated. The first solution of the reader/writer problem that I showed you had 15 lines inside the procedure bodies; the final version had 30 lines, and some quite subtle reasoning about its correctness. You need to consider, for each case, whether the potential cost of ignoring the problem is enough to merit writing a more complex program. This decision will depend on the performance characteristics of your threads implementation, on whether you are using a multi-processor, and on the expected load on your resource. In particular, if your resource is mostly *not* in use then the performance effects will not be a problem, and you should adopt the simplest coding style.

Usually, I find that moving the call of “Signal” to beyond the end of the LOCK clause is easy and worth the trouble, and that the other performance enhancements are not worth making. But sometimes they are important, and you should only ignore them after explicitly considering whether they are required in your particular situation.

Deadlock

You can introduce deadlocks by using condition variables. For example, if you have two resources (call them (1) and (2)), the following sequence of actions produces a deadlock.

```

Thread A acquires resource (1);
Thread B acquires resource (2);
Thread A wants (2), so it waits on (2)'s condition variable;
Thread B wants (1), so it waits on (1)'s condition variable.

```

Deadlocks such as this are not significantly different from the ones we discussed in connection with mutexes. You should arrange that there is a partial order on the resources managed with condition variables, and that each thread wishing to acquire multiple resources does so according to this order. So, for example, you might decide that (1) is ordered before (2). Then thread B would not be permitted to try to acquire (1) while holding (2), so the deadlock would not occur.

One interaction between condition variables and mutexes is a subtle source of deadlock. Consider the following two procedures.

```

VAR a, b: Thread.Mutex;
VAR c: Thread.Condition;
VAR ready: BOOLEAN;

PROCEDURE Get();
BEGIN
  LOCK a DO
    LOCK b DO
      WHILE NOT ready DO Thread.Wait(b,c) END;
    END;
  END;
END Get;

PROCEDURE Give();
BEGIN
  LOCK a DO
    LOCK b DO
      ready := TRUE; Thread.Signal(c);
    END;
  END;
END Give;

```

If “ready” is FALSE and thread A calls “Get”, it will block on a call of “Wait(b,c)”. This unlocks “b”, but leaves “a” locked. So if thread B calls “Give”, intending to cause a call of “Signal(c)”, it will instead block trying to lock “a”, and your program will have deadlocked. Clearly, this example is trivial, since mutex “a” does not protect any data (and the potential for deadlock is quite apparent anyway), but the overall pattern does occur.

Most often this problem occurs when you lock a mutex at one abstraction level of your program then call down to a lower level, which (unknown to the higher level) blocks. If this block can be freed only by a thread that is holding the higher level mutex, you will deadlock. It is generally risky to call into a lower level abstraction while holding one of your mutexes, unless you understand fully the circumstances under which the called procedure might block. One solution here is to explicitly unlock the mutex before calling the lower level abstraction, as we discussed earlier; but as we discussed, this

solution has its own dangers. A better solution is to arrange to end the LOCK clause before calling down. You can find further discussions of this problem, known as the “nested monitor problem”, in the literature [8].

USING FORK: WORKING IN PARALLEL

As we discussed earlier, there are several classes of situations where you will want to fork a thread: to utilize a multi-processor; to do useful work while waiting for a slow device; to satisfy human users by working on several actions at once; to provide network service to multiple clients simultaneously; and to defer work until a less busy time.

It is quite common to find straightforward application programs using several threads. For example, you might have one thread doing your main computation, a second thread writing some output to a file, a third thread waiting for (or responding to) interactive user input, and a fourth thread running in background to clean up your data structures (for example, re-balancing a tree). In the programs we build at SRC, several of our library packages fork threads internally.

When you are programming with threads, you usually drive slow devices through synchronous library calls that suspend the calling thread until the device action completes, but allow other threads in your address space to continue. You will find no need to use older schemes for asynchronous operation (such as interrupts, Unix signals or VMS AST's). If you don't want to wait for the result of a device interaction, invoke it in a separate thread. If you want to have multiple device requests outstanding simultaneously, invoke them in multiple threads. If your operating system still delivers some asynchronous events through these older mechanisms, the runtime library supporting your threads facility should convert them into more appropriate mechanisms. See, for example, the design of the Topaz system calls [11] or the exception and trapping machinery included with Sun's lightweight process library [14,15].

If your program is interacting with a human user, you will usually want it to be responsive even while it is working on some request. This is particularly true of window-oriented interfaces. It is particularly infuriating to the user if the interactive display goes dumb just because the database query is taking a long time. You can achieve responsiveness by using extra threads. Often, the designer of your window system will have already done this for you, and will always call your program in a separate thread. At other times, the window system will call your program in a single thread synchronously with the user input event. In this latter case, you must decide whether the requested action is short enough to do it synchronously, or whether you should fork a thread. The complexity introduced by using forked threads here is that you need to exercise a lot of care in accessing data from the interactive interface (for example, the value of the current selection, or the contents of editable text areas) since these values might change once you start executing asynchronously. This is a difficult design issue, and each window system tackles it differently. I have not yet seen a totally satisfactory design.

Network servers are usually required to service multiple clients concurrently. If your network communication is based on RPC [3], this will happen without any work on your part, since the server side of your RPC system will invoke each concurrent incoming call in a separate thread, by forking a suitable number of threads internally to its implementation. But you can use multiple threads even with other communication paradigms. For example, in a traditional connection-oriented protocol (such as file transfer

layered on top of TCP), you should probably fork one thread for each incoming connection. Conversely, if you are writing a client program and you don't want to wait for the reply from a network server, invoke the server from a separate thread.

The technique of adding threads in order to defer work is quite valuable. There are several variants of the scheme. The simplest is that as soon as your procedure has done enough work to compute its result, you fork a thread to do the remainder of the work, and then return to your caller in the original thread. This reduces the latency of your procedure (the elapsed time from being called to returning), in the hope that the deferred work can be done more cheaply later (for example, because a processor goes idle). The disadvantage of this simplest approach is that it might create large numbers of threads, and it incurs the cost of calling "Fork" each time. Often, it is preferable to keep a single housekeeping thread and feed requests to it. It's even better when the housekeeper doesn't need any information from the main threads, beyond the fact that there is work to be done. For example, this will be true when the housekeeper is responsible for maintaining a data structure in an optimal form, although the main threads will still get the correct answer without this optimization. An additional technique here is to program the housekeeper either to merge similar requests into a single action, or to restrict itself to run not more often than a chosen periodic interval.

On a multi-processor you will want to use "Fork" in order to utilize as many of your processors as you can. There isn't much general advice I can give here—mostly, the decisions about when and what to fork are too problem-specific. One general technique is *pipelining*, which I discuss in the next section.

Pipelining

On a multi-processor, there is one specialized use of additional threads that is particularly valuable. You can build a chain of producer-consumer relationships, known as a *pipeline*. For example, when thread A initiates an action, all it does is enqueue a request in a buffer. Thread B takes the action from the buffer, performs part of the work, then enqueues it in a second buffer. Thread C takes it from there and does the rest of the work. This forms a three-stage pipeline. The three threads operate in parallel except when they synchronize to access the buffers, so this pipeline is capable of utilizing up to three processors. At its best, pipelining can achieve almost linear speed-up and can fully utilize a multi-processor. A pipeline can also be useful on a uni-processor if each thread will encounter some real-time delays (such as page faults, device handling or network communication).

For example, the following program fragment implements a simple three stage pipeline. An action is initiated by calling "PaintChar". One auxiliary thread executes in "Rasterize" and another in "Painter". The pipeline stages communicate through unbounded buffers implemented as linked lists whose last elements are "rasterTail" and "paintTail". The initial values of the tails are dummy elements, to make the program simpler.

```

TYPE RasterList = REF RECORD ch: CHAR; next: RasterList END;
TYPE PaintList = REF RECORD r: Bitmap; next: PaintList END;
VAR rasterTail: RasterList;
VAR paintTail: PaintList;
VAR m: Thread.Mutex;
VAR c1, c2: Thread.Condition;

```

```

PROCEDURE PaintChar(arg: CHAR);
  VAR this: RasterList;
BEGIN
  NEW(this);
  this^.ch := arg; this^.next := NIL;
  (* Enqueue request for Rasterize thread .... *)
  LOCK m DO
    rasterTail^.next := this; rasterTail := this;
  END;
  Thread.Signal(c1);
  (* Now return to our caller .... *)
END PaintChar;

PROCEDURE Rasterize(init: RasterList);
  VAR last: RasterList;
  VAR this: PaintList;
BEGIN
  last := init;
  LOOP
    (* Wait for RasterList request and dequeue it .... *)
    LOCK m DO
      WHILE last^.next = NIL DO Thread.Wait(m, c1); END;
      last := last^.next;
    END;
    (* Convert character to bitmap .... *)
    NEW(this);
    this^.bitmap := Font.Map(last^.ch); this^.next := NIL;
    (* Enqueue request for painter thread .... *)
    LOCK m DO
      paintTail^.next := this; paintTail := this;
    END;
    Thread.Signal(c2);
  END;
END Rasterize;

PROCEDURE Painter(init: PaintList);
  VAR last: PaintList;
BEGIN
  last := init;
  LOOP
    (* Wait for PaintList request and dequeue it .... *)
    LOCK m DO
      WHILE last^.next = NIL DO Thread.Wait(m, c2); END;
      last := last^.next;
    END;
  END;

```

```

        (* Paint the bitmap .... *)
        Display.PaintBitmap(last^.bitmap);
    END;
END Painter;

NEW(rasterTail); rasterTail.next := NIL;
NEW(paintTail); paintTail.next := NIL;
Thread.Fork(Rasterize, rasterTail);
Thread.Fork(Painter, paintTail);

```

There are two problems with pipelining. First, you need to be careful about how much of the work gets done in each stage. The ideal is that the stages are equal: this will provide maximum throughput, by utilizing all your processors fully. Achieving this ideal requires hand tuning, and re-tuning as the program changes. Second, the number of stages in your pipeline determines statically the amount of concurrency. If you know how many processors you have, and exactly where the real-time delays occur, this will be fine. For more flexible or portable environments it can be a problem. Despite these problems, pipelining is a powerful technique that has wide applicability.

The impact of your environment

The design of your operating system and runtime libraries will affect the extent to which it is desirable or useful to fork threads. Your operating system should not suspend the entire address space just because one thread is blocked for an i/o request (or for a page fault). Your operating system and your libraries must permit calls from multiple threads in parallel. Generally, in a well-designed environment for supporting multi-threaded programs you will find that the facilities of your operating system and libraries are available as synchronous calls that block only the calling thread [11].

You will need to know some of the performance parameters of your threads implementation. What is the cost of creating a thread? What is the cost of keeping a blocked thread in existence? What is the cost of a context switch? What is the cost of a LOCK clause when the mutex is not locked? Knowing these, you will be able to decide to what extent it is feasible or useful to add extra threads to your program.

Potential problems with adding threads

You need to exercise a little care in adding threads, or you will find that your program runs slower instead of faster.

If you have significantly more threads ready to run than there are processors, you will usually find that your performance degrades. This is partly because most thread schedulers are quite slow at making general re-scheduling decisions. If there is a processor idle waiting for your thread, the scheduler can probably get it there quite quickly. But if your thread has to be put on a queue, and later swapped into a processor in place of some other thread, it will be more expensive. A second effect is that if you have lots of threads running they are more likely to conflict over mutexes or over the resources managed by your condition variables.

Mostly, when you add threads just to improve your program's structure (for example driving slow devices, or responding to mouse clicks speedily, or for RPC invocations)

you will not encounter this problem; but when you add threads for performance purposes (such as performing multiple actions in parallel, or deferring work, or utilizing multi-processors), you will need to worry whether you are overloading the system.

But let me stress that this warning applies only to the threads that are ready to run. The expense of having threads blocked on condition variables is usually less significant, being just the memory used for scheduler data structures and the thread stack. The programs at SRC often have quite a large number of blocked threads. (50 is not uncommon in application programs; there are usually hundreds blocked inside the operating system—even on personal workstations.)

In most systems the thread creation and termination facilities are not cheap. Your threads implementation will probably take care to cache a few terminated thread carcasses, so that you don't pay for stack creation on each fork, but nevertheless a call of "Fork" will probably incur a total cost of about two or three re-scheduling decisions. So you shouldn't fork too small a computation into a separate thread. One useful measure of a threads implementation on a multi-processor is the smallest computation for which it is profitable to fork a thread.

Despite these cautions, be aware that our experience at SRC running multi-threaded applications on a 5-way multi-processor has been that programmers are as likely to err by creating too few threads as by creating too many.

USING ALERT: DIVERTING THE FLOW OF CONTROL

The purpose of alerts is to cause termination of a long running computation or a long-term wait. For example, on a multi-processor it might be useful to fork multiple competing algorithms to solve the same problem, and when the first of them completes you abort the others. Or you might embark on a long computation (e.g. a database query), but abort it if the user clicks a CANCEL button.

The programming convention we use at SRC is that any procedure in a public interface that might incur a long computation or a long-term wait should be alertable. In other words, a long computation should occasionally call "TestAlert" and long-term waits should be calls of "AlertWait" instead of "Wait". In this context "long" means long enough to upset a human user. The attraction of this convention is that you can be sure that the user can always regain control of the application program. The disadvantage is that programs calling these procedures must be prepared for the "Alerted" exception to come out of them. This convention is less rigorously applied when a single entry point occasionally (but not always) causes a long-term wait.

Another programming convention we have is that you should only alert a thread if you forked the thread. For example, a package should not alert a caller's thread that happens to be executing inside the package. This convention allows you to view an alert as an indication that the thread should terminate completely.

The problem with alerts (or any other form of asynchronous interrupt mechanism, such as Apollo's "task_\$signal") is that they are, by their very nature, intrusive. Using them will tend to make your program less well structured. A straightforward-looking flow of control in one thread can suddenly be diverted because of an action initiated by another thread. This is another example of a facility that makes it harder to verify the correctness of a piece of program by local inspection. Unless alerts are used with great restraint, they will make your program unreadable, unmaintainable, and perhaps incorrect.

There are alternatives to using alerts. If you know which condition variable a thread is blocked on, you can more simply prod it by setting a boolean flag and signalling the condition variable. A package could provide additional entry points whose purpose is to prod a thread blocked inside the package on a long-term wait.

Alerts are most useful when you don't know exactly what is going on. For example, the target thread might be blocked in any of several packages, or within a single package it might be blocked on any of several condition variables. In these cases an alert is certainly the best solution. Even when other alternatives are available, it might be best to use alerts just because they are a single unified scheme for provoking thread termination.

There is no consensus yet among the designers of thread facilities about how to tackle this problem. Each designer has his own solution, and each solution so far has its own problems.

ADDITIONAL TECHNIQUES

Most of the programming paradigms for using threads are quite simple. I've described several of them earlier; you will discover many others as you gain experience. A few of the useful techniques are much less obvious. This section describes some of these less obvious ones.

Up-calls

Most of the time most programmers build their programs using layered abstractions. Higher level abstractions call only lower level ones, and abstractions at the same level do not call each other. All actions are initiated at the top level.

This methodology carries over quite well to a world with concurrency. You can arrange that each thread will honor the abstraction boundaries. Permanent daemon threads within an abstraction initiate calls to lower levels, but not to higher levels. The abstraction layering has the added benefit that it forms a partial order, and this order is sufficient to prevent deadlocks when locking mutexes, without any additional care from the programmer.

This purely top-down layering is not satisfactory when actions that affect high-level abstractions can be initiated at a low layer in your system. One frequently encountered example of this is on the receiving side of network communications. Other examples are user input, and spontaneous state changes in peripheral devices such as disks and tapes.

Consider the example of a communications package dealing with incoming packets from a network. Here there are typically three or more layers of dispatch (corresponding to the data link, network and transport layers in OSI terminology). If you try to maintain a top-down calling hierarchy, you will find that you incur a context switch in each of these layers. The thread that wishes to receive data from its transport layer connection cannot be the thread that dispatches an incoming ethernet packet, since the ethernet packet might belong to a different connection, or a different protocol (for example, UDP instead of TCP), or a different protocol family altogether (for example, DECnet instead of IP). Many implementers have tried to maintain this layering for packet reception, and the effect has been uniformly bad performance—dominated by the cost of context switches.

The alternative technique is known as “up-calls” [5]. In this methodology, you maintain a pool of threads willing to receive incoming data link layer (e.g. ethernet)

packets. The receiving thread dispatches on ethernet protocol type and calls *up* to the network layer (e.g. DECnet or IP), where it dispatches again and calls up to the transport layer (e.g. TCP), where there is a final dispatch to the appropriate connection. In some systems, this up-call paradigm extends into the application. The attraction here is high performance: there are no unnecessary context switches. All the top-performing network implementations are structured this way.

You do pay for this performance. As usual, the programmer's task has been made more complicated. Partly this is because each layer now has an up-call interface as well as the traditional down-call interface. But also the synchronization problem has become more delicate. In a purely top-down system it is fine to hold one layer's mutex while calling a lower layer (unless the lower layer might block on a condition variable and cause the sort of nested monitor deadlock we discussed earlier). But in the presence of up-calls this can easily provoke a deadlock involving just the mutexes—if an up-calling thread holding a lower level mutex needs to lock the higher level one. In other words, the presence of up-calls makes it more likely that you will violate the partial order rule for locking mutexes. To avoid this, you should generally avoid holding a mutex while making an up-call (but this is easier said than done).

Version stamps

Sometimes concurrency can make it more difficult to use cached information. This can happen when a separate thread executing at a lower level in your system invalidates some information known to a thread currently executing at a higher level. For example, information about a disk volume might change—either because of hardware problems or because the volume has been removed and replaced. You can use up-calls to invalidate cache structures at the higher level, but this will not invalidate state held locally by a thread. In the most extreme example, a thread might obtain information from a cache, and be about to call an operation at the lower level. Between the time the information comes from the cache and the time that the call actually occurs, the information might have become invalid.

A technique known as “version stamps” can be useful here. In the low level abstraction you maintain a counter associated with the true data. Whenever the data changes, you increment the counter. (Assume the counter is large enough to never overflow.) Whenever a copy of some of the data is issued to a higher level, it is accompanied by the current value of the counter. If higher level code is caching the data, it caches the associated counter value too. Whenever you make a call back down to the lower level, and the call or its parameters depend on previously obtained data, you include the associated value of the counter. When the low level receives such a call, it compares the incoming value of the counter with the current truth value. If they are different it returns an exception to the higher level, which then knows to re-consider its call. (Sometimes, you can provide the new data with the exception). Incidentally, this technique is also useful when maintaining cached data across a distributed system.

Work crews

There are situations that are best described as “an embarrassment of parallelism”, when you can structure your program to have vastly more concurrency than can be efficiently accommodated on your machine. For example, a compiler implemented using concurrency

might be willing to use a separate thread to compile each procedure, or even each statement. In such situations, if you fork one thread for each action you will create so many threads that the scheduler becomes quite inefficient, or so many that you have numerous lock conflicts, or so many that you run out of memory for the stacks.

Your choice here is either to be more restrained in your forking, or to use an abstraction that will control your forking for you. Such an abstraction is described in Vandevoorde and Roberts' paper [17]. The basic idea is to enqueue requests for asynchronous activity and have a fixed pool of threads that perform the requests. The complexity comes in managing the requests, synchronizing between them, and coordinating the results. See the paper for a full description.

An alternative proposal, which SRC has not yet explored, is to implement "Fork" in such a way that it defers actually creating the new thread until there is a processor available to run it. We call this proposal "lazy forking", but we have not pursued it any further.

BUILDING YOUR PROGRAM

A successful program must be useful, correct, live (as defined below) and efficient. Your use of concurrency can impact each of these. I have discussed quite a few techniques in the previous sections that will help you. But how will you know if you have succeeded? The answer is not clear, but this section might help you towards discovering it.

The place where concurrency can affect usefulness is in the design of the interfaces to library packages. You must design your interfaces with the assumption that your callers will be using multiple threads. This means that you must ensure that all the entry points are thread re-entrant (i.e. they can be called by multiple threads simultaneously), even if this means that each procedure immediately locks a central mutex. You must not return results in shared global variables, nor in global statically allocated storage. Your calls should be synchronous, not returning until their results are available—if your caller wants to do other work meanwhile, he can do it in other threads. Even if you don't presently have any multi-threaded clients of the interface, I strongly recommend that you follow these guidelines so that you will avoid problems in the future.

By "correct" I mean that if your program eventually produces an answer, it will be the one defined by its specification. Your programming environment is unlikely to provide much help here beyond what it already provides for sequential programs. Mostly, you must be fastidious about associating each piece of data with one (and only one) mutex. If you don't pay constant attention to this, your task will be hopeless. If you use mutexes correctly, and you always use condition variables in the recommended style (re-testing the boolean expression after returning from "Wait"), then you are unlikely to go wrong.

By "live", I mean that your program will eventually produce an answer. The alternatives are infinite loops or deadlock. I can't help you with infinite loops. I believe that the hints of the preceding sections will help you to avoid deadlocks. But if you fail and produce a deadlock, it should be quite easy to detect. Your major help in analyzing a deadlock will come from a symbolic debugger. The debugger must provide at least minimal support for threads—enumerating the existing threads and looking at each thread's stack. Hopefully, your debugger will also provide some filtering in the thread enumeration, for example finding all threads that have a stack frame in a particular

module, or finding all threads that are blocked on a particular mutex or condition variable. A very nice feature would be a facility to determine which thread is holding a particular mutex.

By “efficient”, I mean that your program will make good use of the available computer resources, and therefore will produce its answer quickly. Again, the hints in the previous sections should help you to avoid the problem of concurrency adversely affecting your performance. And again, your programming environment needs to give you some help. Performance bugs are the most insidious of problems, since you might not even notice that you have them. The sort of information you need to obtain includes statistics on lock conflicts (for example, how often threads have had to block on this mutex, and how long they then had to wait) and on concurrency levels (for example, what was the average number of threads ready to execute in your program, or what percentage of the time were “n” threads ready).

One final warning: don’t emphasize efficiency at the expense of correctness. It is much easier to start with a correct program and work on making it efficient, than to start with an efficient program and work on making it correct.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Writing concurrent programs has a reputation for being exotic and difficult. I believe it is neither. You need a system that provides you with good primitives and suitable libraries, you need a basic caution and carefulness, you need an armory of useful techniques, and you need to know of the common pitfalls. I hope that this paper has helped you towards sharing my belief.

Butler Lampson, Mike Schroeder, Bob Stewart and Bob Taylor caused me to write this paper. If you found it useful, thank them.

REFERENCES

1. ACCETTA, M. *et al.* Mach: a new kernel foundation for UNIX development. In *Proceedings of the Summer 1986 USENIX Conference* (July 1986), 93-112.
2. Apollo Computer Inc. *Concurrent Programming Support (CPS) Reference*. Order No. 010233, June 1987.
3. BIRRELL, A., AND NELSON, B. Implementing remote procedure calls. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.* 2, 1 (Feb. 1984), 39-59.
4. BIRRELL, A., GUTTAG, J., HORNING, J. AND LEVIN, R. Synchronization primitives for a multiprocessor: a formal specification. In *Proceedings of the 11th Symposium on Operating System Principles* (Nov. 1987), 94-102.
5. CLARK, D. The structuring of systems using up-calls. In *Proceedings of the 10th Symposium on Operating System Principles* (Dec. 1985), 171-180.
6. COOPER, E. AND DRAVES, R. C Threads. *Technical report CMU-CS-88-154*, Carnegie Mellon University. Computer Science Department, Pittsburgh, PA (June 1988).
7. GUTTAG, J., HORNING, J. AND WING, J. The Larch family of specification languages. *IEEE Software* 2, 5, (SEP. 1985), 24-36.
8. HADDON, B. Nested monitor calls. *Operating Systems Review* 11, 4 (Oct. 1977), 18-23.
9. HOARE, C.A.R. Monitors: An operating system structuring concept. *Commun. ACM* 17, 10 (Oct.1974), 549-557.

10. LAMPSON, B AND REDELL, D. Experience with processes and monitors in Mesa. *Commun. ACM* 23, 2 (Feb.1980), 105-117.
11. MCJONES, P AND SWART, G. Evolving the UNIX system interface to support multi-threaded programs. In *Proceedings of the Winter 1989 USENIX Conference* (Feb. 1989).
12. ROVNER, P. Extending Modula-2 to build large, integrated systems. *IEEE Software* 3, 6 (Nov. 1986), 46-57.
13. SALTZER, J. Traffic control in a multiplexed computer system. Th., MAC-TR-30, MIT, Cambridge, Mass., July 1966.
14. Sun Microsystems Inc. *Sun OS 4.0 Reference Manual*, Nov. 1987, section 3L.
15. Sun Microsystems Inc. *System Services Overview*, May 1988, chapter 6.
16. TEVANI, A. *et al* Mach threads and the Unix kernel: the battle for control. In *Proceedings of the Summer 1987 USENIX Conference* (June 1987), 185-197.
17. VANDEVOORDE, M. AND ROBERTS, E. Workcrews: an abstraction for controlling parallelism. (Submitted for publication; copies available from Eric Roberts at SRC).



APPENDIX: OTHER THREAD DESIGNS

In the main body of the paper we were talking entirely in terms of the SRC threads design. That design is quite similar to several other, more publicly available designs. In this appendix, I compare some other designs with SRC's. Where the corresponding features of the other designs differ from SRC's, I try to give you some hints on when and how those differences will be useful or dangerous.

The descriptions here assume that you are reasonably familiar with the original documentation for each of these systems. Please read the documentation yourself before relying on any of the material in this appendix, and please accept my apologies if I have mis-represented your favorite system.

Each design (including SRC's) includes mechanisms that I haven't discussed in this paper. For example, each design has facilities for affecting scheduling decisions (by adjusting priorities, or giving hints on when a pre-emption would be useful); SRC and Sun provide facilities for associating context information with a thread; each system provides a "conditional lock" operation on a mutex. Limits on time and patience preclude exploring these here.

You should bear in mind that each of these systems (including SRC's) is equivalent, in the sense that you can (at least) reproduce one system's facilities by programming on top of another system's. You can solve any concurrent programming problem by using any of these systems. The effect of the differences is just that they make some programming paradigms (good ones or bad ones) easier, and some harder.

The following table summarizes the approximate equivalence between the major SRC facilities and those of Apollo [2], Sun [14,15] and MACH [1,6,16]. The absence of an entry means that I cannot see a reasonably equivalent facility in the documentation I have read. The following sections discuss ways in which these facilities differ from SRC's.

SRC	Apollo Domain CPS	Sun release 4.0	MACH C threads
Fork	task_\$create	lwp_create	cthread_fork
Join	task_\$release		cthread_join
Mutex	task_\$handle_t	mon_t	mutex_t
LOCK	mutex_\$lock	mon_enter	mutex_lock
... END	mutex_\$unlock	mon_exit	mutex_unlock
Condition	ec2_\$eventcount_t	cv_t	condition_t
Wait	ec2_\$wait	cv_wait	condition_wait
Broadcast	ec2_\$advance	cv_broadcast	condition_broadcast
Signal		cv_notify	condition_signal
Alert	task_\$signal		

Apollo Domain Concurrent Programming Support (CPS)

Apollo allows you to specify a timeout with calls of "mutex_\$lock". There seem to be two reasons why you might want to do this. First, your program might have some alternative algorithm it could use if the required mutex is being held too long. This is a technique that would be useful if lock conflicts are common. Generally, you should arrange that lock conflicts are quite rare and of short duration. You can do this by arranging your locking to be fine enough grain, each mutex protecting only the data you

actually intend to touch. But if you cannot achieve this, then you might find the timeout parameter useful. Second, you can use this timeout parameter for detecting (and even recovering from) deadlocks. This I discourage—I view deadlocks as bugs; you should detect them with a debugger and re-program to avoid them.

Apollo’s level 2 eventcounts serve the same purpose as SRC’s condition variables. The simplest usage of “ec2_\$advance” is for a thread to lock a mutex, inspect some data, and decide that it needs to block until the data is changed by some other thread. It does so by reading the value of the eventcount (with “ec2_\$read”), unlocking the mutex, and then calling “ec2_\$wait” to block until the eventcount is advanced. This has the same effect as SRC’s use of “Wait” and “Broadcast”. Reading the value of the eventcount while the mutex is still locked achieves the same atomicity as SRC guarantees in the “Wait” call. (Indeed, this is how SRC implements that atomicity.) Apollo has no equivalent of SRC’s “Signal” operation.

Apollo’s eventcounts provide additional freedom, since they are not explicitly tied to a mutex or its associated data. This allows threads to block and wake up without synchronizing over shared data. This is rarely what you want to do. Almost always, the reason you know that it is profitable to awaken a thread is because you have just changed some data that thread is interested in. If you take advantage of this extra flexibility, you must be careful to prevent errors such as the following sequence of actions.

- 1— Thread A looks at the data and decides to block;
- 2— Thread A unlocks the mutex;
- 3— Thread B locks the mutex and changes the data;
- 4— Thread B calls “ec2_\$advance”;
- 5— Thread A calls “ec2_\$read”;
- 6— Thread A calls “ec2_\$wait”.

With this sequence thread A will not be awoken, even although the data it is wanting has changed. The intended sequence was that step (5) should happen before step (4). To guarantee this, thread A must execute (5) before (2).

Apollo allows you to wait on multiple eventcounts when you call “ec2_\$wait”. This is occasionally convenient. Without this feature, you must have one thread for each condition for which you are waiting. The extra functionality of the Apollo design does not seem to introduce any new problems. The only down-side is additional complexity, and scope for performance penalties, in the threads implementation.

Apollo’s asynchronous fault facility provided by “task_\$signal” substitutes for SRC’s facility for alerting a thread. The SRC design provides only for the target thread to poll for alerts (by calling “AlertWait” or “TestAlert”); the Apollo design produces a fault at an arbitrary point in the target thread’s execution, provided the thread has not inhibited faults. It is important that you don’t interrupt a thread while it is executing with a mutex locked, since that would leave the shared data in an unpredictable state. Apollo enforces this restriction by inhibiting faults while a mutex is locked. The attraction of the polling model is that the flow of control of your program is more clearly visible in the source. The attraction of interrupting at an arbitrary point (outside of LOCK clauses) is that it is easier to be sure that computations can be terminated—there is less likelihood that you will introduce a bug by forgetting to call “TestAlert”. These attractions are both valid, and the ideal design would allow for both.

Sun's lightweight process library

Sun's version 4.0 offers "lightweight processes" as a library [14,15]. These are not true threads—within an address space only one lightweight processes is executing at any time. But the creation and synchronization facilities are the same as you would expect them to be for real threads.

Sun allows a thread to lock a mutex recursively. In other words, while a thread is holding a mutex it can call a procedure (perhaps by recursion) that locks the same mutex. In the SRC design this would deadlock. Which is preferable depends on your intent. If you were careful to restore the monitor invariant before making the call that recursively locks the mutex, all will be fine. But if this is really a bug, because you forgot that the called procedure uses the same data, you will get the wrong answer. Additionally, if you take advantage of this feature remember that you can introduce a deadlock if you split a computation into multiple threads—what used to be a recursive acquisition of the mutex might become an acquisition by a different thread.

Sun does not provide any mechanism for alerting a thread. However, they do provide a mechanism for threads to deal with asynchronous Unix signals by calling "agt_create". Some of these signals serve the same purpose as SRC's alerts, and so these cases are easy to deal with. But remember that alerts are not really a fundamental part of threads—they are just an added convenience.

The library also includes a facility for passing messages between threads. Most designers have adopted the view that message passing is an alternative to shared memory synchronization, not an adjunct to it. I don't recommend using both mechanisms within a single program, except to the extent that you need to use Sun's message system to handle asynchronous Unix signals.

Threads in Mach

The procedures I listed in the table come from Eric Cooper's C library interface to MACH threads [6]. That interface is quite similar to SRC's. The only noticeable omission is any facility for alerting a thread. There are no substantive differences.