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Raising level of abstraction for synchronization

- Previous topic: machine-level atomic operations
  - Fetch-and-op, test-and-set, compare-and-swap, load linked-store conditional
- Then we used these atomic operations to construct higher level synchronization primitives in software:
  - Locks, barriers
  - Lock-free data structures
- We’ve seen how it can be challenging to produce correct programs using these primitives (easy to create bugs that violate atomicity, create deadlock, etc.)
- Today: raising level of abstraction for synchronization even further
  - Idea: transactional memory
What you should know

▪ What a transaction is

▪ The difference (in semantics) between an atomic code block and lock/unlock primitives

▪ The basic design space of transactional memory implementations
  - Data versioning policy
  - Conflict detection policy
  - Granularity of detection

▪ The basics of a software implementation of transactional memory

▪ The basics of a hardware implementation of transactional memory
  (consider how it relates to the cache coherence protocol implementations we’ve discussed previously in the course)
Between a Lock and a Hard Place

- Locks force trade-off between
  - Degree of concurrency $\Rightarrow$ performance
  - Chance of races, deadlock $\Rightarrow$ correctness

- Coarse grain locking
  - low concurrency, higher chance of correctness
    - E.g. single global lock for shared memory

- Fine grain locking
  - high concurrency, lower chance of correctness

- Is there a better synchronization abstraction?
Review: ensuring atomicity via locks

```java
void deposit(Acct account, int amount) {
    lock(account.lock);
    int tmp = bank.get(account);
    tmp += amount;
    bank.put(account, tmp);
    unlock(account.lock);
}
```

- Deposit is a read-modify-write operation: want “deposit” to be atomic with respect to other bank operations on this account
- Locks are one mechanism to synchronize threads to ensure atomicity of update (via ensuring mutual exclusion on the account)
void deposit(Acct account, int amount) {
    lock(account.lock);
    int tmp = bank.get(account);
    tmp += amount;
    bank.put(account, tmp);
    unlock(account.lock);
}

void deposit(Acct account, int amount) {
    atomic {
        int tmp = bank.get(account);
        tmp += amount;
        bank.put(account, tmp);
    }
}

- Atomic construct is declarative
  - Programmer states what to do (maintain atomicity of this code), not how to do it
  - No explicit use or management of locks

- System implements synchronization as necessary to ensure atomicity
  - System could implement atomic{} using locks (see this later)
  - Implementation discussed today uses optimistic concurrency: maintain serialization only in situations of true contention (R-W or W-W conflicts)
Declarative vs. imperative abstractions

- **Declarative**: programmer defines *what* should be done
  - Execute all these independent 1000 tasks
  - Perform this set of operations atomically

- **Imperative**: programmer states *how* it should be done
  - Spawn N worker threads. Assign work to threads by removing work from a shared task queue
  - Acquire a lock, perform operations, release the lock
Transactional Memory (TM)

- Memory transaction
  - An atomic and isolated sequence of memory accesses
  - Inspired by database transactions

- Atomicity (all or nothing)
  - Upon transaction commit, all memory writes in transaction take effect at once
  - On transaction abort, none of the writes appear to take effect (as if transaction never happened)

- Isolation
  - No other processor can observe writes before transaction commits

- Serializability
  - Transactions appear to commit in a single serial order
  - But the exact order of commits is not guaranteed by semantics of transaction
Transactional Memory (TM)

In other words... many of the properties we maintained for a single address in a coherent memory system, we’d like to maintain for sets of reads and writes in a transaction.

Transaction:
Reads: X, Y, Z
Writes: A, X

These memory transactions will either all be observed by other processors, or none of them will. (the effectively all happen at the same time)

What is the consistency model for TM?
Motivating transactional memory
Another example: Java HashMap

Map: Key $\rightarrow$ Value

- Implemented as a hash table with linked list per bucket

```java
public Object get(Object key) {
    int idx = hash(key); // compute hash
    HashEntry e = buckets[idx]; // find bucket
    while (e != null) { // find element in bucket
        if (equals(key, e.key))
            return e.value;
        e = e.next;
    }
    return null;
}
```

Bad: not thread safe (when synchronization needed)

Good: no lock overhead when synchronization not needed
Synchronized HashMap

- **Java 1.4 solution: synchronized layer**
  - Convert any map to thread-safe variant
  - Uses explicit, coarse-grained mutual locking specified by programmer

  ```java
def public Object get(Object key) {
    synchronized (myHashMap) {
      // per-hashmap lock guards all
      // accesses to hashMap
      return myHashMap.get(key);
    }
  }
```

- **Coarse-grain synchronized HashMap**
  - Good: thread-safe, easy to program
  - Bad: limits concurrency, poor scalability
Review from earlier fine-grained sync lecture

What are solutions for making Java’s HashMap thread-safe?

```java
public Object get(Object key) {
    int idx = hash(key); // compute hash
    HashEntry e = buckets[idx]; // find bucket
    while (e != null) { // find element in bucket
        if (equals(key, e.key))
            return e.value;
        e = e.next;
    }
    return null;
}
```

- One solution: use finer-grained synchronization (e.g., lock per bucket)
  - Now thread safe: but incurs lock overhead even if synchronization not needed
Review: performance of fine-grained locking

Reducing contention via fine-grained locking leads to better performance.
Transactional HashMap

- Simply enclose all operation in atomic block
  - Semantics of atomic block: system ensures atomicity of logic within block

```java
public Object get(Object key) {
    atomic {
        // system guarantees atomicity
        return m.get(key);
    }
}
```

- Good: thread-safe, easy to program
- What about performance and scalability?
  - Depends on the workload and implementation of atomic (to be discussed)
Another example: tree update by two threads

Goal: modify nodes 3 and 4 in a thread-safe way
Fine-grained locking example
Goal: modify nodes 3 and 4 in a thread-safe way

Hand-over-hand locking
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Goal: modify nodes 3 and 4 in a thread-safe way
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Fine-grained locking example

Goal: modify nodes 3 and 4 in a thread-safe way

Hand-over-hand locking

Locking can prevent concurrency
(here: locks on node 1 and 2 during update to node 3 could delay update to 4)
Transactions example

Figure highlights data touched as part of transaction

Transaction A
READ: 1, 2, 3
Transactions example

Figure highlights data touched as part of transaction

Transaction A
READ: 1, 2, 3
WRITE: 3
Transactions example

Figure highlights data touched as part of transaction

**Transaction A**
READ: 1, 2, 3
WRITE: 3

**Transaction B**
READ: 1, 2, 4
WRITE: 4

**NO READ-WRITE or WRITE-WRITE conflicts!**
(no transaction writes to data that is accessed by other transactions)
Transactions example #2

(Both transactions modify node 3)

Transaction A
READ: 1, 2, 3
WRITE: 3

Transaction B
READ: 1, 2, 3
WRITE: 3

Conflicts exist: transactions must be serialized
(both transactions write to node 3)
Performance: locks vs. transactions

“TCC” is a TM system implemented in hardware
Another motivation: failure atomicity

void transfer(A, B, amount) {
    synchronized(bank) {
        try {
            withdraw(A, amount);
            deposit(B, amount);
        } catch(exception1) { /* undo code 1*/ } catch(exception2) { /* undo code 2*/ } ...
    }
}

- Complexity of manually catching exceptions
  - Programmer provides “undo” code on a case-by-case basis
  - Complexity: must track what to undo and how…
  - Some side-effects may become visible to other threads
    - E.g., an uncaught case can deadlock the system…
Failure atomicity: transactions

```c
void transfer(A, B, amount)
{
    atomic {
        withdraw(A, amount);
        deposit(B, amount);
    }
}
```

- **System now responsible for processing exceptions**
  - All exceptions (except those explicitly managed by the programmer)
  - Transaction is aborted and memory updates are undone
  - Recall: a transaction either commits or it doesn’t: no partial updates are visible to other threads
    - E.g., no locks held by a failing threads…
Another motivation: composability

- Composing lock-based code can be tricky
  - Requires system-wide policies to get correct
  - System-wide policies can break software modularity

- Programmer caught between a lock and a hard (to implement) place!
  - Coarse-grain locks: low performance
  - Fine-grain locking: good for performance, but mistakes can lead to deadlock

```java
void transfer(A, B, amount)
{
    synchronized(A) {
        synchronized(B) {
            withdraw(A, amount);
            deposit(B, amount);
        }
    }
}
```

Thread 0:
transfer(x, y, 100);  DEADLOCK!

Thread 1:
transfer(y, x, 100);
Composability: locks

void transfer(A, B, amount) {
    synchronized(A) {
        synchronized(B) {
            withdraw(A, amount);
            deposit(B, amount);
        }
    }
}

void transfer2(A, B, amount) {
    synchronized(B) {
        synchronized(A) {
            withdraw(A, 2*amount);
            deposit(B, 2*amount);
        }
    }
}

- Composing lock-based code can be tricky
  - Requires system-wide policies to get correct
  - System-wide policies can break software modularity

- Programmer caught between an lock and a hard (to implement) place
  - Coarse-grain locks: low performance
  - Fine-grain locking: good for performance, but mistakes can lead to deadlock
Composability: transactions

void transfer(A, B, amount) {
    atomic {
        withdraw(A, amount);
        deposit(B, amount);
    }
}

Transactions compose gracefully (in theory)
- Programmer declares global intent (atomic execution of transfer)
  - No need to know about global implementation strategy
- Transaction in `transfer` subsumes any defined in `withdraw` and `deposit`
  - Outermost transaction defines atomicity boundary

System manages concurrency as well as possible
- Serialization for `transfer(A, B, 100)` and `transfer(B, A, 200)`
- Concurrency for `transfer(A, B, 100)` and `transfer(C, D, 200)`

Thread 0:
transfer(x, y, 100)
Thread 1:
transfer(y, x, 100);
Advantages (promise) of transactional memory

- **Easy to use synchronization construct**
  - It is difficult for programmers to get synchronization right
  - Programmer declares need for atomicity, system implements it well
  - Claim: transactions are as easy to use as coarse-grain locks

- **Often performs as well as fine-grained locks**
  - Provides automatic read-read concurrency and fine-grained concurrency
  - Performance portability: locking scheme for four CPUs may not be the best scheme for 64 CPUs
  - Productivity argument for transactional memory: system support for transactions can achieve 90% of the benefit of expert programming with fine-grained locks, with 10% of the development time

- **Failure atomicity and recovery**
  - No lost locks when a thread fails
  - Failure recovery = transaction abort + restart

- **Composability**
  - Safe and scalable composition of software modules
Example integration with OpenMP

- Example: OpenTM = OpenMP + TM

- OpenTM features
  - Transactions, transactional loops and transactional sections
  - Data directives for TM (e.g., thread private data)
  - Runtime system hints for TM

- Code example:

```c
#pragma omp taskwise schedule (static, chunk=50)
for (int i=0; i<N; i++) {
    bin[A[i]]++;
}
```
Self-check: atomic {} ≠ lock() + unlock()

- **The difference**
  - Atomic: high-level declaration of atomicity
    - Does not specify implementation of atomicity
  - Lock: low-level blocking primitive
    - Does not provide atomicity or isolation on its own

- **Keep in mind**
  - Locks can be used to implement an atomic block but...
  - Locks can be used for purposes beyond atomicity
    - Cannot replace all uses of locks with atomic regions
  - Atomic eliminates many data races, but programming with atomic blocks can still suffer from atomicity violations: e.g., programmer erroneous splits sequence that should be atomic into two atomic blocks

Make sure you understand this difference in semantics!
What about replacing synchronized with atomic in this example?

// Thread 1
synchronized(lock1)
{
    ...
    flagA = true;
    while (flagB == 0);
    ...
}

// Thread 2
synchronized(lock2)
{
    ...
    flagB = true;
    while (flagA == 0);
    ...
}
Atomicity violation due to programmer error

- Programmer mistake: logically atomic code sequence (in thread 1) is erroneously separated into two atomic blocks (allowing another thread to set pointer to NULL in between)

```
// Thread 1
atomic
{

    ...  
    ptr = A;  
    ...  
}

atomic
{
    B = ptr->field;  
}

// Thread 2
atomic
{

    ...  
    ptr = NULL;  
    ...
}
Implementing transactional memory
Recall transactional semantics

- Atomicity (all or nothing)
  - At commit, all memory writes take effect at once
  - In event of abort, none of the writes appear to take effect

- Isolation
  - No other code can observe writes before commit

- Serializability
  - Transactions seem to commit in a single serial order
  - The exact order is not guaranteed though
TM implementation basics

- TM systems must provide atomicity and isolation
  - While maintaining concurrency as much as possible

- Two key implementation questions
  - Data versioning policy: How does the system manage uncommitted (new) and previously committed (old) versions of data for concurrent transactions?
  - Conflict detection policy: how/when does the system determine that two concurrent transactions conflict?
Data versioning policy

Manage uncommitted (new) and previously committed (old) versions of data for concurrent transactions

1. Eager versioning (undo-log based)
2. Lazy versioning (write-buffer based)
Eager versioning

Update memory immediately, maintain “undo log” in case of abort

Begin Transaction

Thread (executing transaction)

X: 10
Memory

Undo log

Write $x \leftarrow 15$

Thread (executing transaction)

X: 15
Memory

Undo log

Commit Transaction

Thread (executing transaction)

X: 15
Memory

Undo log

Abort Transaction

Thread (executing transaction)

X: 10
Memory

Undo log
Lazy versioning

Log memory updates in transaction write buffer, flush buffer on commit

Begin Transaction
- Thread (executing transaction)
- Write buffer
- X: 10
- Memory

Write x ← 15
- Thread (executing transaction)
- Write buffer
- X: 15
- Memory

Commit Transaction
- Thread (executing transaction)
- Write buffer
- X: 15
- Memory

Abort Transaction
- Thread (executing transaction)
- Write buffer
- X: 15
- Memory
Data versioning

- **Goal:** manage uncommitted (new) and committed (old) versions of data for concurrent transactions

- **Eager versioning (undo-log based)**
  - Update memory location directly on write
  - Maintain undo information in a log (incurs per-store overhead)
  - Good: faster commit (data is already in memory)

  - Bad: slower aborts, fault tolerance issues (consider crash in middle of transaction)

- **Lazy versioning (write-buffer based)**
  - Buffer data in a write buffer until commit
  - Update actual memory location on commit
  - Good: faster abort (just clear log), no fault tolerance issues

  - Bad: slower commits
Conflict detection

- Must detect and handle conflicts between transactions
  - Read-write conflict: transaction A reads address X, which was written to by pending (but not yet committed) transaction B
  - Write-write conflict: transactions A and B are both pending, and both write to address X

- System must track a transaction’s read set and write set
  - Read-set: addresses read during the transaction
  - Write-set: addresses written during the transaction
Pessimistic detection

- Check for conflicts (immediately) during loads or stores
  - Philosophy: “I suspect conflicts might happen, so let’s always check to see if one has occurred after each memory operation... if I’m going to have to roll back, might as well do it now to avoid wasted work.”

- “Contention manager” decides to stall or abort transaction when a conflict is detected
  - Various policies to handle common case fast
Pessimistic detection examples

Note: diagrams assume “aggressive” contention manager on writes: writer wins, so other transactions abort.

Case 1
- Time: T0, T1
- Transactions: rd A, wr B, wr C
- Results: Success, commit

Case 2
- Time: T0, T1
- Transactions: wr A, rd A, check
- Results: Early detect (and stall), commit

Case 3
- Time: T0, T1
- Transactions: rd A, check, wr A, stall, rd A
- Results: Abort, commit

Case 4
- Time: T0, T1
- Transactions: wr A, check, restart
- Results: No progress, restart

(questions: how to avoid livelock?)
Optimistic detection

- Detect conflicts when a transaction attempts to commit
  - Intuition: “Let’s hope for the best and sort out all the conflicts only when the transaction tries to commit”

- On a conflict, give priority to committing transaction
  - Other transactions may abort later on
Optimistic detection

Case 1
- T0: rd A, wr B, wr C
- T1: commit

Success

Case 2
- T0: rd A, wr A
- T1: commit, check

Abort

Case 3
- T0: rd A, wr A
- T1: commit, check

Success

Case 4
- T0: rd A, wr A
- T1: commit, check

Forward progress
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Conflict detection trade-offs

- Pessimistic conflict detection (a.k.a. “eager”)
  - Good: detect conflicts early (undo less work, turn some aborts to stalls)
  - Bad: no forward progress guarantees, more aborts in some cases
  - Bad: fine-grained communication (check on each load/store)
  - Bad: detection on critical path

- Optimistic conflict detection (a.k.a. “lazy” or “commit”)
  - Good: forward progress guarantees
  - Good: bulk communication and conflict detection
  - Bad: detects conflicts late, can still have fairness problems
TM implementation space (examples)

- **Hardware TM systems**
  - Lazy + optimistic: Stanford TCC
  - Lazy + pessimistic: MIT LTM, Intel VTM
  - Eager + pessimistic: Wisconsin LogTM
  - Eager + optimistic: not practical

- **Software TM systems**
  - Lazy + optimistic (rd/wr): Sun TL2
  - Lazy + optimistic (rd)/pessimistic (wr): MS OSTM
  - Eager + optimistic (rd)/pessimistic (wr): Intel STM
  - Eager + pessimistic (rd/wr): Intel STM

- **Optimal design remains an open question**
  - May be different for HW, SW, and hybrid
Software Transactional Memory

atomic {
    a.x = t1
    a.y = t2
    if (a.z == 0) {
        a.x = 0
        a.z = t3
    }
}

tmTxnBegin()
tmWr(&a.x, t1)
tmWr(&a.y, t2)
if (tmRd(&a.z) != 0) {
    tmWr(&a.x, 0);
    tmWr(&a.z, t3)
}
tmTxnCommit()

- Software barriers (STM function call) for TM bookkeeping
- Versioning, read/write-set tracking, commit, ...
- Using locks, timestamps, data copying, ...
- Requires function cloning or dynamic translation
- Function used inside and outside of transaction
STM Runtime Data Structures

- **Transaction descriptor (per-thread)**
  - Used for conflict detection, commit, abort, ...
  - Includes the read set, write set, undo log or write buffer

- **Transaction record (per data)**
  - Pointer-sized record guarding shared data
  - Tracks transactional state of data
    - Shared: accessed by multiple readers
      - Using version number or shared reader lock
    - Exclusive: access by one writer
      - Using writer lock that points to owner
    - BTW: same way that HW cache coherence works
Mapping Data to Transaction Records

Every data item has an associated transaction record

Java/C#

```java
class Foo {
    int x;
    int y;
}
```

C/C++

```c
struct Foo {
    int x;
    int y;
}
```

Embed in each object

OR

Hash fields or array elements to global table

```
f(obj.hash, field.index)
```

What's the tradeoff?

Address-based hash into global table

Cache-line or word granularity
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Conflict Detection Granularity

- **Object granularity**
  - Low overhead mapping operation
  - Exposes optimization opportunities
  - False conflicts (e.g. Txn 1 and Txn 2)

- **Element/field granularity (word)**
  - Reduces false conflicts
  - Improves concurrency (e.g. Txn 1 and Txn 2)
  - Increased overhead (time/space)

- **Cache line granularity (multiple words)**
  - Matches hardware TM
  - Reduces storage overhead of transactional records
  - Hard for programmer & compiler to analyze

- **Mix & match per type basis**
  - E.g., element-level for arrays, object-level for non-arrays
An Example STM Algorithm

- Based on Intel’s McRT STM [PPoPP’06, PLDI’06, CGO’07]
  - Eager versioning, optimistic reads, pessimistic writes

- Based on timestamp for version tracking
  - Global timestamp
    - Incremented when a writing xaction commits
  - Local timestamp per xaction
    - Global timestamp value when xaction last validated

- Transaction record (32-bit)
  - LS bit: 0 if writer-locked, 1 if not locked
  - MS bits
    - Timestamp (version number) of last commit if not locked
    - Pointer to owner xaction if locked
STM Operations

- **STM read (optimistic)**
  - Direct read of memory location (eager)
  - Validate read data
    - Check if unlocked and data version ≤ local timestamp
    - If not, validate all data in read set for consistency
  - Insert in read set
  - Return value

- **STM write (pessimistic)**
  - Validate data
    - Check if unlocked and data version ≤ local timestamp
  - Acquire lock
  - Insert in write set
  - Create undo log entry
  - Write data in place (eager)
STM Operations (cont)

- **Read-set validation**
  - Get global timestamp
  - For each item in the read set
    - If locked by other or data version > local timestamp, abort
  - Set local timestamp to global timestamp from initial step

- **STM commit**
  - Atomically increment global timestamp by 2 (LSb used for write-lock)
  - If preincremented (old) global timestamp > local timestamp, validate read-set
    - Check for recently committed transactions
  - For each item in the write set
    - Release the lock and set version number to global timestamp
STM Example

- X1 copies object foo into object bar
- X2 should read bar as [0,0] or [9,7]
STM Example

Reads  <foo, 3>  <foo, 3>
Reads  <bar, 5>
Writes  <bar, 5>
Undo   <bar.x, 0>  <bar.y, 0>

No local or global time stamps
Each object has a time stamp
Challenges for STM Systems

- Overhead of software barriers
- Function cloning
- Robust contention management
- Memory model (strong Vs. weak atomicity)
Optimizing Software Transactions

```
atomic {
    a.x = t1
    a.y = t2
    if (a.z == 0) {
        a.x = 0
        a.z = t3
    }
}
```

```
  tmTxnBegin()
  tmWr(&a.x, t1)
  tmWr(&a.y, t2)
  if (tmRd(&a.z) != 0) {
      tmWr(&a.x, 0);
      tmWr(&a.z, t3)
  }
  tmTxnCommit()
```

- Monolithic barriers hide redundant logging & locking from the compiler
Optimizing Software Transactions

atomic {
    a.x = t1
    a.y = t2
    if (a.z == 0) {
        a.x = 0
        a.z = t3
    }
}

- Decomposed barriers expose redundancies

    txnOpenForWrite(a)
    txnLogObjectInt(&a.x, a)
    a.x = t1
    txnOpenForWrite(a)
    txnLogObjectInt(&a.y, a)
    a.y = t2
    txnOpenForRead(a)
    if(a.z != 0) {
        txnOpenForWrite(a)
        txnLogObjectInt(&a.x, a)
        a.x = 0
        txnOpenForWrite(a)
        txnLogObjectInt(&a.z, a)
        a.z = t3
    }
Optimizing Software Transactions

```c
atomic {
    a.x = t1
    a.y = t2
    if (a.z == 0) {
        a.x = 0
        a.z = t3
    }
}
```

```c
txnOpenForWrite(a)
txnLogObjectInt(&a.x, a)
a.x = t1
txnLogObjectInt(&a.y, a)
a.y = t2
if (a.z != 0) {
    a.x = 0
    txnLogObjectInt(&a.z, a)
a.z = t3
}
```

- Allows compiler to optimize STM code
- Produces fewer & cheaper STM operations
Compiler Optimizations for STM

- **Standard compiler optimizations**
  - CSE, PRE, dead-code elimination, …
  - Assuming IR supports TM, few compiler mods needed

- **STM-specific optimizations**
  - Partial inlining of barrier fast paths
    - Often written in optimized assembly
  - No barriers for immutable and transaction local data

- **Impediments to optimizations**
  - Support for nested transactions
  - Dynamically linked STM library
  - Dynamic tuning of STM algorithm
Effect of Compiler Optimizations

- 1 thread overheads over thread-unsafe baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HashMap</th>
<th>TreeMap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synchronized</td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="Synchronized" /></td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="Synchronized" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No STM Opt</td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="No STM Opt" /></td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="No STM Opt" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Base STM Opt</td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="+Base STM Opt" /></td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="+Base STM Opt" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Immutability</td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="+Immutability" /></td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="+Immutability" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Txn Local</td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="+Txn Local" /></td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="+Txn Local" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Fast Path Inlining</td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="+Fast Path Inlining" /></td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="+Fast Path Inlining" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- With compiler optimizations
  - <40% over no concurrency control
  - <30% over lock-based synchronization
Function Cloning

- Problem: need two versions of functions
  - One with and one without STM instrumentation

- Managed languages (Java, C#)
  - On demand cloning of methods using JIT

- Unmanaged languages (C, C++)
  - Allow programmer to mark TM and pure functions
    - TM functions should be cloned by compiler
    - Pure functions touch only transaction-local data
      - No need for clones
  - All other functions handled as irrevocable actions
  - Some overhead for checks and mode transitions
Motivation for Hardware Support

- STM slowdown: 2-8x per thread overhead due to barriers
- Short term issue: demotivates parallel programming
- Long term issue: energy wasteful
- Lack of strong atomicity
- Costly to provide purely in software
Why is STM Slow?

- Measured single-thread STM performance

- 1.8x – 5.6x slowdown over sequential
  - Most time goes in read barriers & validation
  - Most apps read more data than they write
## Types of Hardware Support

- **Hardware-accelerated STM systems (HASTM, SigTM, USTM, ...)**
  - Start with an STM system & identify key bottlenecks
  - Provide (simple) HW primitives for acceleration, but keep SW barriers

- **Hardware-based TM systems (TCC, LTM, VTM, LogTM, ...)**
  - Versioning & conflict detection directly in HW
  - No SW barriers

- **Hybrid TM systems (Sun Rock, ...)**
  - Combine an HTM with an STM by switching modes when needed
    - Based on transaction characteristics available resources, ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HTM</th>
<th>STM</th>
<th>HW-STM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write versioning</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict detection</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>HW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HTM Performance Example

- 2x to 7x over STM performance
- Within 10% of sequential for one thread
- Scales efficiently with number of processors
- Uncommon cases not a performance challenge
TM Implementation Summary 1

- **TM implementation**
  - Data versioning: eager or lazy
  - Conflict detection: optimistic or pessimistic
    - Granularity: object, word, cache-line, ...

- **Software TM systems**
  - Compiler adds code for versioning & conflict detection
    - Note: STM barrier = instrumentation code
  - Basic data-structures
    - Transactional descriptor per thread (status, rd/wr set, ...)
    - Transactional record per data (locked/version)
Hardware transactional memory (HTM)

- Data versioning is implemented in caches
  - Cache the write buffer or the undo log
  - Add new cache line metadata to track transaction read set and write set

- Conflict detection through cache coherence protocol
  - Coherence lookups detect conflicts between transactions
  - Works with snooping and directory coherence

- Note:
  - Register checkpoint must also be taken at transaction begin (to restore execution context state on abort)
HTM design

- Cache lines annotated to track read set and write set
  - R bit: indicates data read by transaction (set on loads)
  - W bit: indicates data written by transaction (set on stores)
  - R/W bits can be at word or cache-line granularity
  - R/W bits gang-cleared on transaction commit or abort

- For eager versioning, need a 2nd cache write for undo log

- Coherence requests check R/W bits to detect conflicts
  - Observing shared request to W-word is a read-write conflict
  - Observing exclusive (intent to write) request to R-word is a write-read conflict
  - Observing exclusive (intent to write) request to W-word is a write-write conflict
Example HTM implementation: lazy-optimistic

- CPU changes
  - Ability to checkpoint register state (available in many CPUs)
  - TM state registers (status, pointers to abort handlers, ...)
Example HTM implementation: lazy-optimistic

- Cache changes
  - R bit indicates membership to read set
  - W bit indicates membership to write set
HTM transaction execution

- **Transaction begin**
  - Initialize CPU and cache state
  - Take register checkpoint

```
Xbegin ←
Load A
Load B
Store C ← 5
Xcommit
```
HTM transaction execution

- **Load operation**
  - Serve cache miss if needed
  - Mark data as part of read set

**Xbegin**

- Load A
- Load B
- Store C ← 5

**Xcommit**
HTM transaction execution

Load A
Load B
Store C ← 5

Load operation
- Serve cache miss if needed
- Mark data as part of read set
HTM transaction execution

- **Store operation**
  - Service cache miss if needed
  - Mark data as part of write set (note: this is not a load into exclusive state. Why?)

---

**Xbegin**
- Load A
- Load B
- Store C ← 5

**Xcommit**
HTM transaction execution: commit

Xbegin
  Load A
  Load B
  Store C ← 5
Xcommit ←

Fast two-phase commit
- Validate: request RdX access to write set lines (if needed)
- Commit: gang-reset R and W bits, turns write set data to valid (dirty) data

upgradeX C
(result: C is now in dirty state)
HTM transaction execution: detect/abort

Assume remote processor commits transaction with writes to A and D

Fast conflict detection and abort
- Check: lookup exclusive requests in the read set and write set
- Abort: invalidate write set, gang-reset R and W bits, restore to register checkpoint
Hardware transactional memory support in Intel Haswell architecture

- **New instructions for “restricted transactional memory” (RTM)**
  - `xbegin`: takes pointer to “fallback address” in case of abort
  - e.g., fallback to code-path with a spin-lock
  - `xend`
  - `xabort`

- Implementation: tracks read and write set in L1 cache

- **Processor makes sure all memory operations commit atomically**
  - But processor may automatically abort transaction for many reasons (e.g., eviction of line in read or write set will cause a transaction abort)
    - Implementation does not guarantee progress (see fallback address)
  - Intel optimization guide (ch 12) gives guidelines for increasing probability that transactions will not abort
Summary: transactional memory

- **Atomic construct**: declaration that atomic behavior must be preserved by the system
  - Motivating idea: increase simplicity of synchronization without (significantly) sacrificing performance

- **Transactional memory implementation**
  - Many variants have been proposed: SW, HW, SW+HW
  - Implementations differ in:
    - Versioning policy (eager vs. lazy)
    - Conflict detection policy (pessimistic vs. optimistic)
    - Detection granularity

- **Software TM systems**
  - Compiler adds code for versioning & conflict detection
    - Note: STM barrier = instrumentation code
  - Basic data-structures
    - Transactional descriptor per thread (status, rd/wr set, …)
    - Transactional record per data (locked/version)

- **Hardware transactional memory**
  - Versioned data is kept in caches
  - Conflict detection mechanisms built upon coherence protocol