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Preemptive Scheduling

- Scheduler selects a READY process and sets it up to run for a maximum of some fixed time (time-slice).
- Scheduled process computes happily, oblivious to the fact that a maximum time-slice was set by the scheduler.
- Whenever a running process exhausts its time-slice, the scheduler needs to suspend the process and select another process to run (assuming one exists).
- To do this, the scheduler needs to be running! To make sure no process computes beyond its time-slice, the scheduler needs a mechanism that guarantees that the scheduler itself is not suspended beyond the duration of one time-slice. A “wake-up” call is needed.
Interrupts and Exceptions

- Interrupts and exceptions suspend the execution of the running thread of control, and activates some kernel routine.
- Three categories of interrupts:
  - Software interrupts
  - Hardware interrupts
  - Exceptions

Software Interrupts

- INT instruction
- Explicitly issued by program
- Synchronous to program execution
- Example: INT 10h
Hardware Interrupts

- Set by hardware components (for example timer), and peripheral devices (for example disk)
  - Timer component, set to generate timer-interrupt at any specified frequency! Separate unit or integral part of interrupt controller
- Asynchronous to program execution
- Non-maskable (NMI), and maskable interrupts.
  - NMI are processed immediately once current instruction is finished.
  - Maskable interrupts may be permanently or temporarily masked

Maskable Interrupt Request

- Some IO devices generate an interrupt request to signal that:
  - An action is required on the part of the program in order to continue operation
  - A previously-initiated operation has been completed with no errors encountered
  - A previously-initiated operation has encountered an error condition and cannot continue
Non-maskable Inerrupt Requests

- In the PC-compatible world, the processor’s non-maskable interrupt request input (NMI) is used to report catastrophic HW failures to the OS

Exceptions

- Initiated by processor
- Three types:
  - Fault: Faulting instruction causes exception without completing. When thread resumes (after IRET), the faulting instruction is re-issued. For example page-fault
  - Trap: Exception is issued after instruction completes. When thread resumes (after IRET), the immediately following instruction is issued. May be used for debugging
  - Abort: Serious failure. May not indicate address of offending instruction

*Have used Intel terminology in this presentation. Classification, terminology, and functionality varies among manufacturers and authors*
I/O and Timer Interrupts

- Overlapping computation and I/O:
  - Within single thread: Non-blocking I/O
  - Among multiple threads: Also blocking I/O with scheduling
- Sharing CPU among multiple threads
  - Set timer interrupt to enforce maximum time-slice
  - Ensures even and fair progression of concurrent threads
- Maintaining consistent kernel structures
  - Disable/enable interrupts cautiously in kernel

When to Schedule?

- Process created
- Process exits
- Process blocks
- I/O interrupt
- Timer
Process State Transitions

- **Running**
  - Scheduler dispatch
  - Terminate (call scheduler)
  - Block for resource (call scheduler)
  - Yield, Timer Interrupt (call scheduler)
  - I/O completion interrupt (move to ready queue)

- **Ready**
  - Create
  - Yield, Timer Interrupt (call scheduler)
  - Block for resource (call scheduler)

- **Blocked**
  - I/O completion interrupt (move to ready queue)

User Level Processes

- KERNEL
  - Trap Handler
  - Trap Return Handler
  - Scheduler
  - Dispatcher
  - PCB's
  - Memory resident part (Process Table)

User Level Processes (cont.)

- MULTIPROGRAMMING
  - Uniprocessor: Interleaving (“pseudoparallelism”)
  - Multiprocessor: Overlapping (“true parallelism”)

Scheduler dispatch

- Running
  - Syscall

- Ready
  - Create

- Blocked
  - Block for resource (call scheduler)
  - I/O completion interrupt (move to ready queue)
### Transparent vs. Non-transparent Interleaving and Overlapping

- Non-preemptive scheduling ("Yield")
  - Current process or thread has control, no other process or thread will execute before current says Yield
    - Access to shared resources simplified
- Preemptive scheduling (timer and I/O interrupts)
  - Current process or thread will loose control at any time without even discovering this, and another will start executing
    - Access to shared resources must be synchronized

### Implementation of Synchronization Mechanisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concurrent Applications</th>
<th>Shared Variables</th>
<th>Message Passing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Level Atomic API</td>
<td>Locks</td>
<td>Semaphores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitors</td>
<td>Send/Receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Level Atomic Ops</td>
<td>Load/Store</td>
<td>Interrupt disable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test&amp;Set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interrupt (timer or I/O completion), Scheduling, Multiprocessor
Hardware Support for Mutex

- Atomic memory load and store
  - Assumed by Dijkstra (CACM 1965): Shared memory w/atomic R and W operations
- Disable Interrupts
- Atomic read-modify-write
  - IBM/360: Test And Set proposed by Dirac (1963)
  - IBM/370: Generalized Compare And Swap (1970)

A Fast Mutual Exclusion Algorithm
(Fischer)

Executed by process no. i.
X is shared memory.
<op> is an Atomic Operation.

```
Repeat
  await <x=0>;
  <x := i>;
  <delay>;
  until <x = i>;
  use shared resource
  <x := 0>;

While x ≠ 0 do skip;
Or could block? How?
```

We are assuming that COMMON CASE will be fast and that all processes will get through eventually
Disable Interrupts

- CPU scheduling
  - Internal events
    - Threads do something to relinquish the CPU
  - External events
    - Interrupts cause rescheduling of the CPU
- Disabling interrupts
  - Delay handling of external events
    - and make sure we have a safe ENTRY or EXIT

Does This Work?

```c
Acquire() {
    disable interrupts;
}

Release() {
    enable interrupts;
}
```

- Kernel cannot let users disable interrupts
- Kernel can provide two system calls, Acquire and Release, but need ID of critical region
- Remember: Critical sections can be arbitrary long (no preemption!)
- Used on uni-processors, but won’t work on multiprocessors
Disabling Interrupts with Busy Wait

**Acquire**(lock) {
  disable interrupts;
  while (lock != FREE){
    enable interrupts;
    disable interrupts;
  }
  lock = BUSY;
  enable interrupts;
}

- We are at Kernel Level!: So why do we need to disable interrupts at all?
- Why do we need to enable interrupts inside the loop in Acquire?
- Would this work for multiprocessors?
- Why not have a “disabled” Kernel?

**Release**(lock) {
  disable interrupts;
  lock = FREE;
  enable interrupts;
}

Using Disabling Interrupts with Blocking

**Acquire**(lock) {
  disable interrupts;
  while (lock == BUSY) {
    insert(caller, lock_queue);
    BLOCK;
  } else
  lock = BUSY;
  enable interrupts;
}

**Release**(lock) {
  disable interrupts;
  if (nonempty(lock_queue)) {
    out(tid, lock_queue);
    READY(tid);
  } else
  lock = FREE;
  enable interrupts;
}

- When must **Acquire** re-enable interrupts in going to sleep?
  - Before insert()?
  - After insert(), but before block?
- Would this work on multiprocessors?
Atomic Read-Modify-Write Instructions

- What we want: Test&Set(lock):
  - Returns TRUE if lock is TRUE (closed), else returns FALSE and closes lock.
- Exchange (xchg, x86 architecture)
  - Swap register and memory
- Compare and Exchange (cmpxchg, 486 or Pentium)
  - cmpxchg d,s: If Dest = (al,ax,eax), Dest = SRC;
    else (al,ax,eax) = Dest
- LOCK prefix in x86
- Load link and conditional store (MIPS, Alpha)
  - Read value in one instruction, do some operations
  - When store, check if value has been modified. If not, ok; otherwise, jump back to start
- The Butterfly multiprocessor
  - atomicadd: one processor can read and increment a memory location while preventing other processors from accessing the location simultaneously

A Simple Solution with Test&Set

INITIALLY: Lock := FALSE; /* OPEN */

Spin until lock = open

Acquire(lock) {
  while (TAS(lock))
    ;
}

Release(lock) {
  lock = FALSE;
}

TAS (lock):
{TAS := lock;
 lock := TRUE;}

- Waste CPU time (busy waiting by all threads)
- Low priority threads may never get a chance to run (starvation possible because other threads always grab the lock, but can be lucky…): No Bounded Waiting (a MUTEX criteria)
- No fairness, no order, random who gets access
Test&Set with Minimal Busy Waiting

CLOSED = TRUE
OPEN = FALSE

Acquire(lock) {
    while (TAS(lock.guard)) {
        if (lock.value) {
            enqueue the thread;
            block and lock.guard:=OPEN;
            %Starts here after a Release()
        }
        lock.value:=CLOSED;
        lock.guard:=OPEN;
    }
}

Release(lock) {
    while (TAS(lock.guard)) {
        if (anyone in queue) {
            dequeue a thread;
            make it ready;
        } else lock.value:=OPEN;
        lock.guard:=OPEN;
    }
}

• Two levels: Get inside a mutex, then check resource availability (and block (remember to open mutex!) or not).
• Still busy wait, but only for a short time
• Works with multiprocessors

A Solution without Busy Waiting?

Acquire(lock) {
    while (TAS(lock)) {
        enqueue the thread;
        block;
    }
}

Release(lock) {
    if (anyone in queue) {
        dequeue a thread;
        make it ready;
    } else
        lock:=OPEN;
}

• BUT: No mutual exclusion on the thread queue for each lock: queue is shared resource
  • Need to solve another mutual exclusion problem
• Is there anything wrong with using this at the user level?
  • Performance
  • “Block”??
Different Ways of Spinning

- Always execute **TAS**
- Perform **TAS** only when **lock.guard** is likely to be cleared
  - **TAS** is expensive

```plaintext
while (TAS(lock.guard))
;

while (TAS(lock.guard)) {
  while (lock.guard)
  ;
}
```

Using System Call **Block/Unblock**

```plaintext
Acquire(lock) {
  while (TAS(lock))
    Block( lock );
}

Release(lock) {
  lock = 0;
  Unblock( lock );
}
```

- Block/Unblock are implemented as system calls
- How would you implement them?
  - Minimal waiting solution
Block (lock) {
    insert (current, lock_queue, last);
    goto scheduler ();
}

Unblock (lock) {
    insert (out (lock_queue, first), Ready_Queue, last);
    goto scheduler;
}