

# MGS 2009: FUN Lecture 5

## *Concurrency*

Henrik Nilsson

University of Nottingham, UK

# This Lecture

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

# A Concurrency Monad (1)

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

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

# A Concurrency Monad (1)

A Thread represents a 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.

# 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.

# 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***.

# 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 (\k -> k x)
```

```
    m >>= f = CM $ \k ->
```

```
        fromCM m (\x -> fromCM (f x) k)
```

# A Concurrency Monad (4)

Atomic operations:

```
cPrint :: Char -> CM ()
```

```
cPrint c = CM (\k -> Print c (k ()))
```

```
cFork :: CM a -> CM ()
```

```
cFork m = CM (\k -> Fork (thread m) (k ()))
```

```
cEnd :: CM a
```

```
cEnd = CM (\_ -> End)
```



# Running a Concurrent Computation (1)

Running a computation:

```
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
```

# 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)
```

# 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)
```

# Example: Concurrent Processes

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

main = print (runCM p3)
```

Result: aAbc1Bd2e3f4g5h6i7j890

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

# 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
```

# Example: Concurrent processes 2

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

main = print (runCM p3)
```

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

# Any Use?

- A number of libraries and embedded languages use similar ideas, e.g.
  - Fudgets
  - Yampa
  - FRP in general
- Studying semantics of concurrent programs.
- Aid for testing, debugging, and reasoning about concurrent programs.

# Concurrent Programming in Haskell

Primitives for concurrent programming provided as operations of the IO monad (or “sin bin” :-). 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
```



# 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.

# 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
```

# 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!"
```

# 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)
```

# 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
    Right (n,w) -> do
      putMVar b (Right (n + 1, w))
      takeMVar w
```

# Example: Unbounded Buffer (3)

```
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 [])
```

# 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)
    ...
```

# 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
```



# 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
```

# Compositionality? (2)

What about this?

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

# Compositionality? (3)

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

That is, ***composing alternatives***.

# Compositionality? (3)

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

That is, ***composing alternatives***.

Hmmm. How do we even begin?

# 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.

# 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!

# 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.

# Software Transactional Memory (2)

- **No locks!** (At the application level.)



# 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 arbitrary I/O actions could cause if part of transaction: How to undo? What if retried?)

# 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
```

# Example: Buffer Revisited (1)

Let us rewrite the 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)
```

## 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
```

```
writeBuffer :: Buffer a -> a -> STM ()
writeBuffer (Buffer b) x = do
  xs <- readTVar b
  writeTVar b (xs ++ [x])
```

# Example: Buffer Revisited (3)

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)
  ...
```

# Example: Buffer Revisited (4)

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

# 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
  ...
```

## 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!



# 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.