Lecture 26: Multiprocessors

- Today’s topics:
  - Snooping-based coherence
  - Synchronization
  - Consistency
Example

- P1 reads X: not found in cache-1, request sent on bus, memory responds, X is placed in cache-1 in shared state
- P2 reads X: not found in cache-2, request sent on bus, everyone snoops this request, cache-1 does nothing because this is just a read request, memory responds, X is placed in cache-2 in shared state

- P1 writes X: cache-1 has data in shared state (shared only provides read perms), request sent on bus, cache-2 snoops and then invalidate its copy of X, cache-1 moves its state to modified
- P2 reads X: cache-2 has data in invalid state, request sent on bus, cache-1 snoops and realizes it has the only valid copy, so it downgrades itself to shared state and responds with data, X is placed in cache-2 in shared state, memory is also updated
## Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Cache Hit/Miss</th>
<th>Request on the bus</th>
<th>Who responds</th>
<th>State in Cache 1</th>
<th>State in Cache 2</th>
<th>State in Cache 3</th>
<th>State in Cache 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1: Rd X</td>
<td>Rd Miss</td>
<td>Rd X</td>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>Inv</td>
<td>Inv</td>
<td>Inv</td>
<td>Inv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2: Rd X</td>
<td>Rd Miss</td>
<td>Rd X</td>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Inv</td>
<td>Inv</td>
<td>Inv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2: Wr X</td>
<td>Perms Miss</td>
<td>Upgrade X</td>
<td>No response. Other caches invalidate.</td>
<td>Inv</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Inv</td>
<td>Inv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3: Wr X</td>
<td>Wr Miss</td>
<td>Wr X</td>
<td>P2 responds</td>
<td>Inv</td>
<td>Inv</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Inv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3: Rd X</td>
<td>Rd Hit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Inv</td>
<td>Inv</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Inv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4: Rd X</td>
<td>Rd Miss</td>
<td>Rd X</td>
<td>P3 responds. Mem wrtbk</td>
<td>Inv</td>
<td>Inv</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cache Coherence Protocols

- Directory-based: A single location (directory) keeps track of the sharing status of a block of memory

- Snooping: Every cache block is accompanied by the sharing status of that block – all cache controllers monitor the shared bus so they can update the sharing status of the block, if necessary
  - Write-invalidate: a processor gains exclusive access of a block before writing by invalidating all other copies
  - Write-update: when a processor writes, it updates other shared copies of that block
Constructing Locks

- Applications have phases (consisting of many instructions) that must be executed atomically, without other parallel processes modifying the data.

- A lock surrounding the data/code ensures that only one program can be in a critical section at a time.

- The hardware must provide some basic primitives that allow us to construct locks with different properties.

Parallel (unlocked) banking transactions:

- Bank balance $1000
- Rd $1000
- Add $100
- Wr $1100

- Rd $1000
- Add $200
- Wr $1200
Synchronization

• The simplest hardware primitive that greatly facilitates synchronization implementations (locks, barriers, etc.) is an atomic read-modify-write

• Atomic exchange: swap contents of register and memory

• Special case of atomic exchange: test & set: transfer memory location into register and write 1 into memory (if memory has 0, lock is free)

• lock: t&s register, location
  bnz register, lock
  CS
  st location, #0

When multiple parallel threads execute this code, only one will be able to enter CS
Coherence Vs. Consistency

• Coherence guarantees (i) write propagation (a write will eventually be seen by other processors), and (ii) write serialization (all processors see writes to the same location in the same order)

• The consistency model defines the ordering of writes and reads to different memory locations – the hardware guarantees a certain consistency model and the programmer attempts to write correct programs with those assumptions
Consistency Example

• Consider a multiprocessor with bus-based snooping cache coherence

Initially A = B = 0
P1 P2
A ← 1 B ← 1
... ...
if (B == 0) if (A == 0)
Crit.Section Crit.Section
Consistency Example

• Consider a multiprocessor with bus-based snooping cache coherence

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initially A = B = 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if (B == 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crit.Section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

The programmer expected the above code to implement a lock – because of ooo, both processors can enter the critical section

The consistency model lets the programmer know what assumptions they can make about the hardware’s reordering capabilities
Sequential Consistency

- A multiprocessor is sequentially consistent if the result of the execution is achievable by maintaining program order within a processor and interleaving accesses by different processors in an arbitrary fashion.

- The multiprocessor in the previous example is not sequentially consistent.

- Can implement sequential consistency by requiring the following: program order, write serialization, everyone has seen an update before a value is read – very intuitive for the programmer, but extremely slow.
Relaxed Consistency

- Sequential consistency is very slow

- The programming complications/surprises are caused when the program has race conditions (two threads dealing with same data and at least one of the threads is modifying the data)

- If programmers are disciplined and enforce mutual exclusion when dealing with shared data, we can allow some re-orderings and higher performance

- This is effective at balancing performance & programming effort