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Memory and Concurrency

We have discussed shared state and concurrency. However, the issues go deeper than that!

Shared state is in shared memory.

Memory has some confusing properties when it is shared.

How does memory become shared, anyway?
Types of Shared Memory

There are several “types” of shared memory in concurrent programming:

- Memory used by the same thread in the same process at different times (and maybe asynchronously)
- Memory used by different threads in the same process (maybe at the same time)
- Memory used by different processes (maybe at the same time)

The first is mostly non-problematic.

The second two require a little extra work.
Acquiring Shared Memory

Memory shared within a process requires no special setup.

Sharing memory between processes requires kernel assistance.

There are several methods for creating shared memory:
- Creating a shared mapping within a process before forking
- Attaching to a named mapping with \texttt{shm_open()}
- Attaching to a memory-mapped file

We will explore only the latter.

\begin{footnote}{fork() is the POSIX method for creating a new process.}\end{footnote}
Sharing Memory

So far, we have explored only one way to share memory: 
*Threads within a process share all memory.*

It is often useful to *share memory in a controlled way.*

For example:

- A typed data structure (such as a list or tree)
- A buffer of raw bytes
- A synchronization tool (such as a producer-consumer queue)
- …
Implicitly Shared Memory

Processes have a lot of implicitly shared memory:
- Shared libraries
- Executable images
- Kernel memory
- …

This memory is not obviously shared, however.

It is either read-only or hidden.
Explicitly Sharing Memory

A process can request explicit memory sharing.

That memory may be mutable and changes may be visible between processes.

Like all other resources, the kernel sets up shared memory.

POSIX systems offer two fundamental system calls (and three methods) for explicitly sharing memory:

- `mmap()` maps a file into memory, and changes to the file can be shared between processes
- `mmap()` can also be used to create an anonymous shared mapping shared between parent and child processes
- `shm_open()` opens a named shared memory region
You have already seen `mmap()`. It asks the kernel to manipulate the process virtual memory map. Its analogue is `munmap()`. It is quite complicated to use properly. The original use of `mmap()` was to map a file into memory.
Using `mmap()`

```c
void *mmap(void *addr, size_t len, int prot,
           int flags, int fd, off_t offset);
```

The `flags` argument determines what kind of mapping is created. It must include either `MAP_PRIVATE` or `MAP_SHARED`. It may include many other options. `MAP_ANONYMOUS`, in particular, means do not map a file.
Using `mmap()`

```c
void *mmap(void *addr, size_t len, int prot,
            int flags, int fd, off_t offset);
```

The `prot` argument determines the permissions of the mapping. It must be either `PROT_NONE` or a bitwise-or of:

- `PROT_READ`: the mapping is readable
- `PROT_WRITE`: the mapping is writeable
- `PROT_EXEC`: the mapping is executable

The selected protection must match the open fd mode. (E.g., an `O_RDONLY` file cannot be mapped `PROT_WRITE`.)

Example of `mmap()`

From your malloc project:

```c
void *mapping = mmap(NULL, size,
                      PROT_READ | PROT_WRITE,
                      MAP_PRIVATE | MAP_ANONYMOUS,
                      -1, 0);
```

- NULL addr because we don’t care
- readable, writeable mapping
- MAP_PRIVATE so the map is not shared, and MAP_ANONYMOUS because there’s no file
- fd is -1 because there’s no file
- The size is as requested, with no offset
Shared Mapping with `mmap()`

```c
void *mapping = mmap(NULL, size,
                      PROT_READ | PROT_WRITE,
                      MAP_SHARED | MAP_ANONYMOUS,
                      -1, 0);
```

This mapping will be **preserved across fork()**.

The memory will be **at the same address** in both processes.

**POSIX semaphores** created in the shared memory, or created in other memory, with `pshared = 1`, will synchronize processes.
Mapping a File

```c
int fd = open("somefile", O_RDWR);
void *mapping = mmap(NULL, 4096,
PROT_READ | PROT_WRITE,
MAP_SHARED, fd, 0);

close(fd);

(Similar to the pixmaps lab.)

This maps the first 4 KB of somefile to the address mapping.

This mapping will be with shared with all processes mapping the same location in the same file.

Note that the file can be deleted after it is mapped.
```
Executable Loading with `mmap()`

Recall that executables on disk are mapped into memory. This is accomplished using `mmap()`.

The various ELF sections are mapped appropriately:
- `.text` with `PROT_READ | PROT_EXEC`
- `.rodata` with `PROT_READ`
- `.data` with `PROT_READ | PROT_WRITE`

The text and read-only data can be `MAP_SHARED` to save RAM.

The BSS is an anonymous mapping using `MAP_ANONYMOUS` and `PROT_READ | PROT_WRITE`. 
Shared Memory Without a File

Mapping a file to share memory can be convenient:
- It persists when no process is using it
- It persists between reboots
- It can be easily analyzed with standard utilities

Mappings can also be created without a file.

The `shm_open()` system call creates a file descriptor referencing a kernel memory buffer.

The file descriptor returned by `shm_open()` is usable with `mmap()`. 
Consistency

Many problems with memory and concurrency are with consistency.

Within the dedicated computer model, we have expectations:

- Writing to a memory location is immediate
- Writes to a memory location are durable

With concurrent flows, these expectations can break.

We have already seen how to mitigate this with synchronization.

However, synchronization must control more than timing.
Temporal Synchronization

Up to now, we have thought of synchronization as a temporal construction:

- Operation $o_1$ occurs before operation $o_2$
- A sequence of operations is not interrupted

However, there are also spatial concerns.

- An operation is visible to another part of the system.
Modern computers have many layers of caching.

Some of these caches are shared, some are local:

- Local to a particular CPU core (*E.g.*, L1)
- Local to a subset of cores (*E.g.*, L3)
- Local to a process
- …

Writes to a local cache may not be visible to concurrent flows.
Caching Structure

Each level of cache stores blocks from the next level.

L1: 7 3 4
L2: 2 7 3 9 4
L3: 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4

Reads come from the first level with the desired data.

 Writes eventually propagate to all levels.
Write Propagation

The consistency problem comes from that eventually: Writes eventually propagate to all levels.

If a cache is local to a core or set of cores, reads from other cores will not reflect its contents.

Consider registers: only one core sees them!

As previously discussed:

- Many operations (even instructions) have multiple steps
- Some of those steps are performed in registers
Write Propagation Problem

Consider:

- Core C₀ executes a write for memory location m
- The write is stored to C₀’s L1 cache
- Core C₁ executes a read for memory location m
- The location m is not in C₁’s L1 or L2
- C₁ reads m from shared L3
- C₀’s L1 propagates m to C₀’s L2
- C₀’s L2 propagates m to the shared L3
Write Propagation II

Temporal synchronization can guarantee that a register is written to memory.

To guarantee it isn’t cached, we need memory barriers.

A memory barrier does one or more of:

- Blocks the current core until a write is visible to all cores
- Blocks the current core until all writes are visible
- Blocks all cores from accessing a location until a write is visible
- …
Memory Barriers

Memory barriers are sometimes called memory fences\(^2\).

Memory barriers are hardware functions.

Most processors have barrier instructions.

For example:
- `mfence` on x86-64
- `dmb` on ARM
- many atomic instructions

\(^2\)A memory barrier and a synchronization barrier are not the same thing.
Write Propagation with Barriers

Consider:

- Core $C_0$ executes a write for memory location $m$
- The write is stored to $C_0$’s L1 cache
- Core $C_1$ issues a barrier for all writes to $m$
- Core $C_1$ executes a read for memory location $m$
- Core $C_1$ blocks because $C_0$ is writing $m$
- $C_0$’s L1 propagates $m$ to $C_0$’s L2
- $C_0$’s L2 propagates $m$ to the shared L3
- $C_1$ reads $m$ from shared L3
Synchronization and Barriers

Synchronization primitives use memory barriers.

These functions, for example, all have barriers:

- `fork()`
- `pthread_mutex_lock()`
- `pthread_mutex_unlock()`
- `pthread_create()`
- `pthread_join()`
- ...

Basically all of the POSIX synchronization functions.
C and Memory Barriers

The C language makes very few guarantees regarding barriers.

C11 has some fence (barrier) operations.

C99 does not expose barriers.

In general libraries or OS functions (such as Pthreads) are required for thread-safe operation in C.

Some C compilers may provide barriers (e.g., __builtin_ia32_mfence() in GCC).
Summary

- Caching and CPU architecture require more than just temporal synchronization
- Memory barriers force data visibility across cores
- Memory barriers are a hardware feature
- POSIX synchronization primitives use memory barriers
- Shared memory requires kernel assistance
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