

# Shared memory review

K. V. S. Prasad  
Dept of Computer Science  
Chalmers Univ  
Thu 18 Sep 2014

# WARNING

- There's a lot more detail in the book than the lectures can possibly cover
  - And the slides are a tiny “trailer” of the lectures
- So: **WORK** with the **TEXTBOOK**
- A little good news:
  - You may skip the Ada, BACI and Promela sections if you wish

# Readers-writers with protected object

- Look again at slide 7.16 (175/363)
- Protected objects
  - Mutex as for monitors
    - Only one operation at a time
  - Condition variables (queues) -> barriers on ops
    - Separate queue for each barrier
    - Implicit wait managed by implementation
  - No explicit waits or signals in code
  - All barriers rechecked on any exit

# Invariants for the R-W problem

- $R \geq 0$ 
  - Does not follow from just the protected object
  - Need to look at user code
- $W \geq 0$ , in fact,  $W \leq 1$ 
  - Easier to see in prot. obj. because of boolean
- $(R > 0 \rightarrow W = 0)$  and  $(W = 1 \rightarrow R = 0)$ 
  - If  $R > 0$  then at least one reader is at p2 or p3. They got there because  $W = 0$ . Can  $W$  change while  $R > 0$ . No, by mutex, and by reader code.
  - $W := 1$  only if  $R = 0$  barrier passed, etc.

# Lemmas needed for monitor version

- If readers waiting, then  $W=1$
- If writers waiting, then  $R>0$  or  $W=1$

At least these are immediate from the code of the protected object.

Can either readers or writers starve? Both can, up to implementation to be fair.

# How bad can the proofs get?

- Very (hard, not necessarily long)
  - If the decent protected objects still need so much thought, ...
    - The less structured methods are surely messier
      - Hence the search for syntactically expressed structure
- So maybe sane people should skip proofs?
  - No, they should skip programming instead
    - Particularly of safety- or mission-critical systems
- If you don't want to study hard and always be very thorough and careful
  - Please don't become a surgeon!

# Monitor for dining philosophers

- Look again at slide 7.11 (170/363)
- Invariants
  - Not empty( $OKtoEat[i]$ )  $\rightarrow$  ( $fork[i] < 2$ )
  - $\text{Sum } (i=0..4) (fork[i]) = 10 - 2 * E$ 
    - Where E is the number of eating philosophers
- Deadlock implies  $E=0$  and all enqueued.
  - impossible

# Intro to functional programming

- Computation = rewriting preserving value
- Rewrite lhs of equation by rhs
  - Set of equations is program
- Read-eval-print loop
- No assignment
  - Value of var not time-dependent