Lecture 8

Parallel Programming

PLQ Review: traits and enums

```
trait Shape {
fn area(\&self) -> f32;
impl Shape for Circle {
fn area(\&self) -> f32 {
   self.0 * self.0 * 3.14
impl Shape for Rect {
fn area(\&self) -> f32 {
   self.0 * self.1
```

```
enum Shape {
 Circle(Circle),
 Rect(Rect),
impl Shape {
 fn area(&self) \rightarrow f32 {
   match self {
     &Shape::Circle(Circle(r)) =>
       r * r * 3.14,
     &Shape::Rect(Rect(x, y)) =>
       x * y,
```

PLQ Review: traits and enums

```
trait Shape {
  fn area(&self) -> f32;
}
```

Can extend implementers but not functionality

- implement trait for a new type
- can't add new trait method without breaking existing implementers

```
enum Shape {
  Circle(Circle),
  Rect(Rect),
}
```

Can extend functionality but not implementers

- Add new enum method to add functionality
- Can't add new variant to enum without breaking existing methods

Where are we? Where are we going?

Multi-threading is the motivation behind many of Rust's features. Today, we'll start tying together many features:

- limiting mutability
- smart pointers
- ownership
- traits

Coming up:

- Two lectures on parallelism
- One lecture on **unsafe** Rust
- One lecture on Rust ecosystem
- One flex lecture

Who cares about parallelism?

Easy to buy more cores, impossible to buy faster cores

• How to use more cores?



Why is parallelism hard?

```
#define NUM_THREADS 10
#define INCREMENTS 10000
```

int counter = 0;

```
void* increment_counter(void* arg) {
  for (int i = 0; i < INCREMENTS; i++) {
     counter = counter + 1;
  }
  return NULL;</pre>
```

```
// wait for threads to finish...
```

```
printf("Counter: %d\n", counter);
```

What is printed?

Data race

time

Multiple accesses with at least one writer

```
for (int i = 0; i < INCREMENTS; i++) {
  int cur_count = counter;
  int new_count = cur_count + 1;
  counter = new_count;
}</pre>
```

7

| TL | N CO | | 1. |
|----|------|----|------------|
| | nea | 1C | L . |

Thread 2:

| cur_count <- 11 | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| | cur_count <- 11 |
| new_count <- 12 | |
| counter <- 12 | |
| | new_count <- 12 |
| | counter <- 12 |

Mutex ("mutual exclusion")

```
#define NUM_THREADS 10
#define INCREMENTS 10000
```

int counter = 0;

pthread mutex t counter mutex;

```
void* increment_counter(void* arg) {
  for (int i = 0; i < INCREMENTS; i++) {
    pthread_mutex_lock(&counter_mutex);
    { counter++;
    pthread_mutex_unlock(&counter_mutex);
    }
    return NULL;
}
</pre>
```

```
// wait for threads to finish...
```

```
printf("Counter: %d\n", counter);
```

Critical section

Guarantee that only one thread will be executing critical section at a time

• Other threads wait if mutex is locked

```
for (int i = 0; i < INCREMENTS; i++) {
  lock(mutex);
  int cur_count = counter;
  int new_count = cur_count + 1;
  counter = new_count;
  unlock(mutex)
}</pre>
```

Thread 1:

Thread 2:

| time | lock(mutex) | |
|------|-----------------|----------------|
| | cur_count <- 11 | |
| | new_count <- 12 | lock(mutex) |
| | counter <- 12 | |
| | unlock(mutex) | |
| | | mutex acquired |

9

Mutex challenges

What are bugs you can make when using mutexes?

Mutex challenges

- Forget to use one at all
- Forget to lock
- Forget to unlock
- Lock in wrong order
- Lock while already locked
- Unlock while already unlocked

Rust's bold claims

Impossible to forget to protect data with a mutex

• Compile-time guarantee of no data races!

Impossible to

- Forget to lock
- Forget to unlock
- Unlock while already unlocked

Can still do:

- Lock in wrong order
- Lock while already locked

Initially [safety and concurrency] seemed orthogonal, but to our amazement, the solution turned out to be identical: **the same tools that make Rust safe also help you tackle concurrency head-on**."

Compiler enforces rules for safe concurrency. **"Thread** safety isn't just documentation; it's law."

https://blog.rust-lang.org/2015/04/10/Fearless-Concurrency.html

What does parallelism look like in Rust?

use std::thread;

const NUM_THREADS: usize = 10; const INCREMENTS PER THREAD: usize = 10000;

```
fn main() {
  let mut counter = 0;
  for in 0..NUM THREADS {
     thread::spawn(|| {
           for _ in 0..INCREMENTS_PER_THREAD {
              counter += 1;
       });
   // wait for threads to finish...
  println!("Counter: {}", counter);
```

What does parallelism look like in Rust?

use std::thread;

const NUM_THREADS: usize = 10; const INCREMENTS PER THREAD: usize = 10000;

Same data race problem as before!

Which (if any) of Rust's ownership/borrowing rules are violated?

```
n main() {
let mut counter = 0;
for _ in 0..NUM_THREADS {
    thread::spawn(|| {
        for _ in 0..INCREMENTS_PER_THREAD {
            counter += 1;
        }
    });
}// wait for threads to finish...
```

println!("Counter: {}", counter);

One (of many) problems

Need to be able to mutate counter, but can't give out multiple mutable references?

One (of many) problems

How long can a thread live? Who owns counter?

Questions to solve:

Need to be able to mutate counter, but can't give out multiple mutable references? How long can a thread live? Who owns counter?

One (of many) problems

```
error[E0373]: closure may outlive `main`, but borrows `counter`, which is owned by `main`
10 |
             thread::spawn(|| {
                           ^^ may outlive borrowed value `counter`
                 for in 0..INCREMENTS PER THREAD {
11 |
12 I
                     counter += 1;
                    ----- `counter` is borrowed here
note: function requires argument type to outlive `'static`
  --> race.rs:10:22
10 I
             let handle = thread::spawn(|| {
                            ^
                    for in 0..INCREMENTS PER THREAD
11
12 |
                        counter += 1;
13 I
14 |
                });
                 ^
help: to force the closure to take ownership of `counter`, use the `move` keyword
10 I
           let handle = thread::spawn(move || {
                                       ++++
```

Rc/RefCell to the rescue?

use std::rc::Rc; use std::cell::RefCell; use std::thread;

```
const NUM_THREADS: usize = 10;
const INCREMENTS PER THREAD: usize = 10000;
```

Shared ownership and interior mutability

```
fn main() {
  let counter = Rc::new(RefCell::new(0));
   for in 0..NUM THREADS {
      let counter = Rc::clone(&counter);
       thread::spawn(move || {
          for in 0..INCREMENTS PER THREAD {
               *counter.borrow mut() += 1;
       });
   // wait for threads to finish...
  println!("Counter: {}", counter.borrow mut());
```

Rc/RefCell to the rescue?



Rc/RefCell to the rescue?

Module std::rc 🖻

1.0.0 · source · [-]

[-] Single-threaded reference-counting pointers. 'Rc' stands for 'Reference Counted'.

The type Rc<T> provides shared ownership of a value of type T, allocated in the heap. Invoking clone on Rc produces a new pointer to the same allocation in the heap. When the last Rc pointer to a given allocation is destroyed, the value stored in that allocation (often referred to as "inner value") is also dropped.

Shared references in Rust disallow mutation by default, and Rc is no exception: you cannot generally obtain a mutable reference to something inside an Rc. If you need mutability, put a Cell or RefCell inside the Rc; see an example of mutability inside an Rc.

Rc uses non-atomic reference counting. This means that overhead is very low, but an Rc cannot be sent between threads, and consequently Rc does not implement Send. As a result, the Rust compiler will check *at compile time* that you are not sending Rcs between threads. If you need multi-threaded, atomic reference counting, use sync::Arc.

Shared ownership and interior mutability

Single Threaded:

Multi-Threaded:

Rc: shared ownership with a reference count

Arc: shared ownership with an *atomic* reference count

RefCell: interior mutability by panicking if multiple mutable borrows

Mutex: interior mutability by making other threads wait

Rust parallelism third attempt

```
use std::sync::{Arc,Mutex};
use std::thread;
```

```
const NUM_THREADS: usize = 10;
const INCREMENTS_PER_THREAD: usize = 10000;
```

Mutex provides interior mutability! Exclusive ownership while mutex locked

```
fn main() {
   let counter = Arc::new(Mutex::new(0));
   for in 0..NUM THREADS {
       let counter = Arc::clone(&counter);
      thread::spawn(move || {
           for in 0..INCREMENTS PER THREAD {
               let mut guard = counter.lock().unwrap();
               *quard += 1;
       });
   // wait for threads to finish...
   println!("Counter: {}", counter.lock().unwrap());
```

Zooming in on thread::spawn



(1) make shared resource

(2) clone shared resource handle once per thread

(3) move shared resource handle into thread

Very common pattern when spawning threads

Shared-state concurrency

Threads have separate stacks but a shared heap

Share ownership of same mutex

Control access of shared counter via mutex



Zooming in on Mutexes

```
use std::sync::{Mutex, MutexGuard};
fn increment(m: &Mutex<u32>) {
   let guard: MutexGuard<u32> = m.lock().unwrap();
   *guard += 1;
   // guard is dropped -> mutex is unlocked
}
fn main() {
   let counter = Mutex::new(0);
   increment(&counter);
```

}

Why is it impossible to forget to unlock a mutex?

Why is it impossible to forget to unlock a mutex?

```
fn copy_inner(m: &Mutex<u32>) -> u32 {
    let guard: MutexGuard<u32> = m.lock().unwrap();
    let value = *guard;
    return value
    // guard is dropped -> mutex is unlocked
}
```

Impossible to not drop MutexGuard

Why is it impossible to forget to lock a mutex?

Why is it impossible to forget to lock a mutex?

Only lock gives access to inner value

```
fn no_lock1(m: &Mutex<u32>) -> u32 {
    let value = m.???();
    return v;
}
```

Can't have reference to inner value outlive guard

```
fn no_lock2(m: &Mutex<u32>) -> &mut u32 {
   let mut guard = m.lock().unwrap();
   let v: &mut u32 = &mut *guard;
   return v;
```

Why is it impossible to unlock a mutex twice?

Why is it impossible to unlock a mutex twice?

```
fn double_unlock (m: &Mutex<u32>) -> u32 {
    let guard = m.lock().unwrap();
    let value = *guard;
    drop(guard);
    drop(guard);
    return value;
}
```

Quiz code

https://godbolt.org/z/P179e9a3z

Compared to C





let counter: Mutex<u32> =
Mutex::new(0);

Nothing associates mutex with data!

Mutex has ownership of protected data

Quiz takeaways

Ownership and reference lifetimes make it impossible to misuse a mutex

Initially [safety and concurrency] seemed orthogonal, but to our amazement, the solution turned out to be identical: **the same tools that make Rust safe also help you tackle concurrency head-on**."

Compiler enforces rules for safe concurrency. **"Thread** safety isn't just documentation; it's law."

https://blog.rust-lang.org/2015/04/10/Fearless-Concurrency.html

How does the compiler know?



suspicious: is this analysis special-cased for standard library types?

How does the compiler know?



Send and Sync

Send: it is safe to send this type to another thread

Sync: it is safe to share this type between threads

• T is Sync if and only if &T is Send

"safe" -> won't cause memory safety errors or data races

Types that are...

| | not Send | Send |
|----------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| not Sync | Rc | RefCell |
| Sync | incredibly rare | Most structs Mutex Arc |

Not Sync or Send: Rc

use std::rc::Rc; use std::thread;

```
fn main() {
```

```
let count = Rc::new(0);
let clone1 = Rc::clone(&count);
let clone2 = Rc::clone(&count);
thread::spawn(move || {
        drop(clone1);
});
thread::spawn(move || {
```

```
drop(clone2);
```

});



Not Sync or Send: Rc



Send but not Sync: RefCell

```
use std::{thread, cell::RefCell};
fn increment(r: &RefCell<u32>) {
   let mut count = r.borrow mut();
   *count += 1;
}
```

```
fn main() {
    let count = RefCell::new(11);
    let ref1 = &count;
    let ref2 = &count;
    thread::spawn(move || {
        increment(ref2);
    });
    increment(ref1);
```



```
borrows is non-atomic: two
threads could both successfully
borrow_mut at the same time
```

Send but not Sync: RefCell



Send and Sync are special

Automatically derived for all types whose members are **Send/Sync**

You won't implement **Send/Sync** for your types, but you may use them as bounds for type parameters in generic functions

If the lock is always automatically released, is it possible to have a deadlock in Rust?

If the lock is always automatically released, is it possible to have a deadlock in Rust?

Yes! Double lock, as shown before

What else?

If the lock is always automatically released, is it Yes! possible to have a deadlock in Rust?

```
fn swap1(a: Arc<Mutex<u32>>, b: Arc<Mutex<u32>>) {
   let mut guard a = a.lock().unwrap();

thread 1 waiting

   let mut guard b = b.lock().unwrap();
   // do the swap
}
fn swap2(a: Arc<Mutex<u32>>, b: Arc<Mutex<u32>>) {
  let mut guard_b = b.lock().unwrap();
                                       thread 2 waiting
   let mut guard a = a.lock().unwrap();
   // do the swap
```

If the lock is always automatically released, is it possible to have a deadlock in Rust?

```
fn swap1(a: Arc<Mutex<u32>>, b:
Arc<Mutex<u32>>) {
    let mut guard_a = a.lock().unwrap();
    let mut guard_b = b.lock().unwrap();
    // do the swap
}
fn swap2(a: Arc<Mutex<u32>>, b:
Arc<Mutex<u32>>) {
    let mut guard b = b.lock().unwrap();
}
```

```
let mut guard_a = a.lock().unwrap();
```

```
// do the swap
```

Yes!

```
fn main() {
    let a = Arc::new(Mutex::new(10));
    let b = Arc::new(Mutex::new(20));
```

```
let a_cloned = Arc::clone(&a);
let b_cloned = Arc::clone(&b);
thread::spawn(move || {
    swap1(a_cloned, b_cloned);
});
swap2(Arc::clone(&a), Arc::clone(&b));
```

One last form of interior mutability

use std::sync::atomic::{AtomicUsize, Ordering};

```
fn increment_atomic(counter: &AtomicUsize) {
    counter.fetch_add(1, Ordering::SeqCst);
```

Atomics: allow mutation through a shared reference.

Other threads are guaranteed not to observe intermediate values.

What's this?

• it's complicated: just use Ordering:SeqCst