Producer/Consumer (Bounded Buffer)

- one or more *producer* threads add to a buffer
- one or more *consumer* threads remove from the buffer
- the buffer has a fixed size
  - can't add when it is full
  - can't remove when it is empty

First Try

```
int buffer;
int count = 0; // initially, empty

void put(int value) {
    assert(count == 0);
    count = 1;
    buffer = value;
}

int get() {
    assert(count == 1);
    count = 0;
    return buffer;
}
```

```
void *producer(void *arg) {
    int i;
    int loops = (int) arg;
    for (i = 0; i < loops; i++) {
        put(i);
    }
}

void *consumer(void *arg) {
    while (1) {
        int tmp = get();
        printf("%d\n", tmp);
    }
}
```

- does this work?
  - no, unless the `put` and `get` calls are interleaved exactly right – two `puts` in a row or two `gets` in a row will result in a violated assertion
  - also race conditions within `put` and `get` themselves

Second Try

add a condition variable to wait for expected buffer status

```
int loops; // must initialize somewhere...
cond_t  cond;
mutex_t mutex;

void *producer(void *arg) {
    int i;
    for (i = 0; i < loops; i++) {
        Pthread_mutex_lock(&mutex);            // p1
        if (count == 1)                        // p2
            Pthread_cond_wait(&cond, &mutex); // p3
        put(i);                                // p4
        Pthread_cond_signal(&cond);            // p5
        Pthread_mutex_unlock(&mutex);          // p6
    }
}

void *consumer(void *arg) {
    int i;
    for (i = 0; i < loops; i++) {
        Pthread_mutex_lock(&mutex);            // c1
        if (count == 0)                        // c2
            Pthread_cond_wait(&cond, &mutex); // c3
        int tmp = get();                       // c4
        Pthread_cond_signal(&cond);            // c5
        Pthread_mutex_unlock(&mutex);          // c6
        printf("%d\n", tmp);
    }
}
```

two consumers, one producer

T_{c1}	State	T_{c2}	State	T_p	State	Count	*Comment*
c1	Run		Ready		Ready	0	
c2	Run		Ready		Ready	0	
c3	Sleep		Ready		Ready	0	Nothing to get
	Sleep		Ready	p1	Run	0	
	Sleep		Ready	p2	Run	0	
	Sleep		Ready	p4	Run	1	Buffer now full
	Ready		Ready	p5	Run	1	T_{c1} awoken
	Ready		Ready	p6	Run	1	
	Ready		Ready	p1	Run	1	
	Ready		Ready	p2	Run	1	
	Ready		Ready	p3	Sleep	1	Buffer full; sleep
	Ready	c1	Run		Sleep	1	T_{c2} sneaks in ...
	Ready	c2	Run		Sleep	1	
	Ready	c4	Run		Sleep	0	... and grabs data
	Ready	c5	Run		Ready	0	T_p awoken
	Ready	c6	Run		Ready	0	
c4	Run		Ready		Ready	0	Oh oh! No data

doesn't work

assumption is that when `wait` returns, the buffer is ready for us – but with more than one producer or consumer, another one could sneak in and invalidate that before we get a chance to run

Third Try

`while` instead of `if`

```
int loops; // must initialize somewhere...
cond_t  cond;
mutex_t mutex;

void *producer(void *arg) {
    int i;
    for (i = 0; i < loops; i++) {
        Pthread_mutex_lock(&mutex);            // p1
        while (count == 1)                     // p2
            Pthread_cond_wait(&cond, &mutex); // p3
        put(i);                                // p4
        Pthread_cond_signal(&cond);            // p5
        Pthread_mutex_unlock(&mutex);          // p6
    }
}

void *consumer(void *arg) {
    int i;
    for (i = 0; i < loops; i++) {
        Pthread_mutex_lock(&mutex);            // c1
        while (count == 0)                     // c2
            Pthread_cond_wait(&cond, &mutex); // c3
        int tmp = get();                       // c4
        Pthread_cond_signal(&cond);            // c5
        Pthread_mutex_unlock(&mutex);          // c6
        printf("%d\n", tmp);
    }
}
```

two consumers, one producer

T_{c1}	State	T_{c2}	State	T_p	State	Count	*Comment*
c1	Run		Ready		Ready	0	
c2	Run		Ready		Ready	0	
c3	Sleep		Ready		Ready	0	Nothing to get
	Sleep	c1	Run		Ready	0	
	Sleep	c2	Run		Ready	0	
	Sleep	c3	Sleep		Ready	0	Nothing to get
	Sleep		Sleep	p1	Run	0	
	Sleep		Sleep	p2	Run	0	
	Sleep		Sleep	p4	Run	1	Buffer now full
	Ready		Sleep	p5	Run	1	T_{c1} awoken
	Ready		Sleep	p6	Run	1	
	Ready		Sleep	p1	Run	1	
	Ready		Sleep	p2	Run	1	
	Ready		Sleep	p3	Sleep	1	Must sleep (full)
c2	Run		Sleep		Sleep	1	Recheck condition
c4	Run		Sleep		Sleep	0	T_{c1} grabs data
c5	Run		Ready		Sleep	0	Oops! Woke T_{c2}
c6	Run		Ready		Sleep	0	
c1	Run		Ready		Sleep	0	
c2	Run		Ready		Sleep	0	
c3	Sleep		Ready		Sleep	0	Nothing to get
	Sleep	c2	Run		Sleep	0	
	Sleep	c3	Sleep		Sleep	0	Everyone asleep...

the problem of a buffer status change between waking and access is fixed

but a single condition variable means that both producers and consumers wait, and thus a thread can be woken by another thread of the same kind rather than the opposite...and if it can't do its job, it goes back to sleep and no one else gets signaled

Fourth Try

separate condition variables for empty buffer and full buffer

```
int buffer;
int count = 0; // initially, empty

void put(int value) {
    assert(count == 0);
    count = 1;
    buffer = value;
}

int get() {
    assert(count == 1);
    count = 0;
    return buffer;
}
```

```
int loops; // must initialize somewhere...
cond_t  empty, fill;
mutex_t mutex;

void *producer(void *arg) {
    int i;
    for (i = 0; i < loops; i++) {
        Pthread_mutex_lock(&mutex);
        while (count == 1)
            Pthread_cond_wait(&empty, &mutex);
        put(i);
        Pthread_cond_signal(&fill);
        Pthread_mutex_unlock(&mutex);
    }
}
void *consumer(void *arg) {
    int i;
    for (i = 0; i < loops; i++) {
        Pthread_mutex_lock(&mutex);
        while (count == 0)
            Pthread_cond_wait(&fill, &mutex);
        int tmp = get();
        Pthread_cond_signal(&empty);
        Pthread_mutex_unlock(&mutex);
        printf("%d\n", tmp);
    }
}
```

- does this work?
  yes!

the buffer itself is not thread safe – why is this not a problem?

separate condition variables is a better solution than broadcast – avoids waking up threads that will just end up going back to sleep right away

Full Producer/Consumer Solution

```
int buffer[MAX];
int fill_ptr = 0;
int use_ptr  = 0;
int count    = 0;

void put(int value) {
    buffer[fill_ptr] = value;
    fill_ptr = (fill_ptr + 1) % MAX;
    count++;
}
int get() {
    int tmp = buffer[use_ptr];
    use_ptr = (use_ptr + 1) % MAX;
    count--;
    return tmp;
}
```

add more slots to the buffer

use a circular array implementation of a queue – `use_ptr` at the head, `fill_ptr` at the tail – to avoid shifting and achieve O(1) operations

```
int loops; // must initialize somewhere...
cond_t empty, fill;
mutex_t mutex;

void *producer(void *arg) {
    int i;
    for (i = 0; i < loops; i++) {
        Pthread_mutex_lock(&mutex);
        while (count == MAX)
            Pthread_cond_wait(&empty, &mutex);
        put(i);
        Pthread_cond_signal(&fill);
        Pthread_mutex_unlock(&mutex);
    }
}

void *consumer(void *arg) {
    int i;
    for (i = 0; i < loops; i++) {
        Pthread_mutex_lock(&mutex);
        while (count == 0)
            Pthread_cond_wait(&fill, &mutex);
        int tmp = get();
        Pthread_cond_signal(&empty);
        Pthread_mutex_unlock(&mutex);
        printf("%d\n", tmp);
    }
}
```


`wait`/`signal` Best Practices

- it is required to hold a lock when calling `wait`
- it is a good idea to hold the (same) lock when calling `signal`
  - not always required for correctness, but avoids bugs in cases where it is needed

---

- use a loop instead of `if` to check conditions
  - protects against state being changed between ready and running
  - avoids problems from spurious wakeups (`signal` waking more than one thread)

> When using condition variables there is always a boolean predicate involving shared variables associated with each condition wait that is true if the thread should proceed. Spurious wakeups from the *pthread_cond_wait()* or *pthread_cond_timedwait()* functions may occur. Since the return from *pthread_cond_wait()* or *pthread_cond_timedwait()* does not imply anything about the value of this predicate, the predicate should be re-evaluated upon such return.

Covering Conditions

```
// how many bytes of the heap are free?
int bytesLeft = MAX_HEAP_SIZE;

// need lock and condition too
cond_t  c;
mutex_t m;

void *
allocate(int size) {
    Pthread_mutex_lock(&m);
    while (bytesLeft < size)
        Pthread_cond_wait(&c, &m);
    void *ptr = ...; // get mem from heap
    bytesLeft -= size;
    Pthread_mutex_unlock(&m);
    return ptr;
}

void free(void *ptr, int size) {
    Pthread_mutex_lock(&m);
    // return some memory to the heap
    bytesLeft += size;
    Pthread_cond_signal(&c);
    Pthread_mutex_unlock(&m);
}
```

if there isn't enough memory available, wait until some is freed

more memory is available – wake a thread that is waiting

...but which one? waking up a thread that needs more memory than is available will prevent one that doesn't from running

Covering Conditions

```
// how many bytes of the heap are free?
int bytesLeft = MAX_HEAP_SIZE;

// need lock and condition too
cond_t  c;
mutex_t m;

void *
allocate(int size) {
    Pthread_mutex_lock(&m);
    while (bytesLeft < size)
        Pthread_cond_wait(&c, &m);
    void *ptr = ...; // get mem from heap
    bytesLeft -= size;
    Pthread_mutex_unlock(&m);
    return ptr;
}

void free(void *ptr, int size) {
    Pthread_mutex_lock(&m);
    // return some memory to the heap
    bytesLeft += size;
    Pthread_cond_broadcast(&c);
    Pthread_mutex_unlock(&m);
}
```

instead wake up all threads

this is a *covering condition* – waking up all threads when memory is freed covers all of the specific cases where a particular thread needs to wake up

`wait`/`signal` Best Practices

- if things only work with `broadcast` instead of `signal`, fix the bug instead
  - waking up threads unnecessarily introduces additional overhead
  - reserve `broadcast` for when it is truly necessary