CS162
Operating Systems and Systems Programming
Lecture 10

Deadlock (cont'd)
Thread Scheduling

February 18, 2010

Ion Stoica

http://inst.eecs.berkeley.edu/~cs162

Review: Deadlock

- Starvation vs. Deadlock
  - Starvation: thread waits indefinitely
  - Deadlock: circular waiting for resources
  - Deadlock⇒Starvation, but not other way around
- Four conditions for deadlocks
  - Mutual exclusion
    - » Only one thread at a time can use a resource
  - Hold and wait
    - » Thread holding at least one resource is waiting to acquire additional resources held by other threads
  - No preemption
    - » Resources are released only voluntarily by the threads
  - Circular wait
    - » There exists a set $\{T_1, \ldots, T_n\}$ of threads with a cyclic waiting pattern

---

Review: Resource Allocation Graph Examples

- Recall:
  - request edge – directed edge $T_1 \rightarrow R_j$
  - assignment edge – directed edge $R_j \rightarrow T_i$



Simple Resource Allocation Graph | Allocation Graph With Deadlock | Allocation Graph With Cycle, but No Deadlock

---

Review: Methods for Handling Deadlocks

- Allow system to enter deadlock and then recover
  - Requires deadlock detection algorithm
  - Some technique for selectively preempting resources and/or terminating tasks
- Ensure that system will *never* enter a deadlock
  - Need to monitor all lock acquisitions
  - Selectively deny those that *might* lead to deadlock
- Ignore the problem and pretend that deadlocks never occur in the system
  - used by most operating systems, including UNIX

Goals for Today

- Preventing Deadlock
- Scheduling Policy goals
- Policy Options
- Implementation Considerations

Note: Some slides and/or pictures in the following are adapted from slides ©2005 Silberschatz, Galvin, and Gagne. Many slides generated from my lecture notes by Kubiatowicz.

Deadlock Detection Algorithm

- Only one of each type of resource ⇒ look for loops
- More General Deadlock Detection Algorithm
  - Let [X] represent an m-ary vector of non-negative integers (quantities of resources of each type):

`[FreeResources]:`	Current free resources each type
`[Request`$_X$`]:`	Current requests from thread X
`[Alloc`$_X$`]:`	Current resources held by thread X

  - See if tasks can eventually terminate on their own

```
[Avail] = [FreeResources]
Add all nodes to UNFINISHED
do {
   done = true
   Foreach node in UNFINISHED {
      if ([Request_node] <= [Avail]) {
         remove node from UNFINISHED
         [Avail] = [Avail] + [Alloc_node]
         done = false
      }
   }
} until(done)
```



  - Nodes left in UNFINISHED ⇒ deadlocked

Deadlock Detection Algorithm Example

[Available] = [0,0]
[Request$_{T2}$] = [0,0]
[Request$_{T2}$] <= [Available]

[Available] = [1,0]
[Request$_{T1}$] = [1,0]
[Request$_{T1}$] <= [Available]

[Available] = [1,1]
[Request$_{T3}$] = [0,1]
[Request$_{T3}$] <= [Available]



What to do when detect deadlock?

- Terminate thread, force it to give up resources
  - In Bridge example, Godzilla picks up a car, hurls it into the river. Deadlock solved!
  - Shoot a dining philosopher
  - But, not always possible – killing a thread holding a mutex leaves world inconsistent
- Preempt resources without killing off thread
  - Take away resources from thread temporarily
  - Doesn't always fit with semantics of computation
- Roll back actions of deadlocked threads
  - Hit the rewind button on TiVo, pretend last few minutes never happened
  - For bridge example, make one car roll backwards (may require others behind him)
  - Common technique in databases (transactions)
  - Of course, if you restart in exactly the same way, may reenter deadlock once again

Techniques for Preventing Deadlock

- Infinite resources
  - Include enough resources so that no one ever runs out of resources. Doesn't have to be infinite, just large
  - Give illusion of infinite resources (e.g. virtual memory)
  - Examples:
    - » Bay bridge with 12,000 lanes. Never wait!
    - » Infinite disk space (not realistic yet?)
- No Sharing of resources (totally independent threads)
  - Not very realistic
- Don't allow waiting
  - How the phone company avoids deadlock
    - » Call to your Mom in Toledo, works its way through the phone lines, but if blocked get busy signal.
  - Technique used in Ethernet/some multiprocessor nets
    - » Everyone speaks at once. On collision, back off and retry

Techniques for Preventing Deadlock (con't)

- Make all threads request everything they'll need at the beginning.
  - Problem: Predicting future is hard, tend to over-estimate resources
  - Example:
    - » If need 2 chopsticks, request both at same time
    - » Don't leave home until we know no one is using any intersection between here and where you want to go; only one car on the Bay Bridge at a time
- Force all threads to request resources in a particular order preventing any cyclic use of resources
  - Thus, preventing deadlock
  - Example (x.P, y.P, z.P,…)
    - » Make tasks request disk, then memory, then…
    - » Keep from deadlock on freeways around SF by requiring everyone to go clockwise

Review: Train Example (Wormhole-Routed Network)

- Circular dependency (Deadlock!)
  - Each train wants to turn right
  - Blocked by other trains
  - Similar problem to multiprocessor networks
- Fix? Imagine grid extends in all four directions
  - Force ordering of channels (tracks)
    - » Protocol: Always go east-west first, then north-south
  - Called "dimension ordering" (X then Y)



Banker's Algorithm for Preventing Deadlock

- Toward right idea:
  - State maximum resource needs in advance
  - Allow particular thread to proceed if:
    - (available resources - #requested) ≥ max remaining that might be needed by any thread

- Banker's algorithm (less conservative):
  - Allocate resources dynamically
    - » Evaluate each request and grant if some ordering of threads is still deadlock free afterward
    - » Technique: pretend each request is granted, then run deadlock detection algorithm, substituting ($[Max_{node}]-[Alloc_{node}] \le [Avail]$) for ($[Request_{node}] \le [Avail]$) Grant request if result is deadlock free (conservative!)
    - » Keeps system in a "SAFE" state, i.e. there exists a sequence $\{T_1, T_2, \ldots T_n\}$ with T_1 requesting all remaining resources, finishing, then T_2 requesting all remaining resources, etc..
  - Algorithm allows the sum of maximum resource needs of all current threads to be greater than total resources

Banker's Algorithm Example



- Banker's algorithm with dining philosophers
  - "Safe" (won't cause deadlock) if when try to grab chopstick either:
    - » Not last chopstick
    - » Is last chopstick but someone will have two afterwards
  - What if k-handed philosophers? Don't allow if:
    - » It's the last one, no one would have k
    - » It's 2nd to last, and no one would have k-1
    - » It's 3rd to last, and no one would have k-2
    - » …

Administrivia

- Project 1 code due this Monday (2/22)
- Autograder will be available by tomorrow morning
- Midterm coming up in two 1/2 weeks
  - Tuesday, 3/9, 3:30 - 6:30 (Requested this room)
  - Should be 2 hour exam with extra time
  - Closed book, one page of hand-written notes (both sides)
- Midterm Topics
  - Everything up to previous Thursday, 3/5
  - History, Concurrency, Multithreading, Synchronization, Protection/Address Spaces

CPU Scheduling



- Earlier, we talked about the life-cycle of a thread
  - Active threads work their way from Ready queue to Running to various waiting queues.
- Question: How is the OS to decide which of several threads to take off a queue?
  - Obvious queue to worry about is ready queue
  - Others can be scheduled as well, however
- **Scheduling**: deciding which threads are given access to resources from moment to moment

Scheduling Assumptions

- CPU scheduling big area of research in early 70's
- Many implicit assumptions for CPU scheduling:
  - One program per user
  - One thread per program
  - Programs are independent
- Clearly, these are unrealistic but they simplify the problem so it can be solved
  - For instance: is "fair" about fairness among users or programs?
    - » If I run one compilation job and you run five, you get five times as much CPU on many operating systems
- The high-level goal: Dole out CPU time to optimize some desired parameters of system



Assumption: CPU Bursts





- Execution model: programs alternate between bursts of CPU and I/O
  - Program typically uses the CPU for some period of time, then does I/O, then uses CPU again
  - Each scheduling decision is about which job to give to the CPU for use by its next CPU burst
  - With timeslicing, thread may be forced to give up CPU before finishing current CPU burst

Scheduling Policy Goals/Criteria

- Minimize Response Time
  - Minimize elapsed time to do an operation (or job)
  - Response time is what the user sees:
    - » Time to echo a keystroke in editor
    - » Time to compile a program
    - » Real-time Tasks: Must meet deadlines imposed by World
- Maximize Throughput
  - Maximize operations (or jobs) per second
  - Throughput related to response time, but not identical:
    - » Minimizing response time will lead to more context switching than if you only maximized throughput
  - Two parts to maximizing throughput
    - » Minimize overhead (for example, context-switching)
    - » Efficient use of resources (CPU, disk, memory, etc)
- Fairness
  - Share CPU among users in some equitable way
  - Fairness is not minimizing average response time:
    - » Better *average* response time by making system *less* fair

First-Come, First-Served (FCFS) Scheduling

- First-Come, First-Served (FCFS)
  - Also "First In, First Out" (FIFO) or "Run until done"
    - » In early systems, FCFS meant one program scheduled until done (including I/O)
    - » Now, means keep CPU until thread blocks

- Example:

Process	Burst Time
P_1	24
P_2	3
P_3	3

  - Suspect processes arrive in the order: P_1 , P_2 , P_3 The Gantt Chart for the schedule is:



  - Waiting time for P_1 = 0; P_2 = 24; P_3 = 27
  - Average waiting time: (0 + 24 + 27)/3 = 17
  - Average Completion time: (24 + 27 + 30)/3 = 27
- *Convoy effect:* short process behind long process

FCFS Scheduling (Cont.)

- Example continued:
  - Suppose that processes arrive in order: P_2 , P_3 , P_1 Now, the Gantt chart for the schedule is:

  - Waiting time for P_1 = 6; P_2 = 0, P_3 = 3
  - Average waiting time: (6 + 0 + 3)/3 = 3
  - Average Completion time: (3 + 6 + 30)/3 = 13
- In second case:
  - average waiting time is much better (before it was 17)
  - Average completion time is better (before it was 27)
- FIFO Pros and Cons:
  - Simple (+)
  - Short jobs get stuck behind long ones (-)
    - » Safeway: Getting milk, always stuck behind cart full of small items

Round Robin (RR)

- FCFS Scheme: Potentially bad for short jobs!
  - Depends on submit order
  - If you are first in line at supermarket with milk, you don't care who is behind you, on the other hand…
- Round Robin Scheme

  - Each process gets a small unit of CPU time (*time quantum*), usually 10-100 milliseconds
  - After quantum expires, the process is preempted and added to the end of the ready queue.
  - *n* processes in ready queue and time quantum is $q \Rightarrow$
    - » Each process gets $1/n$ of the CPU time
    - » In chunks of at most *q* time units
    - » No process waits more than $(n-1)q$ time units
- Performance
  - q large $\Rightarrow$ FCFS
  - q small $\Rightarrow$ Interleaved (really small $\Rightarrow$ hyperthreading?)
  - q must be large with respect to context switch, otherwise overhead is too high (all overhead)

Example of RR with Time Quantum = 20

- Example:

Process	Burst Time
P_1	53
P_2	8
P_3	68
P_4	24

  - The Gantt chart is:

P_1	P_2	P_3	P_4	P_1	P_3	P_4	P_1	P_3	P_3

0 20 28 48 68 88 108 112 125 145 153

  - Waiting time for
    $P_1=(68-20)+(112-88)=72$
    $P_2=(20-0)=20$
    $P_3=(28-0)+(88-48)+(125-108)=85$
    $P_4=(48-0)+(108-68)=88$
  - Average waiting time = $(72+20+85+88)/4=66\frac{1}{4}$
  - Average completion time = $(125+28+153+112)/4 = 104\frac{1}{2}$
- Thus, Round-Robin Pros and Cons:
  - Better for short jobs, Fair (+)
  - Context-switching time adds up for long jobs (-)

Round-Robin Discussion



- How do you choose time slice?
  - What if too big?
    - » Response time suffers
  - What if infinite (∞)?
    - » Get back FIFO
  - What if time slice too small?
    - » Throughput suffers!
- Actual choices of timeslice:
  - Initially, UNIX timeslice one second:
    - » Worked ok when UNIX was used by one or two people.
    - » What if three compilations going on? 3 seconds to echo each keystroke!
  - In practice, need to balance short-job performance and long-job throughput:
    - » Typical time slice today is between 10ms – 100ms
    - » Typical context-switching overhead is 0.1ms – 1ms
    - » Roughly 1% overhead due to context-switching

Comparisons between FCFS and Round Robin

- Assuming zero-cost context-switching time, is RR always better than FCFS?
- Simple example: 10 jobs, each take 100s of CPU time
  RR scheduler quantum of 1s
  All jobs start at the same time
- Completion Times:

Job #	FIFO	RR
1	100	991
2	200	992
…	…	…
9	900	999
10	1000	1000

  - Both RR and FCFS finish at the same time
  - Average response time is much worse under RR!
    - » Bad when all jobs same length
- Also: Cache state must be shared between all jobs with RR but can be devoted to each job with FIFO
  - Total time for RR longer even for zero-cost switch!

Earlier Example with Different Time Quantum



	Quantum	P_1	P_2	P_3	P_4	Average
Wait Time	Best FCFS	32	0	85	8	$31\frac{1}{4}$
	Q = 1	84	22	85	57	62
	Q = 5	82	20	85	58	$61\frac{1}{4}$
	Q = 8	80	8	85	56	$57\frac{1}{4}$
	Q = 10	82	10	85	68	$61\frac{1}{4}$
	Q = 20	72	20	85	88	$66\frac{1}{4}$
	Worst FCFS	68	145	0	121	$83\frac{1}{2}$
Completion Time	Best FCFS	85	8	153	32	$69\frac{1}{2}$
	Q = 1	137	30	153	81	$100\frac{1}{2}$
	Q = 5	135	28	153	82	$99\frac{1}{2}$
	Q = 8	133	16	153	80	$95\frac{1}{2}$
	Q = 10	135	18	153	92	$99\frac{1}{2}$
	Q = 20	125	28	153	112	$104\frac{1}{2}$
	Worst FCFS	121	153	68	145	$121\frac{3}{4}$

What if we Knew the Future?



- Could we always mirror best FCFS?
- Shortest Job First (SJF):
  - Run whatever job has the least amount of computation to do
  - Sometimes called "Shortest Time to Completion First" (STCF)
- Shortest Remaining Time First (SRTF):
  - Preemptive version of SJF: if job arrives and has a shorter time to completion than the remaining time on the current job, immediately preempt CPU
  - Sometimes called "Shortest Remaining Time to Completion First" (SRTCF)
- These can be applied either to a whole program or the current CPU burst of each program
  - Idea is to get short jobs out of the system
  - Big effect on short jobs, only small effect on long ones
  - Result is better average response time

Discussion

- SJF/SRTF are the best you can do at minimizing average response time
  - Provably optimal (SJF among non-preemptive, SRTF among preemptive)
  - Since SRTF is always at least as good as SJF, focus on SRTF
- Comparison of SRTF with FCFS and RR
  - What if all jobs the same length?
    - » SRTF becomes the same as FCFS (i.e. FCFS is best can do if all jobs the same length)
  - What if jobs have varying length?
    - » SRTF (and RR): short jobs not stuck behind long ones

Example to illustrate benefits of SRTF



- Three jobs:
  - A,B: both CPU bound, run for week
    C: I/O bound, loop 1ms CPU, 9ms disk I/O
  - If only one at a time, C uses 90% of the disk, A or B could use 100% of the CPU
- With FIFO:
  - Once A or B get in, keep CPU for two weeks
- What about RR or SRTF?
  - Easier to see with a timeline

SRTF Example continued:



SRTF Further discussion

- Starvation
  - SRTF can lead to starvation if many small jobs!
  - Large jobs never get to run
- Somehow need to predict future
  - How can we do this?
  - Some systems ask the user
    - » When you submit a job, have to say how long it will take
    - » To stop cheating, system kills job if takes too long
  - But: Even non-malicious users have trouble predicting runtime of their jobs
- Bottom line, can't really know how long job will take
  - However, can use SRTF as a yardstick for measuring other policies
  - Optimal, so can't do any better
- SRTF Pros & Cons
  - Optimal (average response time) (+)
  - Hard to predict future (-)
  - Unfair (-)

Summary (Deadlock)

- Four conditions required for deadlocks
  - Mutual exclusion
    - » Only one thread at a time can use a resource
  - Hold and wait
    - » Thread holding at least one resource is waiting to acquire additional resources held by other threads
  - No preemption
    - » Resources are released only voluntarily by the threads
  - Circular wait
    - » ∃ set $\{T_1, \ldots, T_n\}$ of threads with a cyclic waiting pattern
- Deadlock detection
  - Attempts to assess whether waiting graph can ever make progress
- Deadlock prevention
  - Assess, for each allocation, whether it has the potential to lead to deadlock
  - Banker's algorithm gives one way to assess this

Summary (Scheduling)

- Scheduling: selecting a waiting process from the ready queue and allocating the CPU to it
- FCFS Scheduling:
  - Run threads to completion in order of submission
  - Pros: Simple
  - Cons: Short jobs get stuck behind long ones
- Round-Robin Scheduling:
  - Give each thread a small amount of CPU time when it executes; cycle between all ready threads
  - Pros: Better for short jobs
  - Cons: Poor when jobs are same length
- Shortest Job First (SJF)/Shortest Remaining Time First (SRTF):
  - Run whatever job has the least amount of computation to do/least remaining amount of computation to do
  - Pros: Optimal (average response time)
  - Cons: Hard to predict future, Unfair