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Modelling interaction — shared actions

Actions that are common between two processes are **shared** and can be used to model *process interaction*:
>
*Unshared actions* may be *arbitrarily interleaved*
>
*Shared actions* occur *simultaneously* for all participants

\[
\text{MAKER} = (\text{make} \rightarrow \text{ready} \rightarrow \text{MAKER}). \\
\text{USER} = (\text{ready} \rightarrow \text{use} \rightarrow \text{USER}). \\
\mid | \text{MAKER_USER} = (\text{MAKER} | | \text{USER}).
\]

*What are the states of the LTS?*  
*The traces?*
Modelling interaction — handshake

A **handshake** is an action that signals acknowledgement.

\[
\text{MAKERv2} = ( \text{make} \rightarrow \text{ready} \rightarrow \text{used} \rightarrow \text{MAKERv2} ).
\]

\[
\text{USERv2} = ( \text{ready} \rightarrow \text{use} \rightarrow \text{used} \rightarrow \text{USERv2} ).
\]

\[
\text{MAKER\_USERv2} = ( \text{MAKERv2} | | \text{USERv2} ).
\]

*What are the states and traces of the LTS?*
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Safety problems

Objects must only be accessed when they are in a **consistent state**, formalized by a **class invariant**.

Each method *assumes* the class invariant holds when it starts, and it *re-establishes* it when done.

*If methods interleave arbitrarily, an inconsistent state may be accessed, and the object may be left in a “dirty” state.*
A race condition exists if safety may be violated by bad timing

```java
public class AccountBAD extends Account {
    // unsynchronized!
    public void withdraw(int amount) {
        while (amount > assets) {
            Thread.yield(); // busy wait
        }
        Thread.yield(); // race condition!
        assets -= amount;
        checkInvariant(); // might fail!
    }
}
```

if (!(assets >= 0)) { errors++; }
Interference

Consider the two processes:

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ & x = 0 \} \\
AInc: & x := x + 1 \\
BInc: & x := x + 1 \\
\{ & x = ? \}
\end{align*}
\]

How can these processes interfere?
Atomic actions

Individual reads and writes may be atomic actions:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{const } N &= 3 \\
\text{range } T &= 0..N \\
\text{Var} &= \text{Var}[0], \\
\text{Var}[u:T] &= \langle \text{read}[u] \rightarrow \text{Var}[u] \\
&\quad \mid \text{write}[v:T] \rightarrow \text{Var}[v] \rangle. \\
\text{set } \text{VarAlpha} &= \{ \text{read}[T], \text{write}[T] \} \\
\text{Inc} &= \langle \text{read}[v:0..N-1] \\
&\quad \rightarrow \text{write}[v+1] \\
&\quad \rightarrow \text{STOP} \rangle + \text{VarAlpha}.
\end{align*}
\]
A single sequential thread requires no synchronization:

\[ ||\text{SeqInc} = (\text{Var}||\text{Inc}). \]
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Without synchronization, concurrent threads may interfere:

\[
\text{ParInc} = (\{a, b\} :: \text{Var} \mid a : \text{Inc} \mid b : \text{Inc})
\]
Locks are used to make a critical section atomic:

\[
\text{LOCK} = ( \text{acquire} \rightarrow \text{release} \rightarrow \text{LOCK} ).
\]

\[
\text{INC} = ( \text{acquire} \\
\rightarrow \text{read}[v:0..N-1] \\
\rightarrow \text{write}[v+1] \\
\rightarrow \text{release} \\
\rightarrow \text{STOP} ) + \text{VarAlpha}.
\]
Processes can synchronize critical sections by sharing a lock:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ParInc2} &= \{a, b\}::\text{VAR} \parallel \{a, b\}::\text{LOCK} \parallel a::\text{INC} \parallel b::\text{INC}.
\end{align*}
\]
Synchronization in Java

Java Threads also synchronize using locks:

```java
synchronized T m() {
    // method body
}
```

is just \textit{convenient syntax} for:

```java
T m() {
    synchronized (this) {
        // method body
    }
}
```

\textit{Every object has a lock}, and Threads may use them to synchronize with each other.
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Busy-Wait Mutual Exclusion Protocol

P1 sets \( \text{enter1} := \text{true} \) when it wants to enter its CS, but
sets \( \text{turn} := \text{“P2”} \) to yield priority to P2

```
process P1
  loop
    enter1 := true
    turn := “P2”
    while enter2 and
      turn = “P2”
      do skip
    Critical Section
    enter1 := false
    Non-critical Section
  end
end
```

```
process P2
  loop
    enter2 := true
    turn := “P1”
    while enter1 and
      turn = “P1”
      do skip
    Critical Section
    enter2 := false
    Non-critical Section
  end
end
```

Is this protocol correct? Is it fair? Deadlock-free?
We can model integer and boolean variables as processes with atomic read and write actions:

```plaintext
range T = 1..2

Var = Var[1],
Var[u:T] =
  ( read[u] -> Var[u]
  | write[v:T] -> Var[v]).

set Bool = {true,false}

BOOL(Init='false) = BOOL[Init],
BOOL[b:Bool] =
  ( is[b] -> BOOL[b]
  | setTo[x:Bool] -> BOOL[x]).
```
Modelling the busy-wait protocol

Each process performs two actions in its CS:

\[ P_1 = (\text{enter1.setTo['true]} \rightarrow \text{turn.write[2]} \rightarrow \text{Gd1}), \]
\[ \text{Gd1} = (\text{enter2.is['false]} \rightarrow \text{CS1} \]
\[ \quad \mid \text{enter2.is['true]} \rightarrow \]
\[ \quad \quad (\text{turn.read[1]} \rightarrow \text{CS1} \]
\[ \quad \quad \mid \text{turn.read[2]} \rightarrow \text{Gd1})), \]
\[ \text{CS1} = (\text{a -> b} \rightarrow \text{enter1.setTo['false]} \rightarrow \text{P1}). \]

\[ P_2 = (\text{enter2.setTo['true]} \rightarrow \text{turn.write[1]} \rightarrow \text{Gd2}), \]
\[ \text{Gd2} = (\text{enter1.is['false]} \rightarrow \text{CS2} \]
\[ \quad \mid \text{enter1.is['true]} \rightarrow \]
\[ \quad \quad (\text{turn.read[2]} \rightarrow \text{CS2} \]
\[ \quad \quad \mid \text{turn.read[1]} \rightarrow \text{Gd2})), \]
\[ \text{CS2} = (\text{c -> d} \rightarrow \text{enter2.setTo['false]} \rightarrow \text{P2}). \]

|BusyWait = (enter1:BOOL|enter2:BOOL|turn:Var|P1|P2)@{a,b,c,d}. |
Very pretty, but how do we know there are no errors?!
Checking for errors

We can check for errors by composing our system with an agent that moves to the ERROR state if atomicity is violated:

\[
\text{Ok} = (a \rightarrow (c \rightarrow \text{ERROR} \mid b \rightarrow \text{Ok}) \\
\mid c \rightarrow (a \rightarrow \text{ERROR} \mid d \rightarrow \text{Ok})).
\]

\[
\mid \text{BusyWaitOK} = (\text{enter1:BOOL} \mid \text{enter2:BOOL} \mid \text{turn:Var} \mid P1 \mid P2 \mid \text{Ok}).
\]
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A safety property asserts that nothing bad happens
Use ERROR process (-1) to detect erroneous behaviour

Trace to property violation in ACTUATOR:
command
command

ACTUATOR = ( command->ACTION),
ACTION = ( respond->ACTUATOR |
command->ERROR).
**ERROR** conditions state what is not required
In complex systems, it is usually better to specify directly what *is* required.

**property** `SAFE_ACTUATOR`

\[= \text{(command} \rightarrow \text{respond} \rightarrow \text{SAFE_ACTUATOR})\]

**Trace to property violation in `SAFE_ACTUATOR`:**

respond
Checking Busy-Wait (revisited)

**property** \( \text{Ok} = ( \ a \rightarrow b \rightarrow \text{Ok} \\
| \ c \rightarrow d \rightarrow \text{Ok} ). \)

Ok is a *deterministic process* that specifies which traces are safe — everything else is in ERROR.

**Contrast:**

\[
\text{Ok} = ( \ a \rightarrow ( \ c \rightarrow \text{ERROR} | \ b \rightarrow \text{Ok} ) \\
| \ c \rightarrow ( \ a \rightarrow \text{ERROR} | \ d \rightarrow \text{Ok} ) ).
\]
A safety property \( P \) defines a deterministic process that asserts that any trace including actions in the alphabet of \( P \) is accepted by \( P \).

**Transparency of safety properties:**

> Since all actions in the alphabet of a property are eligible choices, composing a property with a set of processes *does not affect their correct behaviour.*

> If a behaviour can occur which violates the safety property, then ERROR is reachable.
Transparency

Why must properties be deterministic to be transparent?

Consider:

property \( P = (a \rightarrow b \rightarrow P \mid a \rightarrow c \rightarrow P) \).

Is \( a \rightarrow b \) allowed or not?
How can we specify that some action, disaster, never occurs?

property CALM = STOP + \{disaster\}.

A safety property must be specified so as to include all the acceptable, valid behaviours in its alphabet.
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Conditional synchronization

A lock *delays* an acquire request if it is already locked:

\[
\text{LOCK} = \left( \text{acquire} \rightarrow \text{release} \rightarrow \text{LOCK} \right).
\]

Similarly, a one-slot buffer delays a put request if it is full and delays a get request if it is empty:

\[
\text{const } N = 2
\]

\[
\text{Slot} = \left( \text{put}[v:0..N] \rightarrow \text{get}[v] \rightarrow \text{Slot} \right).
\]
Producer/Consumer composition

Consumer = ( get[x:0..N] -> Consumer ).

||Chain = ( Producer || Slot || Consumer )
Wait and notify

A Java object whose methods are all synchronized behaves like a monitor

Within a synchronized method or block:
> wait() suspends the current thread, releasing the lock
> notify() wakes up one thread waiting on that object
> notifyAll() wakes up all threads waiting on that object

NB: Outside of a synchronized block, wait() and notify() will raise an IllegalMonitorStateException

Always use notifyAll() unless you are sure it doesn’t matter which thread you wake up!
Slot (put)

class Slot<Value> implements Buffer<Value> {
    private Value slotVal;  // initially null

    public synchronized void put(Value val) {
        while (slotVal != null) {
            try { wait(); }  // become NotRunnable
            catch (InterruptedException e) { }
        }
        slotVal = val;
        notifyAll();  // make waiting threads Runnable
        return;
    }
    ...
}

interface Buffer<Value> {
    public void put(Value val);
    public Value get();
}
Slot (get)

```java
... public synchronized Value get() {
    Value rval;
    while (slotVal == null) {
        try {
            wait();
        } catch (InterruptedException e) {
        }
        rval = slotVal;
        slotVal = null;
        notifyAll();
    }
    return rval;
}
```
Active objects have their own thread.

Producers and Consumers are active objects that communicate and synchronize through a shared buffer.
Active objects

abstract class ActiveObject extends Thread {
    protected int count;
    ActiveObject(String name, int count) {
        super(name);
        this.count = count;
    }
    public void run() {
        int i;
        for (i=1;i<=count;i++) {
            this.action(i);
        }
    }
    protected abstract void action(int n);
}
Producer in Java

A generic Producer puts \textit{count} messages to the slot:

```java
abstract class Producer<Value> extends ActiveObject {
    protected Buffer<Value> slot;
    Producer(String name, int count, Buffer<Value> slot) {
        super(name, count);
        this.slot = slot;
    }
    protected void action(int n) {
        slot.put(produce(n));
    }
    protected abstract Value produce(int n);
}
```
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Consumer in Java

... and the Consumer gets them:

```java
abstract class Consumer<Value> extends ActiveObject {
    protected Buffer<Value> slot;
    Consumer(String name, int count, Buffer<Value> slot) {
        super(name, count);
        this.slot = slot;
    }
    protected void action(int n) {
        consume(n, slot.get());
    }
    protected abstract void consume(int n, Value val);
}
```
Fruit producers and consumers

```java
public class ProducerConsumerDemo {
    ...
    private class FruitProducer extends Producer<String> {
        protected String wares;
        FruitProducer(...) { ... }
        protected String produce(int n) {
            String message;
            message = wares + "(" + n + ")";
            System.out.println(getName() + " put " + message);
            return message;
        }
    }

    private class FruitConsumer extends Consumer<String> {
        ...
    }
}
```
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Composing Producers and Consumers

Multiple producers and consumers may share the buffer:

```java
public class ProducerConsumerDemo {
    static int COUNT = 5;
    ...
    public void demo() {
        Buffer<String> slot = new Slot<String>();

        new FruitProducer("Peter", COUNT, slot, "apple").start();
        new FruitProducer("Paula", COUNT, slot, "orange").start();
        new FruitProducer("Patricia", COUNT, slot, "banana").start();

        new FruitConsumer("Carla", COUNT, slot).start();
        new FruitConsumer("Cris", 2*COUNT, slot).start();
    }
    ...
}
```
What you should know!

> How do you model interaction with FSP?
> What is a critical section? What is critical about it?
> Why don’t sequential programs need synchronization?
> How do locks address safety problems?
> What primitives do you need to implement the busy-wait mutex protocol?
> How can you use FSP to check for safety violations?
> What happens if you call wait or notify outside a synchronized method or block?
> When is it safe to use notifyAll()?
> What are safety properties? How are they modelled in FSP?
Can you answer these questions?

> What is an example of an invariant that might be violated by interfering, concurrent threads?
> What constitute atomic actions in Java?
> Can you ensure safety in concurrent programs without using locks?
> When should you use synchronize(this) rather than synchronize (someObject)?
> Is the busy-wait mutex protocol fair? Deadlock-free?
> How would you implement a Lock class in Java?
> Why is the Java Slot class so much more complex than the FSP Slot specification?
> How would you manually check a safety property?
> Why must safety properties be deterministic to be transparent?
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