

#### **FACULTY OF ENGINEERING & TECHNOLOGY**

BCS-501 Operating System

Lecturer-12

Manisha Verma

Assistant Professor
Computer Science & Engineering

# Process Synchronization

- **≻Mutex Locks**
- **≻**Semaphores



#### **Mutex Locks**

- Previous solutions are complicated and generally inaccessible to application programmers
- OS designers build software tools to solve critical section problem
- Simplest is mutex lock
- Protect a critical section by first acquire() a lock then release() the lock
  - > Boolean variable indicating if lock is available or not
- Calls to acquire() and release() must be atomic
  - Usually implemented via hardware atomic instructions
- But this solution requires busy waiting
  - > This lock therefore called a spinlock

## acquire() and release()

```
acquire() {
   while (!available)
      ; /* busy wait */
    available = false;
 release() {
    available = true;
 do {
  acquire lock
    critical section
  release lock
   remainder section
} while (true);
```



#### Semaphore

Synchronization tool that provides more sophisticated ways (than Mutex locks) for process to synchronize their activities.

Semaphore *S* – integer variable can only be accessed via two indivisible (atomic) operations.



#### Semaphore Usage

- •Counting semaphore integer value can range over an unrestricted domain
- •Binary semaphore integer value can range only between 0 and 1 same as a mutex lock can solve various synchronization problems.

Consider  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  that require  $S_1$  to happen before  $S_2$ 

```
Create a semaphore "synch" initialized to 0 P1: S_1; signal(synch); P2: wait(synch); S_2;
```



Can implement a counting semaphore S as a binary semaphore.

#### **Implementation**

- •Must guarantee that no two processes can execute the wait() and signal() on the same semaphore at the same time Thus, the implementation becomes the critical section problem where the wait and signal code are placed in the critical section could now have busy waiting in critical section implementation
  - ➤ But implementation code is short
  - Little busy waiting if critical section rarely occupied
- Note that applications may spend lots of time in critical sections and therefore this is not a good solution

With each semaphore there is an associated waiting queue.

Each entry in a waiting queue has two data items:

- > value (of type integer)
- > pointer to next record in the list

Two operations:

- ➤block place the process invoking the operation on the appropriate waiting queue
- > wakeup remove one of processes in the waiting queue and place it in the ready queue

```
typedef struct{
  int value;
  struct process *list;
} semaphore;
```

### Implementation with no Busy waiting

```
wait(semaphore *S) {
 S->value--;
 if (S->value < 0) {
   add this process to S->list;
   block();
signal(semaphore *S) {
  S->value++;
 if (S->value <= 0) {
    remove a process P from S->list;
   wakeup(P);
```



#### **Problems with Semaphores**

Incorrect use of semaphore operations:

```
signal (mutex) .... wait (mutex) wait (mutex) ... wait (mutex)
```

Omitting of wait (mutex) or signal (mutex) (or both)

Deadlock and starvation are possible.



# MCQ

Semaphore is a/an to solve the critical section problem.  A. hardware for a system  B. special program for a system  C. integer variable  D. None of these
if the semaphore value is negative :  A. its magnitude is the number of processes waiting on that semaphore  B. it is invalid  C. no operation can be further performed on it until the signal operation is performed on it  D. All of these
The wait operation of the semaphore basically works on the basic system call.  A. stop()  B. block()  C. hold()  D. wait()

What will happen if a non-recursive mutex is locked more than once?

- A. Starvation
- B. Deadlock
- C. Aging
- D. Signaling

A semaphore .....

- A. is a binary mutex
- B. must be accessed from only one process
- C. can be accessed from multiple processes
- D. None of these

