Administrivia

- Reminder: Homework 3 due Monday.
- Review sheet for exam on Web. Homework solutions will be available —
 programming solutions on Web, non-programming solutions in hardcopy.
 Homework 1 today, Homework 2 later today or Monday (which?),
 Homework 3 early Tuesday.

Slide 1

Classical IPC Problems

- Literature (and textbooks) on operating systems talk about "classical problems" of interprocess communication.
- Idea each is an abstract/simplified version of problems o/s designers
 actually need to solve. Also a good way to compare ease-of-use of various
 synchronization mechanisms.

- Examples so far mutual exclusion, bounded buffer.
- Other examples sometimes described in silly anthropomorphic terms, but underlying problem is a simplified version of something "real".

Dining Philosophers Problem

- Scenario (originally proposed by Dijkstra, 1972):
 - Five philosophers sitting around a table, each alternating between thinking and eating.
 - Between every pair of philosophers, a fork; philosopher must have two forks to eat.
 - So, neighbors can't eat at the same time, but non-neighbors can.
- Why is this interesting or important? It's a simple example of something more complex than mutual exclusion — multiple shared resources (forks), processes (philosophers) must obtain two resources together. (Why five? smallest number that's "interesting".)

Dining Philosophers — Naive Solution

- Naive approach we have five mutual-exclusion problems to solve (one per fork), so just solve them.
- Does this work? No deadlock possible.

Slide 4

Dining Philosophers — Simple Solution

• Another approach — just use a solution to the mutual exclusion problem to let only one philosopher at a time eat.

• Does this work? Well, it "works" w.r.t. meeting safety condition and no deadlock, but it's too restrictive.

Slide 5

Dining Philosophers — Dijkstra Solution

- Another approach use shared variables to track state of philosophers and semaphores to synchronize.
- I.e., variables are
 - Array of five state variables (states [5]), possible values thinking, hungry, eating. Initially all thinking.
 - Semaphore mutex, initial value 1, to enforce one-at-a-time access to states.
 - Array of five semaphores self[5], initial values 0, to allow us to make philosophers wait.
- And then the code is somewhat complex ...

Dining Philosophers — Code

• Shared variables as on previous slide.

Pseudocode for philosopher i:

itle (true) { think(); down(mutex); state[i] = hungry; test(i); up(mutex); down(self(i));

eat();
down(mutex);
state[i] = thinking;
test(right(i));
test(left(i));
up(mutex);

Pseudocode for function:

Slide 7

Dining Philosophers — Dijkstra Solution Works?

- Could there be problems with access to shared state variables? No (because all accesses are "protected" by mutual-exclusion semaphore).
- Do we guarantee that neighbors don't eat at the same time? Yes.
- Do we allow non-neighbors to eat at the same time? Yes.
- Could we deadlock? No.
- Does a hungry philosopher always get to eat eventually? Usually. Exception is when two next-to-neighbors (e.g., 1 and 3) seem to conspire to starve their common neighbor (e.g., 2).

Dining Philosophers — Chandy/Misra Solution

 Original solution allows for scenarios in which one philosopher "starves" because its neighbors alternate eating while it remains hungry.

Briefly, we could improve this by maintaining a notion of "priority" between
neighbors, and only allow a philosopher to eat if (1) neither neighbor is eating,
and (2) it doesn't have a higher-priority neighbor that's hungry. After a
philosopher eats, it lowers its priority relative to its neighbors.

Slide 9

Other Classical Problems

- Readers/writers (in textbook).
- $\bullet\,$ Sleeping barber, drinking philosophers, \ldots
- Advice if you ever have to solve problems like this "for real", read the literature . . .

Minute Essay

• Any questions about material in chapter 2?