

Lock-based Concurrent Data Structures

Before moving beyond locks, we'll first describe how to use locks in some common data structures. Adding locks to a data structure to make it usable by threads makes the structure **thread safe**. Of course, exactly how such locks are added determines both the correctness and performance of the data structure. And thus, our challenge:

CRUX: HOW TO ADD LOCKS TO DATA STRUCTURES

When given a particular data structure, how should we add locks to it, in order to make it work correctly? Further, how do we add locks such that the data structure yields high performance, enabling many threads to access the structure at once, i.e., **concurrently**?

Of course, we will be hard pressed to cover all data structures or all methods for adding concurrency, as this is a topic that has been studied for years, with (literally) thousands of research papers published about it. Thus, we hope to provide a sufficient introduction to the type of thinking required, and refer you to some good sources of material for further inquiry on your own. We found Moir and Shavit's survey to be a great source of information [MS04].

28.1 Concurrent Counters

One of the simplest data structures is a counter. It is a structure that is commonly used and has a simple interface. We define a simple non-concurrent counter in Figure 28.1.

```
typedef struct __counter_t {
    int value;
} counter_t;

void init(counter_t *c) {
    c->value = 0;
}

void increment(counter_t *c) {
    c->value++;
}

void decrement(counter_t *c) {
    c->value--;
}

int get(counter_t *c) {
    return c->value;
}
```

Figure 28.1: A Counter Without Locks

Simple But Not Scalable

As you can see, the non-synchronized counter is a trivial data structure, requiring a tiny amount of code to implement. We now have our next challenge: how can we make this code **thread safe**? Figure 28.2 shows how we do so.

This concurrent counter is simple and works correctly. In fact, it follows a design pattern common to the simplest and most basic concurrent data structures: it simply adds a single lock, which is acquired when calling a routine that manipulates the data structure, and is released when returning from the call. In this manner, it is similar to a data structure built with **monitors** [BH73], where locks are acquired and released automatically as you call and return from object methods.

At this point, you have a working concurrent data structure. The problem you might have is performance. If your data structure is too slow, you'll have to do more than just add a single lock; such optimizations, if needed, are thus the topic of the rest of the chapter. Note that if the data structure is *not* too slow, you are done! No need to do something fancy if something simple will work.

To understand the performance costs of the simple approach, we run a benchmark in which each thread updates a single shared counter a fixed number of times; we then vary the number of threads. Figure 28.3 shows the total time taken, with one to four threads active; each

```

typedef struct __counter_t {
    int         value;
    pthread_lock_t lock;
} counter_t;

void init(counter_t *c) {
    c->value = 0;
    Pthread_mutex_init(&c->lock, NULL);
}

void increment(counter_t *c) {
    Pthread_mutex_lock(&c->lock);
    c->value++;
    Pthread_mutex_unlock(&c->lock);
}

void decrement(counter_t *c) {
    Pthread_mutex_lock(&c->lock);
    c->value--;
    Pthread_mutex_unlock(&c->lock);
}

int get(counter_t *c) {
    Pthread_mutex_lock(&c->lock);
    int rc = c->value;
    Pthread_mutex_unlock(&c->lock);
    return rc;
}

```

Figure 28.2: A Counter With Locks

thread updates the counter one million times. This experiment was run upon an iMac with four Intel 2.7 GHz i5 CPUs; with more CPUs active, we hope to get more total work done per unit time.

From the top line in the figure (labeled *precise*), you can see that the performance of the synchronized counter scales poorly. Whereas a single thread can complete the million counter updates in a tiny amount of time (roughly 0.03 seconds), having two threads each update the counter one million times concurrently leads to a massive slowdown (taking over 5 seconds!). It only gets worse with more threads.

Ideally, you'd like to see the threads complete just as quickly on multiple processors as the single thread does on one. Achieving this end is called **perfect scaling**; even though more work is done, it is done in parallel, and hence the time taken to complete the task is not increased.




Figure 28.3: Performance of Traditional vs. Sloppy Counters

Scalable Counting

Amazingly, researchers have studied how to build more scalable counters for years [MS04]. Even more amazing is the fact that scalable counters matter, as recent work in operating system performance analysis has shown [B+10]; without scalable counting, some workloads running on Linux suffer from serious scalability problems on multicore machines.

Though many techniques have been developed to attack this problem, we'll now describe one particular approach. The idea, introduced in recent research [B+10], is known as a **sloppy counter**.

The sloppy counter works by representing a single logical counter via numerous *local* physical counters, one per CPU core, as well as a single *global* counter. Specifically, on a machine with four CPUs, there are four local counters and one global one. In addition to these counters, there are also locks, one for each of the local counters, and one for the global counter.

The basic idea of sloppy counting is as follows. When a thread running on a given core wishes to increment the counter, it increments its local counter; access to this local counter is synchronized via the corresponding local lock. Because each CPU has its own local counter, threads across CPUs can update local counters without contention, and thus counter updates are scalable.

However, to keep the global counter up to date (in case a thread

Time	L_1	L_2	L_3	L_4	G
0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	1	0
2	1	0	2	1	0
3	2	0	3	1	0
4	3	0	3	2	0
5	4	1	3	3	0
6	5 → 0	1	3	4	5 (from L_1)
7	0	2	4	5 → 0	10 (from L_4)

Table 28.1: Tracing the Sloppy Counters

wishes to read its value), the local values are periodically transferred to the global counter, by acquiring the global lock and incrementing it by the local counter's value; the local counter is then reset to zero.

How often this local-to-global transfer occurs is determined by a threshold, which we call S here (for sloppiness). The smaller S is, the more the counter behaves like the non-scalable counter above; the bigger S is, the more scalable the counter, but the further off the global value might be from the actual count. One could simply acquire all the local locks and the global lock (in a specified order, to avoid deadlock) to get an exact value, but that is not scalable.

To make this clear, let's look at an example (Table 28.1). In this example, the threshold S is set to 5, and there are threads on each of four CPUs updating their local counters $L_1 \dots L_4$. The global counter value (G) is also shown in the trace, with time increasing downward. At each time step, a local counter may be incremented; if the local value reaches the threshold S , the local value is transferred to the global counter and the local counter is reset.

The lower line in Figure 28.3 (labeled *sloppy*) shows the performance of sloppy counters with a threshold S of 1024. Performance is excellent; the time taken to update the counter four million times on four processors is hardly higher than the time taken to update it one million times on one processor.

Figure 28.5 shows the importance of the threshold value S , with four threads each incrementing the counter 1 million times on four CPUs. If S is low, performance is poor (but the global count is always quite accurate); if S is high, performance is excellent, but the global count lags (by the number of CPUs multiplied by S). This accuracy/performance trade-off is what sloppy counters enables.

A rough version of such a sloppy counter is found in Figure 28.4. Read it, or better yet, run it yourself in some experiments to better understand how it works.

```

typedef struct __counter_t {
    int          global;           // global count
    pthread_mutex_t glock;       // global lock
    int          local[NUMCPUS];  // local count (per cpu)
    pthread_mutex_t llock[NUMCPUS]; // ... and locks
    int          threshold;       // update frequency
} counter_t;

// init: record threshold, init locks, init values
//       of all local counts and global count
void init(counter_t *c, int threshold) {
    c->threshold = threshold;

    c->global = 0;
    pthread_mutex_init(&c->glock, NULL);

    int i;
    for (i = 0; i < NUMCPUS; i++) {
        c->local[i] = 0;
        pthread_mutex_init(&c->llock[i], NULL);
    }
}

// update: usually, just grab local lock and update local amount
//         once local count has risen by 'threshold', grab global
//         lock and transfer local values to it
void update(counter_t *c, int threadID, int amt) {
    pthread_mutex_lock(&c->llock[threadID]);
    c->local[threadID] += amt;           // assumes amt > 0
    if (c->local[threadID] >= c->threshold) { // transfer to global
        pthread_mutex_lock(&c->glock);
        c->global += c->local[threadID];
        pthread_mutex_unlock(&c->glock);
        c->local[threadID] = 0;
    }
    pthread_mutex_unlock(&c->llock[threadID]);
}

// get: just return global amount (which may not be perfect)
int get(counter_t *c) {
    pthread_mutex_lock(&c->glock);
    int val = c->global;
    pthread_mutex_unlock(&c->glock);
    return val; // only approximate!
}

```

Figure 28.4: Sloppy Counter Implementation




Figure 28.5: Scaling Sloppy Counters

28.2 Concurrent Linked Lists

We next examine a more complicated structure, the linked list. Let's start with a basic approach once again. For simplicity, we'll omit some of the obvious routines that such a list would have and just focus on concurrent insert; we'll leave it to the reader to think about lookup, delete, and so forth. Figure 28.6 shows the code for this rudimentary data structure.

As you can see in the code, the code simply acquires a lock in the insert routine upon entry, and releases it upon exit. One small tricky issue arises if `malloc()` happens to fail (a rare case); in this case, the code must also release the lock before failing the insert.

This kind of exceptional control flow has been shown to be quite error prone; a recent study of Linux kernel patches found that a huge fraction of bugs (nearly 40%) are found on such rarely-taken code paths (indeed, this observation sparked some of our own research, in which we removed all memory-failing paths from a Linux file system, resulting in a more robust system [S+11]).

Thus, a challenge: can we rewrite the insert and lookup routines to remain correct under concurrent insert but avoid the case where the failure path also requires us to add the call to unlock?

```

// basic node structure
typedef struct __node_t {
    int key;
    struct __node_t *next;
} node_t;

// basic list structure (one used per list)
typedef struct __list_t {
    node_t *head;
    pthread_mutex_t lock;
} list_t;

void List_Init(list_t *L) {
    L->head = NULL;
    pthread_mutex_init(&L->lock, NULL);
}

int List_Insert(list_t *L, int key) {
    pthread_mutex_lock(&L->lock);
    node_t *new = malloc(sizeof(node_t));
    if (new == NULL) {
        perror("malloc");
        pthread_mutex_unlock(&L->lock);
        return -1; // fail
    }
    new->key = key;
    new->next = L->head;
    L->head = new;
    pthread_mutex_unlock(&L->lock);
    return 0; // success
}

int List_Lookup(list_t *L, int key) {
    pthread_mutex_lock(&L->lock);
    node_t *curr = L->head;
    while (curr) {
        if (curr->key == key) {
            pthread_mutex_unlock(&L->lock);
            return 0; // success
        }
        curr = curr->next;
    }
    pthread_mutex_unlock(&L->lock);
    return -1; // failure
}

```

Figure 28.6: Concurrent Linked List

TIP: BE WARY OF LOCKS AND CONTROL FLOW

A general design tip, which is useful in concurrent code as well as elsewhere, is to be wary of control flow changes that lead to function returns, exits, or other similar error conditions that halt the execution of a function. Because many functions will begin by acquiring a lock, allocating some memory, or doing other similar stateful operations, when errors arise, the code has to undo all of the state before returning; as it turns out, this is error-prone. Thus, it is best to structure code so as to minimize this pattern.

The answer, in this case, is yes. Specifically, we can rearrange the code a bit so that the lock and release only surround the actual critical section in the insert code, and that a common exit path is used in the lookup code. The former works because part of the lookup actually need not be locked; assuming that `malloc()` itself is thread-safe, each thread can call into it without worry of race conditions or other concurrency bugs. Only when updating the shared list does a lock need to be held. See Figure 28.7 for the details.

As for the lookup routine, it is a simple code transformation to jump out of the main search loop to a single return path. Doing so again reduces the number of lock acquire/release points in the code, and thus decreases the chances of accidentally introducing bugs (such as forgetting to unlock before returning) into the code.

Scaling Linked Lists

Though we again have a basic concurrent linked list, once again we are in a situation where it does not scale particularly well. One technique that researchers have explored to enable more concurrency within a list is something called **hand-over-hand locking** (also known as **lock coupling**) [MS04].

The idea is pretty simple. Instead of having a single lock for the entire list, you instead add a lock per node of the list. When traversing the list, the code first grabs the next node's lock and then releases the current node's lock (which inspires the name hand-over-hand).

```

void List_Init(list_t *L) {
    L->head = NULL;
    pthread_mutex_init(&L->lock, NULL);
}

void List_Insert(list_t *L, int key) {
    // synchronization not needed
    node_t *new = malloc(sizeof(node_t));
    if (new == NULL) {
        perror("malloc");
        return;
    }
    new->key = key;

    // just lock critical section
    pthread_mutex_lock(&L->lock);
    new->next = L->head;
    L->head = new;
    pthread_mutex_unlock(&L->lock);
}

int List_Lookup(list_t *L, int key) {
    int rv = -1;
    pthread_mutex_lock(&L->lock);
    node_t *curr = L->head;
    while (curr) {
        if (curr->key == key) {
            rv = 0;
            break;
        }
        curr = curr->next;
    }
    pthread_mutex_unlock(&L->lock);
    return rv; // now both success and failure
}

```

Figure 28.7: Concurrent Linked List: Rewritten

Conceptually, a hand-over-hand linked list makes some sense; it enables a high degree of concurrency in list operations. However, in practice, it is hard to make such a structure faster than the simple single lock approach, as the overheads of acquiring and releasing locks for each node of a list traversal is prohibitive. Even with very large lists, and a large number of threads, the concurrency enabled by allowing multiple on-going traversals is unlikely to be faster than simply grabbing a single lock, performing an operation, and releasing it. Perhaps some kind of hybrid (where you grab a new lock every so many nodes) would be worth investigating.

TIP: MORE CONCURRENCY ISN'T NECESSARILY FASTER

If the scheme you design adds a lot of overhead (for example, by acquiring and releasing locks frequently, instead of once), the fact that it is more concurrent may not be important. Simple schemes tend to work well, especially if they use costly routines rarely. Adding more locks and complexity can be your downfall. All of that said, there is one way to really know: build both alternatives (simple but less concurrent, and complex but more concurrent) and measure how they do. In the end, you can't cheat on performance; your idea is either faster, or it isn't.

28.3 Concurrent Queues

As you know by now, there is always a standard method to make a concurrent data structure: add a big lock. For a queue, we'll skip that approach, assuming you can figure it out.

Instead, we'll take a look at a slightly more concurrent queue designed by Michael and Scott [MS98]. The data structures and code used for this queue are found in Figure 28.8 on the following page.

If you study this code carefully, you'll notice that there are two locks, one for the head of the queue, and one for the tail. The goal of these two locks is to enable concurrency of enqueue and dequeue operations. In the common case, enqueue will only access the tail lock, and dequeue the head lock.

One trick used by the Michael and Scott is to add a dummy node (allocated in the queue initialization code); this dummy enables the separation of head and tail operations. Study the code, or better yet, type it in and run and measure it, to understand it fully.

Queues are commonly used in multi-threaded applications. However, the type of queue used here (with just locks) often does not completely meet the needs of such programs. A more fully developed bounded queue, that enables a thread to wait if the queue is either empty or overly full, is the subject of our intense study in the next chapter on condition variables.

```

typedef struct __node_t {
    int          value;
    struct __node_t *next;
} node_t;

typedef struct __queue_t {
    node_t      *head;
    node_t      *tail;
    pthread_mutex_t headLock;
    pthread_mutex_t tailLock;
} queue_t;

void Queue_Init(queue_t *q) {
    node_t *tmp = malloc(sizeof(node_t));
    tmp->next = NULL;
    q->head = q->tail = tmp;
    pthread_mutex_init (&q->headLock, NULL);
    pthread_mutex_init (&q->tailLock, NULL);
}

void Queue_Enqueue(queue_t *q, int value) {
    node_t *tmp = malloc(sizeof(node_t));
    assert (tmp != NULL);
    tmp->value = value;
    tmp->next = NULL;

    pthread_mutex_lock (&q->tailLock);
    q->tail->next = tmp;
    q->tail = tmp;
    pthread_mutex_unlock (&q->tailLock);
}

int Queue_Dequeue(queue_t *q, int *value) {
    pthread_mutex_lock (&q->headLock);
    node_t *tmp = q->head;
    node_t *newHead = tmp->next;
    if (newHead == NULL) {
        pthread_mutex_unlock (&q->headLock);
        return -1; // queue was empty
    }
    *value = newHead->value;
    q->head = newHead;
    pthread_mutex_unlock (&q->headLock);
    free (tmp);
    return 0;
}

```

Figure 28.8: Michael and Scott Concurrent Queue

28.4 Concurrent Hash Table

We end our discussion with a simple and widely applicable concurrent data structure, the hash table. We'll focus on a simple hash table that does not resize; a little more work is required to handle resizing, which we leave as an exercise for the reader (sorry!).

```
#define BUCKETS (101)

typedef struct __hash_t {
    list_t lists[BUCKETS];
} hash_t;

void Hash_Init(hash_t *H) {
    int i;
    for (i = 0; i < BUCKETS; i++) {
        List_Init(&H->lists[i]);
    }
}

int Hash_Insert(hash_t *H, int key) {
    int bucket = key % BUCKETS;
    return List_Insert(&H->lists[bucket], key);
}

int Hash_Lookup(hash_t *H, int key) {
    int bucket = key % BUCKETS;
    return List_Lookup(&H->lists[bucket], key);
}
```

Figure 28.9: A Concurrent Hash Table

This concurrent hash table is straightforward, is built using the concurrent lists we developed earlier, and works incredibly well. The reason for its good performance is that instead of having a single lock for the entire structure, it uses a lock per hash bucket (each of which is represented by a list). Doing so enables many concurrent operations to take place.

Figure 28.10 shows the performance of the hash table under concurrent updates (from 10,000 to 50,000 concurrent updates from each of four threads, on the same iMac with four CPUs). Also shown, for the sake of comparison, is the performance of a linked list (with a single lock). As you can see from the graph, this simple concurrent hash table scales magnificently; the linked list, in contrast, does not.




Figure 28.10: Scaling Hash Tables

28.5 Summary

We have introduced a sampling of concurrent data structures, from counters, to lists and queues, and finally to the ubiquitous and heavily-used hash table. We have learned a few important lessons along the way: to be careful with acquisition and release of locks around control flow changes; that enabling more concurrency does not necessarily increase performance; that performance problems should only be remedied once they exist. This last point, of avoiding **premature optimization**, is central to any performance-minded developer; there is no value in making something faster if doing so will not improve the overall performance of the application.

Of course, we have just scratched the surface of high performance structures. See Moir and Shavit's excellent survey for more information, as well as links to other sources [MS04]. In particular, you might be interested in other structures (such as B-trees); for this knowledge, a database class is your best bet. You also might be interested in techniques that don't use traditional locks at all; such **non-blocking data structures** are something we'll get a taste of in the chapter on common concurrency bugs, but frankly this topic is an entire area of knowledge requiring more study than is possible in this humble book. Find out more on your own if you are interested (as always!).

TIP: AVOID PREMATURE OPTIMIZATION

When building a concurrent data structure, start with the most basic approach, which is to add a single big lock to provide synchronized access. By doing so, you are likely to build a *correct* lock; if you then find that it suffers from performance problems, you can refine it, thus only making it fast if need be. As **Knuth** famously stated, “Premature optimization is the root of all evil.”

Many operating systems added a single lock when transitioning to multiprocessors, including Sun OS and Linux. In the latter, it even had a name, the **big kernel lock (BKL)**, and was the source of performance problems for many years until it was finally removed in 2011. In SunOS (which was a BSD variant), the notion of removing the single lock protecting the kernel was so painful that the Sun engineers decided on a different route: building the entirely new Solaris operating system, which was multi-threaded from day one. Read the Linux and Solaris kernel books for more information [BC05, MM00].

References

[B+10] "An Analysis of Linux Scalability to Many Cores"
Silas Boyd-Wickizer, Austin T. Clements, Yandong Mao, Aleksey Pesterev, M. Frans Kaashoek, Robert Morris, Nickolai Zeldovich
OSDI '10, Vancouver, Canada, October 2010
A great study of how Linux performs on multicore machines, as well as some simple solutions.

[BH73] "Operating System Principles"
Per Brinch Hansen, Prentice-Hall, 1973
Available: <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=540365>
One of the first books on operating systems; certainly ahead of its time. Introduced monitors as a concurrency primitive.

[BC05] "Understanding the Linux Kernel (Third Edition)"
Daniel P. Bovet and Marco Cesati
O'Reilly Media, November 2005
The classic book on the Linux kernel. You should read it.

[L+13] "A Study of Linux File System Evolution"
Lanyue Lu, Andrea C. Arpaci-Dusseau, Remzi H. Arpaci-Dusseau, Shan Lu
FAST '13, San Jose, CA, February 2013
Our paper that studies every patch to Linux file systems over nearly a decade. Lots of fun findings in there; read it to see! The work was painful to do though; the poor graduate student, Lanyue Lu, had to look through every single patch by hand in order to understand what they did.

[MS98] "Nonblocking Algorithms and Preemption-safe Locking on Multiprogrammed Shared-memory Multiprocessors"
M. Michael and M. Scott
Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing, Vol. 51, No. 1, 1998
Professor Scott and his students have been at the forefront of concurrent algorithms and data structures for many years; check out his web page, numerous papers, or books to find out more.

[MS04] "Concurrent Data Structures"
Mark Moir and Nir Shavit
In Handbook of Data Structures and Applications
(Editors D. Metha and S.Sahni)
Chapman and Hall/CRC Press, 2004
Available: www.cs.tau.ac.il/~shanir/concurrent-data-structures.pdf
A short but relatively comprehensive reference on concurrent data structures. Though it is missing some of the latest works in the area (due to its age), it remains an incredibly useful reference.

[MM00] "Solaris Internals: Core Kernel Architecture"

Jim Mauro and Richard McDougall

Prentice Hall, October 2000

The Solaris book. You should also read this, if you want to learn in great detail about something other than Linux.

[S+11] "Making the Common Case the Only Case with Anticipatory Memory Allocation"

Swaminathan Sundararaman, Yupu Zhang, Sriram Subramanian,

Andrea C. Arpaci-Dusseau, Remzi H. Arpaci-Dusseau

FAST '11, San Jose, CA, February 2011

Our work on removing possibly-failing calls to malloc from kernel code paths. The idea is to allocate all potentially needed memory before doing any of the work, thus avoiding failure deep down in the storage stack.