Universality of Consensus

Companion slides for The Art of Multiprocessor Programming by Maurice Herlihy & Nir Shavit



- A mathematical model of computation
- Computable = Computable on a T-Machine



Shared-Memory Computability



- Model of asynchronous concurrent computation
- Computable = Wait-free/Lock-free computable on Amultiprocession BROWN Programming@ Copyright Herlihy-Shavit 2007





Theorem: Universality

- Consensus is universal
- From n-thread consensus build a
 - Wait-free
 - Linearizable
 - n-threaded implementation
 - Of any sequentially specified object



Proof Outline

- A universal construction
 - From n-consensus objects
 - And atomic registers
- · Any wait-free linearizable object
 - Not a practical construction
 - But we know where to start looking ...



Like a Turing Machine

- This construction
 - Illustrates what needs to be done
 - Optimization fodder
- Correctness, not efficiency
 - Why does it work? (Asks the scientist)
 - How does it work? (Asks the engineer)
 - Would you like fries with that? (Asks the liberal arts major)



A Generic Sequential Object

public interface SeqObject {
 public abstract Response
apply(Invocation invoc);
}



A Generic Sequential Object

public interface SeqObject {
 public abstract Response
apply(Invocation invoc);
}

Push:5, Pop:null



Invocation

```
public class Invoc {
  public String method;
  public Object[] args;
}
```



Invocation





Invocation





A Generic Sequential Object





Response





A Universal Concurrent Object

public interface SeqObject {
 public abstract Response
apply(Invocation invoc);
}

A concurrent object that is linearizable to the generic sequential object



Start with Lock-Free Universal Construction

 First Lock-free: infinitely often some method call finishes.

 Then Wait-Free: each method call takes a finite number of steps to finish



Universal Construction: Naïve Idea

- Use consensus object to store pointer to cell with current state
- Each thread creates new cell
 - computes outcome,
 - and tries to switch pointer to its outcome
- Unfortunately not...
 - consensus objects can be used once only



Naïve Idea











Solved one time 2-consensus. Not clear how to allow reuse of object or reading its state...





Universal Construction

- Object represented as
 - Initial Object State
 - A Log: a linked list of the method calls
- New method call
 - Find end of list
 - Atomically append call
 - Compute response by traversing the log upto the call



Basic Idea

- Use one-time consensus object to decide next pointer
- All threads update actual next pointer based on decision
 - OK because they all write the same value
- Challenges
 - Lock-free means we need to worry what happens if a thread stops in the middle



```
public class Node implements
java.lang.Comparable {
 public Invoc invoc;
 public Consensus<Node> decideNext;
 public Node next;
 public int seq;
 public Node(Invoc invoc) {
    invoc = invoc;
    decideNext = new Consensus<Node>()
    seq = 0;
```







public class Node implements iava_lang_Comparable_{ public Invoc invoc; blic Consensus<Node> decideNext; public Node next; public int seq; the invocation 1 nvoc = 1 nvoc;decideNext = new Consensus<Node>() seq = 0;}





public class Node implements java.lang.Comparable { public Invoc invoc; public Consensus<Node> decideNext; public Node next; ublic int seq; public Node(Invest invoc) { invoc - invocTraversable pointer to next node (needed because you cannot repeatedly read a consensus object) Programming Copyright 28 🕮 🕮 BROWN Herlihy-Shavit 2007





BROWN









Universal Object

```
public class Universal {
   private Node[] head;
   private Node tail = new Node();
   tail.seq = 1;
   for (int j=0; j < n; j++){
        head[j] = tail
   }
</pre>
```



Universal Object



Head Pointers Array



Universal Object




Universal Object





Universal Object



```
public static Node max(Node[] array) {
    Node max = array[0];
    for (int i = 1; i < array.length; i++)
        if (max.seq < array[i].seq)
        max = array[i];
        return max;
    }
</pre>
```









Compare the seq nums of nodes pointed to by the array





public Response apply(Invoc invoc) { int i = ThreadID.get(); Node prefer = new node(invoc); while (prefer.seq == 0) { Node before = Node.max(head); Node after = before.decideNext.decide(prefer); before.next = after; after.seq = before.seq + 1; head[i] = after; }











....





public Response apply(Invoc invoc) { int i = ThreadID.get(); Node prefer = new node(invoc); while (prefer.seq == 0) { Node before = Node.max(head); Node after = before.decideNext.decide(prefer); before.next = after As long as I after.seq = before have not; been head[i] = after; threaded into } list



....

public Response apply(Invoc invoc) {
 int i = ThreadID.get();
 Node prefer = new node(invoc);
 while (prefer.seq == 0) {

Node before = Node.max(head);

Node after =

before.decideNext.decide(prefer); before.next = aftNode at head of after.seq = beforeistethat¹will try head[i] = after; } and to append to



....





Universal Application





public Response apply(Invoc invoc) { int i = ThreadID.get(); Node prefer = new node(invoc); while (prefer.seq == 0) { Node before = Node.max(head); Node after = before.decideNext.decide(prefer); before.next = after; after.seq = before.seq + 1; add to head head[i] = after; array so new head will be Art of Multiprocessor found Programming[©] Copyright BROWN Herlihy-Shavit 2007



```
//compute my response
SeqObject MyObject = new SeqObject();
current = tail.next;
while (current != prefer){
  MyObject.apply(current.invoc);
  current = current.next;
return MyObject.apply(current.invoc);
}
```



//compute my response SeqObject MyObject = new SeqObject(); current = tail.next; while (current != prefer){ MyObject.apply(current.invoc); current = current next;

Compute the result by sequentially applying the method calls in the list to a private copy of the object starting from the initial state

:.invoc);

compute my response SeqObject MyObject = new SeqObject(); ext: while (current != prefer) { MyObject.apply(current.invoc) current = current.next; return MyObject.apply(current.i ivoc); } Start with initialized copy of the sequential object



//compute my response SeqObject MyObject = new SeqObject(); current = tail.next; while (current != prefer){ MyObject.apply(current.invoc); current = current. return MyObject.apply(current.invoc); } First new method call is appended after the tail





While not reached my own



Art o**methogs**or **Call** Programming© Copyright Herlihy-Shavit 2007





Correctness

- List defines linearized sequential history
- Thread returns its response based on list order



Lock-freedom

- Lock-free because
- New winner node is added into the head array within a finite number of steps
- A thread moves forward in list
- Can repeatedly fail to win consensus on "real" head only if another succeeds



Wait-free Construction

- Lock-free construction + announce array
- Stores (pointer to) node in announce
 - If a thread doesn't append its node
 - Another thread will see it in array and help append it



Helping

- "Announcing" my intention
 - Guarantees progress
 - Even if the scheduler hates me
 - My method call will complete
- Makes protocol wait-free
- Otherwise starvation possible







The Announce Array

public class Universal {
 private Node[] announce;
 private Node[] head;
 private Node tail = new node();
 tail.seq = 1;
 for (int j=0; j < n; j++){
 head[j] = tail; announce[j] = tail
 };</pre>



The Announce Array



Announce array



The Announce Array

public class Universal {
 private Node[] announce;
 private Node[] head;
 private Node tail = new node();
 tail.seq = 1;
 for (int j=0; j < n; j++){
 head[j] = tail [announce[j] = tail
 };
</pre>

All entries initially point to tail



public Response apply(Invoc invoc) {
 int i = ThreadID.get();
 announce[i] = new Node(invoc);
 head[i] = Node.max(head);
 while (announce[i].seq == 0) {
 ...
 // while node not appended to list
 ...
 }





Announce new method call (node), asking help from others





Look for end of list





Main loop, while node not appended (either by me or some thread helping me)


- Non-zero sequence number indicates success
- Thread keeps helping append nodes
- Until its own node is appended



```
while (announce[i].seq == 0) {
  Node before = head[i];
  Node help = announce[(before.seq + 1 % n)];
  if (help.seq == 0)
     prefer = help;
     else
     prefer = announce[i];
```

















Altruism

- Choose a thread to "help"
- If that thread needs help
 - Try to append its node
 - Otherwise append your own
- Worst case
 - Everyone tries to help same pitiful loser
 - Someone succeeds



Help!

- When last node in list has sequence number k
- All threads check ...
 - Whether thread k+1 mod n wants help
 - If so, try to append her node first



Help!

- First time after thread k+1 announces
 No guarantees
- After n more nodes appended
 - Everyone sees that thread k+1 wants help
 - Everyone tries to append that node
 - Someone succeeds



Sliding Window Lemma

- After thread A announces its node
- No more than n other calls
 - Can start and finish
 - Without appending A's node







Sliding Help Window









```
while (prefer.seq == 0) {
...
Node after =
    before.decideNext.decide(prefer);
    before.next = after;
    after.seq = before.seq + 1;
    head[i] = after;
}
```















Finishing the Job

- Once thread's node is linked
- The rest is again the same as in lockfree alg
- Compute the result by sequentially applying the method calls in the list to a private copy of the object starting from the initial state



Then Same Part II

```
//compute my response
SeqObject MyObject = new SeqObject();
current = tail.next;
while (current != prefer){
  MyObject.apply(current.invoc);
  current = current.next;
return MyObject.apply(current.invoc);
}
```



Universal Application Part II



Shared-Memory Computability



Wait-free/Lock-free computable

Threads with methods that solve n-

consensus



GetAndSet is not Universal

```
public class RMWRegister {
  private int value;
  public boolean getAndSet(int update)
  {
    int prior = this.value;
    this.value = update;
    return prior;
  }
}
```



GetAndSet is not Universal





GetAndSet is not Universal





CompareAndSet is Universal

```
public class RMWRegister {
 private int value;
 public boolean
   compareAndSet(int expected,
                 int update) {
 int prior = this.value;
  if (this.value == expected) {
   this.value = update;
   return true;
  }
 return false;
 }}
```



CompareAndSet is Universal





CompareAndSet is Universal





Practical Implications

- Any architecture that does not provide a universal primitive has inherent limitations
- You cannot avoid locking for concurrent data structures ...



Older Architectures

- IBM 360
 - testAndSet (getAndSet)
- NYU UltraComputer
 - getAndAdd
- Neither universal
 - Except for 2 threads



Newer Architectures

- Intel x86, Itanium, SPARC
 - compareAndSet
- Alpha AXP, PowerPC
 - Load-locked/store-conditional
- All universal
 - For any number of threads
- Trend is clear ...





This work is licensed under a <u>Creative Commons Attribution</u>-<u>ShareAlike 2.5 License</u>.

You are free:

- **to Share** to copy, distribute and transmit the work
- **to Remix** to adapt the work
- Under the following conditions:
 - Attribution. You must attribute the work to "The Art of Multiprocessor Programming" (but not in any way that suggests that the authors endorse you or your use of the work).
 - Share Alike. If you alter, transform, or build upon this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under the same, similar or a compatible license.
- For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work. The best way to do this is with a link to
 - http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/.
- Any of the above conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.
- Nothing in this license impairs or restricts the author's moral rights.

