A Review/Tour of Concurrency & Parallelism

CMPT 886 Automated Software Analysis & Security Nick Sumner

Seeking out performance

- Improving performance can come from tuning
 - Algorithmic complexity
 - Memory access patterns
 - Concurrency
 - Parallelism

Seeking out performance

- Improving performance can come from tuning
 - Algorithmic complexity
 - Memory access patterns
 - Concurrency
 - Parallelism
- As processor speeds have slowed increasing, much focus has been placed on the last two

- **Concurrency** is the management of multiple tasks at the same time.
 - e.g. Sharing a CPU across multiple processes.

- **Concurrency** is the management of multiple tasks at the same time.
 - e.g. Sharing a CPU across multiple processes.



Sequential

- **Concurrency** is the management of multiple tasks at the same time.
 - e.g. Sharing a CPU across multiple processes.



- **Concurrency** is the management of multiple tasks at the same time.
 - e.g. Sharing a CPU across multiple processes.
- **Parallelism** is using multiple resources to perform multiple tasks at the same time.
 - e.g. multiple cores for tasks, vector instructions

- **Concurrency** is the management of multiple tasks at the same time.
 - e.g. Sharing a CPU across multiple processes.
- **Parallelism** is using multiple resources to perform multiple tasks at the same time.
 - e.g. multiple cores for tasks, vector instructions



• Large problems can sometimes be split into parallel tasks, and the effects of the parallel tasks combined





• Large problems can sometimes be split into parallel tasks, and the effects of the parallel tasks combined



• The best possible running time is determined by the *critical path* or *span* of dependent tasks through the program.

• Large problems can sometimes be split into parallel tasks, and the effects of the parallel tasks combined



• The best possible running time is determined by the *critical path* or *span* of dependent tasks through the program.

- Large problems can sometimes be split into parallel tasks, and the This is too optimistic! Why?
- The best possible running time is determined by the *critical path* or *span* of dependent tasks through the program.

• There are often more tasks than compute resources

- There are often more tasks than compute resources
 - Brent's Theorem describes the time accounting for limits

Given p processors, $\frac{\text{Time}_1}{p} \le \text{Time}_p \le \frac{\text{Time}_1}{p} + \text{Time}_\infty$

- There are often more tasks than compute resources
 - Brent's Theorem describes the time accounting for limits

Given p processors, $\frac{\text{Time}_1}{p} \le \text{Time}_p \le \frac{\text{Time}_1}{p} + \text{Time}_\infty$

• Identifying good opportunities for effective parallelism is open to research

- There are often more tasks than compute resources
 - Brent's Theorem describes the time accounting for limits

Given p processors,
$$\frac{\text{Time}_1}{p} \le \text{Time}_p \le \frac{\text{Time}_1}{p} + \text{Time}_{\infty}$$

- Identifying good opportunities for effective parallelism is open to research
 - Profiling for tasks to extract
 - Understanding the effect of speeding specific tasks

. . .

Correctness issues

- Parallel & concurrent code is challenging to write
 - Nondeterministic timing
 - Actions of one task may subtly affect others

Correctness issues

- Parallel & concurrent code is challenging to write
 - Nondeterministic timing
 - Actions of one task may subtly affect others
- Specifically
 - Deadlock / Livelock
 - Starvation
 - Data races
 - Atomicity violations
 - Order violations

Correctness issues

- Parallel & concurrent code is challenging to write
 - Nondeterministic timing
 - Actions of one task may subtly affect others
- Specifically
 - Deadlock / Livelock
 - Starvation
 - Data races

 Atomicity violations 3 97% of real world
 Order violations 3 concurrency bugs [Lu, ASPLOS 2008]

• A data race occurs when:

A data race occurs when:
1) two threads access the same location

A data race occurs when:

 two threads access the same location
 the accesses are *logically simultaneous*

- A data race occurs when:
 - - 3) at least one access is a write (WAW, WAR, RAR)

- A data race occurs when:
 - 1) two threads access the same location 2) the accesses are *logically simultaneous*
 - 3) at least one access is a write (WAW, WAR, RAR)



$$\begin{array}{c} x++ \\ & \longrightarrow \\ x = tmp \end{array}$$

 $tmp_1 = x$ $tmp_1 = tmp_1+1$ $x = tmp_1$

 $tmp_2 = x$ $tmp_2 = tmp_2+1$ $x = tmp_2$





- Sometimes a developer will make use of a data race
 - Avoid expensive synchronization
 - The race looks "benign" or harmless

- Sometimes a developer will make use of a data race
 - Avoid expensive synchronization
 - The race looks "benign" or harmless
- Both programming languages and hardware have memory models that determine what is *really* okay

- Sometimes a developer will make use of a data race
 - Avoid expensive synchronization
 - The race looks "benign" or harmless
- Both programming languages and hardware have memory models that determine what is really okay
 - A *memory model* determines what values may be read by a given memory access, esp. w.r.t. previous writes [CACM 2010, PLDI 2018]

```
if (!init) {
   lock();
   if (!init) {
      data = create();
      init = true;
   unlock();
}
tmp = data;
```

[Boehm, Hotpar 2011]

```
if (!init) {
    lock();
    if (!init) {
        data = create();
        init = true;
    }
    unlock();
}
tmp = data;
```

[Boehm, Hotpar 2011]

- Threads race on init
- The compiler assumes no races while optimizing

```
if (!init) {
   lock();
   if (!init) {
      data = create();
      init = true;
   unlock();
tmp = data;
  [Boehm, Hotpar 2011]
```

- Threads race on init
- The compiler assumes no races while optimizing

```
if (!init) {
   lock();
   if (!init) {
      init = true;
      data = create();
  unlock();
     = data;
```

```
if (!init) {
   lock();
   if (!init) {
      data = create();
      init = true;
   unlock();
tmp = data;
  [Boehm, Hotpar 2011]
```

- Threads race on init
- The compiler assumes no races while optimizing tmp = data;

if (!init) { lock(); if (!init) { data = create(); tmp = data; init = true; unlock();

```
local = counter;
if (local > localMax) {
    handler = ...;
}
update = work();
if (local > localMax) {
    handler(update);
}
```

[Boehm, Hotpar 2011]

local = counter; if (local > localMax) { handler = ...; } update = work(); if (local > localMax) { handler(update);

[Boehm, Hotpar 2011]

• Data race freedom allows extra reads.

```
local = counter;
if (local > localMax) {
    handler = ...;
}
update = work();
if (counter > localMax) {
    handler(update);
}
```


[Dolan, PLDI 2018]

• Races can introduce bugs on non-racy variables

c = a + 10 ... b = a + 10

[Dolan, PLDI 2018]

$$\begin{array}{l} a=1 \\ flag=true \end{array} \begin{array}{l} a=2 \\ f=flag \\ b=a \\ c=a \end{array}$$

[Dolan, PLDI 2018]

• Races can jump forward and backward in time

$$\begin{array}{l} a=1 \\ flag=true \end{array} & \begin{array}{l} a=2 \\ f=flag \\ b=a \\ c=a \end{array}$$

[Dolan, PLDI 2018]

• Races can jump forward and backward in time

This can happen in Java when flag is volatile & b is a complex reference

$$a = 2$$

$$a = 1$$

$$flag = true$$

$$f = flag$$

$$b = a$$

$$c = 2$$

$$\begin{array}{l} a=1 \\ flag=true \end{array} & \begin{array}{l} a=2 \\ f=flag \\ b=a \\ c=a \end{array}$$

[Dolan, PLDI 2018]

• Races can jump forward and backward in time

This can happen in Java when flag is volatile & b is a complex reference

• Memory models are often specified using Happens-Before relations.

- Memory models are often specified using Happens-Before relations.
 - a partial order over logical time (recall: simultaneously)
 - defined behavior occurs when writes & reads are ordered

- Memory models are often specified using Happens-Before relations.
 - a partial order over logical time (recall: *simultaneously*)
 - defined behavior occurs when writes & reads are ordered
 - lock/unlock, fork/join constrain order
 - access to volatile variables keeps per variable order

- Memory models are often specified using Happens-Before relations.
 - a partial order over logical time (recall: *simultaneously*)
 - defined behavior occurs when writes & reads are ordered
 - lock/unlock, fork/join constrain order
 - access to volatile variables keeps per variable order
- Happens-Before ordering of a specific execution can be tracked to identify bugs

T1 T2



lock() tmp = x tmp = tmp+1 x = tmp unlock()

T1 T2



T1 T2







- Note, this only detects races in the current execution!
 - Sound predictive data race detection can extend it across other executions [PLDI 2017/2018]

- Note, this only detects races in the current execution!
 - Sound predictive data race detection can extend it across other executions [PLDI 2017/2018]
- Requires careful tracking of dependences
 - Careful construction of logical time using vector clocks [JVM 2001, PLDI 2009]

T1 T2



T1 T2



T1 T2

lock(a) write x unlock(a)

write x

write y

lock(a) read x unlock(a) Clocks T1↦[1,0] T2↦[0,0] Shadow Memory X → R[0,0] W[1,0]

y → R[0,0]

W[0,0]

T1 T2



T1 T2



T1 T2

lock(a) write x unlock(a)

write x

write y

lock(a) read x unlock(a) Clocks T1↦[2,0] T2↦[2,1] Shadow Memory X → R[2,1] W[1,0] y → R[0,0] W[0,0]

T1 T2

lock(a) write x unlock(a)

write x

write y

lock(a) read x **unlock(a)** Clocks T1↦[2,0] T2↦[2,2] Shadow Memory X → R[2,1] W[1,0] y → R[0,0] W[0,0]

T1 T2

lock(a) write x unlock(a)

write x

write y

lock(a) read x unlock(a) Clocks T1↦[2,0] T2↦[2,2] Shadow Memory X → R[2,1] W[2,0] y → R[0,0] W[0,0]

T1 T2

write y

lock(a)

read x

lock(a) write x unlock(a)

write x

Clocks Shadow Memory $x \mapsto R[2,1]$ $T1 \mapsto [2,0]$ W[2,0] T2 → [2,2] $y \mapsto R[0,0]$ W[0,0]unlock(a)

> $C(R,X) \not\subseteq C(W,X) \rightarrow race!$ (simplified for this case)

- Lack of synchronization arises with complex locking
- We can dynamically track the locks guarding an address!

- Lack of synchronization arises with complex locking
- We can dynamically track the locks guarding an address! T1 T2

lock(a); lock(b) read y write x unlock(b) write x unlock(a) Shadow Memory

y⊷a,b x⊷a,b

lock(b) write x unlock(b)

- Lack of synchronization arises with complex locking
- We can dynamically track the locks guarding an address! T1 T2

lock(b) write x

unlock(b)

lock(a); lock(b) read y write x unlock(b) **write x** unlock(a) Shadow Memory

y⊷a,b <mark>x⊷a</mark>

- Lack of synchronization arises with complex locking
- We can dynamically track the locks guarding an address! T1 T2

lock(a); lock(b) read y write x unlock(b) write x unlock(a) Shadow Memory



lock(b) write x unlock(b)

- Lack of synchronization arises with complex locking
- We can dynamically track the locks guarding an address! T1 T2

lock(b) write x

unlock(b)

lock(a); lock(b) read y write x unlock(b) write x unlock(a) Shadow Memory

y⊷a,b x⊷{}

Note: Both x and y are always protected by locks. x *still* races.

- Lockset based data race detection has many issues
 - Synchronization may be fork/join, wait/notify based
 - Initialization --> Process in Parallel --> Combine
 - Richer parallel designs

- Lockset based data race detection has many issues
 - Synchronization may be fork/join, wait/notify based
 - Initialization --> Process in Parallel --> Combine
 - Richer parallel designs
- Tends to have many false positives

Order Violations

• Some accesses are wrongly assumed to occur before others

x = new Data

T1

T2

x->datum wait/notify or condition variables can fix these

Atomicity Violations

- Data races are a matter of perspective
 - Fine grained locking doesn't solve much.

Atomicity Violations

- Data races are a matter of perspective
 - Fine grained locking doesn't solve much.

UNIOCK

Atomicity Violations

- Data races are a matter of perspective
 - Fine grained locking doesn't solve much.


- Data races are a matter of perspective
 - Fine grained locking doesn't solve much.
- An execution (or fragment thereof) is *atomic* if it is equivalent to a sequentially executed one.

- Data races are a matter of perspective
 - Fine grained locking doesn't solve much.
- An execution (or fragment thereof) is *atomic* if it is equivalent to a sequentially executed one.

- Acq(m) - Rd(y,0) - Rd(x,0) - Wr(y,1) - Wr(x,1) - Wr(y,2) - Rel(m) -

- Data races are a matter of perspective
 - Fine grained locking doesn't solve much.
- An execution (or fragment thereof) is *atomic* if it is equivalent to a sequentially executed one.

$$-Acq(m) - Rd(y,0) - Rd(x,0) - Wr(y,1) - Wr(x,1) - Wr(y,2) - Rel(m) \rightarrow Acq(m) - Rd(x,0) - Wr(x,1) - Rel(m) - Rd(y,0) - Wr(y,1) - Wr(y,2) \rightarrow Acq(m) - Rd(x,0) - Wr(x,1) - Rel(m) - Rd(y,0) - Wr(y,1) - Wr(y,2) - Product of the second seco$$

- Data races are a matter of perspective
 - Fine grained locking doesn't solve much.
- An execution (or fragment thereof) is *atomic* if it is equivalent to a sequentially executed one.
 - This also takes care of data races
 - Similar to notions from databases (serializability & linearizability)

• How can we find atomicity violations?

- How can we find atomicity violations (or correctness)?
 - Lipton's Theory of Reduction [CACM '75, POPL '04]

- How can we find atomicity violations (or correctness)?
 - Lipton's Theory of Reduction [CACM '75, POPL '04]
- Acq(m) Rd(y,0) Rd(x,0) Wr(y,1) Wr(x,1) Wr(y,2) Rel(m) -

- How can we find atomicity violations (or correctness)?
 - Lipton's Theory of Reduction [CACM '75, POPL '04]



- How can we find atomicity violations (or correctness)?
 - Lipton's Theory of Reduction [CACM '75, POPL '04]
- $Acq(m) Rd(y,0) Rd(x,0) Wr(y,1) Wr(x,1) Wr(y,2) Rel(m) \rightarrow$ $Acq(m) Rd(x,0) Wr(x,1) Rel(m) Rd(y,0) Wr(y,1) Wr(y,2) \rightarrow$

- How can we find atomicity violations (or correctness)?
 - Lipton's Theory of Reduction [CACM '75, POPL '04]
 - 2 thread atomicity patterns [Lu ASPLOS '06]

- How can we find atomicity violations (or correctness)?
 - Lipton's Theory of Reduction [CACM '75, POPL '04]
 - 2 thread atomicity patterns [Lu ASPLOS '06]



Only some patterns are unserializable. Detect unlikely issues via training.

- How can we find atomicity violations (or correctness)?
 - Lipton's Theory of Reduction [CACM '75, POPL '04]
 - 2 thread atomicity patterns [Lu ASPLOS '06]
 - Conflict graphs [PLDI '08, RV '11]

- How can we find atomicity violations (or correctness)?
 - Lipton's Theory of Reduction [CACM '75, POPL '04]
 - 2 thread atomicity patterns [Lu ASPLOS '06]
 - Conflict graphs [PLDI '08, RV '11]



- How can we find atomicity violations (or correctness)?
 - Lipton's Theory of Reduction [CACM '75, POPL '04]
 - 2 thread atomicity patterns [Lu ASPLOS '06]
 - Conflict graphs [PLDI '08, RV '11]



- How can we find atomicity violations (or correctness)?
 - Lipton's Theory of Reduction [CACM '75, POPL '04]
 - 2 thread atomicity patterns [Lu ASPLOS '06]
 - Conflict graphs [PLDI '08, RV '11]





- How can we find atomicity violations (or correctness)?
 - Lipton's Theory of Reduction [CACM '75, POPL '04]
 - 2 thread atomicity patterns [Lu ASPLOS '06]
 - Conflict graphs [PLDI '08, RV '11]



- How can we find atomicity violations (or correctness)?
 - Lipton's Theory of Reduction [CACM '75, POPL '04]
 - 2 thread atomicity patterns [Lu ASPLOS '06]
 - Conflict graphs [PLDI '08, RV '11]





- How can we find atomicity violations (or correctness)?
 - Lipton's Theory of Reduction [CACM '75, POPL '04]
 - 2 thread atomicity patterns [Lu ASPLOS '06]
 - Conflict graphs [PLDI '08, RV '11]





- How can we find atomicity violations (or correctness)?
 - Lipton's Theory of Reduction [CACM '75, POPL '04]
 - 2 thread atomicity patterns [Lu ASPLOS '06]
 - Conflict graphs [PLDI '08, RV '11]
- How do we know what regions should be atomic?

• What if we don't already have a buggy execution?

- What if we don't already have a buggy execution?
- Explore bounded schedules
 - 2 threads and few pre-emptions finds most bugs

- What if we don't already have a buggy execution?
- Explore bounded schedules
 - 2 threads and few pre-emptions finds most bugs
- Careful schedule generation & selection

- What if we don't already have a buggy execution?
- Explore bounded schedules
 - 2 threads and few pre-emptions finds most bugs
- Careful schedule generation & selection
- Generate API unit tests targeting concurrency
 - Small enough for exhaustive schedule exploration

Other Directions

- Shepherding toward good behaviors
- Tolerating & avoiding on the fly
- Static analysis

Summary

- Parallelism is important for modern performance
- Choosing what to parallelize can be hard
- Parallelizing correctly can be very hard

Summary

- Parallelism is important for modern performance
- Choosing what to parallelize can be hard
- Parallelizing correctly can be very hard

And the hard problems are interesting to study.