# Foundations of Programming – Concurrency – Session 10 – April 18, 2002

Uwe Nestmann

**EPFL-LAMP** 

Foundations of Programming – Concurrency – Session 10 – April 18, 2002 – (produced on April 17, 2002, 21:11) – p.1/6

## **Session 10: The Scheduler Problem**

- □ informal specification
  - black box
  - flow graph
- □ specification as sequential process expression
  - transition graph
- □ implementation as concurrent process expression
  - flow graph
  - transition graph ?
- □ proof "by hand"
- ☐ proof using the CWB

## **Informal Specification [Mil99, § 3.6]**

- $\Box$  processes  $P_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$  to be scheduled
- $\Box P_i$  starts by pressing  $a_i$  of the scheduler
- $\Box P_i$  completes by signalling  $b_i$  to the scheduler
- $\Box$  each  $P_i$  must not run two tasks at a time
- $\Box$  tasks of different  $P_i$  may run at the same time
- $\Box a_i$  are required to occur cyclically (initially, 1 starts)
- $\Box$  for each *i*, *a<sub>i</sub>* and *b<sub>i</sub>* must occur cyclically
- permit maximal "pressure"

## Formal Specification [Mil99, § 3.6]

$$\begin{split} i \in \{1 \dots, n\} & X \subseteq \{1 \dots, n\} \\ \mathbf{S}_{i,X}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & \text{scheduler, where } i \text{ is next and } X \text{ are running} \\ & (\text{* we omit the parameters in the following *}) \\ \hline \mathbf{S}_{i,X} & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & \mathbf{S}_{1,\emptyset} \\ \mathbf{S}_{i,X} & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & \left\{ \begin{split} \sum_{j \in X} b_j . \mathbf{S}_{i,X-j} & (i \in X) \\ \sum_{j \in X} b_j . \mathbf{S}_{i,X-j} + a_i . \mathbf{S}_{i+1 \mod n, X \cup i} & (i \notin X) \end{split} \right. \end{split}$$

- $\Box$  draw the transition graph for n = 2
- $\Box$  show that the scheduler is never deadlocked
- $\Box$  what is the difference when dropping  $i \in X$ ?

## Formal "Implementation" (I) [§ 7.3]

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
A(a,b,c,d) & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & a.c.b.\overline{d}.A \\
\hline A(a,b,c,d) & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & a.C\langle a,b,c,d \rangle \\
C(a,b,c,d) & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & c.B\langle a,b,c,d \rangle \\
B(a,b,c,d) & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & b.D\langle a,b,c,d \rangle \\
D(a,b,c,d) & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & \overline{d}.A\langle a,b,c,d \rangle \\
\hline A_i & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & A\langle a,b,c_i,c_{i-1} \rangle \\
\hline & \ddots \\
S(\vec{a},\vec{b}) & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & (\boldsymbol{\nu}\vec{c}) \left( A_1 | D_2 | \cdots | D_n \right) \\
\hline \end{array}$$

## Formal "Implementation" (II) [§ 7.3]

$$\begin{array}{rcl} A(a,b,c,d) & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & a.c.(b.\overline{d}.A + \overline{d}.b.A) \\ \hline A(a,b,c,d) & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & a.C\langle a,b,c,d \rangle \\ C(a,b,c,d) & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & c.E\langle a,b,c,d \rangle \\ E(a,b,c,d) & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & b.D\langle a,b,c,d \rangle + \overline{d}.B\langle a,b,c,d \rangle \\ B(a,b,c,d) & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & b.A\langle a,b,c,d \rangle \\ \hline D(a,b,c,d) & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & \overline{d}.A\langle a,b,c,d \rangle \\ \hline A_i & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & A\langle a,b,c_i,c_{i-1} \rangle \\ & \ddots \\ S(\vec{a},\vec{b}) & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & (\boldsymbol{\nu}\vec{c}) \left( A_1 | D_2 | \cdots | D_n \right) \\ \hline \end{array}$$