Lamport Clocks

- Distributed systems are inherently concurrent, asynchronous, and nondeterministic, so executing programs on multiple machines requires coordination
- Lamport introduce methods to define an ordering of events
- Want to create a partial ordering of events (instructions, message passing, or whatever)
- Define a happens before relation: $a \rightarrow b$
  - event $a$ happened before event $b$
  - event $a$ can causally affect event $b$

Happens Before Relation

1. If $a$ and $b$ are events in the same process, and $a$ comes before $b$, then $a \rightarrow b$
2. If $a$ is sending of a message by one process and $b$ is the receipt of the same message by another process, then $a \rightarrow b$
3. If $a \rightarrow b$ and $b \rightarrow c$ then $a \rightarrow c$ (transitivity)

- Partial Order: Unordered events are concurrent

Notes

- Midterm exam on April 16
  - sample exam questions posted
- Research project questions?
Logical Clocks

- Clock Condition: For any events $a, b$: if $a \rightarrow b$ then $C_{a} < C_{b}$
- Holds if $C1$ and $C2$ are satisfied:
  - $C1$: If $a$ and $b$ are events in Process $P_i$ and $a$ comes before $b$, then $C_{i,a} < C_{i,b}$
  - $C2$: If $a$ is the sending of a message by process $P_i$ and $b$ is the receipt of that message by process $P_j$, then $C_{i,a} < C_{j,b}$
- Implementation
  - IR1. Each process $P_i$ increments $C_i$ between any two successive events
  - IR2a. If event $a$ is the sending of a message $m$ by Process $P_i$, then the message $m$ contains a timestamp $T_m = C_{i,a}$.
  - IR2b. Upon receiving a message $m$, process $P_j$ sets $C_j$ greater than or equal to its present value and greater than $T_m$.

Total Ordering

- Partial ordering not always enough
- Prioritize processes $P_i \prec P_j$
- Total ordering $a \Rightarrow b$:
  If $a$ is in $P_i$ and $b$ is in $P_j$, then $a \Rightarrow b$ iff
  - $C_{i,a} < C_{j,b}$
  - $C_{i,a} = C_{j,b}$ and $P_i \prec P_j$

Logical Clocks

- Issues with physical clocks (clock drift, etc.)
- For many purposes, it is sufficient to know the order in which events occurred
- BUT: Logical clocks cannot be used to order events outside the system

Strong Clock Condition

- Approach does not take into account external events
- Define new set of events $L$
  - Strong Clock Condition: For any events $a, b$ in $L$:
    - $a \Rightarrow b$ then $C_{a} < C_{b}$
- Achieve strong clock condition with physical clocks
Physical Clocks

- Run continuously
- PC1. Clocks must run at approximately the correct rate
  - \( \exists k. k << 1, |dC(t)/dt-1| < k \)
- PC2. Clocks must be synchronized
  - \( |C_i(t) - C_j(t)| < \epsilon \)
- Minimum message delay \( \mu \)
  - \( C_i(t+\mu) - C_i(t) > 0 \)
- Satisfying Strong Clock Condition:
  - IR1: Each event occurs at a precise instant
  - IR2:
    - If \( P_i \) sends a message \( m \) at physical time \( t \), then \( m \) contains a timestamp \( T_m = C_i(t) \).
    - Upon receiving a message \( m \) at time \( t' \), process \( P_j \) sets \( C_j(t') \) equal to the maximum of \( C_j(t') \) and \( (T_m + \mu_m) \).

Eraser

- What is the problem?
  - Implementing multi-threaded programs is difficult and error prone

- Who cares?
  - Developers (and users) of multi-threaded systems

- What is the approach?
  - Provide tool support to automatically verify synchronization

Other Approaches

- Monitors by Hoare
  - Do not account for dynamically allocated data
- Static race detection
  - Need many test cases to produce reliable results
- Race detection based on Happens Before
  - Inefficient since large amount of information is required

Eraser

- Dynamic data race detection tool
- Supports only lock-based synchronization
- Claim: Simpler, more efficient, and more thorough than approaches based on *happens before*
- Lock
  - Synchronization object used for mutual exclusion
  - Only the owner of a lock may release it (not like a semaphore)
- Data Race
  - More than 1 thread has read or write access to a variable without synchronization, and at least one is doing a write
Lockset Algorithm

- First version: Enforces simple locking discipline
  - Each shared variable is protected by at least one lock
- Problem: Eraser doesn't know which lock is for which variables
- Solution: Infer protection relation from execution history
- Set $C(v)$ of candidate locks for each shared variable $v$
  - Holds the locks that have protected a variable during execution
- Intuition:
  - Every time a thread $t$ accesses a shared variable $v$ it must hold at least one lock $l$
- Algorithm:
  - Initialize $C(v)$ with all locks
  - $C(v) := C(v) \cap \text{locks\_held}(t)$
  - $C(v) = \emptyset \rightarrow$ issue warning

Improvements

- Relax locking discipline
- Initialization: Shared variables initialized w/o holding lock
  - Algorithm “pauses” until variable is accessed by a second thread
- Read-shared data: Variables written during init only and read-only thereafter
  - No races are reported until a second thread writes to variable
- Read-write locks: Multiple readers can access a shared variable but only one writer at a time.
  - Keep track separately of write locks

States of Memory Locations

- Virgin:
  - New data, not referenced
- Exclusive
  - Accessed by one thread
- Shared
  - One write and multiple read accesses
- Shared-Modified
  - Multiple write accesses

Implementation

- Developed for DIGITAL Unix OS
  - now known as Tru64 UNIX (by HP)
- Input: Unmodified program binary
- Output: Instrumented binary that is functionally identical but includes calls to Eraser
- Race report:
  - file + line
  - list of stack frames
  - thread ID, memory address, type of access
Maintaining and Representing Lock Sets

- To maintain $C(v)$
  - Instrument each call to storage allocator to init $C(v)$ for dynamically allocated data
  - Instrument each load/store instruction
- To maintain $lock\_held(t)$
  - Instrument each lock acquire/release (+ initialize/finalize)
- Each 32-bit word on heap or global data is possible shared variable
- List of lock sets for each memory location inefficient
  - Use hash tables to avoid duplicate lock sets
- Shared variables represented by *Shadow Words*
  - 30 bit for lockset index (or thread ID in exclusive state)
  - 2 bit for state condition

Evaluation

- Effectiveness
  - Eraser more efficient than manual validation
- Sensitivity
  - Not sensitive to the number of threads
- Extension to detecting deadlocks possible

Problems

- Slows down program by a factor of 10 to 30
- Removing false positives might be time consuming

Current Status

- Helgrind implements the Lockset algorithm (current web page says it implements *happens before*)
- CheckSync implements Eraser for Java
- Microsoft was working on RaceTrack
  - http://research.microsoft.com/research/sv/racettrack
- Intel?