Principles of Concurrency and Parallelism

Lecture 4: Message-Passing and CSP I/19/12

Issues

- Given a collection of threads, how should they communicate information among one another?
- Using message-passing, they communicate through messages, information that is directed from one thread to another.
 - Sometimes the recipient may be anonymous
 - channel-based communication
 - Typically, the recipient is known
- What should the sender do after the message is sent?
 - wait until the recipient acknowledges receipt (synchronous)
 - proceed regardless (asynchronous)

Communicating Sequential Processes

- Landmark proposal by Hoare in 1978
- Key components
 - guarded commands
 - dynamic thread creation
 - synchronous message passing
 - an input action in a guarded command causes the actions in the guard to block until the input action can be satisfied
 - there is a matching output action
 - No communication through global (shared) variables

Parallel Commands

```
room :: ROOM | | fork(i:0..4) :: FORK | | phil(i:0..4) :: PHIL
```

- Defines eleven processes
- Behavior of processes fork(0), ..., fork(4) specified by command FORK
 - Bound variable i indicates identity of a particular fork
- Similar structure for phil

Input and Output Commands

- · X ? (a,b)
 - inputs from process X a pair, binding the first element to a and the second to b
- Y ! (3 * a, b + 13)
 - outputs to process Y a pair, consisting of the values computed by the corresponding expressions within the environment in which the command takes place
- X(i)? V()
 - From the ith array of processes X, input a signal V()
- display(i-2)! "A"
 - send to the i-2nd display the character "A"

Guarded Commands

```
x >= y --> m := x [] y >= x m := y
```

Assign m to x if $x \ge y$; assign m to y if $y \ge x$. Do one or the other if x = y.

```
i := 0;
* [ i < size; content(i) <> n -> i := i + 1 ]
```

Scan the elements of the array contents incrementing counter i as long as n is not encountered and the end of the array is not reached.

Guarded Commands

What does this program do? What assumptions does it make?

Bounded Buffer

```
X::
  buffer:(0..9) portion;
  in,out:integer, in:= 0; out := 0;
  *[in < out + 10; producer?buffer(in mod 10) --> in := in + 1
    []
    out < in; consumer?more() --> consumer ! buffer(out mod 10);
    out := out + 1
]
```

Consumer contains pairs of commands X!more() and X?p Producer contains commands of the form X!p

Small Set of Integers

```
S::
   content:(0..99)integer, size:integer,size := 0;
*[ n:integer,X?has(n) --> SEARCH;X!(i<size)
   || n:integer; X?insert(n) --> SEARCH;
        [i<size --> skip
        | i = size; size < 100 --> content(size) := n; size := size + 1
]
```

where SEARCH is:

```
i:integer; i := 0;
*[i < size; content(i) <> n --> i := i + 1 ]
```

Dining Philosophers

- Five philosophers:
 - Only eat and think
 - Share a common dining room.
 - Shared bowl of spaghetti
 - Five forks
 - Need two forks to eat (both right and left)
 - After finishing eating, puts both forks down

Dining Philosophers

```
PHIL = *[ ... for ith philosopher ....
               THINK:
                room!enter( );
                fork(i)!pickup(); fork((i+1) mod 5)!pickup();
               EAT;
                 fork(i)!putdown(); fork((i+1) mod 5)!putdown();
                 room!exit()
FORK = *[phil(i)?pickup() --> phil(i)?putdown()
                 (phil(i-1) \mod 5)?pickup() \longrightarrow phil((i-1) \mod 5)?putdown()
ROOM = occupancy:integer; occupancy := 0;
               *[(i:0..4)phil(i)?enter() --> occupancy := occupancy + 1
               (i:0..4)phil(i)?exit() --> occupancy := occupancy - 1
[room::ROOM | fork(i:0..4)::FORK | phil(i:0..4)::PHIL]
```

What happens if all five philosophers enter the room, and each picks up the left fork? How would you solve the problem?

Issues

- Explicit naming of source and destination
 - No first-class channels or ports
- Fully synchronous
 - How would you model asynchronous communication?
- No unbounded number of processes

Output guards

```
z:: [X!2 || Y!3] could be expressed as: Z::[X!2 --> Y!3 [] Y!3 --> X!2]
Why does the following not work? Z::[true --> X!2; Y!3 [] true --> Y!3; X!2]
Consider: Y :: Z?y; X!go() || X:: Y?go(); Z?x
```

Readings

- Communicating Sequential Processes, Hoare (1978)
- See also http://www.usingcsp.com/cspbook.pdf