Overview

• Process vs threads
  – how related
• Concurrency
  – why threads
• Design space of process/threads
  – a simple taxonomy
• Kernel threads
  – more efficient
• User-level threads
  – even faster
• No lecture on THURSDAY Feb 2 2017
What’s “in” a process?

• A process consists of (at least):
  – An address space, containing
    • the code (instructions) for the running program
    • the data for the running program
  – Thread state, consisting of
    • The program counter (PC), indicating the next instruction
    • The stack pointer register (implying the stack it points to)
    • Other general purpose register values
  – A set of OS resources
    • open files, network connections, sound channels, …

• Decompose …
  – address space
  – thread of control (stack, stack pointer, program counter, registers)
  – OS resources
Threads: Concurrency vs. Parallelism

- Threads are about **concurrency** and **parallelism**

- **Concurrent execution on single-core system:**

  ![Diagram of concurrent execution on single-core system]

- **Parallelism on a multi-core system:**

  ![Diagram of parallelism on a multi-core system]
Motivation

• Threads are about **concurrency** and **parallelism**
• One way to get concurrency and parallelism is to use multiple processes
  – The programs (code) of distinct processes are isolated from each other
• Threads are another way to get concurrency and parallelism
  – Threads “share a process” – same address space, same OS resources
  – Threads have private stack, CPU state – are schedulable
What’s needed?

• In many cases
  – Everybody wants to run the same code
  – Everybody wants to access the same data
  – Everybody has the same privileges
  – Everybody uses the same resources (open files, network connections, etc.)

• But you’d like to have multiple hardware execution states:
  – an execution stack and stack pointer (SP)
    • traces state of procedure calls made
  – the program counter (PC), indicating the next instruction
  – a set of general-purpose processor registers and their values
How could we achieve this?

• Given the process abstraction as we know it:
  – fork several processes
  – cause each to *map* to the *same* physical memory to share data
    • see the *shmget()* system call for one way to do this

• This is really inefficient
  – space: PCB, page tables, etc.
  – time: creating OS structures, fork/copy address space, etc.
Can we do better?

- Key idea:
  - separate the concept of a process (address space, OS resources)
  - … from that of a minimal “thread of control” (execution state: stack, stack pointer, program counter, registers)

- This execution state is usually called a thread, or sometimes, a lightweight process
Threads and processes

• Most modern OS’s (Mach (Mac OS), Chorus, Windows, UNIX) therefore support two entities:
  – the **process**, which defines the address space and general process attributes (such as open files, etc.)
  – the **thread**, which defines a sequential execution stream within a process

• A thread is bound to a single process / address space
  – address spaces, however, can have multiple threads executing within them
  – sharing data between threads is cheap: all see the same address space
  – creating threads is cheap too!

• **Threads** become the unit of scheduling
  – processes / address spaces are just **containers** in which threads execute
Single and Multithreaded Processes

- Single-threaded process
  - Registers
  - Stack
  - Code
  - Data
  - Files

- Multithreaded process
  - Registers
  - Registers
  - Registers
  - Stack
  - Stack
  - Stack

- Thread
Communication

- Threads are **concurrent executions sharing an address space** (and some OS resources)
- Address spaces provide isolation
  - If you can’t name it, you can’t read or write it
- Hence, communicating between processes is expensive
  - Must go through the OS to move data from one address space to another
- Because threads are in the same address space, communication is simple/cheap
  - Just update a shared variable!
The design space

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>address space</th>
<th>thread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS/DOS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one thread per process</td>
<td>one process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Java</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many threads per process</td>
<td>one process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

older UNIXes

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>many threads per process</td>
<td>one process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(old) Process address space

- **0xFFFFF00000000**
- **0x00000000**

**address space**

**stack**
(dynamic allocated mem)

**heap**
(dynamic allocated mem)

**static data**
(data segment)

**code**
(text segment)

**PC**

**SP**
(new) Address space with threads

- Code (text segment)
- Static data (data segment)
- Heap (dynamic allocated mem)
- Stack
  - Thread 1 stack
  - Thread 2 stack
  - Thread 3 stack

Address space:
- 0x00000000
- 0xFFFFFFFF
Process/thread separation

- Concurrency (multithreading) is useful for:
  - handling concurrent events (e.g., web servers and clients)
  - building parallel programs (e.g., matrix multiply, ray tracing)
  - improving program structure (the Java argument)

- Multithreading is useful even on a uniprocessor
  - even though only one thread can run at a time

- Supporting multithreading – that is, separating the concept of a process (address space, files, etc.) from that of a minimal thread of control (execution state), is a big win
  - creating concurrency does not require creating new processes
  - “faster / better / cheaper”
Terminology

• Just a note that there’s the potential for some confusion …
  – Old: “process” == “address space + OS resources + single thread”
  – New: “process” typically refers to an address space + system resources + all of its threads …
    • When we mean the “address space” we need to be explicit “thread” refers to a single thread of control within a process / address space

• A bit like “kernel” and “operating system” …
  – Old: “kernel” == “operating system” and runs in “kernel mode”
  – New: “kernel” typically refers to the microkernel; lots of the operating system runs in user mode
Where do threads come from?

- Natural answer: the OS is responsible for creating/managing threads
  - For example, the kernel call to create a new thread would
    - allocate an execution stack within the process address space
    - create and initialize a Thread Control Block
      - stack pointer, program counter, register values
    - stick it on the ready queue

- We call these **kernel threads**
  - There is a “thread name space”
    - Thread id’s (TID’s)
    - TID’s are integers
Kernel threads

address space

thread

Mach, NT, Chorus, Linux, …

os kernel

CPU

(thread create, destroy, signal, wait, etc.)
Kernel threads

- OS now manages threads and processes / address spaces
  - all thread operations are implemented in the kernel
  - OS schedules all of the threads in a system
    - if one thread in a process blocks (e.g., on I/O), the OS knows about it, and can run other threads from that process
    - possible to overlap I/O and computation inside a process
- Kernel threads are cheaper than processes
  - less state to allocate and initialize
- But, they’re still pretty expensive for fine-grained use
  - orders of magnitude more expensive than a procedure call
  - thread operations are all system calls
    - context switch
    - argument checks
  - must maintain kernel state for each thread
Cheaper alternative

• There is an alternative to kernel threads
• Threads can also be managed at the user level (within the process)
  – a library linked into the program manages the threads
    • the thread manager doesn’t need to manipulate address spaces (which only the kernel can do)
    • threads differ (roughly) only in hardware contexts (PC, SP, registers), which can be manipulated by user-level code
    • the thread package multiplexes user-level threads on top of kernel thread(s)
    • each kernel thread is treated as a “virtual processor”
  – we call these user-level threads
User-level threads

Now thread id is unique within the context of a process, not unique system-wide
User-level threads: what the kernel sees
User-level threads

One problem: If a user-level thread blocked due to I/O, all other blocked
User-level threads

• User-level threads are small and fast
  – managed entirely by user-level library
    • E.g., pthreads (libpthreads.a)
  – each thread is represented simply by a PC, registers, a stack, and a small thread control block (TCB)
  – creating a thread, switching between threads, and synchronizing threads are done via procedure calls
    • no kernel involvement is necessary!
• User-level thread operations can be 10-100x faster than kernel threads as a result
OLD Performance example

• On a 700MHz Pentium running Linux 2.2.16 (only the relative numbers matter; ignore the ancient CPU!):

  – Processes
    • `fork/exit`: 251 µs

  – Kernel threads
    • `pthread_create()/pthread_join()`: 94 µs (2.5x faster)

  – User-level threads
    • `pthread_create()/pthread_join`: 4.5 µs (another 20x faster)
User-level thread implementation

- The OS schedules the kernel thread
- The kernel thread executes user code, including the thread support library and its associated thread scheduler
- The thread scheduler determines when a user-level thread runs
  - it uses queues to keep track of what threads are doing: run, ready, wait
    - just like the OS and processes
    - but, implemented at user-level as a library
Thread interface

- This is taken from the POSIX pthreads API:
  - `rcode = pthread_create(&t, attributes, start_procedure)`
    - creates a new thread of control
    - new thread begins executing at `start_procedure`
  - `pthread_cond_wait(condition_variable, mutex)`
    - the calling thread blocks, sometimes called `thread_block()`
  - `pthread_signal(condition_variable)`
    - starts a thread waiting on the condition variable
  - `pthread_exit()`
    - terminates the calling thread
  - `pthread_join(t)`
    - waits for the named thread to terminate
Thread context switch

• Very simple for user-level threads:
  – save context of currently running thread
    • push CPU state onto thread stack
  – restore context of the next thread
    • pop CPU state from next thread’s stack
  – return as the new thread
    • execution resumes at PC of next thread
  – Note: no changes to memory mapping required

• This is all done in assembly language
  – it works at the level of the procedure calling convention
How to keep a user-level thread from hogging the CPU?

• Strategy 1: force everyone to cooperate
  – a thread willingly gives up the CPU by calling `yield()`
  – `yield()` calls into the scheduler, which context switches to another ready thread
  – what happens if a thread never calls `yield()`?

• Strategy 2: use preemption
  – scheduler requests that a timer interrupt be delivered by the OS periodically
    • usually delivered as a UNIX signal (`man signal`)
    • signals are just like software interrupts, but delivered to user-level by the OS instead of delivered to OS by hardware
  – at each timer interrupt, scheduler gains control and context switches as appropriate
What if a thread tries to do I/O?

• The kernel thread “powering” it is lost for the duration of the (synchronous) I/O operation!
  – The kernel thread blocks in the OS, as always
  – It maroons with it the state of the user-level thread

• Could have one kernel thread “powering” each user-level thread
  – “common case” operations (e.g., synchronization) would be quick

• Could have a limited-size “pool” of kernel threads “powering” all the user-level threads in the address space
  – the kernel will be scheduling these threads, obliviously to what’s going on at user-level
Multiple kernel threads “powering” each address space

- address space
- thread

- user-level thread library
- (thread create, destroy, signal, wait, etc.)
- kernel threads

- (kernel thread create, destroy, signal, wait, etc.)
Summary

• Multiple threads per address space
• Kernel threads are much more efficient than processes, but still expensive
  – all operations require a kernel call and parameter validation
• User-level threads are:
  – much cheaper and faster
  – great for common-case operations
    • creation, synchronization, destruction
  – can suffer in uncommon cases due to kernel obliviousness
    • I/O
    • preemption of a lock-holder
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