

Review: Thread package API

- `tid thread_create (void (*fn) (void *), void *arg);`
 - Create a new thread that calls `fn` with `arg`
- `void thread_exit ();`
- `void thread_join (tid thread);`
- **The execution of multiple threads is interleaved**
- **Can have *non-preemptive threads*:**
 - One thread executes exclusively until it makes a blocking call
- **Or *preemptive threads* (what we usually mean in this class):**
 - May switch to another thread between any two instructions.
- **Using multiple CPUs is inherently preemptive**
 - Even if you don't take CPU_0 away from thread T , another thread on CPU_1 can execute "between" any two instructions of T

1/44

Program A

```
int flag1 = 0, flag2 = 0;

void p1 (void *ignored) {
    flag1 = 1;
    if (!flag2) { critical_section_1 (); }
}

void p2 (void *ignored) {
    flag2 = 1;
    if (!flag1) { critical_section_2 (); }
}

int main () {
    tid id = thread_create (p1, NULL);
    p2 ();
    thread_join (id);
}
```

Q: Can both critical sections run?

2/44

Program B

```
int data = 0;
int ready = 0;

void p1 (void *ignored) {
    data = 2000;
    ready = 1;
}

void p2 (void *ignored) {
    while (!ready)
        ;
    use (data);
}

int main () { ... }
```

Q: Can `use` be called with value 0?

3/44

Program C

```
int a = 0;
int b = 0;

void p1 (void *ignored) {
    a = 1;
}

void p2 (void *ignored) {
    if (a == 1)
        b = 1;
}

void p3 (void *ignored) {
    if (b == 1)
        use (a);
}
```

Q: If `p1-3` run concurrently, can `use` be called with value 0?

4/44

Correct answers

Correct answers

- Program A: I don't know

5/44

5/44

Correct answers

- Program A: I don't know
- Program B: I don't know

5 / 44

Correct answers

- Program A: I don't know
- Program B: I don't know
- Program C: I don't know
- Why don't we know?
 - It depends on what machine you use
 - If a system provides *sequential consistency*, then answers all No
 - But not all hardware provides sequential consistency
- Note: Examples, other content from [Adve & Gharachorloo]
- Another great reference: [Why Memory Barriers](#)

5 / 44

Outline

- 1 Memory consistency
- 2 The critical section problem
- 3 Mutexes and condition variables
- 4 Implementing synchronization
- 5 Alternate synchronization abstractions

6 / 44

Sequential Consistency

Definition

Sequential consistency: The result of execution is as if all operations were executed in some sequential order, and the operations of each processor occurred in the order specified by the program.

– Lamport

- Boils down to two requirements on loads and stores:
 1. Maintaining *program order* of on individual processors
 2. Ensuring *write atomicity*
- Without SC (Sequential Consistency), multiple CPUs can be “worse”—i.e., less intuitive—than preemptive threads
 - Result may not correspond to *any* instruction interleaving on 1 CPU
- Why doesn't all hardware support sequential consistency?

7 / 44

SC thwarts hardware optimizations

- Complicates write buffers
 - E.g., read $flag_n$ before $flag(3 - n)$ written through in [Program A](#)
- Can't re-order overlapping write operations
 - Concurrent writes to different memory modules
 - Coalescing writes to same cache line
- Complicates non-blocking reads
 - E.g., speculatively prefetch data in [Program B](#)
- Makes cache coherence more expensive
 - Must delay write completion until invalidation/update ([Program B](#))
 - Can't allow overlapping updates if no globally visible order ([Program C](#))

8 / 44

SC thwarts compiler optimizations

- Code motion
- Caching value in register
 - Collapse multiple loads/stores of same address into one operation
- Common subexpression elimination
 - Could cause memory location to be read fewer times
- Loop blocking
 - Re-arrange loops for better cache performance
- Software pipelining
 - Move instructions across iterations of a loop to overlap instruction latency with branch cost

9 / 44

x86 consistency [intel 3a, §8.2]

- **x86 supports multiple consistency/caching models**
 - Memory Type Range Registers (MTRR) specify consistency for ranges of physical memory (e.g., frame buffer)
 - Page Attribute Table (PAT) allows control for each 4K page
- **Choices include:**
 - **WB:** Write-back caching (the default)
 - **WT:** Write-through caching (all writes go to memory)
 - **UC:** Uncacheable (for device memory)
 - **WC:** Write-combining – weak consistency & no caching (used for frame buffers, when sending a lot of data to GPU)
- **Some instructions have weaker consistency**
 - String instructions (written cache-lines can be re-ordered)
 - Special “non-temporal” store instructions (`movnt*`) that bypass cache and can be re-ordered with respect to other writes

10 / 44

x86 WB consistency

- **Old x86s (e.g, 486, Pentium 1) had almost SC**
 - Exception: A read could finish before an earlier write to a different location
 - Which of Programs *A, B, C* might be affected?

11 / 44

x86 WB consistency

- **Old x86s (e.g, 486, Pentium 1) had almost SC**
 - Exception: A read could finish before an earlier write to a different location
 - Which of Programs *A, B, C* might be affected? *Just A*
- **Newer x86s also let a CPU read its own writes early**

```
volatile int flag1;          volatile int flag2;
int p1 (void)                int p2 (void)
{
    register int f, g;        {
    flag1 = 1;                register int f, g;
    f = flag1;                flag2 = 1;
    g = flag2;                f = flag2;
    return 2*f + g;           g = flag1;
                             return 2*f + g;
}                             }
```

 - E.g., *both* `p1` and `p2` can return 2:
 - Older CPUs would wait at “`f = ...`” until store complete

11 / 44

x86 atomicity

- **lock prefix makes a memory instruction atomic**
 - Historically locks bus for duration of instruction (expensive!)
 - Can avoid locking if memory already exclusively cached
 - All lock instructions totally ordered
 - Other memory instructions cannot be re-ordered with locked ones
- **xchg instruction is always locked (even without prefix)**
- **Special barrier (or “fence”) instructions can prevent re-ordering**
 - `lfence` – can’t be reordered with reads (or later writes)
 - `sfence` – can’t be reordered with writes (e.g., use after non-temporal stores, before setting a *ready* flag)
 - `mfence` – can’t be reordered with reads or writes

12 / 44

Outline

- 1 Memory consistency
- 2 The critical section problem
- 3 Mutexes and condition variables
- 4 Implementing synchronization
- 5 Alternate synchronization abstractions

13 / 44

Assuming sequential consistency

- **Often we reason about concurrent code assuming SC**
- **But for low-level code, know your memory model!**
 - May need to sprinkle barrier/fence instructions into your source
 - Or may need compiler barriers to restrict optimization
- **For most code, avoid depending on memory model**
 - Idea: If you obey certain rules (*discussed later*) ... system behavior should be indistinguishable from SC
- **Let’s for now say we have sequential consistency**
- **Example concurrent code: Producer/Consumer**
 - `buffer` stores `BUFFER_SIZE` items
 - `count` is number of used slots
 - `out` is next empty buffer slot to fill (if any)
 - `in` is oldest filled slot to consume (if any)

14 / 44

```

void producer (void *ignored) {
    for (;;) {
        item *nextProduced = produce_item ();
        while (count == BUFFER_SIZE)
            /* do nothing */;
        buffer[in] = nextProduced;
        in = (in + 1) % BUFFER_SIZE;
        count++;
    }
}

void consumer (void *ignored) {
    for (;;) {
        while (count == 0)
            /* do nothing */;
        item *nextConsumed = buffer[out];
        out = (out + 1) % BUFFER_SIZE;
        count--;
        consume_item (nextConsumed);
    }
}

```

Q: What can go wrong in above threads (even with SC)?

15 / 44

Data races

- `count` may have wrong value
- Possible implementation of `count++` and `count--`

```

register←count      register←count
register←register + 1  register←register - 1
count←register      count←register

```
- Possible execution (`count` one less than correct):

```

register←count
register←register + 1

register←count
register←register - 1

count←register

count←register

```

16 / 44

Data races (continued)

- What about a single-instruction `add`?
 - E.g., i386 allows single instruction `addl $1, _count`
 - So implement `count++/--` with one instruction
 - Now are we safe?

17 / 44

Data races (continued)

- What about a single-instruction `add`?
 - E.g., i386 allows single instruction `addl $1, _count`
 - So implement `count++/--` with one instruction
 - Now are we safe? Not on multiprocessors!
- A single instruction may encode a load and a store operation
 - S.C. doesn't make such *read-modify-write* instructions atomic
 - So on multiprocessor, suffer same race as 3-instruction version
- Can make x86 instruction atomic with `lock` prefix
 - But `lock` potentially very expensive
 - Compiler assumes you don't want penalty, doesn't emit it
- Need solution to *critical section* problem
 - Place `count++` and `count--` in critical section
 - Protect critical sections from concurrent execution

17 / 44

Desired properties of solution

- **Mutual Exclusion**
 - Only one thread can be in critical section at a time
- **Progress**
 - Say no process currently in critical section (C.S.)
 - One of the processes trying to enter will eventually get in
- **Bounded waiting**
 - Once a thread T starts trying to enter the critical section, there is a bound on the number of times other threads get in
- **Note progress vs. bounded waiting**
 - If no thread can enter C.S., don't have progress
 - If thread A waiting to enter C.S. while B repeatedly leaves and re-enters C.S. *ad infinitum*, don't have bounded waiting

18 / 44

Peterson's solution

- Still assuming sequential consistency
- Assume two threads, T_0 and T_1
- Variables
 - `int not_turn;` // not this thread's turn to enter C.S.
 - `bool wants[2];` // `wants[i]` indicates if T_i wants to enter C.S.

```

Code:
for (;;) { /* assume i is thread number (0 or 1) */
    wants[i] = true;
    not_turn = i;
    while (wants[1-i] && not_turn == i)
        /* other thread wants in and not our turn, so loop */;
    Critical_section ();
    wants[i] = false;
    Remainder_section ();
}

```

19 / 44

Does Peterson's solution work?

```
for (;;) { /* code in thread i */
    wants[i] = true;
    not_turn = i;
    while (wants[1-i] && not_turn == i)
        /* other thread wants in and not our turn, so loop */;
    Critical_section ();
    wants[i] = false;
    Remainder_section ();
}
```

- **Mutual exclusion – can't both be in C.S.**
 - Would mean `wants[0] == wants[1] == true`, so `not_turn` would have blocked one thread from C.S.
- **Progress – given demand, one thread can always enter C.S.**
 - If T_{1-i} doesn't want C.S., `wants[1-i] == false`, so T_i won't loop
 - If both threads want in, one thread is not the `not_turn` thread
- **Bounded waiting – similar argument to progress**
 - If T_i wants lock and T_{1-i} tries to re-enter, T_{1-i} will set `not_turn = 1 - i`, allowing T_i in

20 / 44

Outline

- 1 Memory consistency
- 2 The critical section problem
- 3 **Mutexes and condition variables**
- 4 Implementing synchronization
- 5 Alternate synchronization abstractions

21 / 44

Mutexes

- **Peterson expensive, only works for 2 processes**
 - Can generalize to n , but for some fixed n
- **Must adapt to machine memory model if not SC**
 - If you need machine-specific barriers anyway, might as well take advantage of other instructions helpful for synchronization
- **Want to insulate programmer from implementing synchronization primitives**
- **Thread packages typically provide mutexes:**

```
void mutex_init (mutex_t *m, ...);
void mutex_lock (mutex_t *m);
int mutex_trylock (mutex_t *m);
void mutex_unlock (mutex_t *m);
```

 - Only one thread acquires `m` at a time, others wait

22 / 44

Thread API contract

- **All global data should be protected by a mutex!**
 - Global = accessed by more than one thread, at least one write
 - Exception is initialization, before exposed to other threads
 - This is the responsibility of the application writer
- **If you use mutexes properly, behavior should be indistinguishable from Sequential Consistency**
 - This is the responsibility of the threads package (& compiler)
 - Mutex is broken if you use properly and don't see SC
- **OS kernels also need synchronization**
 - Some mechanisms look like mutexes
 - But interrupts complicate things (incompatible w. mutexes)

23 / 44

Same concept, many names

- **Most popular application-level thread API: Pthreads**
 - Function names in this lecture all based on Pthreads
 - Just add `pthread_` prefix
 - E.g., `pthread_mutex_t`, `pthread_mutex_lock`, ...
- **C11 uses `mtx_` instead of `mutex_`, C++11 uses methods on `mutex`**
- **Pintos uses `struct lock` for mutexes:**

```
void lock_init (struct lock *);
void lock_acquire (struct lock *);
bool lock_try_acquire (struct lock *);
void lock_release (struct lock *);
```
- **Extra Pintos feature:**
 - Release checks that lock was acquired by same thread
 - `bool lock_held_by_current_thread (struct lock *lock);`

24 / 44

Improved producer

```
mutex_t mutex = MUTEX_INITIALIZER;

void producer (void *ignored) {
    for (;;) {
        item *nextProduced = produce_item ();

        mutex_lock (&mutex);
        while (count == BUFFER_SIZE) {
            mutex_unlock (&mutex);
            thread_yield ();
            mutex_lock (&mutex);
        }

        buffer [in] = nextProduced;
        in = (in + 1) % BUFFER_SIZE;
        count++;
        mutex_unlock (&mutex);
    }
}
```

25 / 44

Improved consumer

```
void consumer (void *ignored) {
    for (;;) {
        mutex_lock (&mutex);
        while (count == 0) {
            mutex_unlock (&mutex); /* <--- Why? */
            thread_yield ();
            mutex_lock (&mutex);
        }

        item *nextConsumed = buffer[out];
        out = (out + 1) % BUFFER_SIZE;
        count--;
        mutex_unlock (&mutex);

        consume_item (nextConsumed);
    }
}
```

26 / 44

Condition variables

- **Busy-waiting in application is a bad idea**
 - Consumes CPU even when a thread can't make progress
 - Unnecessarily slows other threads/processes or wastes power
- **Better to inform scheduler of which threads can run**
- **Typically done with *condition variables***
- `struct cond_t;` (`pthread_cond_t` or `condition` in Pintos)
- `void cond_init (cond_t *, ...);`
- `void cond_wait (cond_t *c, mutex_t *m);`
 - Atomically unlock `m` and sleep until `c` signaled
 - Then re-acquire `m` and resume executing
- `void cond_signal (cond_t *c);`
`void cond_broadcast (cond_t *c);`
 - Wake one/all threads waiting on `c`

27 / 44

Improved producer

```
mutex_t mutex = MUTEX_INITIALIZER;
cond_t nonempty = COND_INITIALIZER;
cond_t nonfull = COND_INITIALIZER;

void producer (void *ignored) {
    for (;;) {
        item *nextProduced = produce_item ();

        mutex_lock (&mutex);
        while (count == BUFFER_SIZE)
            cond_wait (&nonfull, &mutex);

        buffer [in] = nextProduced;
        in = (in + 1) % BUFFER_SIZE;
        count++;
        cond_signal (&nonempty);
        mutex_unlock (&mutex);
    }
}
```

28 / 44

Improved consumer

```
void consumer (void *ignored) {
    for (;;) {
        mutex_lock (&mutex);
        while (count == 0)
            cond_wait (&nonempty, &mutex);

        item *nextConsumed = buffer[out];
        out = (out + 1) % BUFFER_SIZE;
        count--;
        cond_signal (&nonfull);
        mutex_unlock (&mutex);

        consume_item (nextConsumed);
    }
}
```

29 / 44

Re-check conditions

- **Always re-check condition on wake-up**
`while (count == 0) /* not if */`
`cond_wait (&nonempty, &mutex);`
- **Otherwise, breaks with spurious wakeup or two consumers**
 - Start where Consumer 1 has mutex but buffer empty, then:

Consumer 1	Consumer 2	Producer
<code>cond_wait (...);</code>		<code>mutex_lock (...);</code>
		<code>⋮</code>
		<code>count++;</code>
		<code>cond_signal (...);</code>
		<code>mutex_unlock (...);</code>
	<code>mutex_lock (...);</code>	
	<code>if (count == 0)</code>	
	<code>⋮</code>	
	<code>USE buffer[out] ...</code>	
	<code>count--;</code>	
	<code>mutex_unlock (...);</code>	

`use buffer[out] ...` ← No items in buffer

30 / 44

Condition variables (continued)

- **Why must `cond_wait` both release mutex & sleep?**
- **Why not separate mutexes and condition variables?**
`while (count == BUFFER_SIZE) {`
`mutex_unlock (&mutex);`
`cond_wait (&nonfull);`
`mutex_lock (&mutex);`
`}`

31 / 44

Condition variables (continued)

- Why must `cond_wait` both release mutex & sleep?
- Why not separate mutexes and condition variables?

```
while (count == BUFFER_SIZE) {
    mutex_unlock (&mutex);
    cond_wait (&nonfull);
    mutex_lock (&mutex);
}
```

- Can end up stuck waiting when bad interleaving

Producer

```
while (count == BUFFER_SIZE)
    mutex_unlock (&mutex);

cond_wait (&nonfull);
```

Consumer

```
mutex_lock (&mutex);
...
count--;
cond_signal (&nonfull);
```

- Problem: `cond_wait` & `cond_signal` do not commute

31 / 44

Other thread package features

- Alerts – cause exception in a thread
- Timedwait – timeout on condition variable
- Shared locks – concurrent read accesses to data
- Thread priorities – control scheduling policy
 - Mutex attributes allow various forms of *priority donation* (will be familiar concept after lab 1)
- Thread-specific global data
 - Need for things like `errno`
- Different synchronization primitives (later in lecture)

32 / 44

Outline

- 1 Memory consistency
- 2 The critical section problem
- 3 Mutexes and condition variables
- 4 Implementing synchronization
- 5 Alternate synchronization abstractions

33 / 44

Implementing synchronization

- Implement mutex as straight-forward data structure?

```
typedef struct mutex {
    bool is_locked; /* true if locked */
    thread_id_t owner; /* thread holding lock, if locked */
    thread_list_t waiters; /* threads waiting for lock */
};
```

34 / 44

Implementing synchronization

- Implement mutex as straight-forward data structure?

```
typedef struct mutex {
    bool is_locked; /* true if locked */
    thread_id_t owner; /* thread holding lock, if locked */
    thread_list_t waiters; /* threads waiting for lock */
    lower_level_lock_t lk; /* Protect above fields */
};
```

- Fine, so long as we avoid data races on the mutex itself
- Need lower-level lock `lk` for mutual exclusion
 - Internally, `mutex_*` functions bracket code with `lock(&mutex->lk) ... unlock(&mutex->lk)`
 - Otherwise, data races! (E.g., two threads manipulating `waiters`)
- How to implement `lower_level_lock_t`?
 - Could use Peterson's algorithm, but typically a bad idea (too slow and don't know maximum number of threads)

34 / 44

Approach #1: Disable interrupts

- Only for apps with $n : 1$ threads (1 kthread)
 - Cannot take advantage of multiprocessors
 - But sometimes most efficient solution for uniprocessors
- Typical setup: periodic timer signal caught by thread scheduler
- Have per-thread “do not interrupt” (DNI) bit
- `lock (lk)`: sets thread's DNI bit
- If timer interrupt arrives
 - Check interrupted thread's DNI bit
 - If DNI clear, preempt current thread
 - If DNI set, set “interrupted” (I) bit & resume current thread
- `unlock (lk)`: clears DNI bit *and* checks I bit
 - If I bit is set, immediately yields the CPU

35 / 44

Approach #2: Spinlocks

- Most CPUs support atomic read-[modify-]write
- **Example:** `int test_and_set (int *lockp);`
 - Atomically sets `*lockp = 1` and returns old value
 - Special instruction – no way to implement in portable C99 (C11 supports with explicit `atomic_flag_test_and_set` function)
- Use this instruction to implement *spinlocks*:

```
#define lock(lockp) while (test_and_set (lockp))
#define trylock(lockp) (test_and_set (lockp) == 0)
#define unlock(lockp) *lockp = 0
```
- Spinlocks implement mutex's `lower_level_lock_t`
- Can you use spinlocks instead of mutexes?
 - Wastes CPU, especially if thread holding lock not running
 - Mutex functions have short C.S., less likely to be preempted
 - On multiprocessor, sometimes good to spin for a bit, then yield

36 / 44

Synchronization on x86

- Test-and-set only one possible atomic instruction
- x86 `xchg` instruction, exchanges reg with mem
 - Can use to implement test-and-set

```
_test_and_set:
    movl 4(%esp), %edx # %edx = lockp
    movl $1, %eax # %eax = 1
    xchgl %eax, (%edx) # swap (%eax, *lockp)
    ret
```
- CPU locks memory system around read and write
 - Recall `xchgl` always acts like it has implicit `lock` prefix
 - Prevents other uses of the bus (e.g., DMA)
- Usually runs at memory bus speed, not CPU speed
 - Much slower than cached read/buffered write

37 / 44

Synchronization on alpha

- `ldl_1` – load locked
`stl_c` – store conditional (reg ← 0 if not atomic w. `ldl_1`)

```
_test_and_set:
    ldq_l v0, 0(a0) # v0 = *lockp (LOCKED)
    bne v0, 1f # if (v0) return
    addq zero, 1, v0 # v0 = 1
    stq_c v0, 0(a0) # *lockp = v0 (CONDITIONAL)
    beq v0, _test_and_set # if (failed) try again
    mb
    addq zero, zero, v0 # return 0
1:
    ret zero, (ra), 1
```
- **Note:** Alpha memory consistency weaker than x86
 - Want all CPUs to think memory accesses in C.S. happened after acquiring lock, before releasing
 - *Memory barrier* instruction `mb` ensures this (c.f. `mfence` on x86)
 - See [Why Memory Barriers](#) for why alpha still worth understanding

38 / 44

Kernel Synchronization

- Should kernel use locks or disable interrupts?
- Old UNIX had 1 CPU, non-preemptive threads, no mutexes
 - Interface designed for single CPU, so `count++` etc. not data race
 - ...Unless memory shared with an interrupt handler

```
int x = splhigh (); /* Disable interrupts */
/* touch data shared with interrupt handler ... */
splx (x); /* Restore previous state */
```
 - C.f., `intr_disable`/`intr_set_level` in Pintos, and `preempt_disable`/`preempt_enable` in linux
- Used arbitrary pointers like condition variables
 - `int [t]sleep (void *ident, int priority, ...);`
put thread to sleep; will wake up at priority (`~cond_wait`)
 - `int wakeup (void *ident);`
wake up all threads sleeping on `ident` (`~cond_broadcast`)

39 / 44

Kernel locks

- Nowadays, should design for multiprocessors
 - Even if first version of OS is for uniprocessor
 - Someday may want multiple CPUs and need *preemptive* threads
 - That's why Pintos uses sleeping locks (*sleeping locks* means mutexes, as opposed to *spinlocks*)
- Multiprocessor performance needs fine-grained locks
 - Want to be able to call into the kernel on multiple CPUs
- If kernel has locks, should it ever disable interrupts?

40 / 44

Kernel locks

- Nowadays, should design for multiprocessors
 - Even if first version of OS is for uniprocessor
 - Someday may want multiple CPUs and need *preemptive* threads
 - That's why Pintos uses sleeping locks (*sleeping locks* means mutexes, as opposed to *spinlocks*)
- Multiprocessor performance needs fine-grained locks
 - Want to be able to call into the kernel on multiple CPUs
- If kernel has locks, should it ever disable interrupts?
 - Yes! Can't sleep in interrupt handler, so can't wait for lock
 - So even modern OSes have support for disabling interrupts
 - Often uses [DNI](#) trick when cheaper than masking interrupts in hardware

40 / 44

Outline

- 1 Memory consistency
- 2 The critical section problem
- 3 Mutexes and condition variables
- 4 Implementing synchronization
- 5 **Alternate synchronization abstractions**

41 / 44

Semaphores [Dijkstra]

- A *Semaphore* is initialized with an integer N
- Provides two functions:
 - `sem_wait (S)` (originally called P , called `sema_down` in Pintos)
 - `sem_signal (S)` (originally called V , called `sema_up` in Pintos)
- **Guarantees `sem_wait` will return only N more times than `sem_signal` called**
 - Example: If $N == 1$, then semaphore acts as a mutex with `sem_wait` as lock and `sem_signal` as unlock
- **Semaphores give elegant solutions to some problems**
 - Unlike condition variables, wait & signal commute
- **Linux primarily uses semaphores for sleeping locks**
 - `sema_init`, `down_interruptible`, `up`, ...
 - Also weird reader-writer semaphores, `rw_semaphore` [Love]

42 / 44

Semaphore producer/consumer

- **Initialize full to 0 (block consumer when buffer empty)**
- **Initialize empty to N (block producer when queue full)**

```
void producer (void *ignored) {
    for (;;) {
        item *nextProduced = produce_item ();
        sem_wait (&empty);
        buffer [in] = nextProduced;
        in = (in + 1) % BUFFER_SIZE;
        sem_signal (&full);
    }
}

void consumer (void *ignored) {
    for (;;) {
        sem_wait (&full);
        item *nextConsumed = buffer[out];
        out = (out + 1) % BUFFER_SIZE;
        sem_signal (&empty);
        consume_item (nextConsumed);
    }
}
```

43 / 44

Various synchronization mechanisms

- **Other more esoteric primitives you might encounter**
 - Plan 9 used a `rendezvous` mechanism
 - Haskell uses `MVars` (like channels of depth 1)
- **Many synchronization mechanisms equally expressive**
 - Pintos implements locks, condition vars using semaphores
 - Could have been vice versa
 - Can even implement condition variables in terms of mutexes
- **Why base everything around semaphore implementation?**
 - High-level answer: no particularly good reason
 - If you want only one mechanism, can't be condition variables (interface fundamentally requires mutexes)
 - Because `sem_wait` and `sem_signal` commute, eliminates **problem of condition variables w/o mutexes**

44 / 44