FDS 2012:
Implementing an atomic bit

Administrivia

- Static web page:
  - ✓http://www.inet.tu-berlin.de/menue/teaching0/ss2012/fds12/parameter/en/
- Next tutorial: May 7
- Next class: May 8

The space of registers

- Nb of writers and readers: from 1W1R to NWNR
- Size of the value set: from binary to multi-valued
- Safety properties: safe, regular, atomic



All registers are (computationally) equivalent!

Transformations

From 1W1R binary safe to 1WNR multi-valued atomic

I. From safe to regular (1W1R)
II. From one-reader to multiple-reader (regular binary or multi-valued)
III. From binary to multi-valued (1WNR regular)
IV. From regular to atomic (1W1R)
V. From 1W1R to 1WNR (multi-valued atomic)
VI. From 1WNR to NWNR (multi-valued atomic)

This class

- Implementing an atomic bit
- Atomic snapshot: reading multiple locations atomically

How to implement an atomic bit?

The problem: implement a binary 1W1R atomic register (atomic bit) from binary 1W1R safe ones (safe bits).

A brute-force approach

- Binary 1W1R safe => binary 1W1R regular
- Binary 1W1R regular => multi-valued 1W1R regular
- Multi-valued 1W1R regular => multi-valued 1W1R atomic

The reader never writes (to the base objects), but…

☹ Unbounded # of base safe bits (to account for sequence numbers)

An optimal solution

- No sequence numbers?
- Bounded number of safe bits, O(1)?
- Bounded number of base actions, O(1)?

Can we do it if the reader does not write?

Safe bit to regular bit? Easy

- the writer is allowed only to *change* the value
- What about atomic?



Impossible if the reader does not write for bounded # of regular bits!

Proof sketch (by contradiction):

- Suppose only the writer executes writes on the base (regular) bits.
- Every write operation W(1) is a sequence of writes actions w_1, …w_k on base regular bits
  - ✓Corresponds to the sequence of shared-memory states $s_0,s_1,\ldots,s_k$ (defined for sequential runs)



Proof (contd): digests

- There are only finitely many states!
  (bounded # of base registers)
- Each sequence $s_0,s_1,\ldots,s_k$ of states (though possibly unbounded) defines a digest $d_0,d_1,\ldots,d_m$
  - ✓ $d_0=s_0$, $d_m=s_k$ (same global state transition)
  - ✓ $d_0=s_0$ => i=j (all digest elements are distinct)
  - ✓ for all (d_i,d_{i+1}), exists (s_j,s_{j+1}) such that $s_j=d_i$ and $s_{j+1}=d_{i+1}$
    7,4,8,4,2,8,3 => 7,4,8,3
- Each write operation "looks" like its digest
- There are only finitely many digests!

Proof (contd.): counter-example

- Consider a run with infinitely many alternating writes: $W_1(1)$,W(0),$W_2(1)$,… (no reads)
  - ✓Writes $W_1,W_2,\ldots$ give an infinite sequence of digests $D_1,D_2,\ldots$
- At least one digest $D=d_0,d_1,\ldots,d_m$ appears infinitely often in $D_1,D_2,\ldots$
  - ✓Why?
- We can amend our run with a sequence of reads $R_0,R_1,\ldots,R_m$ (in that order), each R_i "sees" state d_{m-i}
  - ✓How?

Proof (contd.): the "switch"

- R_0 "sees" d_m and, thus, returns 1
  - ✓Could have happened right after W(1)
- R_m "sees" d_0 and, thus, returns 0
  - ✓Could have happened right before W(1)

⇒There exists i such that R_i returns 1 and R_{i+1} returns 0 (by induction on i=0,…,m)

Proof (contd.): contradiction

- The (sequential) execution of R_i and R_{i+1} is indistinguishable (to the reader) from a concurrent one



New-old inversion!

The reader must write

- And the writer must read
- But how the writer would tell what it read?
  - ✓The writer needs at least two bits!
  - ✓Why?
- Suppose the writer writes to one bit only
  - ✓ there are exactly two digests 0,1 and 1,0
  - ✓ suppose infinitely many W(1) operations export digests 0,1
  - ✓new-old inversion:



Optimal construction?

- Two bits for the writer
  - ✓ REG: for storing the current value
  - ✓ WR: for signaling to the reader
- One bit for the reader
  - ✓RR: for signaling to the writer

Necessary, but is it also sufficient?

Evolutionary approach: Iteration 1

The reader should be able to distinguish the two cases:

- ✓A new value was written: WR≠RR:
- ✓The value is unchanged: WR=RR:

Writer:

change REG
if WR=RR then change WR

Reader:

if WR≠RR then change RR
val:= REG
return val

Does not work: the read value does not depend on RR

Iteration 2

Return the "old" value if nothing changed

(local variable val initialized to the initial value of REG)

Writer:

change REG
if WR=RR then change WR

Reader:

if WR=RR then return val
change RR
val:= REG
return val

Counter-example 2

Does not work: a read finds WR≠RR, a subsequent read finds WR≠RR and reads an old value in REG (new-old inversion)



Counter-example 2

1. $w_1(1)$ completes
2. r_1 reads WR, finds WR≠RR and changes RR
3. $w_2(0)$ begins, changes REG to 0, reads RR, finds WR = RR, changes WR, restoring the predicate WR≠RR, and completes
4. $w_3(1)$ begins and starts changing REG from 0 to 1
5. r_1 concurrently reads REG and returns the new value 1
6. r_2 begins, finds RR≠WR, reads REG and returns the old value 0

Iteration 3

Read WR twice, if WR changed while the read is executed, return a conservative (old) value

Writer:

change REG
if WR=RR then change WR

Reader:

if WR=RR then return val
aux := REG
change RR
val:= REG
if WR=RR then return val
return aux

Counter-example 3

Still a problem:

- *aux* gets a new value and *val* gets an old value (the two reads of REG are concurrent with a write on REG)
- succeeding read observes RR=WR (the two reads of WR are concurrent with a write on WR)

Homework: construct the counter-example

Iteration 4

Evaluate *val* again before returning the "old" value (*aux*): to make sure *val* is at at least as old as *aux*

Writer:

change REG
if WR=RR then change WR

Reader:

if WR=RR then return val
aux := REG
change RR
val:= REG
if WR=RR then return val
val:= REG
return aux

Counter-example 4

Still (!) a problem:

Unconditionally changing RR may be invalidated by a concurrent update of WR



Solution: check if WR≠RR again before changing RR

Final solution [Tromp, 1989]

Writer protocol	**Reader protocol**
change REG	(1) if WR=RR then return val
if WR=RR then	(2) aux := REG
change WR	(3) if WR≠RR then change RR
	(4) val :=REG
	(5) if WR=RR then return val
	(6) val := REG
	(7) return aux

Proof sketch: reading functions

A reading function π: for each complete read operation r (returning v), π(r) is *a* write operation w(v)

Show that for every run of the algorithm, there exists an atomic reading function π:

(A0) No read r precedes π(r)
- ✓No read returns a value not yet written

(A1) w precedes r => w=π(r) or w precedes π(r)
- ✓No read obtains an overwritten value

(A2) r_1 precedes r_2 => π(r_2) does not precede π(r_1)
- ✓No new/old inversion

A run is linearizable iff an atomic reading function exists (Section 4.3 of the lecture notes)

Proof: constructing π

- Let r return a value v
- Let ρ_r be the read of REG that got the value of r
  - ✓ If r returns in line 7, ρ_r is the read action in line 2 of r
  - ✓ If r returns in line 5, ρ_r is is the read action in line 4
  - ✓ If r returns in line 1, ρ_r is is the read in line 4 or 6 of some previous r' (depending on how r' returns)
- Let ϕ_r be the last write action on REG that precedes or is concurrent to ρ_r and writes the value returned by r (and ρ_r)
- Define π(r) as the write operation that contains ϕ_r

Proof: show that π is atomic

- A0 is easy: by construction of π, π(r) precedes or is concurrent to r
- A1? A2? Homework

Hint: assume the contrary and come to absurdum