Concurrent programming: From theory to practice

Concurrent Algorithms 2016

Tudor David

From theory to practice

Theoretical (design)	Practical (design)	Practical (implementation)

From theory to practice

Theoretical (design)	Practical (design)	Practical (implementation)

- Impossibilities
- Upper/Lower bounds
- Techniques
- System models
- Correctness proofs
- **Correctness**

Design (pseudo-code)

From theory to practice

Theoretical (design)	Practical (design)	Practical (implementation)

- Impossibilities
- Upper/Lower bounds
- Techniques
- System models
- Correctness proofs
- **Correctness**

Design (pseudo-code)

- System models
  - shared memory
  - message passing
- Finite memory
- Practicality issues
  - re-usable objects
- **Performance**

Design (pseudo-code, prototype)

From theory to practice

Theoretical (design)	Practical (design)	Practical (implementation)

• Impossibilities
• Upper/Lower bounds
• Techniques
• System models
• Correctness proofs
• **Correctness**
	• System models
	  • shared memory
	  • message passing
	• Finite memory
	• Practicality issues
	  • re-usable objects
	• **Performance**
		• **Hardware**
		• Which atomic ops
		• Memory consistency
		• Cache coherence
		• Locality
		• **Performance**
		• **Scalability**

		
Design (pseudo-code)	**Design (pseudo-code, prototype)**	**Implementation (code)**

Example: linked list implementations



Outline

- CPU caches
- Cache coherence
- Placement of data
- Hardware synchronization instructions
- Correctness: Memory model & compiler
- Performance: Programming techniques

Outline

- **CPU caches**
- Cache coherence
- Placement of data
- Hardware synchronization instructions
- Correctness: Memory model & compiler
- Performance: Programming techniques

Why do we use caching?



- Core freq: 2GHz = 0.5 ns / instr
- Core → Disk = ~ms

Why do we use caching?



- Core freq: 2GHz = 0.5 ns / instr
- Core → Disk = ~ms
- Core → Memory = ~100ns

Why do we use caching?



- Core freq: 2GHz = 0.5 ns / instr
- Core → Disk = ~ms
- Core → Memory = ~100ns
- Cache
  - Large = slow
  - Medium = medium
  - Small = fast

Why do we use caching?



- Core freq: 2GHz = 0.5 ns / instr
- Core → Disk = ~ms
- Core → Memory = ~100ns
- Cache
  - Core → L3 = ~20ns
  - Core → L2 = ~7ns
  - Core → L1 = ~1ns

Typical server configurations

- **Intel Xeon**
  - 12 cores @ 2.4GHz
  - L1: 32KB
  - L2: 256KB
  - L3: 24MB
  - Memory: 256GB



- **AMD Opteron**
  - 8 cores @ 2.4GHz
  - L1: 64KB
  - L2: 512KB
  - L3: 12MB
  - Memory: 256GB



Experiment

Throughput of accessing some memory, depending on the memory size

Outline

- CPU caches
- **Cache coherence**
- Placement of data
- Hardware synchronization instructions
- Correctness: Memory model & compiler
- Performance: Programming techniques

Until ~2004: Single-cores



- Core freq: 3+GHz
- Core → Disk
- Core → Memory
- Cache
  - Core → L3
  - Core → L2
  - Core → L1

After ~2004: Multi-cores



- Core freq: ~2GHz
- Core → Disk
- Core → Memory
- Cache
  - Core → **shared** L3
  - Core → L2
  - Core → L1

Multi-cores with private caches



= multiple copies

Cache coherence for consistency



Core 0 has X and Core 1

- wants to write on X
- wants to read X
- did Core 0 write or read X?

Cache-coherence principles



- To perform a write
  - invalidate all readers, or
  - previous writer
- To perform a read
  - find the latest copy

Cache coherence with MESI

- A state diagram
- State (per cache line)
  - **M**odified: the only dirty copy
  - **E**xclusive: the only clean copy
  - **S**hared: a clean copy
  - **I**nvalid: useless data



The ultimate goal for scalability

- Possible states
  - **M**odified: the only dirty copy
  - **E**xclusive: the only clean copy
  - **S**hared: a clean copy
  - **I**nvalid: useless data

- **Which state is our "favorite"?**

The ultimate goal for scalability

- Possible states
  - **M**odified: the only dirty copy
  - **E**xclusive: the only clean copy
  - **S**hared: a clean copy
  - **I**nvalid: useless data

= threads can keep the data close (L1 cache)

= faster

Experiment

The effects of false sharing

Outline

- CPU caches
- Cache coherence
- **Placement of data**
- Hardware synchronization instructions
- Correctness: Memory model & compiler
- Performance: Programming techniques

Uniformity vs. non-uniformity

- Typical **desktop** machine



= Uniform

- Typical **server** machine



= non-Uniform (**NUMA**)

Latency (ns) to access data



Latency (ns) to access data



Latency (ns) to access data



Latency (ns) to access data



Latency (ns) to access data



Latency (ns) to access data



Latency (ns) to access data



Latency (ns) to access data



Latency (ns) to access data



Conclusion: we need to take care of locality

Experiment

The effects of locality

Outline

- CPU caches
- Cache coherence
- Placement of data
- **Hardware synchronization instructions**
- Correctness: Memory model & compiler
- Performance: Programming techniques

The Programmer's Toolbox: Hardware synchronization instructions

- Depends on the processor
- CAS generally provided ☺
- TAS and atomic increment not always provided
- x86 processors (Intel, AMD):
  - Atomic exchange, increment, decrement provided
  - Memory barrier also available
- Intel as of 2014 provides transactional memory

Example: Atomic ops in GCC

```
type __sync_fetch_and_OP(type *ptr,  type value);
type __sync_OP_and_fetch(type *ptr,  type value);
// OP in {add,sub,or,and,xor,nand}

type __sync_val_compare_and_swap(type *ptr,  type
                                 oldval, type newval);
bool __sync_bool_compare_and_swap(type *ptr,  type
                                 oldval, type newval);

__sync_synchronize(); // memory barrier
```

Intel's transactional synchronization extensions (TSX)

1. Hardware lock elision (HLE)

- Instruction prefixes:

```
XACQUIRE
XRELEASE
```

Example (GCC):

```
__hle_{acquire,release}_compare_exchange_n{1,2,4,8}
```

- Try to execute critical sections without acquiring/releasing the lock
- If conflict detected, abort and acquire the lock before re-doing the work

Intel's transactional synchronization extensions (TSX)

2. Restricted Transactional Memory (RTM)

```
_xbegin();
_xabort();
_xtest();
_xend();
```

Limitations:

- Not starvation free
- Transactions can be aborted various reasons
- Should have a non-transactional back-up
- Limited transaction size

Intel's transactional synchronization extensions (TSX)

2. Restricted Transactional Memory (RTM)

Example:

```
if (_xbegin() == _XBEGIN_STARTED){
   counter = counter + 1;
   _xend();
} else {
   __sync_fetch_and_add(&counter,1);
}
```

Outline

- CPU caches
- Cache coherence
- Placement of data
- Hardware synchronization instructions
- **Correctness: Memory model & compiler**
- Performance: Programming techniques

Concurrent algorithm correctness

- Designing **correct** concurrent algorithms:
  1. Theoretical part
  2. **Practical part → involves implementation**

The processor and the compiler optimize assuming no concurrency!

The memory consistency model

```
//A, B shared variables, initially 0;
//r1, r2 – local variables;
```

P1	P2
`A = 1;`	`B = 1;`
`r1 = B;`	`r2 = A;`

What values can r1 and r2 take?

(assume x86 processor)

Answer:

(0,1), (1,0), (1,1) and (0,0)

The memory consistency model

→ The order in which memory instructions appear to execute

What would the programmer like to see?

Sequential consistency

All operations executed in some sequential order;

Memory operations of each thread in program order;

Intuitive, but limits performance;

The memory consistency model

How can the processor reorder instructions to different memory addresses?

x86 (Intel, AMD): TSO variant

- Reads not reordered w.r.t. reads
- Writes not reordered w.r.t writes
- Writes not reordered w.r.t. reads
- Reads may be reordered w.r.t. writes to different memory addresses

```
//A,B,C
//globals
…
int x,y,z;
x = A;
y = B;
B = 3;
A = 2;
y = A;
C = 4;
z = B;
…
```

The memory consistency model

- Single thread – reorderings transparent;
- Avoid reorderings: memory barriers
  - x86 – implicit in atomic ops;
  - “volatile” in Java;
  - Expensive - use only when really necessary;
- **Different processors – different memory models**
  - e.g., ARM – relaxed memory model (anything goes!);
  - VMs (e.g. JVM, CLR) have their own memory models;

Beware of the compiler

```
void lock(int * some_lock) {
   while (CAS(some_lock,0,1) != 0) {}
   asm volatile("" ::: "memory"); //compiler barrier
}
void unlock(int * some_lock) {
   asm volatile("" ::: "memory"); //compiler barrier
   *some_lock = 0;
}
```

C "volatile" != Java "volatile"

```
volatile int the_lock=0;
```

```
lock(&the_lock);
…
unlock(&the_lock);
```

- **The compiler can**:
  - reorder instructions
  - remove instructions
  - not write values to memory

Outline

- CPU caches
- Cache coherence
- Placement of data
- Hardware synchronization instructions
- Correctness: Memory model & compiler
- **Performance: Programming techniques**

Concurrent Programming Techniques

- What techniques can we use to speed up our concurrent application?

- **Main idea**: Minimize contention on cache lines

- **Use case: Locks**
  - `acquire() = lock()`
  - `release() = unlock()`

TAS – The simplest lock

Test-and-Set Lock

```
typedef volatile uint lock_t;

void acquire(lock_t * some_lock) {
   while (TAS(some_lock) != 0) {}
   asm volatile("" ::: "memory");
}
void release(lock_t * some_lock) {
   asm volatile("" ::: "memory");
   *some_lock = 0;
}
```

How good is this lock?

- A simple benchmark
- Have 48 threads continuously acquire a lock, update some shared data, and unlock
- Measure how many operations we can do in a second

Test-and-Set lock: 190K operations/second

How can we improve things?

Avoid cache-line ping-pong: Test-and-Test-and-Set Lock

```
void acquire(lock_t * some_lock) {
   while(1) {
      while (*some_lock != 0) {}
      if (TAS(some_lock) == 0) {
         return;
      }
   }
   asm volatile("" ::: "memory");
}
void release(lock_t * some_lock) {
   asm volatile("" ::: "memory");
   *some_lock = 0;
}
```

Performance comparison



But we can do even better

Avoid thundering herd: Test-and-Test-and-Set with Back-off

```
void acquire(lock_t * some_lock) {
    uint backoff = INITIAL_BACKOFF;
    while(1) {
        while (*some_lock != 0) {}
        if (TAS(some_lock) == 0) {
            return;
        } else {
            lock_sleep(backoff);
            backoff=min(backoff*2,MAXIMUM_BACKOFF);
        }
    }
    asm volatile("" ::: "memory");
}
void release(lock_t * some_lock) {
    asm volatile("" ::: "memory");
    *some_lock = 0;
}
```

Performance comparison



Are these locks fair?



What if we want fairness?

Use a FIFO mechanism: Ticket Locks

```
typedef ticket_lock_t {
   volatile uint head;
   volatile uint tail;
} ticket_lock_t;


void acquire(ticket_lock_t * a_lock) {
   uint my_ticket = fetch_and_inc(&(a_lock->tail));
   while (a_lock->head != my_ticket) {}
   asm volatile("" ::: "memory");
}
void release(ticket_lock_t * a_lock) {
   asm volatile("" ::: "memory");
   a_lock->head++;
}
```

What if we want fairness?



Performance comparison



Can we back-off here as well?

Yes, we can:
Proportional back-off

```
void acquire(ticket_lock_t * a_lock) {
   uint my_ticket = fetch_and_inc(&(a_lock->tail));
   uint distance, current_ticket;
   while (1) {
      current_ticket = a_lock->head;
      if (current_ticket == my_ticket) break;
      distance = my_ticket – current_ticket;
      if (distance > 1)
         lock_sleep(distance * BASE_SLEEP);
   }
   asm volatile(“” ::: “memory”);
}
void release(ticket_lock_t * a_lock) {
   asm volatile(“” ::: “memory”);
   a_lock->head++;
}
```

Performance comparison



Still, everyone is spinning on the same variable….

Use a different address for each thread:

Queue Locks



Use with care:

1. storage overheads
2. complexity

Performance comparison



To summarize on locks

1. Reading before trying to write
2. Pausing when it's not our turn
3. Ensuring fairness (does not always bring ++)
4. Accessing disjoint addresses (cache lines)

More than 10x performance gain!

Conclusion

- **Concurrent algorithm design**
  - Theoretical design
  - Practical design (may be just as important)
  - Implementation

- **You need to know your hardware**
  - For correctness
  - For performance