


# CSCI 5828: Foundations of Software Engineering

Lecture 13, 17: Monitors & Condition Synchronization

Slides created by Magee and Kramer for the Concurrency textbook



# Monitors & Condition Synchronization





## monitors & condition synchronization

---

### Concepts: monitors:

encapsulated data + access procedures

mutual exclusion + condition synchronization

single access procedure active in the monitor


nested monitors

### Models: guarded actions

**Practice:** private data and synchronized methods (exclusion).  
`wait()`, `notify()` and `notifyAll()` for condition synch.  
single thread active in the monitor at a time

## 5.1 Condition synchronization

---




A controller is required for a carpark, which only permits cars to enter when the carpark is not full and does not permit cars to leave when there are no cars in the carpark. Car arrival and departure are simulated by separate threads.

## carpark model

---

- ◆ Events or actions of interest?  
arrive and depart
- ◆ Identify processes.  
arrivals, departures and carpark control
- ◆ Define each process and interactions (structure).



## carpark model

---

```
CARPARKCONTROL(N=4) = SPACES[N],  
SPACES[i:0..N] = (when(i>0) arrive->SPACES[i-1]  
                | when(i<N) depart->SPACES[i+1]  
                ).
```

```
ARRIVALS = (arrive->ARRIVALS).
```

```
DEPARTURES = (depart->DEPARTURES).
```

```
|| CARPARK =  
    (ARRIVALS || CARPARKCONTROL(4) || DEPARTURES).
```

**Guarded actions** are used to control arrive and depart.


*LTS?*

## carpark program


---

- ◆ **Model** - all entities are **processes** interacting by actions
- ◆ **Program** - need to identify **threads** and **monitors**
  - ◆ **thread** - **active** entity which initiates (output) actions
  - ◆ **monitor** - **passive** entity which responds to (input) actions.

### For the carpark?



# carpark program - class diagram



We have omitted **DisplayThread** and **GraphicCanvas** threads managed by **ThreadPanel**.



## carpark program

---

**Arrivals** and **Departures** implement **Runnable**,  
**CarParkControl** provides the control (condition synchronization).

Instances of these are created by the **start()** method of the  
**CarPark** applet :

```
public void start() {  
    CarParkControl c =  
        new DisplayCarPark(carDisplay, Places);  
    arrivals.start(new Arrivals(c));  
    departures.start(new Departures(c));  
}
```

## carpark program - Arrivals and Departures threads

---

```
class Arrivals implements Runnable {
    CarParkControl carpark;

    Arrivals(CarParkControl c) {carpark = c;}

    public void run() {
        try {
            while(true) {
                ThreadPanel.rotate(330);
                carpark.arrive();
                ThreadPanel.rotate(30);
            }
        } catch (InterruptedException e){}
    }
}
```

Similarly **Departures**  
which calls  
**carpark.depart()**.

How do we implement the control of **CarParkControl**?

## Carpark program - CarParkControl monitor

---

```
class CarParkControl {  
    protected int spaces;  
    protected int capacity;  
  
    CarParkControl(int n)  
        {capacity = spaces = n;}  
  
    synchronized void arrive() {  
        ... --spaces; ...  
    }  
  
    synchronized void depart() {  
        ... ++spaces; ...  
    }  
}
```

*mutual exclusion  
by synch methods*

*condition  
synchronization?*

*block if full?  
(spaces==0)*

*block if empty?  
(spaces==N)*

## condition synchronization in Java

---

Java provides a thread **wait set** per monitor (actually per object) with the following methods:

**public final void notify()**

Wakes up a single thread that is waiting on this object's wait set.

**public final void notifyAll()**

Wakes up all threads that are waiting on this object's wait set.

**public final void wait()**

**throws InterruptedException**


Waits to be notified by another thread. The waiting thread releases the synchronization lock associated with the monitor. When notified, the thread must wait to reacquire the monitor before resuming execution.


## condition synchronization in Java

---

We refer to a thread *entering* a monitor when it acquires the mutual exclusion lock associated with the monitor and *exiting* the monitor when it releases the lock.

**Wait()** - causes the thread to exit the monitor, permitting other threads to enter the monitor.







## condition synchronization in Java

---

**FSP:**    **when** *cond* **act** -> NEWSTAT

```
Java: public synchronized void act()  
      throws InterruptedException  
      {  
      while (!cond) wait();  
          // modify monitor data  
      notifyAll();  
      }
```

The **while** loop is necessary to retest the condition *cond* to ensure that *cond* is indeed satisfied when it re-enters the monitor.

**notifyall()** is necessary to awaken other thread(s) that may be waiting to enter the monitor now that the monitor data has been changed.

## CarParkControl - condition synchronization

---

```
class CarParkControl {
    protected int spaces;
    protected int capacity;

    CarParkControl(int n)
        {capacity = spaces = n;}

    synchronized void arrive() throws InterruptedException {
        while (spaces==0) wait();
        --spaces;
        notifyAll();
    }

    synchronized void depart() throws InterruptedException {
        while (spaces==capacity) wait();
        ++spaces;
        notifyAll();
    }
}
```

*Is it safe to use notify()  
here rather than notifyAll()?*

## models to monitors - summary

---

**Active** entities (that initiate actions) are implemented as **threads**.

**Passive** entities (that respond to actions) are implemented as **monitors**.

Each guarded action in the model of a monitor is implemented as a **synchronized** method which uses a while loop and **wait()** to implement the guard. The while loop condition is the negation of the model guard condition.

Changes in the state of the monitor are signaled to waiting threads using **notify()** or **notifyAll()**.

## 5.2 Semaphores

---

Semaphores are widely used for dealing with inter-process synchronization in operating systems. Semaphore  $s$  is an integer variable that can take only non-negative values.

The only operations permitted on  $s$  are  $up(s)$  and  $down(s)$ . Blocked processes are held in a FIFO queue.

```
down(s): if  $s > 0$  then
            decrement  $s$ 
            else
                block execution of the calling process

up(s):    if processes blocked on  $s$  then
            awaken one of them
            else
                increment  $s$ 
```

## modeling semaphores

---

To ensure analyzability, we only model semaphores that take a finite range of values. If this range is exceeded then we regard this as an **ERROR**. **N** is the initial value.


```
const Max = 3
range Int = 0..Max

SEMAPHORE (N=0) = SEMA [ N ] ,
SEMA [ v : Int ] = ( up -> SEMA [ v + 1 ]
                    | when ( v > 0 ) down -> SEMA [ v - 1 ]
                    ) ,
SEMA [ Max + 1 ] = ERROR.
```

**LTS?**

## modeling semaphores

---



Action **down** is only accepted when value  $v$  of the semaphore is greater than 0.

Action **up** is not guarded.

Trace to a violation:

**up**  $\rightarrow$  **up**  $\rightarrow$  **up**  $\rightarrow$  **up**



## semaphore demo - model

---

Three processes  $p[1..3]$  use a shared semaphore `mutex` to ensure mutually exclusive access (action `critical`) to some resource.

```
LOOP = (mutex.down->critical->mutex.up->LOOP) .  
|| SEMADEMO = (p[1..3]:LOOP  
               || {p[1..3]}::mutex:SEMAPHORE(1)) .
```


For mutual exclusion, the semaphore initial value is 1. *Why?*

*Is the **ERROR** state reachable for SEMADEMO?*

*Is a **binary** semaphore sufficient (i.e. Max=1) ?*

***LTS?***

# semaphore demo - model



## semaphores in Java

---

Semaphores are passive objects, therefore implemented as **monitors**.

*(In practice, semaphores are a low-level mechanism often used in implementing the higher-level monitor construct.)*

```
public class Semaphore {
    private int value;

    public Semaphore (int initial)
        {value = initial;}


    synchronized public void up() {
        ++value;
        notifyAll();
    }

    synchronized public void down()
        throws InterruptedException {
        while (value== 0) wait();
        --value;
    }
}
```

*Is it safe to use `notify()` here rather than `notifyAll()`?*

## SEMADEMO display

---



current  
semaphore  
value

thread 1 is  
executing  
critical  
actions.

thread 2 is  
blocked  
waiting.

thread 3 is  
executing  
non-critical  
actions.

## SEMADEMO

---

*What if we adjust the time that each thread spends in its **critical section** ?*

◆ large resource requirement - *more conflict?*

(eg. more than 67% of a rotation)?

◆ small resource requirement - *no conflict?*

(eg. less than 33% of a rotation)?

Hence the time a thread spends in its critical section should be kept as short as possible.

## SEMADEMO program - revised ThreadPanel class

---

```
public class ThreadPanel extends Panel {
    // construct display with title and rotating arc color c
    public ThreadPanel(String title, Color c) {...}
    // hasSlider == true creates panel with slider
    public ThreadPanel
        (String title, Color c, boolean hasSlider) {...}
    // rotate display of currently running thread 6 degrees
    // return false when in initial color, return true when in second color
    public static boolean rotate()
        throws InterruptedException {...}
    // rotate display of currently running thread by degrees
    public static void rotate(int degrees)
        throws InterruptedException {...}
    // create a new thread with target r and start it running
    public void start(Runnable r) {...}
    // stop the thread using Thread.interrupt()
    public void stop() {...}
}
```



## SEMADEMO program - MutexLoop

```
class MutexLoop implements Runnable {
    Semaphore mutex;


    MutexLoop (Semaphore sema) {mutex=sema;}

    public void run() {
        try {
            while(true) {
                while(!ThreadPanel.rotate());
                mutex.down();           // get mutual exclusion
                while(ThreadPanel.rotate()); //critical actions
                mutex.up();             //release mutual exclusion
            }
        } catch (InterruptedException e) {}
    }
}
```

Threads and semaphore are created by the applet `start()` method.

`ThreadPanel.rotate()` returns `false` while executing non-critical actions (dark color) and `true` otherwise.


## 5.3 Bounded Buffer



A bounded buffer consists of a fixed number of slots. Items are put into the buffer by a *producer* process and removed by a *consumer* process. It can be used to smooth out transfer rates between the *producer* and *consumer*.


(see car park example)

## bounded buffer - a data-independent model



The behaviour of BOUNDEDBUFFER is independent of the actual data values, and so can be modelled in a data-independent manner.

LTS:



## bounded buffer - a data-independent model

---

```
BUFFER(N=5) = COUNT[0],  
COUNT[i:0..N]  
    = (when (i<N) put->COUNT[i+1]  
      |when (i>0) get->COUNT[i-1]  
      ).
```

```
PRODUCER = (put->PRODUCER).  
CONSUMER = (get->CONSUMER).
```

```
|| BOUNDEDBUFFER =  
(PRODUCER | | BUFFER(5) | | CONSUMER).
```

## bounded buffer program - buffer monitor

```
public interface Buffer <E> {...}

class BufferImpl <E> implements Buffer <E> {
    ...
    public synchronized void put(E o)
        throws InterruptedException {
        while (count==size) wait();
        buf[in] = o; ++count; in=(in+1)%size;
        notifyAll();
    }

    public synchronized E get()
        throws InterruptedException {
        while (count==0) wait();
        E o =buf[out];
        buf[out]=null; --count; out=(out+1)%size;
        notifyAll();
        return (o);
    }
}
```

We separate the interface to permit an alternative implementation later.

*Is it safe to use `notify()` here rather than `notifyAll()`?*

## bounded buffer program - producer process

---

```
class Producer implements Runnable {
    Buffer buf;
    String alphabet= "abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz";

    Producer(Buffer b) {buf = b;}

    public void run() {
        try {
            int ai = 0;
            while(true) {
                ThreadPanel.rotate(12);
                buf.put(alphabet.charAt(ai));
                ai=(ai+1) % alphabet.length();
                ThreadPanel.rotate(348);
            }
        } catch (InterruptedException e){}
    }
}
```

Similarly **Consumer**  
which calls **buf.get()**.

## 5.4 Nested Monitors

---

Suppose that, in place of using the *count* variable and condition synchronization directly, we instead use two semaphores *full* and *empty* to reflect the state of the buffer.

```
class SemaBuffer <E> implements Buffer <E> {
    ...

    Semaphore full; //counts number of items
    Semaphore empty; //counts number of spaces

    SemaBuffer(int size) {
        this.size = size; buf =(E[])new Object[size];
        full = new Semaphore(0);
        empty= new Semaphore(size);
    }
    ...
}
```

## nested monitors - bounded buffer program

```
synchronized public void put(E o)
    throws InterruptedException {
    empty.down();
    buf[in] = o;
    ++count; in=(in+1)%size;
    full.up();
}

synchronized public E get()
    throws InterruptedException{
    full.down();
    E o =buf[out]; buf[out]=null;
    --count; out=(out+1)%size;
    empty.up();
    return (o);
}
```

*Does this behave  
as desired?*

*empty* is decremented during a **put** operation, which is blocked if *empty* is zero; *full* is decremented by a **get** operation, which is blocked if *full* is zero.



## nested monitors - bounded buffer model

```
const Max = 5
range Int = 0..Max

SEMAPHORE ...as before...

BUFFER = (put -> empty.down ->full.up ->BUFFER
          |get -> full.down ->empty.up ->BUFFER
          ).

PRODUCER = (put -> PRODUCER).
CONSUMER = (get -> CONSUMER).

|| BOUNDEDBUFFER = (PRODUCER || BUFFER || CONSUMER
                  || empty:SEMAPHORE(5)
                  || full:SEMAPHORE(0)
                  )@{put,get}.
```

*Does this behave  
as desired?*

## nested monitors - bounded buffer model

---

*LTSA* analysis predicts a possible **DEADLOCK**:

**Composing**

**potential DEADLOCK**

**States Composed: 28 Transitions: 32 in 60ms**

**Trace to DEADLOCK:**

**get**


The **Consumer** tries to **get** a character, but the buffer is empty. It blocks and releases the lock on the semaphore **full**. The **Producer** tries to **put** a character into the buffer, but also blocks. **Why?**

This situation is known as the *nested monitor problem*.

## nested monitors - bounded buffer model

---

```
synchronized public Object get()  
    throws InterruptedException{  
    full.down(); // if no items, block!  
    ...  
}
```



## nested monitors - revised bounded buffer program

---

The only way to avoid it in Java is by careful design. In this example, the deadlock can be removed by ensuring that the monitor lock for the buffer is not acquired until *after* semaphores are decremented.

```
public void put(E o)
    throws InterruptedException {
    empty.down();
    synchronized(this) {
        buf[in] = o; ++count; in=(in+1)%size;
    }
    full.up();
}
```

## nested monitors - revised bounded buffer model

---

```
BUFFER = (put -> BUFFER
          | get -> BUFFER
          ) .
```

```
PRODUCER = (empty.down->put->full.up->PRODUCER) .
CONSUMER = (full.down->get->empty.up->CONSUMER) .
```

The semaphore actions have been moved to the producer and consumer. This is exactly as in the implementation where the semaphore actions are *outside* the monitor .

*Does this behave as desired?*

*Minimized LTS?*

## 5.5 Monitor invariants

An **invariant** for a monitor is an assertion concerning the variables it encapsulates. This assertion must hold whenever there is no thread executing inside the monitor i.e. on thread **entry** to and **exit** from a monitor .

CarParkControl Invariant:	$0 \leq spaces \leq N$
Semaphore Invariant:	$0 \leq value$
Buffer Invariant:	$0 \leq count \leq size$
	<b>and</b> $0 \leq in < size$
	<b>and</b> $0 \leq out < size$
	<b>and</b> $in = (out + count) \text{ modulo } size$

Invariants can be helpful in reasoning about correctness of monitors using a logical *proof-based* approach. Generally we prefer to use a *model-based* approach amenable to mechanical checking .

# Summary

---

## ◆ Concepts

- **monitors**: encapsulated data + access procedures  
mutual exclusion + condition synchronization
- nested monitors

## ◆ Model

- guarded actions

## ◆ Practice

- private data and synchronized methods in Java
- **wait()**, **notify()** and **notifyAll()** for condition synchronization
- single thread active in the monitor at a time