

## COMP4075: Lecture 10

### Concurrency

Henrik Nilsson

University of Nottingham, UK

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.141

## A Concurrency Monad (2)

Introduce a monad representing “interleavable computations”. At this stage, this amounts to little more than a convenient way to construct threads by sequential composition.

How can *Threads* be constructed sequentially? The only way is to parameterize thread prefixes on the rest of the *Thread*. This leads directly to **continuations**.

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.141

## Running a Concurrent Computation (1)

```
type Output = [Char]
type ThreadQueue = [Thread]
type State = (Output, ThreadQueue)
runCM :: CM a → Output
runCM m = runHlp ("", []) (thread m)
where
  runHlp s t =
    case dispatch s t of
      Left (s', t) → runHlp s' t
      Right o → o
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.141

## This Lecture

- A concurrency monad (adapted from Claessen (1999))
- Basic concurrent programming in Haskell
- Software Transactional Memory (the STM monad)

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.141

## A Concurrency Monad (3)

```
newtype CM a = CM ((a → Thread) → Thread)
fromCM :: CM a → ((a → Thread) → Thread)
fromCM (CM x) = x
thread :: CM a → Thread
thread m = fromCM m (const End)
instance Monad CM where
  return x = CM (λk → k x)
  m >>= f = CM $ λk →
    fromCM m (λx → fromCM (f x) k)
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.141

## Running a Concurrent Computation (2)

Dispatch on the operation of the currently running *Thread*. Then call the scheduler.

```
dispatch :: State → Thread
→ Either (State, Thread) Output
dispatch (o, rq) (Print c t) =
  schedule (o ++ [c], rq ++ [t])
dispatch (o, rq) (Fork t1 t2) =
  schedule (o, rq ++ [t1, t2])
dispatch (o, rq) End =
  schedule (o, rq)
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.141

## A Concurrency Monad (1)

A *Thread* represents a (branching) process: a stream of primitive **atomic** operations:

```
data Thread = Print Char Thread
           | Fork Thread Thread
           | End
```

Note that a *Thread* represents the **entire rest** of a computation.

Note also that a *Thread* can spawn other *Threads* (so we get a tree, if you prefer).

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.141

## A Concurrency Monad (4)

Atomic operations:

```
cPrint :: Char → CM ()
cPrint c = CM (λk → Print c (k ()))
cFork :: CM a → CM ()
cFork m = CM (λk → Fork (thread m) (k ()))
cEnd :: CM a
cEnd = CM (λ_ → End)
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.141

## Running a Concurrent Computation (3)

Selects next *Thread* to run, if any.

```
schedule :: State → Either (State, Thread)
Output
schedule (o, []) = Right o
schedule (o, t : ts) = Left ((o, ts), t)
```

This all amounts to a **topological sorting** of the nodes in the *Thread*-tree.

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.141

## Example: Concurrent Processes

```
p1 :: CM ()   p2 :: CM ()   p3 :: CM ()
p1 = do      p2 = do      p3 = do
  cPrint 'a'  cPrint '1'   cFork p1
  cPrint 'b'  cPrint '2'   cPrint 'A'
  ...        ...         cFork p2
  cPrint 'j'  cPrint '0'   cPrint 'B'

main = print (runCM p3)
```

Result: aAbc1Bd2e3f4g5h6i7j890

**Note:** As it stands, the output is only made available after **all** threads have terminated.)

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.1041

## Any Use?

- Illustrates the flexibility offered by monads for introducing new control abstractions, including on top of basic concurrency primitives (cf. *Control.Concurrent.Async*).
- A number of libraries and embedded languages use similar ideas, e.g.
  - Fudgets: A GUI library
  - Yampa: A FRP library
- Studying semantics of concurrent programs.
- Aid for testing, debugging, and reasoning about concurrent programs.

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.1041

## Example: Basic Synchronization (1)

```
module Main where
import Control.Concurrent
countFromTo :: Int -> Int -> IO ()
countFromTo m n
  | m > n = return ()
  | otherwise = do
    putStrLn (show m)
    countFromTo (m + 1) n
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.1041

## Incremental Output

Incremental output:

```
runCM :: CM a -> Output
runCM m = dispatch [] (thread m)
dispatch :: ThreadQueue -> Thread -> Output
dispatch rq (Print c t) = c : schedule (rq ++ [t])
dispatch rq (Fork t1 t2) = schedule (rq ++ [t1, t2])
dispatch rq End         = schedule rq
schedule :: ThreadQueue -> Output
schedule [] = []
schedule (t : ts) = dispatch ts t
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.1041

## Concurrent Programming in Haskell

Primitives for concurrent programming provided as operations of the IO monad. They are in the module *Control.Concurrent*. Excerpts:

```
forkIO      :: IO () -> IO ThreadId
killThread  :: ThreadId -> IO ()
threadDelay :: Int -> IO ()
newMVar     :: a -> IO (MVar a)
newEmptyMVar :: IO (MVar a)
putMVar     :: MVar a -> a -> IO ()
takeMVar    :: MVar a -> IO a
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.1041

## Example: Basic Synchronization (2)

```
main = do
  start <- newEmptyMVar
  done <- newEmptyMVar
  forkIO $ do
    takeMVar start
    countFromTo 1 10
    putMVar done ()
  putStrLn "Go!"
  putMVar start ()
  takeMVar done
  countFromTo 11 20
  putStrLn "Done!"
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.1041

## Example: Concurrent processes 2

```
p1 :: CM ()   p2 :: CM ()   p3 :: CM ()
p1 = do      p2 = do      p3 = do
  cPrint 'a'  cPrint '1'   cFork p1
  cPrint 'b'  undefined    cPrint 'A'
  ...        ...         cFork p2
  cPrint 'j'  cPrint '0'   cPrint 'B'

main = print (runCM p3)
```

Result: aAbc1Bd \*\*\* Exception: Prelude.undefined

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.1041

## MVars

- The fundamental synchronisation mechanism is the *MVar* (“em-var”).
- An *MVar* is a “one-item box” that may be **empty** or **full**.
- Reading (*takeMVar*) and writing (*putMVar*) are **atomic** operations:
  - Writing to an empty *MVar* makes it full.
  - Writing to a full *MVar* blocks.
  - Reading from an empty *MVar* blocks.
  - Reading from a full *MVar* makes it empty.

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.1041

## Example: Unbounded Buffer (1)

```
module Main where
import Control.Monad (when)
import Control.Concurrent
newtype Buffer a =
  Buffer (MVar (Either [a] (Int, MVar a)))
newBuffer :: IO (Buffer a)
newBuffer = do
  b <- newMVar (Left [])
  return (Buffer b)
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.1041

## Example: Unbounded Buffer (2)

```
readBuffer :: Buffer a → IO a
readBuffer (Buffer b) = do
  bc ← takeMVar b
  case bc of
    Left (x : xs) → do
      putMVar b (Left xs)
      return x
    Left [] → do
      w ← newEmptyMVar
      putMVar b (Right (1, w))
      takeMVar w
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.1941

## Example: Unbounded Buffer (3)

```
...
Right (n, w) → do
  putMVar b (Right (n + 1, w))
  takeMVar w
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.2041

## Example: Unbounded Buffer (4)

```
writeBuffer :: Buffer a → a → IO ()
writeBuffer (Buffer b) x = do
  bc ← takeMVar b
  case bc of
    Left xs →
      putMVar b (Left (xs + [x]))
    Right (n, w) → do
      putMVar w x
      if n > 1
      then putMVar b (Right (n - 1, w))
      else putMVar b (Left [])
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.2141

## Example: Unbounded Buffer (4)

The buffer can now be used as a channel of communication between a set of “writers” and a set of “readers”. E.g.:

```
main = do
  b ← newBuffer
  forkIO (writer b)
  forkIO (writer b)
  forkIO (reader b)
  forkIO (reader b)
  ...
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.2241

## Example: Unbounded Buffer (5)

```
reader :: Buffer Int → IO ()
reader n b = rLoop
  where
    rLoop = do
      x ← readBuffer b
      when (x > 0) $ do
        putStrLn (n ++ ": " ++ show x)
        rLoop
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.2341

## Compositionality? (1)

Suppose we would like to read two **consecutive** elements from a buffer `b`?

That is, **sequential composition**.

Would the following work?

```
x1 ← readBuffer b
x2 ← readBuffer b
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.2441

## Compositionality? (2)

What about this?

```
mutex ← newMVar ()
...
takeMVar mutex
x1 ← readBuffer b
x2 ← readBuffer b
putMVar mutex ()
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.2541

## Compositionality? (3)

Suppose we would like to read from **one of two** buffers.

That is, **composing alternatives**.

Hmmm. How do we even begin?

- No way to attempt reading a buffer without risking blocking.
- We have to change or enrich the buffer implementation. E.g. add a `tryReadBuffer` operation, and then repeatedly poll the two buffers in a tight loop. Not so good!

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.2641

## Software Transactional Memory (1)

- Operations on shared mutable variables grouped into **transactions**.
- A transaction either succeeds or fails in its **entirety**. I.e., **atomic** w.r.t. other transactions.
- Failed transactions are automatically **retried** until they succeed.
- **Transaction logs**, which records reading and writing of shared variables, maintained to enable transactions to be validated, partial transactions to be rolled back, and to determine when worth trying a transaction again.

COMP4075: Lecture 10 – p.2741

## Software Transactional Memory (2)

- **Basic consistency requirement:** The effects of reading and writing within a transaction must be indistinguishable from the transaction having been carried out in isolation.
- **No locks!** (At the application level.)

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.2841

## Example: Buffer Revisited (1)

Unbounded buffer using the STM monad:

```
module Main where
import Control.Monad (when)
import Control.Concurrent
import Control.Concurrent.STM
newtype Buffer a = Buffer (TVar [a])
newBuffer :: STM (Buffer a)
newBuffer = do
  b ← newTVar []
  return (Buffer b)
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.3141

## Example: Buffer Revisited (4)

The main program and code for readers and writers can remain unchanged, except that STM operations must be carried out **atomically**:

```
main = do
  b ← atomically newBuffer
  forkIO (writer b)
  forkIO (writer b)
  forkIO (reader b)
  forkIO (reader b)
  ...
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.3441

## STM and Pure Declarative Languages

- STM perfect match for **purely declarative languages**:
  - reading and writing of shared mutable variables explicit and relatively rare;
  - most computations are pure and need not be logged.
- Disciplined use of effects through monads a **huge** payoff: easy to ensure that **only** effects that can be undone can go inside a transaction.  
(Imagine the havoc of arbitrary I/O actions if part of transaction: How to undo? What if retried?)

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.2941

## Example: Buffer Revisited (2)

```
readBuffer :: Buffer a → STM a
readBuffer (Buffer b) = do
  xs ← readTVar b
  case xs of
    [] → retry
    (x : xs') → do
      writeTVar b xs'
      return x
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.3241

## Example: Buffer Revisited (5)

```
reader :: Buffer Int → IO ()
reader n b = rLoop
  where
    rLoop = do
      x ← atomically (readBuffer b)
      when (x > 0) $ do
        putStrLn (n + ": " + show x)
        rLoop
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.3541

## The STM monad

The software transactional memory abstraction provided by a monad *STM*. **Distinct from IO!**  
Defined in *Control.Concurrent.STM*.

Excerpts:

```
newTVar :: a → STM (TVar a)
writeTVar :: TVar a → a → STM ()
readTVar :: TVar a → STM a
retry :: STM a
atomically :: STM a → IO a
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.3041

## Example: Buffer Revisited (3)

```
writeBuffer :: Buffer a → a → STM ()
writeBuffer (Buffer b) x = do
  xs ← readTVar b
  writeTVar b (xs ++ [x])
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.3241

## Composition (1)

*STM* operations can be **robustly composed**. That's the reason for making *readBuffer* and *writeBuffer* *STM* operations, and leaving it to client code to decide the scope of atomic blocks.

Example, sequential composition: reading two consecutive elements from a buffer *b*:

```
atomically $ do
  x1 ← readBuffer b
  x2 ← readBuffer b
  ...
```

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.3641

## Composition (2)

Example, composing alternatives: reading from one of two buffers  $b1$  and  $b2$ :

```
x ← atomically $
  readBuffer b1
  'orElse' readBuffer b2
```

The buffer operations thus composes nicely. No need to change the implementation of any of the operations!

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.37/41

## Further STM Functionality (3)

Other process communication and synchronization facilities:

- $TChan\ a$ : Unbounded FIFO channel
- $TQueue\ a$ : Variation of  $TChan$  with faster (amortised) throughput.
- $TBQueue\ a$ : Bounded FIFO channel
- $TSem$ : Transactional counting semaphore

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.40/41

## Further STM Functionality (1)

$TMVar$ : STM version of  $MVars$  for synchronisation; built on top of  $TVars$ :

$$TMVar\ a \approx TVar\ (Maybe\ a)$$

Some operations:

- $newTMVar :: a \rightarrow STM\ (TMVar\ a)$
- $newEmptyTMVar :: STM\ (TMVar\ a)$
- $putTMVar :: TMVar\ a \rightarrow a \rightarrow STM\ ()$
- $takeTMVar :: TMVar\ a \rightarrow STM\ a$
- $readTMVar :: TMVar\ a \rightarrow STM\ a$
- $swapTMVar :: TMVar\ a \rightarrow a \rightarrow STM\ a$

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.38/41

## Reading

- Koen Claessen. A Poor Man's Concurrency Monad. *Journal of Functional Programming*, 9(3), 1999.
- Wouter Swierstra and Thorsten Altenkirch. Beauty in the Beast: A Functional Semantics for the Awkward Squad. In *Proceedings of Haskell'07*, 2007.
- Tim Harris, Simon Marlow, Simon Peyton Jones, Maurice Herlihy. Composable Memory Transactions. In *Proceedings of PPOPP'05*, 2005
- Simon Peyton Jones. Beautiful Concurrency. Chapter from *Beautiful Code*, ed. Greg Wilson, O'Reilly 2007.

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.41/41

## Further STM Functionality (2)

Some non-blocking operations:

- $isEmptyTMVar :: TMVar\ a \rightarrow STM\ Bool$
- $tryPutTMVar :: TMVar\ a \rightarrow a \rightarrow STM\ Bool$
- $tryTakeTMVar :: TMVar\ a \rightarrow STM\ (Maybe\ a)$
- $tryReadTMVar :: TMVar\ a \rightarrow STM\ (Maybe\ a)$

COMP4075: Lecture 10 - p.39/41