Chapter 12

Shared Objects

12.1 Introduction

Assume that there is a common resource (e.g. a common variable or data structure) to which all nodes in a network need to access from time to time. If the nodes are allowed to change the common object when accessing it, we need to guarantee that no two nodes have access to the object at the same time. In order to achieve this, we need protocols that allow the nodes of a network to store and manage access to such a shared object. A simple and obvious solution is to store the shared object at a central location (see Algorithm 40).

Algorithm 40 Shared Object: Centralized Solution

Initialization: Global object stored at root node r of a spanning tree of the network graph (i.e., each node knows its parent in the spanning tree).
Accessing Object: (by node v)
  1: v sends request up the tree
  2: request processed by root r (atomically)
  3: result sent down the tree to node v

Remarks:

- Algorithm 40 works. Instead of a spanning tree, one can use routing.

- It is however not very efficient. Assume that the object is accessed by a single node v repeatedly. Then we get a high message/time complexity. Instead v could store the object, or at least cache it. But then, in case another node w accesses the object, we might run into consistency problems.

- Alternative idea: The accessing node should become the new master of the object. The shared object then becomes mobile. There exist several variants of this idea. The simplest version is a home-based solution like in Mobile IP (see Algorithm 41).

Algorithm 41 Shared Object: Home-Based Solution

Initialization: An object has a home base (a node) that is known to every
    node. All requests (accesses to the shared object) are routed through the
    home base.
Accessing Object: (by node v)
  1: v acquires a lock at the home base, receives object.

Remark:

- Home-based solutions suffer from the triangular routing problem. If two
  close-by nodes access the object on a rotating basis, all the traffic is routed
  through the potentially far away home-base.

12.2 Arrow and Friends

We will now look at a protocol (called the Arrow algorithm) that always
moves the shared object to the node currently accessing it without creating
the triangular routing problem of home-based solutions. The protocol runs on
a precomputed spanning tree. Assume that the spanning tree is rooted at the
current position of the shared object. When a node u wants to access the shared
object, it sends out a *find* request towards the current position of the object.
While searching for the object, the edges of the spanning tree are redirected
such that in the end, the spanning tree is rooted at u (i.e., the new holder of the
object). The details of the algorithm are given by Algorithm 42. For simplicity,
we assume that a node u only starts a find request if u is not currently the
holder of the shared object and if u has finished all previous find requests (i.e.,
it is not currently waiting to receive the object).

Remarks:

- The parent pointers in Algorithm 42 are only needed for the find operation.
  Sending the variable to u in line 14 or to (w.successor in line 26 is done
  using routing (on the spanning tree or on the underlying network).

- When we draw the parent pointers as arrows, in a quiescent moment
  (where no "find" is in motion), the arrows all point towards the node
  currently holding the variable (i.e., the tree is rooted at the node holding
  the variable)

- What is really great about the Arrow algorithm is that it works in a
  completely asynchronous and concurrent setting (i.e., there can be many
  find requests at the same time).

Theorem 12.1. *(Arrow, Analysis) In an asynchronous, steady-state, and con-
current setting, a "find" operation terminates with message and time complexity
D, where D is the diameter of the spanning tree.*

Algorithm 42 Shared Object: Arrow Algorithm

Initialization: As for Algorithm 40, we are given a rooted spanning tree. Each node has a pointer to its parent, the root r is its own parent. The variable is initially stored at r. For all nodes v, v.successor := **null**, v.wait := **false**.

Start Find Request at Node u:
1: **do atomically**
2:    u.parent := u
3:    u sends "find by u" message to parent node
4:    u.wait := **true**
5: **end do**

Upon w Receiving "Find by u" Message from Node v:
6: **do atomically**
7:    **if** w.parent $\neq w$ **then**
8:      w.parent := v
9:      w sends "find by u" message to parent
10:    **else**
11:      w.parent := v
12:      **if not** w.wait **then**
13:        send variable to u // *w holds var. but does not need it any more*
14:      **else**
15:        w.successor := u // *w will send variable to u a.s.a.p.*
16:      **end if**
17:    **end if**
18: **end do**

Upon w Receiving Shared Object:
19: perform operation on shared object
20: **do atomically**
21:    w.wait := **false**
22:    **if** w.successor $\neq$ **null then**
23:      send variable to w.successor
24:      u.successor := **null**
25:    **end if**
26: **end do**

Before proving Theorem 12.1, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 12.2. *An edge $\{u, v\}$ of the spanning tree is in one of four states:*

>   *1.) Pointer from u to v (no message on the edge, no pointer from v to u)*
>   *2.) Message on the move from u to v (no pointers)*
>   *3.) Pointer from v to u (no message on the edge, no pointer from u to v)*
>   *4.) Message on the move from v to u (no pointers)*

Proof. W.l.o.g., assume that initially the edge $\{u, v\}$ is in state 1. With a message arrival at u (or if u starts a "find by u" request, the edge goes to state 2. When the message is received at v, v directs its pointer to u and we are therefore in state 3. A new message at v (or a new request initiated by v) then brings the edge back to state 1.   □

Proof of Theorem 12.1. Since the "find" message will only travel on a static tree, it suffices to show that it will not traverse an edge twice. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there is a first "find" message f that traverses an edge $e = \{u, v\}$ for the second time and assume that e is the first edge that is traversed twice by f. The first time, f traverses e. Assume that e is first traversed from u to v. Since we are on a tree, the second time, e must be traversed from v to u. Because e is the first edge to be traversed twice, f must re-visit e before visiting any other edges. Right before f reaches v, the edge e is in state 2 (f is on the move) and in state 3 (it will immediately return with the pointer from v to u). This is a contradiction to Lemma 12.2.   □

Remarks:

- Finding a good tree is an interesting problem. We would like to have a tree with low stretch, low diameter, low degree, etc.

- It seems that the Arrow algorithm works especially well when lots of "find" operations are initiated concurrently. Most of them will find a "close-by" node, thus having low message/time complexity. For the sake of simplicity we analyze a synchronous system.

Theorem 12.3. *(Arrow, Concurrent Analysis) Let the system be synchronous. Initially, the system is in a quiescent state. At time 0, a set S of nodes initiates a "find" operation. The message complexity of all "find" operations is $O(\log |S| \cdot m^*)$ where m^* is the message complexity of an optimal (with global knowledge) algorithm on the tree.*

Proof Sketch. Let d be the minimum distance of any node in S to the root. There will be a node u_1 at distance d from the root that reaches the root in d time steps, turning all the arrows on the path to the root towards u_1. A node u_2 that finds (is queued behind) u_1 cannot distinguish the system from a system where there was no request u_1, and instead the root was initially located at u_1. The message cost of u_2 is consequentially the distance between u_1 and u_2 on the spanning tree. By induction the total message complexity is exactly as if a collector starts at the root and then "greedily" collects tokens located at the nodes in S (greedily in the sense that the collector always goes towards the closest token). Greedy collecting the tokens is not a good strategy in general because it will traverse the same edge more than twice in the worst

case. An asymptotically optimal algorithm can also be translated into a depth-first-search collecting paradigm, traversing each edge at most twice. In another area of computer science, we would call the Arrow algorithm a nearest-neighbor TSP heuristic (without returning to the start/root though), and the optimal algorithm TSP-optimal. It was shown that nearest-neighbor has a logarithmic overhead, which concludes the proof. □

Remarks:

- An average request set S on a not-to-bad tree gives usually a much better bound. However, there is an almost tight $\log|S|/\log\log|S|$ worst-case example.

- It was recently shown that Arrow can do as good in a dynamic setting (where nodes are allowed to initiate requests at any time). In particular the message complexity of the dynamic analysis can be shown to have a $\log D$ overhead only, where D is the diameter of the spanning tree (note that for logarithmic trees, the overhead becomes $\log\log n$).

- What if the spanning tree is a star? Then with Theorem 12.1, each find will terminate in 2 steps! Since also an optimal algorithm has message cost 1, the algorithm is 2-competitive...? Yes, but because of its high degree the star center experiences contention... It can be shown that the contention overhead is at most proportional to the largest degree Δ of the spanning tree.

- Thought experiment: Assume a balanced binary spanning tree—by Theorem 12.1, the message complexity per operation is $\log n$. Because a binary tree has maximum degree 3, the time per operation therefore is at most $3\log n$.

- There are better and worse choices for the spanning tree. The stretch of an edge $\{u,v\}$ is defined as distance between u and v in a spanning tree. The maximum stretch of a spanning tree is the maximum stretch over all edges. A few years ago, it was shown how to construct spanning trees that are $O(\log n)$-stretch-competitive.

What if most nodes just want to read the shared object? Then it does not make sense to acquire a lock every time. Instead we can use caching (see Algorithm 43).

Theorem 12.4. *Algorithm 43 is correct. More surprisingly, the message complexity is 3-competitive (at most a factor 3 worse than the optimum).*

Proof. Since the accesses do not overlap by definition, it suffices to show that between two writes, we are 3-competitive. The sequence of accessing nodes is $w_0, r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_k, w_1$. After w_0, the object is stored at w_0 and not cached anywhere else. All reads cost twice the smallest subtree T spanning the write w_0 and all the reads since each read only goes to the first copy. The write w_1 costs T plus the path P from w_1 to T. Since any data management scheme must use an edge in T and P at least once, and our algorithm uses edges in T at most 3 times (and in P at most once), the theorem follows. □

Algorithm 43 Shared Object: Read/Write Caching

- Nodes can either read or write the shared object. For simplicity we first assume that reads or writes do not overlap in time (access to the object is sequential).
- Nodes store three items: a parent pointer pointing to one of the neighbors (as with Arrow), and a cache bit for each edge, plus (potentially) a copy of the object.
- Initially the object is stored at a single node u; all the parent pointers point towards u, all the cache bits are false.
- When initiating a read, a message follows the arrows (this time: without inverting them!) until it reaches a cached version of the object. Then a copy of the object is cached along the path back to the initiating node, and the cache bits on the visited edges are set to true.
- A write at u writes the new value locally (at node u), then searches (follow the parent pointers and reverse them towards u) a first node with a copy. Delete the copy and follow (in parallel, by flooding) all edge that have the cache flag set. Point the parent pointer towards u, and remove the cache flags.

Remarks:

- Concurrent reads are not a problem, also multiple concurrent reads and one write work just fine.

- What about concurrent writes? To achieve consistency writes need to invalidate the caches before writing their value. It is claimed that the strategy then becomes 4-competitive.

- Is the algorithm also time competitive? Well, not really: The optimal algorithm that we compare to is usually offline. This means it knows the whole access sequence in advance. It can then cache the object before the request even appears!

- Algorithms on trees are often simpler, but have the disadvantage that they introduce the extra stretch factor. In a ring, for example, any tree has stretch $n - 1$; so there is always a bad request pattern.

Algorithm 44 Shared Object: Pointer Forwarding

Initialization: Object is stored at root r of a precomputed spanning tree T (as in the Arrow algorithm, each node has a parent pointer pointing towards the object).

Accessing Object: (by node u)

1: follow parent pointers to current root r of T

2: send object from r to u

3: r.parent := u; u.parent := u;   // *u is the new root*

Algorithm 45 Shared Object: Ivy

Initialization: Object is stored at root r of a precomputed spanning tree T (as before, each node has a parent pointer pointing towards the object). For simplicity, we assume that accesses to the object are sequential.

Start Find Request at Node u:

1: u sends "find by u" message to parent node

2: u.parent := u

Upon v receiving "Find by u" Message:

3: **if** v.parent := v **then**

4:    send object to u

5: **else**

6:    send "find by u" message to v.parent

7: **end if**

8: v.parent := u // *u will become the new root*

12.3   Ivy and Friends

In the following we study algorithms that do not restrict communication to a tree. Of particular interest is the special case of a complete graph ("Peer-to-Peer" if you wish). A simple solution for this case is given by Algorithm 44.

Remarks:

- If the graph is not complete, routing can be used to find the root.

- Assume that the nodes line up in a linked list. If we always choose the first node of the linked list to acquire the object, we have message/time complexity n. The new topology is again a linearly linked list. Pointer forwarding is therefore bad in a worst-case.

- If edges are not FIFO, it can even happen that the number of steps is unbounded for a node having bad luck. An algorithm with such a property is named "not fair," or "not wait-free." (Example: Initially we have the list $4 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1$; 4 starts a find; when the message of 4 passes 3, 3 itself starts a find. The message of 3 may arrive at 2 and then 1 earlier, thus the new end of the list is $2 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 3$; once the message of 4 passes 2, the game re-starts.)

There seems to be a natural improvement of the pointer forwarding idea. Instead of simply redirecting the parent pointer from the old root to the new

Figure 12.1: Reversal of the path $x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5$.

root, we can redirect all the parent pointers of the nodes on the path visited during a find message to the new root. The details are given by Algorithm 45. Figure 12.1 shows how the pointer redirecting affects a given tree (the right tree results from a find request started at node x_0 on the left tree).

Remark:

- Also with Algorithm 45, we might have a bad linked list situation. However, if the start of the list acquires the object, the linked list turns into a star. As the following theorem will show, the search paths are not long on average. Since paths sometimes can be bad, we will need amortized analysis.

Theorem 12.5. *If the initial tree is a star, a find request of Algorithm 45 needs* $O(\log n)$ *steps on average, where n is the number of processors.*

Proof. All logarithms in the following proof are to base 2. We assume that accesses to the shared object are sequential. We use a potential function argument. Let $s(u)$ be the size of the subtree rooted at node u (the number of nodes in the subtree including u itself). We define the potential Φ of the whole tree T as (V is the set of all nodes)

$$\Phi(T) = \sum_{u \in V} \frac{\log s(u)}{2}.$$

Assume that the path traversed by the ith operation has length k_i, i.e., the ith operation redirects k_i pointers to the new root. Clearly, the number of steps of the ith operation is proportional to k_i. We therefore need to show that for m consecutive operations,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i \;=\; O(m \cdot \log n). \tag{12.1}$$

Let T_0 be the initial tree and let T_i be the tree after the ith operation. Further, let $a_i = k_i - \Phi(T_{i-1}) + \Phi(T_i)$ be the *amortized cost* of the ith operation. We have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \big(k_i - \Phi(T_{i-1}) + \Phi(T_i)\big) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i - \Phi(T_0) + \Phi(T_m).$$

For any tree T, we have $\Phi(T) \geq \log(n)/2$. Because we assume that T_0 is a star, we also have $\Phi(T_0) = \log(n)/2$. We therefore get that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i.$$

It therefore suffices to show that the amortized cost a_i of every operation is $a_i = O(\log n)$ to prove Equation (12.1) and thus the theorem.

Let us therefore analyze the amortized cost a_i of the ith operation. Let $x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{k_i}$ be the path that is reversed by the operation. Further for $0 \leq j \leq k_i$, let s_j be the subtree rooted at x_j before the reversal. The size of x_0 after the reversal is s_{k_i} and the size of x_j after the reversal, for $1 \leq j \leq k_i$, is $s_j - s_{j-1}$ (see Figure 12.1). We can thus write a_i as

$$
\begin{aligned}
a_i &= k_i - \left(\sum_{j=0}^{k_i} \frac{1}{2} \log s_j \right) + \left(\frac{1}{2} \log s_{k_i} + \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \frac{1}{2} \log(s_j - s_{j-1}) \right) \\
&= k_i + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{k_i-1} \left(\log(s_{j+1} - s_j) - \log s_j \right) = k_i + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{k_i-1} \log \left(\frac{s_{j+1} - s_j}{s_j} \right).
\end{aligned}
$$

For $0 \leq j \leq k_i - 1$, let $\alpha_j = s_{j+1}/s_j$. Note that $s_{j+1} > s_j$ and thus that $\alpha_j > 1$. Further note, that $(s_{j+1} + s_j)/s_j = \alpha_j - 1$. We therefore have that

$$a_i = k_i + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{k_i-1} \log(\alpha_j - 1) = \sum_{j=0}^{k_i-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \log(\alpha_j - 1) \right).$$

For $\alpha > 1$, it can be shown that $1 + \log(\alpha - 1)/2 \leq \log \alpha$ (see Lemma 12.6). From this inequality, we obtain

$$a_i \leq \sum_{j=0}^{k_i-1} \log \alpha_j = \sum_{j=0}^{k_i-1} \log \frac{s_{j+1}}{s_j} = \sum_{j=0}^{k_i-1} \left(\log s_{j+1} - \log s_j \right) = \log s_{k_i} - s_0 \leq \log n,$$

because $s_{k_i} = n$ and $s_0 \geq 1$. This concludes the proof. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 12.6. *For $\alpha > 1$, $1 + \log(\alpha - 1)/2 \leq \log \alpha$.*

Proof. The claim can be verified by the following chain of reasoning:

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq (\alpha - 2)^2 \\
0 &\leq \alpha^2 - 4\alpha + 4 \\
4(\alpha - 1) &\leq \alpha^2 \\
\log_2 \left(4(\alpha - 1) \right) &\leq \log_2 \left(\alpha^2 \right) \\
2 + \log_2(\alpha - 1) &\leq 2 \log_2 \alpha \\
1 + \frac{1}{2} \log_2(\alpha - 1) &\leq \log_2 \alpha.
\end{aligned}
$$

$\qquad\square$

Remarks:

- Systems guys (the algorithm is called Ivy because it was used in a system with the same name) have some fancy heuristics to improve performance even more: For example, the root every now and then broadcasts its name such that paths will be shortened.

- What about concurrent requests? It works with the same argument as in Arrow. Also for Ivy an argument including congestion is missing (and more pressing, since the dynamic topology of a tree cannot be chosen to have low degree and thus low congestion as in Arrow).

- Sometimes the type of accesses allows that several accesses can be combined into one to reduce congestion higher up the tree. Let the tree in Algorithm 40 be a balanced binary tree. If the access to a shared variable for example is "add value x to the shared variable," two or more accesses that accidentally meet at a node can be combined into one. Clearly accidental meeting is rare in an asynchronous model. We might be able to use synchronizers (or maybe some other timing tricks) to help meeting a little bit.