Subject Matter

discussion on abstract concepts as to unilateral and multilateral synchronisation, thus, partial and mutual exclusion
  - with the general semaphore as a measure that supports both
  - while the binary semaphore was/is intended to support the latter, only
  - comprehensive differentiation of semaphore and mutex
    - in terms of the mutual exclusion aspect only, computer science folklore is right in stating disparities between the general variant and a mutex
    - but one have to be much more precise and argue with caution as far as the binary alternative is concerned

Hint (Methods v. Implementation/Entity)

A binary semaphore is a valid implementation of one of the many “mutex methods”, but not that restrictive as a “mutex entity” need to be.

- elaboration of various implementation aspects regarding both types of semaphore as well as mutex as an entity
Concept for Cooperation and Communication

Definition (Binary Semaphore)

The semaphores are essentially non-negative integers; when only used to solve the mutual exclusion problem, the range of their values will even be restricted to “0” and “1”. [2, p. 28]

- Jumping-off point for sleeping lock (Ger. Schlafsperrre, [8, p. 9]) and, in particular, mutex (abbr. mutual exclusion)

Definition (General Semaphore)

It is the merit of [...] C. S. Scholten to have demonstrated a considerable field of applicability for semaphores that can also take on larger values. [2, p. 28]

- Also referred to as counting semaphore (Ger. zählender Semaphor), to control resource allocation in a quantitative measure

Elementary Operations

Insensitive to the distinction between binary and general semaphore is the definition of two intrinsic primitives [1]:

- **P** abbr. for (Hol.) prolaag; a.k.a. down, wait, or acquire, resp.
  - Increases the value of the semaphore by 1
  - Iff the resulting value would be non-negative [2, p. 29]
  - Non-constraining [3, p. 345]
  - Blocks the process iff the value is or was, resp., 0 before decrease
  - Blocking processes are put on a waitlist associated with each semaphore

- **V** abbr. for (Hol.) verhoog; a.k.a. up, signal, or release, resp.
  - Increases the value of the semaphore by 1
  - As the case may be, unblocks a process blocked on the semaphore
  - Which process becomes unblocked is to be regarded as unspecified

Each primitive needs to be considered as an indivisible operation

Hint (Waitlist)

The queuing discipline rivals with planning decisions of the process scheduler and, thus, may be the cause of critical interference.

1 This does not only mean subtraction or addition, resp., in arithmetical terms.
multilateral synchronisation [5, p. 15] of interacting processes
- the critical section is considered as a non-preemptable reusable resource
  that needs to be allocated indivisibly to a process to be usable correctly
- in logical respect, the process having completed P on semaphore S is the
  only one being authorised to complete V on S

```c
semaphore_t mutex = {1};
{
    P(&mutex);
    /* critical section */
    V(&mutex);
}
```

default value is, normally, 1
- block out only in the moment of a simultaneous process
- allow full bent, else
- in case of a default value of 0
  V must come before P

A mutex is a binary semaphore that incorporates an explicit check for authorisation to release a critical section in the moment of V.

## General Semaphore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Dedication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unilateral synchronisation [5, p. 15] of interacting processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used for availability control of entities of the following resource types:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. a consumable resource in the form of any data of any number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. a reusable resource of limited number, e.g., a data store (buffer), any device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typical for, but not limited to, producer/consumer systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also as noted previously [5, p. 15], this art of synchronisation means:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical coordination as indicated by a particular “role playing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g., in order to proceed, a “data consumer” depends on the data to be made available by a “data producer”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditional coordination as indicated by a condition for making progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g., in order to proceed, a “data producer” depends on the store available for data handling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the end, the data store will have to be deallocated and, thus, made available again by the “data consumer”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from this it follows that P and V applied to the same semaphore S must have to be accomplishable by different processes, normally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which makes the big difference to a binary semaphore or mutex, resp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Binary Semaphore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Dedication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>multilateral synchronisation [5, p. 15] of interacting processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the critical section is considered as a non-preemptable reusable resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that needs to be allocated indivisibly to a process to be usable correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in logical respect, the process having completed P on semaphore S is the only one being authorised to complete V on S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```c
semaphore_t data = {0};
void producer() {
    for (;;) {
        /* data released */
        V(&data);
    }
}
void consumer() {
    for (;;) {
        P(&data);
        /* data acquired */
    }
}
```

usually, producer and consumer are different interacting processes
- in case of one and the same process, the number of a completed V must exceed the number of a completed P in order to prevent deadlock
- #V > #P, which implies a path V \(\rightarrow\) P (i.e., V “happens before” P)

## Consumable Resource

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>consumable resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g., in order to proceed, a “data consumer” depends on the data to be made available by a “data producer”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>default value is N ≥ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P must block out only if there is no store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V indicates more store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calling sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V must beactable independent of P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in order to complete, P depends on V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beware of an overflow of the values margin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```c
semaphore_t store = {N};
void producer() {
    for (;;) {
        P(&store);
        /* store acquired */
    }
}
void consumer() {
    for (;;) {
        P(&store);
        /* store released */
    }
}
```

as to interacting processes in the line of producer and consumer, the same applies as mentioned before: #V > #P

in other cases: #V ≤ #P, must be completed by the same process
### Semaphore v. Mutex I

**Technical Level**

**Hint**

Checking **authorisation** for release of a critical section in that very moment is improper for a general semaphore, optional for a binary semaphore, and **may be demanded** for a mutex (cf. p. 15).

- **demanded**: a **mutex entity** ensures that the release of critical section CS will succeed only for the process having acquired CS

- **improper**: P and V on a **general semaphore** must be accomplishable in particular also by different processes

- **optional**: basically, a **binary semaphore** may be implemented by a general semaphore S, with \( S \leq 1 \Rightarrow \) never a mutex entity

- **if authorisation fails**, the process attempting to release CS should be aborted—in kernel mode, the computing system must be halted...

### Semaphore v. Mutex II

**Conceptual Level**

**Hint (Computer Science Folklore)**

A semaphore can be released by any process.

- incomplete or rough, if not broad-brush, phrase that must be regarded with suspicion—one have to distinguish between semaphore types

- strictly, essence of this phrase is requirement for a general semaphore

- strictly as well, it is merely an **option** for a binary semaphore
  - in logical respect, a binary semaphore may not be released by any process
  - in physical respect, this however is not a must for any implementation

**Hint (Computer Science Folklore)**

A mutex can be released only by the process having it acquired.

- a phrase that is slanted towards only one aspect as to the leastwise twofold non-uniform common understanding about a mutex:
  - i. a category of **methods** for ensuring mutual exclusion or
  - ii. the **implementation** of one of these methods in terms of an **entity**

---

```c
void producer() {
  for (;;) {
    P(&store);
    */ store acquired */
    /* data acquired */
    P(&data);
    */ data acquired */
    /* store released */
    */ store released */
    V(&data);
    V(&store);
  }
}

void consumer() {
  for (;;) {
    P(&data);
    */ data acquired */
    /* data acquired */
    P(&store);
    */ store acquired */
    /* store released */
    V(&store);
    V(&data);
  }
}
```

---

2see also p. 38
Waitlist Association

- in order to aid $V$, processes blocked by $P$ at a semaphore are entered on a waitlist in either logical or physical means
  - logical: to block, a **blocked-on mark** is stored in the process descriptor
  - physical: to block, the process descriptor joins a **queue data structure**
- to unblock, a process-table walk looks for that mark
- variable but bounded above ($V$) run-time
- blocked-on mark is a “magic” address, no extra attributes

**Hint (Process-Table Walk—Conformance to Scheduling)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of the scheduler, lookup function to locate a process descriptor on the basis of the blocked-on mark as search key.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Indivisible Operation I**

- in the absence of simultaneous processes, the implementation of a semaphore could be as simple as follows:

```c
void prolaag(s semaphore_t *sema) {
  atomic *sema = {
    if (!claim(sema)) /* at the moment, unavailable */
    sleep(&sema->wand);
  }
}

void verhoog(s semaphore_t *sema) {
  if (unban(sema)) /* as from now, available */
    rouse(&sema->wand);
}
```

- whereat claim decreases and unban increases the value of the semaphore according to binary or general, resp., characteristic

- but, assuming that the presence of simultaneous processes is possible, this implementation shows a **race condition** ~ **lost wakeup**

3. while going to sleep, i.e. being “sleepy”, the process gets delayed

7–8. but in good faith of a sleeper, the “sleepy” process may be missed

**Shallows**

- protection of the $P/V$ pair against simultaneous processes sharing a semaphore follows either the blocking or non-blocking paradigm

**Blocking**

- inhibit FLIH, postpone SLIH, or lock process
- problem-specific construction of an **enter/leave** pair
- coming right up next in this lecture (cf. p. 22ff.)

**Non-blocking**

- fall back on the elementary operations of the ISA level
- problem-specific construction of $P$ and $V$
- coming up as a case study in the context of LEC 10/11

**Deadlock Prevention**

- Provided that protection of the critical section on the $P$ side is not deregulated, the $V$ side will never complete and, thus, will never cause unblocking of a process:

  - the right location for deregulation is **sleep**
  - after the process was marked sleeping

**Hint (Process-Table Walk—Conformance to Scheduling)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of the scheduler, lookup function to locate a process descriptor on the basis of the blocked-on mark as search key.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Indivisible Operation II**

- $P$ and $V$ itself constitute a **critical section**, likewise, that must be protected in order to function correctly
- a characteristic by means of which **priority violation** will be prevented
- usually, this excludes straightforward queuing disciplines such as FCFS

**Rationale**

- a characteristic by means of which **priority violation** will be prevented
- but, assuming that the presence of simultaneous processes is possible, this implementation shows a **race condition** ~ **lost wakeup**

3. while going to sleep, i.e. being “sleepy”, the process gets delayed

7–8. but in good faith of a sleeper, the “sleepy” process may be missed

**Shallows Implementation**

- protection of the $P/V$ pair against simultaneous processes sharing a semaphore follows either the blocking or non-blocking paradigm

**Blocking**

- inhibit FLIH, postpone SLIH, or lock process
- problem-specific construction of an **enter/leave** pair
- coming right up next in this lecture (cf. p. 22ff.)

**Non-blocking**

- fall back on the elementary operations of the ISA level
- problem-specific construction of $P$ and $V$
- coming up as a case study in the context of LEC 10/11

**Deadlock Prevention**

- Provided that protection of the critical section on the $P$ side is not deregulated, the $V$ side will never complete and, thus, will never cause unblocking of a process:

  - the right location for deregulation is **sleep**
  - after the process was marked sleeping

**Hint (Process-Table Walk—Conformance to Scheduling)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of the scheduler, lookup function to locate a process descriptor on the basis of the blocked-on mark as search key.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Indivisible Operation II**

- $P$ and $V$ itself constitute a **critical section**, likewise, that must be protected in order to function correctly
- protection should be constructed **per semaphore instance**, not $P/V$

**Rationale**

- a characteristic by means of which **priority violation** will be prevented
- but, assuming that the presence of simultaneous processes is possible, this implementation shows a **race condition** ~ **lost wakeup**

3. while going to sleep, i.e. being “sleepy”, the process gets delayed

7–8. but in good faith of a sleeper, the “sleepy” process may be missed

**Shallows Implementation**

- protection of the $P/V$ pair against simultaneous processes sharing a semaphore follows either the blocking or non-blocking paradigm

**Blocking**

- inhibit FLIH, postpone SLIH, or lock process
- problem-specific construction of an **enter/leave** pair
- coming right up next in this lecture (cf. p. 22ff.)

**Non-blocking**

- fall back on the elementary operations of the ISA level
- problem-specific construction of $P$ and $V$
- coming up as a case study in the context of LEC 10/11

**Deadlock Prevention**

- Provided that protection of the critical section on the $P$ side is not deregulated, the $V$ side will never complete and, thus, will never cause unblocking of a process:

  - the right location for deregulation is **sleep**
  - after the process was marked sleeping

**Hint (Process-Table Walk—Conformance to Scheduling)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of the scheduler, lookup function to locate a process descriptor on the basis of the blocked-on mark as search key.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Semaphore Data Type

typedef volatile struct semaphore {
  int gate;  /* value: binary or general */
  wand_t wand;  /* protective shield */
} semaphore_t;

- purpose of “wand” (Ger. Zauberstab) is to safeguard the semaphore operations in various respects
  - i. protect P and V against simultaneous processes
  - ii. give leeway for protection variants (cf. p. 20)

- a wand that takes care of mutual exclusion techniques by means of locks [8], for example, could be the following:

typedef volatile struct wand {
  lock_t clue;  /* protects P or V, resp. */
  event_t wait;  /* list of sleeping processes */
} wand_t;

becoming acquainted with other wands is content of future lectures...

P and V Safeguarded

void prolaag(semaphore_t *sema) {
  enter(&sema->wand); /* avert overlapped P or V */
  lodge(sema); /* raise claim to proceed */
  when (!avail(sema)) /* check for process delay */
    sleep(&sema->wand); /* await wakeup signal */
  leave(&sema->wand); /* allow P or V */
}

void verhoog(semaphore_t *sema) {
  enter(&sema->wand); /* avert overlapped P or V */
  if (unban(sema)) /* release semaphore */
    rouse(&sema->wand); /* cause wakeup signal */
  else /* no sleeping process... */
    leave(&sema->wand); /* allow P or V */
}

exercise caution in the analysis of these program statements:
- if applicable, “when” takes care of overtaking processes
- if applicable, search for sleepers happens unconditionally
  - in case of (i) logical waitlist and (ii) strict binary semaphore

Acquire and Release Semaphore I

load/store-based implementation for a binary semaphore:

inline int lodge(semaphore_t *sema) {
  return 42;
}

inline bool avail(semaphore_t *sema) {
  return (sema->gate == 0) ? false : !(sema->gate = 0);
}

inline bool unban(semaphore_t *sema) {
  return (sema->gate = 1) && exist(&sema->wand);
}

- note that the semaphore value alone shows no indication of processes that potentially await a reveille (Ger. Wecksignal) as to this very semaphore
- only an explicit waitlist scan sheds light on that ~ exist

- also note the persisting sensitivity to simultaneous processes: avail
- use within a safeguarded program section is assumed...
**Acquire and Release Semaphore II**

- enumerator-based implementation for a **general semaphore**:

```c
inline int lodge(semaphore_t *sema) {
  return sema->gate--; /* ... */
}
```

```c
inline bool avail(semaphore_t *sema) {
  return sema->gate >= 0;
}
```

```c
inline bool unban(semaphore_t *sema) {
  return (sema->gate++ < 0);
}
```

- note that the absolute value of a “negative semaphore” gives the number of processes awaiting a reveille as to this very semaphore
- thus, there is no need for an explicit waitlist scan
- also note the persisting sensitivity to simultaneous processes: `--`/`++`
- use within a safeguarded program section is assumed...  

**Special Process Management**

**Prevent Lost Wakeup**

```c
inline void sleep(wand_t *wand) {
  catch(&wand->wait); /* disclose process to V */
  leave(wand); /* allow P or V */
  coast(); /* take a break */
  enter(wand); /* apply for return to P */
}
```

```c
inline void rouse(wand_t *wand) {
  leave(wand); /* allow P or V */
  cause(&wand->wait); /* signal end of break */
}
```

- **constrict concurrency to no more than what is absolutely necessary:**
- endorse interest of the current process of upcoming dormancy
- soon dormant process was made known, deregulate P safeguard
- transition to dormant state: rescheduling, context switch or idleness
- apply for return to safeguarded P
- dormant processes could be available, deregulate V safeguard
- annulment of dormant state: rescheduling, context switch

**General Process Management**

**Event Handling**

- **catch** has two variants, depending on the waitlist model (cf. p.17):
  - i. store of a blocked-on mark in the process descriptor or
  - ii. enqueue of the process descriptor into a queue data structure
- variant (i) writes to an own data structure of the current process, while variant (ii) manipulates a shared data structure
- signalises upcoming blocking (dormancy) of registered process

- **coast** blocks the current process, reschedules the processor, and either performs a context switch or runs through the idle loop
- manipulates a shared data structure (ready list)
- performs the queuing function of the queue-based catch
- eventually returns when the blocking condition was nullified

- **cause** unblocks the next registered process, if any, found by means of a
  - (i) process-table walk or (ii) dequeue operation
  - manipulates a shared data structure (ready list)
- if need be, the current process defers to a prior-ranking process

**Hint (Idle State (cf. p. 16 and p. 39))**

*The last process blocked may find itself on the ready list. Same may happen to the “sleepy process” as coast runs deregulated to P/V.*
Process States and State Transitions

- ready ↔ running
- blocked → ready
- running ← pending
- pending → blocked

Semaphore Gatekeeper

- as there is no single solution to protect \( P \) and \( V \) adequately, the wand attribute symbolises intention to application orientation
- depending on the mode of operation or use case, the wand acts differently
- assuming that processing elements are multiplexed [7, p. 5], then:

```
inline void enter(wand_t *wand) {
    avert(IRQ); lock(&wand->clue);
}

inline void leave(wand_t *wand) {
    unlock(&wand->clue); admit(IRQ);
}
```

Kernel-level Safeguard:
1. disable IRQ
2. lock critical section

Specialisation of a Binary Semaphore

- given the concept of a binary semaphore, implementation of a mutex is straightforward and, absolutely, no black magic
- a mutex data structure is composed of two parts:
  i. a binary semaphore used to actually protect the critical section and
  ii. a handle that uniquely identifies the process having acquired the mutex
- given such a structure, let the following two functions be defined:
  acquire – performs the \( P \) and registers the current process as owner
  release – conditionally unregisters the owner and performs the \( V \)
- in case of a wrong owner, the current process or kernel panics

A corresponding data type may be laid out as follows:

```
typedef volatile struct mutex {
    semaphore_t sema; /* binary semaphore */
    process_t *link; /* owning process or 0 */
} mutex_t;
```

- release of a mutex by an unauthorised process is a serious matter
- presumably, the non-sequential program contains a software fault (bug)
- returning an error code is no option, as one cannot rely on error checking
- any other than “raising a non-maskable exception” is a botch job...

Semaphore Gatekeeper (Ger.) Schrankenwärter, Türhüter

- as there is no single solution to protect \( P \) and \( V \) adequately, the wand attribute symbolises intention to application orientation
- depending on the mode of operation or use case, the wand acts differently
- assuming that processing elements are multiplexed [7, p. 5], then:

```
inline void enter(wand_t *wand) {
    avert(IRQ); lock(&wand->clue);
}

inline void leave(wand_t *wand) {
    unlock(&wand->clue); admit(IRQ);
}
```

Kernel-level Safeguard:
1. disable IRQ
2. lock critical section

Specialisation of a Binary Semaphore Mutex (cf. p. 14/15)

- given the concept of a binary semaphore, implementation of a mutex is straightforward and, absolutely, no black magic
- a mutex data structure is composed of two parts:
  i. a binary semaphore used to actually protect the critical section and
  ii. a handle that uniquely identifies the process having acquired the mutex
- given such a structure, let the following two functions be defined:
  acquire – performs the \( P \) and registers the current process as owner
  release – conditionally unregisters the owner and performs the \( V \)
- in case of a wrong owner, the current process or kernel panics

A corresponding data type may be laid out as follows:

```
typedef volatile struct mutex {
    semaphore_t sema; /* binary semaphore */
    process_t *link; /* owning process or 0 */
} mutex_t;
```

- release of a mutex by an unauthorised process is a serious matter
- presumably, the non-sequential program contains a software fault (bug)
- returning an error code is no option, as one cannot rely on error checking
- any other than “raising a non-maskable exception” is a botch job...
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```
inline void enter(wand_t *wand) {
    avert(IRQ); lock(&wand->clue);
}

inline void leave(wand_t *wand) {
    unlock(&wand->clue); admit(IRQ);
}
```

Kernel-level Safeguard:
1. disable IRQ
2. lock critical section

Specialisation of a Binary Semaphore

- given the concept of a binary semaphore, implementation of a mutex is straightforward and, absolutely, no black magic
- a mutex data structure is composed of two parts:
  i. a binary semaphore used to actually protect the critical section and
  ii. a handle that uniquely identifies the process having acquired the mutex
- given such a structure, let the following two functions be defined:
  acquire – performs the \( P \) and registers the current process as owner
  release – conditionally unregisters the owner and performs the \( V \)
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A corresponding data type may be laid out as follows:
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typedef volatile struct mutex {
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Specialisation of a Binary Semaphore
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  i. a binary semaphore used to actually protect the critical section and
  ii. a handle that uniquely identifies the process having acquired the mutex
- given such a structure, let the following two functions be defined:
  acquire – performs the \( P \) and registers the current process as owner
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A corresponding data type may be laid out as follows:
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typedef volatile struct mutex {
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    process_t *link; /* owning process or 0 */
} mutex_t;
```

- release of a mutex by an unauthorised process is a serious matter
- presumably, the non-sequential program contains a software fault (bug)
- returning an error code is no option, as one cannot rely on error checking
- any other than “raising a non-maskable exception” is a botch job...

Semaphore Gatekeeper

- as there is no single solution to protect \( P \) and \( V \) adequately, the wand attribute symbolises intention to application orientation
- depending on the mode of operation or use case, the wand acts differently
- assuming that processing elements are multiplexed [7, p. 5], then:

```
inline void enter(wand_t *wand) {
    avert(IRQ); lock(&wand->clue);
}

inline void leave(wand_t *wand) {
    unlock(&wand->clue); admit(IRQ);
}
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Specialisation of a Binary Semaphore

- given the concept of a binary semaphore, implementation of a mutex is straightforward and, absolutely, no black magic
- a mutex data structure is composed of two parts:
  i. a binary semaphore used to actually protect the critical section and
  ii. a handle that uniquely identifies the process having acquired the mutex
- given such a structure, let the following two functions be defined:
  acquire – performs the \( P \) and registers the current process as owner
  release – conditionally unregisters the owner and performs the \( V \)
- in case of a wrong owner, the current process or kernel panics

A corresponding data type may be laid out as follows:

```
typedef volatile struct mutex {
    semaphore_t sema; /* binary semaphore */
    process_t *link; /* owning process or 0 */
} mutex_t;
```

- release of a mutex by an unauthorised process is a serious matter
- presumably, the non-sequential program contains a software fault (bug)
- returning an error code is no option, as one cannot rely on error checking
- any other than “raising a non-maskable exception” is a botch job...
Résumé

- fundamental concept for cooperation and communication
- binary and general/counting semaphore, intrinsic primitives $P$ and $V$
- correlation to unilateral and multilateral synchronisation
- differentiation as to mutex (methods v. implementation/entity):

**Hint**

*A binary semaphore* is a valid implementation of one of the many "mutex methods", but not that restrictive as a "mutex entity" need to be.

- hierarchic placement at operating system machine level
- characteristics important in functional and non-functional terms
- logical or physical waitlist, conformance to the scheduling discipline
- deregulation of the protection of $P$ against simultaneous processes
- further shallows such as overtaking of unblocked processes in $P$:

**Hint**

Constrict concurrency to no more than what is absolutely necessary.

- not least, basic approaches and sketches of an implementation...
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**Extent of Critical Section**

Binary Semaphore devoid of Waitlist

```c
... movl 16(%esp), %edi
leal 4(%edi), %esi
jmp LBB0_2

LBB0_1:
  movl _life, %eax
  movl %esi, 4(%eax)
  movl %esi, (%esp)
call _unlock

call _coast

LBB0_2:
  movl %esi, (%esp)
call _lock
  cmpl $0, (%edi)
  je LBB0_1
  movl $1, (%edi)
  movl %esi, (%esp)
call _unlock
```

**Semaphore v. Mutex III**
cf. p.14/15

**Commonalities and differences as to their possible internal states.**

- **general semaphore** $S_g$:
  - **positive** $N > 0$ processes will complete $P(S_g)$ without blocking
  - **zero** $P(S_g)$ will block the running process on the waitlist of $S_g$
  - **negative** $P(S_g)$ will block the running process on the waitlist of $S_g$
    - $|N|$ processes are blocked on the waitlist of $S_g$

- **binary semaphore** $S_b$:
  - **not taken** exactly one process will complete $P(S_b)$ without blocking
    - the very process becomes logical owner of $S_b$
  - **taken** $P(S_b)$ will block the running process on the waitlist of $S_b$
    - $V(S_b)$ should be performed only by the logical owner of $S_b$

- **mutex entity** $M$: let $A$ be acquire and let $R$ be release
  - **not owned** exactly one process will complete $A(M)$ without blocking
    - the very process becomes physical owner of $M$
  - **owned** $A(M)$ will block the running process on the waitlist of $M$
    - $R(M)$ can succeed only for the physical owner of $M$

**Idle State**
cf. p. 28

- principle pattern of a scheduler function to block a process
  - called by coast (cf. p. 27) and other functions to pause computation

```c
void block() {
  process_t *next, *self = being(OONESELF);

  while (!(next = elect(hoard(READY))))
    relax(); /* no ready to run... */

  if (next != self) { /* must relinquish */
    self->state = BLOCKED; /* vacate processor */
    seize(next); /* resume elected */
  }
  self->state = RUNNING; /* occupy processor */
}
```

- choose next process to be dispatched to the processor

- ready list is empty, so the running process fades to the idle process

- as the case may be, the running process may be allowed to continue:
  - i the idle/running process found itself ready-to-run on the ready list
  - ii the running process, sent to sleep due to $P$, was roused due to $V$ (p.27)