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-1does 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 invalidates 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

Request	Cache Hit/Miss	Request on the bus	Who responds	State in Cache 1	State in Cache 2	State in Cache 3	State in Cache 4
				Inv	Inv	Inv	Inv
P1: Rd X	Rd Miss	Rd X	Memory	S	Inv	Inv	Inv
P2: Rd X	Rd Miss	Rd X	Memory	S	S	Inv	Inv
P2: Wr X	Perms Miss	Upgrade X	No response. Other caches invalidate.	Inv	Μ	Inv	Inv
P3: Wr X	Wr Miss	Wr X	P2 responds	Inv	Inv	Μ	Inv
P3: Rd X	Rd Hit	-	-	Inv	Inv	М	Inv
P4: Rd X	Rd Miss	Rd X	P3 responds. Mem wrtbk	Inv	Inv	S	S

- 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

- 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



- 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 = 0P1P2 $A \leftarrow 1$ $B \leftarrow 1$if (B == 0)if (A == 0)Crit.SectionCrit.Section

Consistency Example

 Consider a multiprocessor with bus-based snooping cache coherence

Initially A = B = 0P1P2 $A \leftarrow 1$ $B \leftarrow 1$if (B == 0)if (A == 0)Crit.SectionCrit.Section

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

9

- A multiprocessor is sequentially consistent if the result of the execution is achieveable 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

- 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