Concurrent Data Structures

Concurrent Algorithms 2016

Tudor David

(based on slides by Vasileios Trigonakis)

Data Structures (DSs)

- Constructs for efficiently storing and retrieving data
  - **Different types**: lists, hash tables, trees, queues, …
- Accessed through the DS interface
  - Depends on the DS type, but always includes
  - Store an element
  - Retrieve an element
- Element
  - Set: just one value

Concurrent Data Structures (CDSs)

- Concurrently accessed by multiple threads
  - Through the CDS interface → linearizable operations!

- Really important on multi-cores
- U t software system

What do we care about in practice?

- Progress of individual operations – sometimes
- More often:
  - Number of operations per second (throughput)
  - The evolution of throughput as we increase the number of threads (scalability)



DS Example: Linked List



- A sequence of elements (nodes)
- Interface
  - search (aka contains)
  - insert
  - remove (aka delete)

```
struct node
{
  value_t value;
  struct node* next;
};
```

Search Data Structures

- Interface
  1. search
  2. insert
  3. remove

  updates

- Semantics
  1. read-only
  2. read-only
  3. read-only
  4. read-write



Optimistic vs. Pessimistic Concurrency

20-core Xeon
1024 elements



(Lesson$_1$) Optimistic concurrency is the only way to get scalability

The Two Problems in Optimistic Concurrency

- Concurrency Control
  How threads synchronize their writes to the shared memory (e.g., nodes)
  - Locks
  - CAS
  - Transactional memory

- Memory Reclamation
  How and when threads free and reuse the shared memory (e.g., nodes)
  - Garbage collectors
  - Hazard pointers
  - RCU
  - Quiescent states

ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE FÉDÉRALE DE LAUSANNE

Tools for Optimistic Concurrency Control (OCC)

- RCU: slow in the presence of updates
  - (also a memory reclamation scheme)
- STM: slow in general
- HTM: not ubiquitous, not very fast (yet)

- Wait-free algorithms: slow in general
- (Optimistic) Lock-free algorithms: ☺

We either need a lock-free or an optimistic lock-based algorithm

Parenthesis: Target platform

2-socket Intel Xeon E5-2680 v2 Ivy Bridge

- 20 cores @ 2.8 GHz, 40 hyper-threads
- 25 MB LLC (per socket)
- 256GB RAM



Concurrent Linked Lists – 5% Updates

1024 elements
5% updates



Wait-free algorithm is slow ☹

Optimistic Concurrency in Data Structures



Validation plays a key role in concurrent data structures

Validation in Concurrent Data Structures

- Lock-free: atomic operations

  - marking pointers, flags, helping, …
- Lock-based: lock → validate



  - flags, pointer reversal, parsing twice,

Validation is what differentiates algorithms

ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE
FÉDÉRALE DE LAUSANNE

Let's design two concurrent linked lists:
A lock-free and a lock-based

Lock-free Sorted Linked List: Naïve



Is this a correct (linearizable) linked list?

Lock-free Sorted Linked List: Naïve – Incorrect

P0:
Insert(x)
P1:
Delete(y)



- What is the problem?
  - Insert involves one existing node;
  - Delete involves two existing nodes

How can we fix the problem?

Lock-free Sorted Linked List: Fix

- Idea! To delete a node, make it unusable first…
  - **Mark it for deletion** so that
    1. You fail marking if someone changes **next** pointer;
    2. An insertion fails if the predecessor node is marked.

→ In other words: delete in two steps

1. Mark for deletion; and then
2. Physical deletion



1. Failing Deletion (Marking)

P0: Insert(x)
P1: Delete(y)



- Upon failure → restart the operation
  - Restarting is part of "all" state-of-the-art-data structures

1. Failing Insertion due to Marked Node

P1:CAS(remove)

P1: find modification spot

P1:CAS(mark)

P0: find modification spot

P0:CAS → false

P0: Insert(x)

P1: Delete(y)



- Upon failure → restart the operation
  - Restarting is part of "all" state-of-the-art-data structures

How can we implement marking?

Implementing Marking (C Style)

- Pointers in 64 bit architectures
  - Word aligned - 8 bit aligned!




```
boolean mark(node_t* n)
    uintptr_t unmarked = n->next & ~0x1L;
    uintptr_t marked   = n->next | 0x1L;
    return CAS(&n->next, unmarked, marked) == unmarked;
```

Lock-free List: Putting Everything Together

- Traversal: traverse (requires unmarking nodes)
- Search: traverse
- Insert: traverse → CAS to insert
- Delete: traverse → CAS to mark → CAS to remove

What happens if this CAS fails??

- Garbage (marked) nodes
  - Cleanup while traversing (*helping* in this course's terms)

A pragmatic implementation of lock-free linked lists

ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE FÉDÉRALE DE LAUSANNE

What is not Perfect with the Lock-free List?

1. Garbage nodes
   - Increase path length; and
   - Increase complexity

     `if (is_marked_node(n)) …`
2. Unmarking every single pointer
   - Increase complexity

     `curr = get_unmark_ref(curr->next)`

Can we simplify the design with locks?

Lock-based Sorted Linked List: Naïve



Is this a correct (linearizable) linked list?

Lock-based List: Validate After Locking



!pred->marked && !curr->marked && pred->next did not change

Concurrent Linked Lists – 0% updates

1024
elements
0% updates



(Lesson$_2$) Sequential complexity matters → Simplicity ☺

Optimistic Concurrency Control: Summary

- Lock-free: atomic operations



  - marking pointers, flags, helping, …
- Lock-based: lock → validate



  - flags, pointer reversal, parsing twice, …

Word of caution: lock-based algorithms

- Search data structures ☺
- Queues, stacks, counters, ... ☹



Memory Reclamation: OCC's Side Effect

- Delete a node → free and reuse this memory
- Subset of the garbage collection problem
- Who is accessing that memory?
- Can we just directly do free(node)?



We cannot directly free the memory! Need memory reclamation

Memory Reclamation Schemes

1. Reference counting
   – Count how many references exist on a node
2. Hazard pointers
   – Tell to others what exactly you are reading
3. Quiescent states
   – Wait until it is certain than no one holds references
4. Read-Copy Update (RCU)
   – Quiescent states - The extreme approach

1. Reference Counting

- Pointer + Counter



- Dereference:

```
rc_dereference(rc_pointer* rcp)
    atomic_increment(&rcp->counter);
    return *pointer;
```

- “Release” :

```
rc_release(rc_pointer* rcp)
    atomic_decrement(&rcp->counter);
```

- Free: iff counter = 0

(Lesson$_3$) Readers cannot write on the shared nodes

Bad bad bad idea: Readers write on shared nodes!

2. Hazard pointers (1/2)

- Reference counter → property of the node
- Hazard pointer → property of the thread
  - A Multi-Reader Single-Writer (MRSW) register

hazard_pointe
addres
s

- Protect:

```
hp_protect(node* n)
    hazard_pointer* hp = hp_get(
    hp->address = n;
```

Depends on the data structure type

- Release:

```
hp_release(hazard_pointer* hp)
```

2. Hazard pointers (2/2)

- Free memory **x**
  1. Collect all hazard pointers
  2. Check if **x** is accessed by any thread
     1. If yes, buffer the free for later
     2. If not, free the memory
- Buffering the free is implementation specific

hazard_pointe

addres

- + lock-free

O(data structure size) hazard pointers **hp_protect**

3. Quiescent States

- Keep the memory until it is certain it is not accessed
- Can be implemented in various ways
- Example implementation
  search / insert / delete
  qs_unsafe(); I’m accessing shared data
  …
  qs_safe(); I’m not accessing shared data

The data written in qs_[un]safe must be local-mostly

3. Quiescent States: qs_[un]safe Implementation

- List of “thread-local” (mostly)



- qs_state (initialized to 0)
  - even : in safe mode (not accessing shared data)
  - odd : in unsafe mode
- qs_safe / qs_unsafe

How do we free memory?

3. Quiescent States: Freeing memory

- List of “thread-local” (mostly) c…s



- Upon `qs_free`: Timestamp memory (vector_ts)
  - Can do this for batches of frees

```
for t in thread_ids
  if (vts_mem[t] is odd &&
   vts_now[t] = vts_mem[t])
    return false;
return true;
```

- Safe to reuse the memory
  vector_ts >> vector_ts

How do the schemes we have seen perform?

Hazard Pointers vs. Quiescent States

1024 elements
0% updates



Quiescent-state reclamation is as fast as it gets

4. Read-Copy Update (RCU)

- Quiescent states at their extreme
  - Deletions wait all readers to reach a safe state
- Introduced in the Linux kernel in ~2002
  - More than 10000 uses in the kernel!
- (Example) Interface
  - `rcu_read_lock` (= `qs_unsafe`)
  - `rcu_read_unlock` (= `qs_safe`)
  - `synchronize_rcu` → wait all readers

ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE FÉDÉRALE DE LAUSANNE

4. Using RCU

- Search / Traverse

```
rcu_read_lock()
…
rcu_read_unlock()
```

- Delete

… physical deletion of **x**

```
synchronize_rcu()
free(x)
```

- + simple
- + read-only workloads
- – bad for writes

Memory Reclamation: Summary

- How and when to reuse freed memory
- Many techniques, no silver bullet
  1. Reference counting
  2. Hazard pointers
  3. Quiescent states
  4. Read-Copy Update (RCU)

Summary

- Concurrent data structures are very important
- Optimistic concurrency necessary for scalability
  - Only recently a lot of active work for CDSs
- Memory reclamation is
  - Inherent to optimistic concurrency;
  - A difficult problem;
  - A potential performance/scalability bottleneck