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Threads

Thread of execution: stack + registers (which includes the PC)

Informally: where an execution stream is currently at in the program and the method invocation chain that brought the execution stream to the current place

Example: A called B which called C which called B which called C

The PC should be pointing somewhere inside C at this point

The stack should contain 5 activation records: A/B/C/B/C

Thread for short

Process model discussed last time implies a single thread
Why limit ourselves to a single thread?

Think of a web server that must service a large stream of requests
If only have one thread, can only process one request at a time
What to do when reading a file from disk?

Multi-threading model

Each process can have multiple threads
Each thread has a private stack
    Registers are also private
All threads of a process share the code, globals, and heap
    Objects to be shared across multiple threads should be allocated on the heap or in the globals area
Process Address Space Revisited

(a) Single-threaded address space

(b) Multi-threaded address space
Multi-Threading (cont)

Implementation

Each thread is described by a *thread-control block* (TCB)

A TCB typically contains

- Thread ID
- Space for saving registers
- Pointer to thread-specific data not on stack

Observation

Although the model is that each thread has a private stack, threads actually share the process address space

⇒ There’s no memory protection!

⇒ Threads could potentially write into each other’s stack
Thread Creation

- thread_create() code
- PCBs
- TCBs
- new_thread_starts_here
- stacks
Suppose a process has multiple threads on a machine with a single non-multithreaded CPU core … what to do?

In fact, even if we only had one thread per process, we would have to do something about running multiple processes …

We *multiplex* the multiple threads on the core

At any point in time, only one thread is *running* (again, assuming a single non-multithreaded core)

At some point, the OS may decide to stop the currently running thread and allow another thread to run

This switching from one running thread to another is called *context switching*
Diagram of Thread State

- new
- admitted
- ready
- interrupt
- running
- exit
- terminated
- waiting
- I/O or event completion
- scheduler dispatch
- I/O or event wait
Context Switching (cont)

How to do a context switch?

Save state of currently executing thread

   Copy all “live” registers to thread control block

   For register-only machines, need at least 1 scratch register
       points to area of memory in thread control block that registers
       should be saved to

Restore state of thread to run next

   Copy values of live registers from thread control block to registers

When does context switching take place?
Context Switching (cont)

When does context switching occur?

When the OS decides that a thread has run long enough and that another thread should be given the CPU

When a thread performs an I/O operation and needs to block to wait for the completion of this operation

To wait for some other thread

Thread synchronization: we’ll talk about this lots in a couple of lectures
How Is the Switching Code Invoked?

user thread executing → clock interrupt → PC modified by hardware to “vector” to interrupt handler → user thread state is saved for restart → clock interrupt handler is invoked → disable interrupt checking → check whether current thread has run “long enough” → if yes, post asynchronous software trap (AST) → enable interrupt checking → exit clock interrupt handler → enter “return-to-user” code → check whether AST was posted → if not, restore user thread state and return to executing user thread; if AST was posted, call context switch code

Why need AST?
How Is the Switching Code Invoked? (cont)

user thread executing → system call to perform I/O → PC modified by hardware to “vector” to trap handler → user thread state is saved for restart → OS code to perform system call is invoked → disable interrupt checking → I/O operation started (by invoking I/O driver) → set thread status to waiting → move thread’s TCB from run queue to wait queue associated with specific device → enable interrupt checking → exit trap handler → call context switching code
At entry to CS, the return address is either in a register or on the stack (in the current activation record)

CS saves this return address to the TCB instead of the current PC

To thread, it looks like CS just took a while to return!

If the context switch was initiated from an interrupt, the thread never knows that it has been context switched out and back in unless it looks at the “wall” clock
Context Switching (cont)

Even that is not quite the whole story

When a thread is switched out, what happens to it?

How do we find it to switch it back in?

This is what the TCB is for. System typically has

- A run queue that points to the TCBs of threads ready to run
- A blocked queue per device to hold the TCBs of threads blocked waiting for an I/O operation on that device to complete

When a thread is switched out at a timer interrupt, it is still ready to run so its TCB stays on the run queue

When a thread is switched out because it is blocking on an I/O operation, its TCB is moved to the blocked queue of the device
Ready Queue And Various I/O Device Queues

- **Ready Queue**
  - **Head**
  - **Tail**

- **TCB**
  - **Registers**

- **mag tape unit 0**
  - **Head**
  - **Tail**

- **disk unit 0**
  - **Head**
  - **Tail**

- **terminal unit 0**
  - **Head**
  - **Tail**
  - **Registers**
Switching Between Threads of Different Processes

What if switching to a thread of a different process?

Caches, TLB, page table, etc.?

Caches
- Physical addresses: no problem
- Virtual addresses: cache must either have process tag or must flush cache on context switch

TLB
- Each entry must have process tag or must flush TLB on context switch

Page table
- Typically have page table pointer (register) that must be reloaded on context switch
Threads & Signals

What happens if kernel wants to signal a process when all of its threads are blocked?

When there are multiple threads, which thread should the kernel deliver the signal to?

- OS writes into process control block that a signal should be delivered
- Next time any thread from this process is allowed to run, the signal is delivered to that thread as part of the context switch
- What happens if kernel needs to deliver multiple signals?
Thread Implementation

Kernel-level threads (lightweight processes)

- Kernel sees multiple execution contexts
- Thread management done by the kernel

User-level threads

- Implemented as a thread library which contains the code for thread creation, termination, scheduling and switching
- Kernel sees one execution context and is unaware of thread activity
- Can be preemptive or not
User-Level vs. Kernel-Level Threads

Advantages of user-level threads

- Performance: low-cost thread operations (do not require crossing protection domains)
- Flexibility: scheduling can be application-specific
- Portability: user-level thread library easy to port

Disadvantages of user-level threads

- If a user-level thread is blocked in the kernel, the entire process (all threads of that process) are blocked
- Cannot take advantage of multiprocessing (the kernel assigns one process to only one processor)
User-Level vs. Kernel-Level Threads

**User-Level Threads**
- threads
- thread scheduling
- process
- process scheduling
- processor

**Kernel-Level Threads**
- threads
- thread scheduling
- process
- process scheduling
- processor
No reason why we shouldn’t have both

Most systems now support kernel threads

User-level threads are available as linkable libraries
Threads vs. Processes

Why multiple threads?

Can’t we use multiple processes to do whatever that is that we do with multiple threads?

Of course, we need to be able to share memory (and other resources) between multiple processes ...

But this sharing is already supported

Operations on threads (creation, termination, scheduling, etc) are cheaper than the corresponding operations on processes

This is because thread operations do not involve manipulations of other resources associated with processes

Inter-thread communication is supported through shared memory without kernel intervention

Why not? Have multiple other resources, why not threads
## Thread/Process Operation Latencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>User-level Thread ($\mu$s)</th>
<th>Kernel Threads ($\mu$s)</th>
<th>Processes ($\mu$s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null fork</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>11,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal-wait</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Kernel Threads ($\mu$s)</th>
<th>Processes ($\mu$s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null fork</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Time

Synchronization