

# Introduction to Parallel & Distributed Programming

Lec 10 – Memory Consistency (Causal, Processor),  
Synchronisation 1 – Flush & Atomic

Subodh Sharma | Feb 2, 2026



# Causal Consistency

- **Rules of Happens-Before relation ( $\rightarrow$ ):**
  - **Thread order:** If in a thread,  $a < b$ , then  $a \rightarrow b$
  - **Reads-from:** If a read operation  $b$  reads the value from a write operation  $a$  then  $a \rightarrow b$
  - **Transitivity**

# Causal Consistency

- **Rules of causality guarantee:**
  - **Causal Writes:** If process P writes to  $x$ , say  $w_1$ , and then some process observes  $x$  and then writes to  $y$ , say  $w_2$ , then  $w_1 \rightarrow w_2$ 
    - That is: every process must observe the same order of writes
  - Rules of HB hold.
- **What is allowed?**

# Causal Consistency

thread A	thread B	thread C	thread D
$x = a$		$y_1 = x (b)$	$z_1 = x (a)$
<del>concurrent</del>	$x = b$	$y_2 = x (a)$	$z_2 = x (b)$

Allowed?

- **To justify Thread C's behaviour:**  $W(x, b) \rightarrow R(x, b) \rightarrow W(x, a) \rightarrow R(x, a)$
- **To justify Thread D's behaviour:**  $W(x, a) \rightarrow R(x, a) \rightarrow W(x, b) \rightarrow R(x, b)$
- **Since the two writes are concurrent, different threads can see them take place in different orders**
- **CAUSAL CONSISTENT**

# Causal Consistency

thread A	thread B	thread C	thread D
$x = a$	$y_1 = x (a)$	$y_1 = x (b)$	$z_1 = x (a)$
$x = b$		$y_2 = x (a)$	$z_2 = x (b)$

Allowed?

- **To justify Thread C's behaviour:**  $W(x, b) \rightarrow R(x, b) \rightarrow W(x, a) \rightarrow R(x, a)$
- **To justify Thread D's behaviour:**  $W(x, a) \rightarrow R(x, a) \rightarrow W(x, b) \rightarrow R(x, b)$
- **But note that  $W(x, a) \rightarrow W(x, b)$ ; but thread C violates this order**
- **NOT CAUSAL CONSISTENT**

# Processor Consistency

- **Rules:**
  - **Writes by a single processor are observed in the order they were issued**
  - **Writes from different processors to the same location must be seen in the same order**
- **Weaker than Causal Consistency - WHY?**

$T_1$

$W(x, 1)$

$T_2$

$R(x, 1)$

$T_3$

$R(y, 1)$

$W(y, 1)$

$R(x, ?)$

# Processor Consistency

$T_1$

$T_2$

$T_3$

$W(x,1)$

$R(x,1)$

$R(y,1)$

$W(y,1)$

$R(x, v)$

- **Under PC:** Even though  $R(y,1)$ , it is not obligated that  $R(x, v)$  where  $v = 1$ 
  - Which means  $v = 0/1$
- Under Causal Consistency:  $W(x,1) \rightarrow R(x,1) \rightarrow W(y,1) \dots$ 
  - Which means in  $R(x, v)$ ,  $v = 1$

# Processor Consistency

$T_1$

$T_2$

$T_3$

$W(x,1)$

$R(x,2)$

$R(y,3)$

$W(x,2)$

$W(y,3)$

$R(x,1)$

- The execution is **Processor Consistent**

# Processor Consistency

$T_1$

$T_2$

$W(x,1)$

$R(y,3)$

$W(x,2)$

$R(x,1)$

$W(y,3)$

- The execution is **NOT Processor Consistent**

# Synchronisation

## Types of Synchronisation Tools

- **Memory fences** (eg: `# pragma omp flush`, h/w memory fences like `mfence`)
- **Atomic Operations:** event should happen uninterrupted
  - **Test & set, Fetch & add, Compare & swap**
- **Critical sections, Lock, Mutexes:** Events should **NOT** happen together
- **Barriers:** Events should happen together
- **Wait, Condition variables:** event A should happen before event B

# Properties of Synchronisation

- Safety, Liveness
- Blocking
- Starvation-free, Deadlock-free, Lock-free, Wait-free

	Not lock-based Independent of Scheduler	Lock-based Depends on Scheduler
Everyone Progresses	Wait Free	Starvation Free
Someone Progresses	Lock Free	Deadlock Free

# The Flush Operation

- Flush directive performs two primary actions:
  - It forces the thread's temporary view of the variables to be written back to memory
  - It forces the thread to invalidate its local copy and reload vars from the memory
- Flush doesn't provide atomicity or mutual exclusion
  - It only ensures consistent visibility

# The Flush Operation

## Thread A

```
flagA = 1;  
#pragma omp flush  
if (flagB == 0) {  
    shared ++; ← mutual exclusion → shared++;  
}  
flagA = 0;  
#pragma omp flush
```

## Thread B

```
flagB = 1;  
#pragma omp flush  
if (flagA == 0) {  
    shared ++;  
}  
flagB = 0;  
#pragma omp flush
```

# Atomic Operations

## Test & Set

- **Test-and-Set (TAS):** Atomically reads a location and sets it to 1 and returns the old value

- **Semantics:**

```
bool old_value = *location;  
*location = true;  
return old_value;
```

- Can be used to implement Locks
- **Limitations?**

# Atomic Operations

## Fetch-and-Add

- **FAA** - Atomically adds a value to a memory location and returns the old value
- **Signature:** `T fetch_add(T* location, T increment)`
- **Semantics:**

```
T old_value = *location;
*location = old_value + increment;
return old_value;
```
- **Limitations:** No conditional update, Limited to addition, cache line contention, overflows-underflows