Deadlock Prevention, Avoidance, and Detection
The Deadlock problem

- In a computer system deadlocks arise when members of a group of processes which hold resources are blocked indefinitely from access to resources held by other processes within the group.
Deadlock example

- \( P_i \) requests one I/O controller and the system allocates one.
- \( P_j \) requests one I/O controller and again the system allocates one.
- \( P_i \) wants another I/O controller but has to wait since the system ran out of I/O controllers.
- \( P_j \) wants another I/O controller and waits.
Conditions for deadlocks

- **Mutual exclusion.** No resource can be shared by more than one process at a time.
- **Hold and wait.** There must exist a process that is holding at least one resource and is waiting to acquire additional resources that are currently being held by other processes.
- **No preemption.** A resource cannot be preempted.
- **Circular wait.** There is a cycle in the wait-for graph.
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Graph-theoretic models

- Wait-for graph.

- Resource-allocation graph.
Wait-for graph
Resource allocation graph
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Wait-for graph and Resource-allocation graph conversion

- Any resource allocation graph with a single copy of resources can be transferred to a wait-for graph.
Strategies for handling deadlocks

- **Deadlock prevention.** Prevents deadlocks by restraining requests made to ensure that at least one of the four deadlock conditions cannot occur.

- **Deadlock avoidance.** Dynamically grants a resource to a process if the resulting state is safe. A state is safe if there is at least one execution sequence that allows all processes to run to completion.

- **Deadlock detection and recovery.** Allows deadlocks to form; then finds and breaks them.
Two types of deadlocks

- **Resource deadlock**: uses AND condition.
  
  **AND condition**: a process that requires resources for execution can proceed when it has acquired all those resources.

- **Communication deadlock**: uses OR condition.
  
  **OR condition**: a process that requires resources for execution can proceed when it has acquired at least one of those resources.
- P-out-of –Q condition which means that a process simultaneously requests Q resources and remains blocked until it is granted any P of those resources.
- AND-OR model, which may specify any combination of AND and OR models. E.g. a AND (b OR c).
Deadlock conditions

- The condition for deadlock in a system using the AND condition is the existence of a cycle.
- The condition for deadlock in a system using the OR condition is the existence of a knot.

A knot (K) consists of a set of nodes such that for every node a in K, all nodes in K and only the nodes in K are reachable from node a.
Example: OR condition
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Deadlock Prevention

1. A process acquires all the needed resources simultaneously before it begins its execution, therefore breaking the hold and wait condition.

E.g. In the dining philosophers’ problem, each philosopher is required to pick up both forks at the same time. If he fails, he has to release the fork(s) (if any) he has acquired.

Drawback: over-cautious.
2. All resources are assigned unique numbers. A process may request a resource with a unique number I only if it is not holding a resource with a number less than or equal to I and therefore breaking the circular wait condition.

- E.g. In the dining philosophers problem, each philosopher is required to pick a fork that has a larger id than the one he currently holds. That is, philosopher P5 needs to pick up fork F5 and then F1; the other philosopher Pi should pick up fork Fi followed by Fi-1.

- Drawback: over-cautions.
3. Each process is assigned a unique priority number. The priority numbers decide whether process Pi should wait for process Pj and therefore break the non-preemption condition.

E.g. Assume that the philosophers’ priorities are based on their ids, i.e., Pi has a higher priority than Pj if i < j. In this case Pi is allowed to wait for Pi+1 for i=1,2,3,4. P5 is not allowed to wait for P1. If this case happens, P5 has to abort by releasing its acquired fork(s) (if any).

Drawback: starvation. The lower priority one may always be rolled back. Solution is to raise the priority every time it is victimized.
4. Practically it is impossible to provide a method to break the mutual exclusion condition since most resources are intrinsically non-sharable, e.g., two philosophers cannot use the same fork at the same time.
A Deadlock Prevention Example
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process id</th>
<th>priority</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; request time</th>
<th>length</th>
<th>Retry interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deadlock Avoidance

Four resources ABCD. A has 6 instances, B has 3 instances, C Has 4 instances and D has 2 instances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABCD</td>
<td>ABCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>3011</td>
<td>4111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>0100</td>
<td>0212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>4210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>1101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>2110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the current state safe?
If P5 requests for (1,0,1,0), can this be granted?
Deadlock Detection and Recovery

- Centralized approaches
- Distributed approaches
- Hierarchical approaches
Centralized approaches

B releases R and then B wants T. But B wants T reaches coordinator first and results in false deadlock.
Distributed approaches

- A copy of the global wait-for graph is kept at each site with the result that each site has a global view of the system.
- The global wait-for graph is divided and distributed to different sites.
Chandy-Misra-Haas distributed deadlock detection algorithm
Hierarchical approaches

- In hierarchical deadlock detection algorithms, sites are arranged hierarchically in a tree. A site detects deadlocks involving only its descendant sites.

- For example, let A, B and C be controllers such that C is the lowest common ancestor of A and B. Suppose that node Pi appears in the local wait-for graph of controllers A and B. Then Pi must also appear in the local wait-for graph as:

  - Controller of C.
  - Every controller in the path from C to A.
  - Every controller in the path from C to B.

- In addition, if Pi and Pj appear in the wait-for graph of controller D and there exists a path from Pi to Pj in the wait-for graph of one of the children of D, then an edge (Pi, Pj) must be in the wait-for graph of D.