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Introduction

Shared memory multiprocessors
- Various different architectures
- All have hardware support for mutual exclusion
  - Various flavors of atomic read-modify-write instruction
  - Can be used directly or to build higher level abstractions

This paper focuses on *spin locks*
- Used to protect short critical sections
- Arguably the simplest of the higher level abstractions

The challenge
- How to implement scalable, low-latency spin locks on multiprocessors
Multiprocessor Architecture

Two dimensions:
- Interconnect type (bus or multistage network)
- Cache coherence strategy

Six architectures considered:
- Bus: no cache coherence
- Bus: snoopy write through invalidation cache coherence
- Bus: snoopy write-back invalidation cache coherence
- Bus: snoopy distributed write cache coherence
- Multistage network: no cache coherence
- Multistage network: invalidation based cache coherence
MESI Cache Coherence

Cache line states:
- Modified
- Exclusive
- Shared
- Invalid
MESI State Transitions
MESI Messages

Read (cache line address)
Read Response (data)
Invalidate (cache line address)
Invalidate Acknowledge
Read Invalidate (cache line address)
Writeback (address, data)
Messages Take Time!
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Atomic Instructions

The paper based on Test-and-set instruction
- A lock is a single word variable with two values
- HELD or FREE

Test-and-set does the following *atomically*
- Store HELD in lock and return its previous value

If the return value is FREE then you got the lock!
- So continue

If the return value is HELD then someone else already had the lock
- So try again
Spin on Test-and-Set

```c
while (TestAndSet(lock) = BUSY);
<critical section>
Lock := CLEAR;
```

Tradeoff: frequent polling gets you the lock faster, but slows everyone else down!
If you fix this problem using a more complex algorithm latency may become an issue
Spin on Read

Test-and-Test-and-Set

while (lock = BUSY or TestAndSet(lock) = BUSY);
<critical section>
lock := CLEAR;

Intended for architectures with per-CPU caches
- Why should it perform much better?
- Why might it not perform much better?
Time to Quiescence

- When the lock is released its value is modified, hence all cached copies of it are invalidated
- Subsequent reads on all processors miss in cache, hence generating bus contention
- Many see the lock free at the same time because there is a delay in satisfying the cache miss of the one that will eventually succeed in getting the lock next
- Many attempt to set it using TSL
- Each attempt generates contention and invalidates all copies
- All but one attempt fails, causing the CPU to revert to reading
- The first read misses in the cache!
- By the time all this is over, the critical section has completed and the lock has been freed again!
Spin on TSL vs Spin on Read

Fig. 1. Principal performance comparison: elapsed time (second) to execute benchmark (measured). Each processor loops one million/P times: acquire lock, do critical section, release lock, and compute.
Quiescence Time

Fig. 2. Time to quiesce, spin on read (microseconds).
Improving Performance

Paper presents 5 alternative approaches
- 4 are based on CSMA-CD network strategies
- Approaches differ by:
  - Where to wait
  - Whether wait time is determined statically or dynamically

Where to wait
- Delay only on attempted set
  - spin on read, notice release then delay before setting
- Delay after every memory access
  - Better for architectures where spin on read generates contention!
Delay Only on Attempted Set

while (lock=BUSY or TestAndSet(lock)=BUSY)
begin
    while (lock=BUSY); /* spin on read without delay */
    delay(); /* delay before TestAndSet */
end;
<critical section>

Cuts contention and invalidations by adding latency between retries

Performance is good if:
- Delay is short and there are few other spinners
- Delay is long but there are many spinners
Delay on Every Access

while (lock=BUSY or TestAndSet(lock)=BUSY)
    delay();
<critical section>

Basically, just check the lock less frequently
Good for architectures in which spin on read generates contention (those without caches)
How Long to Delay?

Statically determined
- There is no single “right” answer
  - Sometimes there are many contending threads and sometimes there are few/none
  - If all processors are given the same delay and they conflict once they will conflict repeatedly!
    - Except that one succeeds in the event of a conflict (unlike CSMA-CD networks!)

Dynamically determined
- Based on what?
- How can we estimate number of contending threads?
Static Delay

Each processor is assigned a different static delay (slot)
Few empty slots means good latency
Few crowded slots means little contention
Good performance with:
- Fewer slots, fewer spinning processors
- Many slots, more spinning processors
Overhead vs. Number of Slots

Fig. 4. Spin-waiting overhead (seconds) versus number of slots.
Variable Delay

while(lock=BUSY or TestAndSet(lock)=BUSY)
  delay();
  delay += randomBackoff();
<critical section>

Like Ethernet backoff
- If processor collides with another processor, it backs off for a greater random interval each time
- Indirectly, processors base back-off interval on the number of spinning processors
Problems with Backoff

Both dynamic and static backoff are bad when the critical section is long: they just keep backing off while the lock is being held.

- Failing in test-and-set is not necessarily a sign of many spinning threads!

Maximum time to delay should be bounded

Initial delay on arrival should be a fraction of the last delay
Queueing

Delay-based approaches try to separate contending accesses in time.

Queueing separates contending accesses in space

Naïve approach
- Insert each waiting process into a queue
- Each process spins on the flag of the process ahead of it
  - All are spinning on different locations!
  - No cache or bus contention
- But queue insertion and deletion operations require locks
  - Not good for small critical sections – such as queue ops!
Queueing

A more efficient approach

- Each arriving process uses an atomic read and increment instruction to get a unique sequence number
- On completion of the critical section a process releases the process with the next highest sequence number
  - How?
  - Use a sequenced array of flags
  - Each process is spinning reading its own flag (in a separate cache line) – based on its sequence number
  - On release a process sets the flag of the process behind it in the logical queue (next sequence number)

... But you need an atomic read and increment instruction!
Queueing

**Init**
flags[0] := HAS_LOCK;
flags[1..P-1] := MUST_WAIT;
queueLast := 0;

**Lock**
myPlace := ReadAndIncrement(queueLast);
while(flags[myPlace mod P]=MUST_WAIT);
<critical section>

**Unlock**
flags[myPlace mod P] := MUST_WAIT;
flags[(myPlace+1) mod P] := HAS_LOCK;
Spin-Lock Alternatives

Fig. 3. Principal performance comparison: spin-waiting overhead (seconds) in executing the benchmark (measured). Each processor loops one million/$P$ times: acquire lock, do critical section, release lock, and compute.
Queueing Performance

Works especially well for multistage networks – each flag can be on a separate module, so a single memory location isn’t saturated with requests.

Works less well if there’s a bus without caches, because we still have the problem that each process has to poll for a single value in one place (memory).

Lock latency is increased due to overhead, so it has poor performance relative to other approaches when there’s no contention.
Hardware-Specific Implementation

Distributed write coherence
- All processors can share the same global “next” counter

Invalidation-based coherence
- All processors should spin in a different cache line

Non-coherent multistage network
- Processes should poll locations in different memory modules

Non-coherent bus
- Polling can swamp bus
- Delay based on how close to the front a process is
Ticket Lock – a similar idea

Based on two integer values, the *queue* and *dequeue* *tickets*

**Lock:**
- Atomic read and increment the queue ticket
- Compare your value to the dequeue ticket
- While not equal, try again (spin on read)

**Unlock:**
- Atomic increment dequeue ticket
Conclusions

Spin-locking performance doesn’t scale easily
A variant of Ethernet back-off has good results when there is little lock contention
Queuing (parallelizing lock handoff) has good results when there is a lot of contention
A little supportive hardware goes a long way!
Spare Slides
Network Hardware Solutions

Combining Networks
- Combine requests to same lock (forward one only)
- Combining benefit increases with increased contention

Hardware Queuing
- Blocking enter and exit instructions queue processes at memory module
- Eliminate polling across the network

Goodman’s Queue Links
- Stores the name of the next processor in the queue directly in each processor’s cache
- Inform next processor asynchronously (via inter-processor interrupt?)
Bus Hardware Solutions

Use additional bus with write broadcast coherence for TSL (push the new value)
Invalidate cache copies only when Test-and-Set succeeds

Read broadcast
- Whenever some other processor reads a value which I know is invalid, I get a copy of that value too (piggyback)
- Eliminates the cascade of read-misses

Special handling of Test-and-Set
- Cache and bus controllers don’t mess with the bus if the lock is busy
Overhead For Bursty Workload

Fig. 5. Spin-waiting overhead in achieving barrier, normalized by the number of processors (microseconds per processor).