

Semaphores Augmented with a Waiting Array

Dave Dice 

Oracle Labs

USA

first.last@oracle.com

Alex Kogan 

Oracle Labs

USA

first.last@oracle.com

Abstract

Semaphores are a widely used and foundational synchronization and coordination construct used for shared memory multithreaded programming. They are a keystone concept, in the sense that most other synchronization constructs can be implemented in terms of semaphores, although the converse does not generally hold. Semaphores and the quality of their implementation are of consequence as they remain heavily used in the Linux kernel and are also available for application programming via the pthreads programming interface.

We first show that semaphores can be implemented by borrowing ideas from the classic *ticket lock* algorithm. The resulting *ticket-semaphore* algorithm is simple and compact (space efficient) but does not scale well because of the detrimental impact of global spinning. We then transform *ticket-semaphore* into the TWA-semaphore by the applying techniques derived from the TWA - *Ticket Locks Augmented with a Waiting Array* algorithm, yielding a scalable semaphore that remains compact and has extremely low latency.

CCS Concepts: • **Software and its engineering** → *Multithreading; Mutual exclusion; Concurrency control; Process synchronization.*

Keywords: Semaphores, Locks, Mutexes, Mutual Exclusion, Synchronization, Concurrency Control

1 Introduction

Semaphores are perhaps the oldest known synchronization construct, dating back to at least 1962 or 1963 [9, 14]. Semaphore constitute a key building block – many other synchronization constructs, such as locks (mutexes) or condition variables can and are be trivially implemented in terms of semaphores. Semaphores are also commonly used to build higher level primitives, such as thread pools, bounded buffers, producer-consumer patterns, reader-writer locks, messages queues, and so on [10].

Conceptually, a semaphore could be implemented as a simple atomic counter. The take operator waits for the counter to become positive, and then decrements the counter and returns. The post operator increments the counter ¹.

In practice, such an implementation, while useful for explanation, is not generally considered viable – it fails common

quality of implementation (QoI) criteria. Such an implementation, for instance, does not guarantee first-come-first-served admission order, which is a desirable property.

Semaphores are widely available. The POSIX pthreads application programming interface, C++20, and Java’s `java.util.concurrent` expose semaphore implementations for application use. The linux kernel also makes heavy internal use of semaphores.

Ticket Locks We briefly shift our attention to *ticket locks* [11, 15, 16], which are a mutual exclusion primitive, and show how ticket locks can be transformed into semaphores. A ticket lock consists of `ticket` and `grant` fields. Threads arriving to acquire the lock atomically fetch-and-add to advance the `ticket` value and then wait for the `grant` field to become equal to the value returned by the fetch-and-add primitive. The unlock operator simply increments the `grant`. Incrementing `grant` does not require an atomic read-modify-write operation.

Ticket-Semaphore We can transform a ticket lock in a semaphore, yielding the *Ticket-Semaphore* algorithm, by making the following changes to the ticket lock algorithm. First, we require the use of an atomic increment in update the `grant` field, as multiple threads might release the semaphore concurrently. (With a mutex, in contrast, only a single thread, the owner, can release the lock at any given time). Next, we use *magnitude*-based comparisons in the take operator instead of simple equality comparisons. If the unique `ticket` value, obtained from the atomic fetch-and-add operator exceeds the value of `grant` field, then the thread can proceed, otherwise it needs to wait until that condition is satisfied. And finally, as we are using magnitude-based comparisons, arithmetic roll-over of the `ticket` and `grant` becomes a concern. To address that issue we simply ensure that `ticket` and `grant` are 64-bit unsigned integers. Assuming a processor could increment a value at most once per nanosecond, these fields would not overflow and wrap around in less than 200 years, so arithmetic overflow is not a practical concern. Like ticket locks, *Ticket-Semaphore* provides strict first-come-first-served admission order, assuming the underlying atomic fetch-and-add primitive is wait-free. Listing 1 illustrates a canonical embodiment of the *Ticket-Semaphore* algorithm.

While this semaphore is simple and compact, and offers extremely low latency absent contention or at low contention, it suffers, like ticket locks, from excessive coherence traffic

¹The naming conventions for semaphore operators vary considerably. Take-Post are sometime called P-V, acquire-release, consume-produce, wait-signal, down-up, get-put, procure-liberate, procure-vacate, proberen-verhogen, etc.

generate by *global spinning* where multiple threads busy-wait on the grant field, and thus performance fades as we increase the number of participating threads.

TWA TWA (Ticket Locks Augmented with a Waiting Array) [4, 5] provides a way to make ticket locks scale, while still remaining compact and retaining the desirable low handover latency found in ticket locks. Under TWA, threads arriving at the lock operator atomically fetch-and-add 1 to the ticket field to obtain their private ticket value. The thread then compares that ticket value in hand to the grant field. When grant becomes equal to the ticket value, the thread has obtained ownership of the lock and can enter the critical section, otherwise it waits. If the numeric difference between grant and the ticket value is small, under some threshold, then we allow the thread to use global spinning on grant but otherwise if the difference exceeds the threshold then we force the thread to switch to *semi-local* longer-term waiting as follows. The thread hashes the address of the lock and the ticket value to form an index into a new waiting array that is used for longer term waiting. The unlock operator increments grant as usual, but then also hashes the grant value to compute an index into the waiting array, and updates the waiting array element to notify specific long term waiters that they need to recheck the distance between their ticket value and the grant field, shifting from long-term waiting to short-term on grant as appropriate. Absent hash collisions, this approach notifies just the single corresponding waiter.

Crucially, this approach greatly reduces global spinning, to at most one thread per lock at a given time, and diffuses waiting over the waiting array via the hash operation. The hash operator is intentionally designed to be ticket-aware. The waiting array is shared by all threads in the process and is of fixed size. Because of hash collisions, multiple threads might wait on the same waiting array element, thus we have statistical *semi-local* waiting instead of strict local waiting. Lock handover is efficient as the successor thread is waiting directly on the grant field. When the unlock operator increments grant, the successor can notice immediately and enter the critical section. While the successor is entering the critical section, the unlock operator, in parallel, signals the successor's successor (if any) via the long-term waiting array to shift from long-term waiting on the waiting array to short-term waiting on grant. Cueing and staging of that next thread overlaps with entry and execution of the critical section, allowing for useful parallelism.

The tunable threshold parameter is named `LongTermThreshold` in our source code listings, and we use 1 as a default value, but note that the optimal value is platform-specific and related to the overheads imposed by global spinning, which is driven by coherent cache communication costs. Empirically, we have found that 1 works well under a wide variety of platforms.

TWA-Semaphore Just as we transformed a simple non-scalable ticket lock into the scalable TWA variant, we can, by analogy, apply those same lessons to transform *Ticket-Semaphore* into a scalable form, which we call *TWA-Semaphore*. The resultant *TWA-Semaphore* is fair, with a first-come-first-served (FCFS), or, more precisely, first-come-first-enabled [1] admission order. We show a working example in Listing 2. We note that this transformation is readily applicable to other synchronization constructs, such as *EventCount* and *Sequencers* [16].

2 Waiting Strategies

A critical design choice for both locks and semaphores is exactly *how* threads wait in the take primitive. A detailed survey of waiting strategies appears in [3]. We describe a set selected subset of approaches suitable for our semaphore designs.

Spinning Also called *busy-waiting*, threads simply loop, fetching (polling) and checking variables until the condition of interest is satisfied. Spinning loops are usually decorated with a `PAUSE` or `YIELD` instruction which informs that processor that a busy-waiting is active. Such instructions may act to cede resources to other processors, reduce thermal or energy consumption, and inform hypervisors (virtual machine monitors) that busy-waiting is in play to enable gang scheduling, if necessary. `PAUSE` is considered an advisory “hint” to the system and has no specific semantics.

Loops may also include calls to operating system services such as `sched_yield`, which hints to the scheduler to transiently surrender the processor to other potentially runnable threads. The actual semantics of `sched_yield` are intentionally defined to be advisory and vague, providing considerable latitude to the implementation. For instance let's say our system has 2 CPUs. Thread *T1* is running on CPU-0 and thread *T2* is running on CPU-1. Thread *T3* is in ready state on CPU-0's local ready queue. If *T2* calls `sched_yield` there is no guarantee that *T3* will be scheduled onto CPU-1. Often, the call to `sched_yield` will return immediately if there are no ready threads on the caller's local ready queue. As such, `sched_yield` is not particularly helpful for spin loops.

While waiting, the spinning thread occupies a CPU that might be otherwise used by other ready threads. (And in fact those other ready threads might be the ones destined to satisfy the condition of interest). As such, except for certain kernel environments, long-term unbounded spinning is frowned up and is considered an *anti-pattern*. In particular, if we have more runnable threads than processors, then involuntary preemption, as provided by the scheduler, can be deeply problematic with respect to performance. For instance, let's say our system has 4 processors. Threads *T1*, *T2*, *T3* and *T4* have been dispatched onto the processors are busy-waiting for a lock held by *T5* where *T5* is runnable but has been preempted. To make forward progress we need

to T5 to be scheduled via preemption of one of the other threads. Preemption, however, tends to operate in longer millisecond time frames, so throughput over the lock can be greatly impaired by using a pure spinning waiting strategy.

In the context of *TWA-Semaphore*, spinning could be used both short-term spinning on the grant field or longer-term waiting via the waiting array.

MONITOR-MWAIT on the x86 architecture, and similar facilities, such as WFE or WFET on ARM processors, offer a more “polite” mode of waiting, potentially consuming less resources during polling, but still cause the waiting thread to occupy a processor.

Linux Kernel Futex The *futex* [12] mechanism allows threads to designate an address of interest and then block in the kernel, surrendering the processor (allowing other threads to immediately use the processor), until some other thread performs a corresponding notification system call on that same address. Microsoft Windows exposes a similar *WaitOnAddress* mechanism. The underlying futex implementation hashes the specified virtual address into an index into a kernel hashtable, where each bucket contains a spinlock and a pointer to a linked list of threads waiting on that bucket. The spin lock is used to protect that specific bucket.

In the context of *TWA* or *TWA-Semaphore*, we could utilize the futex services to wait on the buckets in our waiting array. This approach confers an additional scalability advantage. As the futex operator hashes address into kernel hashtable buckets, but by using multiple address in the waiting array, we in turn disperse futex operations over the entire futex hashtable, avoiding hot spots and reducing contention on individual per-bucket futex hash table spinlocks.

Threads deeper on the logical queue than `LongTermThreshold` wait via futex while those closer to the front spin. If we desire that all threads wait by futex and need to eliminate all spinning, then we simply set `LongTermThreshold` to 0. We note too that hybrid *spin-then-park* [3] waiting strategies could also be employed, where threads would attempt a brief bounded local spinning phase followed, if necessary, by park. The goal is to avoid voluntary context switching costs imposed by park-unpark if the waiting period is short.

Waiting Chains Some low-level waiting primitives, such as park-unpark [13], allow a thread to park, which deschedules the calling thread until a corresponding unpark. Again, this allows the CPU of thread calling park to be re-allocated and dispatched onto immediately, allowing other ready threads to start running. If the unpark were to execute before the corresponding park, the threading system maintains a per-thread flag set accordingly, and the subsequent park operation clears the flag and returns immediately. Park-unpark can thus be considered to provide a bounded binary per-thread semaphore. park-unpark is a 1:1 point-to-point model, in that the unpark operator must know and

pass the identity of the specific thread to be unparked, and unpark wakes just that one thread.

We note that park-unpark is *identity-based* while the futex operator is address-based. Using waiting chains, we can easily implement address-based waiting via identity based park-unpark primitives.

To use park-unpark services with *TWA* and *TWA-Semaphore* we propose the following algorithm, described in detail in Listing 3. In this case, the waiting array elements are pointers to linked lists (stacks) of threads waiting at that bucket. Waiting threads use an atomic exchange operator to push Waiting Element addresses onto the stack. The waiting elements can be allocating on the calling thread’s stack and require no special memory management considerations. The elements contain a flag (Gate) and, if using park-unpark, the identity of the associated thread. To notify long-term waiters at a particular index, we use an atomic exchange to detach the entire chain (stack) and then unpark all the threads on the chain, allowing them the opportunity to reevaluate their corresponding grant values to see if the wait condition has been satisfied. Critically, management of these chains is itself completely lock-free. We have implemented a concurrent *pop-stack* [2] to maintain lists of waiting threads. For brevity, in Listing 3 we have elided the `LongTermThreshold` logic.

We observe that the optimized waiting techniques described in [8], where the condition of interest is (re)evaluated by the notifier instead of the notifyee, are applicable in this context, and would allow further optimizations to the waiting strategy.

Using waiting chains may still be useful even if park-unpark is not available. In that case park calls could be replaced by PAUSE and unpark becomes an empty “no-op” operation, in which case waiting devolves to unbounded local spinning.

We also note that waiting chains offer another avenue for optimization. When thread in post performs notification, we can easily propagate the address of the semaphore and the posted grant value along the notification chain, from waiter to waiter. When a waiter wakes, it can then check its own condition against that passed information, which in turn can often allow the waiter to recognize that it has been admitted without any need to fetch and check against the grant field, further reducing coherence traffic on the central semaphore shared variables.

3 Empirical Evaluation

Unless otherwise noted, all data was collected on an Oracle X5-2 system. The system has 2 sockets, each populated with an Intel Xeon E5-2699 v3 CPU running at 2.30GHz. Each socket has 18 cores, and each core is 2-way hyperthreaded, yielding 72 logical CPUs in total. The system was running Ubuntu 18.04 with a stock Linux version 4.15 kernel, and all software was compiled using the provided GCC version 7.3 toolchain at optimization level “-O3”. 64-bit C++ code was

used for all experiments. Factory-provided system defaults were used in all cases, and Turbo mode [17] was left enabled. In all cases default free-range unbound threads were used to provide a realistic evaluation environment.

We used C++ `std::atomic<>` for low-level atomic operations, but opted for the sake of brevity in explication to avoid any explicit optimizations related to using relaxed memory order accesses. As such, the implementation may be conservatively over-fenced. We leave such optimizations, which may be profitable on platforms with weaker memory models, such as ARM, for future work. All busy-wait loops used the Intel PAUSE instruction for polite waiting.

We use a 128 byte sector size on Intel processors for alignment to avoid false sharing. The unit of coherence is 64 bytes throughout the cache hierarchy, but 128 bytes is required because of the adjacent cache line prefetch facility where pairs of lines are automatically fetched together.

We modified the MutexBench benchmark [6, 7] to replace locks with semaphores, yielding the semabench benchmark. Semabench spawns T concurrent threads. Each thread loops as follows: acquire a central shared semaphore S ; execute a critical section; release S ; execute a non-critical section. At the end of a 10 second measurement interval the benchmark reports the total number of aggregate iterations completed by all the threads. We report the median of 11 independent runs in Figure-1. The critical section advances a shared C++ `std::mt19937` pseudo-random generator (PRNG) 1 step. The non-critical section advances a thread-private PRNG instance 1 step. To use the semaphore much as a lock, after initializing the semaphore and before any of the threads are launched, we post once to the semaphore. For clarity and to convey the maximum amount of information to allow a comparison of the algorithms, the X-axis is offset to the minimum score and the Y-axis is logarithmic. For reference, we also include the results of the default system user-mode semaphore, pthread, which does not provide FIFO admission.

As can be seen in the figure, *Ticket-Semaphore* and *TWA-Semaphore* perform about the same at low thread counts, with little or no contention. Performance drops for all the semaphore implementations as we increase from 1 to 2 threads as the benefits from the available parallelism do not yet overcome the cost of cache coherent communications. As we increase the number of threads, *TWA-Semaphore* outperforms *Ticket-Semaphore*. Performance drops at about 16 threads as the scheduler starts to disperse the threads over the NUMA nodes.

while our approach is deterministic we note that performance under TWA can be influenced by the activities of other unrelated threads and locks by means of collisions in the shared waiting array, potentially reducing predictability. Other shared resources incur the same risk. Examples include (a) competition for occupancy of shared hardware

caches and (b) collisions in the Linux *futex* hash table, where lock addresses map to hash chains of blocked threads.




Figure 1. Semaphore Benchmark

4 Conclusion

Our approach allows the construction of simple yet scalable semaphores. The exhibit state-of-the-art performance at both low and high contention levels, and are compact, with a highly constrained impact on space. They can be easily tailored to use futexes or parking, making them a practical choice for real-world software.

References

- [1] Yehuda Afek, Danny Dolev, Eli Gafni, Michael Merritt, and Nir Shavit. 1994. A bounded first-in, first-enabled solution to the l-exclusion problem. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* (1994). <https://doi.org/10.1145/177492.177731>
- [2] D. Avis and M. Newborn. 1981. On pop-stacks in series. *Utilitas Math.* 19 (1981), 129–140.
- [3] Dave Dice. 2015. Malthusian Locks. *CoRR* abs/1511.06035 (2015). arXiv:1511.06035 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1511.06035>
- [4] Dave Dice and Alex Kogan. 2019. TWA – Ticket Locks Augmented with a Waiting Array. In *Euro-Par 2019: Parallel Processing*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-29400-7_24
- [5] Dave Dice and Alex Kogan. 2019. TWA – Ticket Locks Augmented with a Waiting Array. (2019). arXiv:1810.01573 [cs.OS]
- [6] Dave Dice and Alex Kogan. 2020. Fissile Locks. arXiv:2003.05025 [cs.OS] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.05025>
- [7] Dave Dice and Alex Kogan. 2021. Fissile Locks. In *Networked Systems – NETYS*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-67087-0_13
- [8] Dave Dice and Alex Kogan. 2021. Ready When You Are: Efficient Condition Variables via Delegated Condition Evaluation. arXiv:2105.06961 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.06961>
- [9] Edsger W. Dijkstra. undated, 1962 or 1963. Over de sequentialiteit van procesbeschrijvingen. (EWD-35) E.W. Dijkstra Archive. Center for American History, University of Texas at Austin. (transcription).
- [10] Allen B. Downey. 2016. *The Little Book of Semaphores*. Green Tea Press. <https://greenteapress.com/semaphores/LittleBookOfSemaphores.pdf>

- [11] M. J. Fischer, N. A. Lynch, J. E. Burns, and A. Borodin. 1979. Resource allocation with immunity to limited process failure. In *20th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 1979)*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1979.37>
- [12] Hubertus Franke, Rusty Russel, and Matthew Kirkwood. [n.d.]. Fuss, Futexes and Furwocks: Fast User-level Locking in Linux. <https://www.kernel.org/doc/ols/2002/ols2002-pages-479-495.pdf>. Ottawa Linux Symposium.
- [13] Doug Lea. 2005. The java.util.concurrent synchronizer framework. *Science of Computer Programming* (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scico.2005.03.007> Special Issue on Concurrency and synchronization in Java programs.
- [14] Jouni Leppäjärvi. 2008. A pragmatic, historically oriented survey on the universality of synchronization primitives. <http://www.enseignement.polytechnique.fr/informatique/INF431/X09-2010-2011/AmphiTHC/SynchronizationPrimitives.pdf>
- [15] John M. Mellor-Crummey and Michael L. Scott. 1991. Algorithms for Scalable Synchronization on Shared-memory Multiprocessors. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.* (1991). <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/103727.103729>
- [16] David P. Reed and Rajendra K. Kanodia. 1979. Synchronization with Eventcounts and Sequencers. *Commun. ACM* (1979). <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/359060.359076>
- [17] U. Verner, A. Mendelson, and A. Schuster. 2017. Extending Amdahl's Law for Multicores with Turbo Boost. *IEEE Computer Architecture Letters* (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1109/LCA.2015.2512982>

5 Appendix : Listings

Listing 1. Ticket-Semaphore

```
// Semaphores implemented with ideas borrowed with ticket locks

struct Semaphore {
    std::atomic<uint64_t> Ticket {0} ;
    std::atomic<uint64_t> Grant  {0} ;
};

static void Pause() { __asm__ __volatile__ ("rep;nop;") ;}

static void SemaTake (Semaphore * S) {
    const auto tx = S->Ticket.fetch_add(1) ;
    int64_t dx = S->Grant.load() - tx ;

    // Fast-path uncontended return
    if (dx > 0) return ;

    // slow-path contention -- need to wait
    for (;;) {
        dx = S->Grant.load() - tx ;
        if (dx > 0) return ;
        // If desired, we could use a delay proportional in length to dx
        Pause() ;
    }
}

static void SemaPost (Semaphore * S) {
    S->Grant.fetch_add(1) ;
}
```

Listing 2. TWA-Semaphore

```
// Semaphores implemented with ticket locks or TWA

struct Semaphore {
    std::atomic<uint64_t> Ticket {0} ;
    std::atomic<uint64_t> Grant  {0} ;
};

// Design considerations for the TWAHash() function -- ticket-aware hash function
// The hash function maps lock address and Ticket value pairs to indices -- ``buckets'' --
// in the long-term waiting array.
//
// @ Desiderata for the hash function
// Efficient, low-latency and enables instruction-level parallelism ILP to
// the extent possible.
// We do NOT generally require a full-strength arbitrary hash function
// with the usual avalanche property.
// Instead, one specialized to the problem is better.
// @ Index-aware in the sense that we understand that ticket values
// from a given lock or semaphore increase by 1, which we can use to our advantage.
// Ideally, as the ticket advances, the index computed by
// TWAHash(L,ticket) will "walk" through the full gamut of possible bucket
// indices before repeating.
// @ To reduce coherence traffic and false sharing, adjacent (or numerically proximal) ticket
// values should map to indices in the table that reside on different cache lines.
// A set of waiting threads will have adjacent ticket values but we want them
// well-dispersed over the buckets to avoid false sharing or even true collisions.
// @ Hash collisions induce extra coherence traffic _and also
// induce futile wakeups in the buckets, as our wakeup operator
// activates _all the elements of a bucket and presumes that collisions are rare.
// We expect in general, however, that only one thread waits on a
// given bucket at a given time.
// @ Cache-friendly and TLB-friendly to the bucket array
// @ Standing in tension to the above, we are also concerned about inter-lock
// parallel ticket entrainment, where two different locks or semaphores might move in unison,
// inadvertently generate streams of ticket values that continue to collide in the array.
// Simple supplementary hashes can mitigate this issue.
// Multiplying the "L" lock address component by the "Ticket" component would
// be ideal but also tends thwart some of our other desiderata, enumerated above.
// Broadly, however, the other concerns dominate and have precedence over this
// particular design aspect.
// @ Be aware of automatic stride-based hardware prefetch on some CPUs.
// @ The multiplication constants in the TWAHash() function should be coprime
// with each other and the length of the array, and also sufficiently
// large that adjacent ticket values map to indices that map to
// different cache lines.
// This gives us the optimal "tickets marching through the array" behavior that we
// prefer and desire.
// The choice of constants is also convolved with the size of the bucket elements.
// @ An interesting variation is to precondition the incoming ticket value : Ticket >>= 1.
```

```

// This groups threads with numerically adjacent ticket values into pairs.
// This increases futile wakeups but also yields a pipelined early wakeup effect
// that can put "near" futile successors a chance to wake early and warmup.
// @ Another profitable variation divides the ticket value into distinct bit fields.
// The upper bits directly identify and select a logical "sub-page" in the waiting array.
// The lower bits undergo a hash operation.
// A given stream of sequential incrementing ticket values will "orbit" within a
// sub-page, accessing all elements, and then shift to the next sub-page.
// This approach minimizes page transitions for a given stream of ticket values.
// In turn, that access pattern can act to reduce TLB pressure.
// This is somewhat related to "Morton" or Z-order access patterns.
// @ Gray codes also show promise

static uint32_t TWAHash (Semaphore * L, uint32_t Ticket) {
    | return uintptr_t(L) + (Ticket * 17) ;
}

// Changes to the UpdateSequence field indicate that long-term waiters
// on that particular bucket must should re-check the Grant values to
// see if the waiting condition has been satisfied.

struct WaitBucket {
    | std::atomic<uint64_t> UpdateSequence {0} ;
} ;

// TableSize is a tunable parameter ...
// A sensible policy is to set TableSize to be proportional to the number
// of logical CPUs in the system.
// We force alignment to reduce the number of TLBs underlying the table in
// order to reduce TLB misses.
// Ideally, we would place the table on large pages.
// We note that an extremely large table might sound appealing, as that
// design will reduce hash collisions and false wakeups, but a large
// table will also result in cache pollution as the ticket values
// march over the table.

static WaitBucket * IndexToBucket (uintptr_t A) {
    constexpr int TableSize = 2048 ;
    static_assert (TableSize > 0 && (TableSize & (TableSize-1)) == 0) ;
    static WaitBucket WaitSlots [TableSize] __attribute__((aligned(4096))) ;
    const int ix = A & (TableSize-1) ;
    return &WaitSlots [ix] ;
}

static inline void Pause() { __asm__ __volatile__ ("rep;nop;") ;}

// LongTermThreshold tunable parameter ...
// Threshold for near-global vs far-local polite waiting
static constexpr int LongTermThreshold = 1 ;

static void SemaTake (Semaphore * S) {
    const auto tx = S->Ticket.fetch_add(1) ;
    int64_t dx = S->Grant.load() - tx ;

    // Fast-path uncontended return
    if (dx > 0) return ;

    // slow-path contention -- need to wait
    const auto s = IndexToBucket(TWAHash(S, tx)) ;
    auto mx = s->UpdateSequence.load() ;

    for (;;) {
        dx = S->Grant.load() - tx ;
        if (dx > 0) {
            | return ;
        }

        // Short-term waiting -- global waiting on S->Grant
        // Our thread is near the head of the logical queue of waiting threads.
        // It is "proximal" or "near" to acquisition.
        // As such we switch from semi-local waiting in the WaitArray to
        // This strategy yields 2 modes or phases of waiting : near and far
        if ((dx + LongTermThreshold) > 0) {
            | Pause() ;
            | continue ;
        }

        // Long-term distal waiting -- semi-local waiting via the WaitingArray.
        // We use indirect waiting on s->UpdateSequence "proxy" indicator
        // our thread is "far" from the head of the logical queue
        const auto vx = mx ;
        while ((mx = s->UpdateSequence.load()) == vx) {
            | Pause() ;
        }
    }
}

```

```

    }
}

// Optional optimizations ...
// Try to avoid unnecessary long-term notification operations in the common
// uncontended case where there are no waiters.
// Our approach automatically confers the same "fast path" benefits conferred by the
// well-known "benaphore" optimization :
// https://www.haiku-os.org/legacy-docs/benewsletter/Issue1-26.html#Engineering1-26

static void SemaPost (Semaphore * S) {
    auto g = S->Grant.fetch_add(1) ;
    g += LongTermThreshold ;

    // Optional optimization ...
    // In the case where there are no long-term waiting threads on this specific semaphore,
    // we would prefer to avoid otherwise unnecessary accesses to the long-term waiting array.
    // Absent such an optimization, back-to-back sequences of SemaPost() operations would tend to
    // "march" through the long-term waiting array, increasing cache pressure, with futile accesses.
    //
    // To this end, we fetch and examine the value of S->Ticket.
    // If the difference between that observed ticket value and the value we just wrote into
    // grant is less than the LongTermThreshold value then we can safely intuit that there
    // are no long-term waiters that need notification, and can skip the long-term notification step.
    // Note that this approach is conservative and racy.
    // If some other thread calls SemaPost() in the window between the fetch_add(), above, and
    // the fetch of S->Ticket, then we might still perform unnecessary notification, but
    // that is benign in terms of correctness.
    // That is, the fast-path return does not filter out all unnecessary long-term notifications.
    //
    // This optimization constitutes a "bet".
    // The downside is that we incur more coherence traffic as all SemaPost() operations access
    // both Ticket and Grant fields. Having said that, the cache line underlying Ticket and Grant is
    // most likely still in local "M"-state (MESI "modified") at the time of the load() and has
    // not yet been arbitrated away by concurrent accesses during the fetch_add() - load() window.
    // The economic "profitability" model for this optimization is thus platform-specific.
    // The access to Ticket is wasted and futile if we still ultimately need to poke
    // long-duration waiters spinning in the bucket.
    //
    // If we fail to take the fast-path return, then access to Ticket was futile
    // and we have incurred a penalty in terms of path length and coherence traffic.
    // So we have a tension and trade-off.
    // The fast-path attempt helps under light load but may incur a performance penalty
    // under contention.
    //
    // Using the fast-path shortcut return optimization means that the
    // SemaPost() operator must access both Ticket and Grant fields.
    // This precludes or obviates any coherence traffic benefit we might see from
    // sequestering Ticket and Grant fields on distinct cache lines.
    int64_t dx = g - S->Ticket.load() ;
    if (dx >= 0) {
        return ;           // common fast-path return : short-cut
    }

    // Poke successor-of-successor from long-term mode into short-term mode
    // The immediate successor has already been enabled to enter the critical section.
    // Our approach yields some useful pipeline parallelism as we now act
    // to shift the successor's successor from long-term waiting to short-term waiting mode.
    const auto s = IndexToBucket (TWAHash(S,g)) ;
    s->UpdateSequence.fetch_add(1) ;
}

```

Listing 3. TWA-Semaphore with waiting chains

```

// Semaphores implemented with ticket locks or TWA
// Address-based waiting chains

struct Semaphore {
    std::atomic<uint64_t> Ticket {0} ;
    std::atomic<uint64_t> Grant  {0} ;
} ;

// Waiting chain services :
// In the original TWA paper, threads busy-waited on an element in the global "WaitArray".
// Those array elements served as proxy modification indicators.
// We could use exactly the same approach for TWA semaphores.
//
// But we also desire extend the algorithm to allow spin-the-block spin-then-park waiting via a
// park-unpark interface so our threads can wait politely in the kernel, surrendering
// the processor to other ready or runnable threads.
// Specifically, to use park-unpark, we need to map a single waiting array slot to a set

```



```

// of waiting threads, as the park-unpark interface needs to be able wake specific threads
// by their identity or associated address.
//
// To accomplish this, we change the elements in the WaitArray be pointers to the head
// of a stack of waiting threads instead of a modification counter.
// Arriving threads push themselves onto the chain with an atomic exchange (SWAP).
// The list of waiting threads on a given chain is implicit.
// Like CLH locks, a thread knows the identity (address) of its successor in the chain,
// but nothing more.
// We avoid intrusive linkage -- there is no need for "next" pointers, for instance
// Once a thread has pushed its "WaitElement" onto the chain, it then busy-waits (or parks)
// on a the "Gate" field within that WaitElement.
// Our design intentionally allows WaitElements to be allocated on-stack, which much simplifies
// the design and removes memory management and lifecycle entanglements.
//
// To notify and wake threads, we detach the _entire chain with an exchange(nullptr) operation
// and activate the 1st thread in the chain. That thread, in turn, activates its successor,
// and so on, in a systolic fashion, to make sure all the detached elements are made awake
// so they can recheck their respective conditions of interest.
// Hash collision can result in multiple threads emplaced on a given chain, and thus
// our waiting design admits spurious wakeups, so either the waiting primitives or their caller
// must reevaluate the condition before determining the wait is satisfied.
//
// The key operators on the concurrent stack are push-one and detach-all.
// We observe that a "pop-stack" structure, which supports push and detach-all operations,
// is well-known : https://mathscinet.ams.org/mathscinet/relay-station?mr=0624050.
// We implement our waiting chains as a specialized _concurrent pop-stack.
// We use a wait-one wake-all notification policy.
//
// In lieu of a full park-unpark interface, we could also use linux kernel "Futex" waiting.
// on the WaitElement "Gate" fields.
//
// We note that our waiting chain design is applicable and could be used in TWA itself
// as an improvement to that algorithm.
//
// Our waiting chain construction converts global spinning (where multiple threads might
// busy-wait on one location) into local 1-to-1 spinning where at most one thread waits
// on a given location.
// In turn, this transformation makes waiting amenable to blocking primitives such
// as park-park facilities, or linux kernel futex operators.
//
// Given that we always wake _all threads on the chain, the mechanism exhibits quadratic
// wakeup complexity. We expect, however, that the number of threads even found
// concurrently on a chain to be extremely small.

// Harmonize C++ std::atomic API with conventions in the academic literature :
// The following lets us write compare-and-swap cas()
template <typename T> class Atomic : public std::atomic<T> {
public :
    T cas (T cmp, T set) { this->compare_exchange_strong (cmp, set) ; return cmp ; }
    T operator=(T rhs)    { this->store(rhs); return rhs; }
};

// We impose alignment on WaitElement to reduce on-stack false sharing
// We use 128 instead of 64 to avoid adjacent sector prefetch issues on x86.
// WaitElement instances are thread-specific.
// That is, at most one thread is associated with or waiting on a WaitElement
// at any given time.

struct alignas(128) WaitElement {
    std::atomic<int> Gate {0} ;           // made ready -- notified
    uintptr_t who ;                       // thread identity for park-unpark
};

// The Waiting table is an array of WaitChain elements -- implemented as a flat hashtable.
// These WaitChain instances are the "buckets" (slots or cells) in the hashtable.
// In turn, each WaitChain holds a pointer to the front of a list of WaitElements.
// Individual threads wait on those WaitElements.
// We hash into the Waiting table via an address to select a specific WaitChain instance.
// As noted, those slots contain a pointer to a list of waiting threads that are currently
// monitoring addresses that happen to map to that table index.

struct WaitChain {                      // AKA : WaitingList or WaitingThreads or WaitBucket
    Atomic<WaitElement *> Chain {nullptr} ;
};

// TableSize is a tunable parameter ...
// A sensible policy would be to set TableSize to be proportional to the number
// of logical CPUs in the system.
// We force alignment to reduce the number of virtual pages underlying the
// table in order to reduce TLB (translation lookaside buffer) misses.
// Ideally, we would place the table on large pages, if available.

```

```

// We note that an excessively large table might sound appealing, as that
// design will reduce hash collisions and false wakeups, but a large
// table will also result in cache pollution as the ticket values
// march over the table.
// Empirically, 4096 elements is a reasonable choice for most systems.

static WaitChain * KeyToChain (uintptr_t A) {
    // If desired, we could also apply an optional secondary hash to A
    constexpr int TableSize = 4096 ;
    static_assert (TableSize > 0 && (TableSize & (TableSize-1)) == 0) ;
    static WaitChain WaitSlots [TableSize] __attribute__((aligned(4096))) ;
    const int ix = A & (TableSize-1) ;
    return &WaitSlots [ix] ;
}

static void Poke (WaitElement * e) {
    if (e == nullptr) return ;
    auto who = e->Who ;
    assert (e->Gate == 0) ;
    e->Gate.store(1, std::memory_order_release);
    // Once we set e->Gate=1, it is possible e will fall immediately out of scope.
    // That is, once we set e->Gate=1, it is no longer safe to access e.
    // It is safe, however, to unpark a stale thread reference.
    Unpark (who) ;
}

static void AddressSignal (uintptr_t A) {
    const auto slot = KeyToChain (A) ;
    Poke (slot->Chain.exchange(nullptr)) ;
}

// The "polite" form avoids mutating the chain pointer if it is already empty,
// reducing coherence traffic if there are no waiting threads.

static void AddressSignalPolite (uintptr_t A) {
    const auto slot = KeyToChain (A) ;
    if (slot->Chain.load() != nullptr) {
        Poke (slot->Chain.exchange(nullptr)) ;
    }
}

static uintptr_t AddressWaitUntil (uintptr_t A, std::invocable auto && Satisfied) {
    // Optional optimization :
    // Before our waiter goes to the expense of becoming visible on the chain
    // we re-evaluate the condition to see if we skip the more expensive steps.
    // Could also implement a bounded spinning phase here, which
    // is tantamount to global spinning.
    uintptr_t v = Satisfied() ;
    if (v != 0) return v ;

    // Switch to a more polite waiting strategy -- local spinning
    const auto s = KeyToChain (A) ;
    for (;;) {
        // Optional optimization but reduces coherence traffic on the chain
        v = Satisfied() ;
        if (v != 0) return v ;

        // Emplace candidate element E on the wait chain -- start monitoring A.
        // At this point our thread becomes a "visible" waiter and has "published" E
        // which expresses our interest in updates to A.
        // We now wait via E instead of busy-waiting directly on A.
        // Pass thread identity from waiter to wakee via the "who" field
        WaitElement E {} ;
        E.who = Self() ;
        const auto prv = s->Chain.exchange (&E) ;
        assert (prv != &E) ;

        // Recheck the condition -- ratify and confirm we still need to wait
        // This closes a race condition where a thread in AddressWaitUntil()
        // concurrently races against one in AddressSignal().
        // We recheck to avoid lost or missed wakeup pathologies.
        //
        // Dekker Duality and "pivot" :
        // Wait : ST Chain; LD Condition
        // Post : ST Condition; LD Chain

        v = Satisfied() ;
        if (v != 0) {
            // We mis-queued ourself -- need to recover
            // We expect this path to be rarely taken
            // Abort the waiting operation and get E off the chain.
            // While the condition of interest is satisfied, we can't yet return

```

```

// until E is off the chain and our successors have been notified.
// We must ensure E is off-list and thus privatized/localized before we return.
//
// We apply a number of optional optimizations to try avoid full
// flush of the chain.
//
// optional optimization : try to recover with atomic compare-and-swap (CAS).
// See if we can simply "undo" the push, above.
// This optimization succeeds if no other threads have pushed in the exchange-CAS window.
// This is safe and immune to ABA pathologies as no other thread can emplace &E.
// Threads only enqueue themselves, not others.
// and the chain suffix is stable if the head refers to our same element, E.
const auto k = s->Chain.cas(&E, prv) ;
if (k == &E) {
    assert (E.Gate == 0) ;
    return v ;
}

// Optional optimization for common case
if (k == nullptr) {
    Poke (prv);
    while (E.Gate == 0) {
        Park() ;
    }
    return v ;
}

// optional optimization
// If E is found already off-list then we can dispense with and avoid
// the full flush
if (E.Gate != 0) {
    Poke (prv) ;
    return v ;
}

// We need to use a full chain flush ...
// Eject and wake all the elements
// QoI : we can wake the chain elements in any order, but it's more polite to wakeup
// the older elements in the suffix (identified via prv) before the newer elements
// in the just detached prefix.
//
// prv points to the suffix
// s->Chain points to the prefix
// It is safe to wake the prefix and suffix segments in either order.
// But if we use "Poke(Prv); Poke(s->Chain.exchange(nullptr))" then the suffix elements
// may race our thread and simply re-queue or migrate back onto s->Chain,
// before we execute the exchange(), resulting in futile concurrent chain activity.
// This is benign but may impact performance.
const auto Prefix = s->Chain.exchange (nullptr) ;
assert ((prv != Prefix) || (prv == nullptr && Prefix == nullptr)) ;
Poke (prv) ;
Poke (Prefix) ;
while (E.Gate == 0) {
    Park () ;
}
return v ;
}

// We are properly enqueued on the chain and can now just wait politely
// We expect this to be the normal dominant case
while (E.Gate == 0) {
    Park () ;
}

// propagate the wakeup through the remainder of the stack, if any ...
Poke (prv) ;

// Cases :
// @ We were correctly signaled
// @ We were purged by a flush operation
// @ We were purged by a hash collision
//
// Our thread is now off the chain and it is safe for E to fall out of scope.
// There will be no subsequent concurrent accesses to E.
// E is privatized.
// We need to reevaluate the condition as we might have been ejected from the
// chain via false or spurious wakeups arising from hash collisions.
// If necessary, we will re-push ourselves on the stack and resume waiting.
// False wakeups are benign and a performance concern, not a correctness issue.
// As the ticket values and their hash (TWAHash) disperse waiting over the
// set of chains, we expect false wakeups to be rare.
// And specifically we expect that having more than one element on a given chain
// to be a rare condition.

```

```

    // A lazy implementation might return here and let the higher level
    // decide whether to re-evaluate the condition and then loop or not.
    // Our implementation happens to be strict and persistent.
}
}

// In normal "classic" usage, we might use AddressWaitUntil() and AddressSignal() as follows.
// Say a global shared variable X is initially 0 and thread T1 desires to wait until X becomes 1.
// Thread T2, at some point in the future, eventually sets X to 1.
// T1 would execute : AddressWaitUntil (&X, [&]{ return X == 1;}) ;
// T2 would execute : X=1; AddressSignal(&X)
//
// For ticket-based waiting, however, we can be more clever and instead of using an simple address,
// we can compose the Ticket value into an abstract "key" which we use in lieu of the
// address of a shared global variable. This confers a distinct performance advantage,
// as AddressSignal(), absent any hash collisions, will selectively wake up and notify
// just the single waiting thread that is interested in that particular ticket value.
// We use TWAHash() to map the address of the semaphore instance and ticket value to
// such abstract keys.
//
// As noted, these "synthetic" ticket-based keys disperse waiting over the slots in the table and
// act to keep the chains short, which improves performance and reduces the rate of
// futile wakeups that would otherwise occur if we just forced all waiting to
// use a single address.

static uint32_t TWAHash (Semaphore * L, uint32_t Ticket) {
    return uintptr_t(L) + (Ticket * 17) ;
}

static void SemaTake (Semaphore * S) {
    const auto tx = S->Ticket.fetch_add(1) ;
    // dx represents the "distance" or surplus
    int64_t dx = S->Grant.load() - tx ;

    // Fast-path uncontended return
    if (dx > 0) return ;

    // slow-path contention -- need to wait
    // Compose the address of the semaphore and the ticket value into a key
    // A simple XOR or "+" of the semaphore's address and the ticket value suffices.
    auto Key = TWAHash(S, tx) ;
    AddressWaitUntil (Key, [&]{ return S->Grant.load() > tx ; }) ;
    assert (S->Grant.load() > tx) ;
}

static void SemaPost (Semaphore * S) {
    auto g = S->Grant.fetch_add(1) ;
    auto Key = TWAHash (S, g) ;
    AddressSignal (Key) ;
}

```

Listing 4. TWA-Semaphore with MONITOR-MWAIT inspired waiting chains

```

// Semaphores implemented with ticket locks or TWA
// Address-based waiting chains

struct Semaphore {
    std::atomic<uint64_t> Ticket {0} ;
    std::atomic<uint64_t> Grant {0} ;
} ;

// Waiting chain services :
// In the original TWA paper, threads busy-waited on an element in the global "WaitArray".
// Those array elements served as proxy modification indicators.
// We could use exactly the same approach for TWA semaphores.
//
// But we also desire extend the algorithm to allow spin-the-block spin-then-park waiting via a
// park-unpark interface so our threads can wait politely in the kernel, surrendering
// the processor to other ready or runnable threads.
// Specifically, to use park-unpark, we need to map a single waiting array slot to a set
// of waiting threads, as the park-unpark interface needs to be able wake specific threads
// by their identity or associated address.
//
// To accomplish this, we augment the elements in the WaitArray with pointers to the head
// of a stack of waiting threads in addition to a modification counter.
// Arriving threads push themselves onto the chain with an atomic exchange (SWAP).
// The list of waiting threads on a given chain is implicit.
// Like CLH locks, a thread knows the identity (address) of its successor in the chain,
// but nothing more.
// We avoid intrusive linkage -- there is no need for "next" pointers, for instance
// Once a thread has pushed its "WaitElement" onto the chain, it then busy-waits (or parks)
// on a the "Gate" field within that WaitElement.

```

```

// Our design intentionally allows WaitElements to be allocated on-stack, which much simplifies
// the design and removes memory management and lifecycle entanglements.
//
// To notify and wake threads, we detach the _entire chain with an exchange(nullptr) operation
// and activate the 1st thread in the chain. That thread, in turn, activates its successor,
// and so on, in a systolic fashion, to make sure all the detached elements are made awake
// so they can recheck their respective conditions of interest.
// their respective conditions of interest.
// Hash collision can result in multiple threads emplaced on a given chain, and thus
// our waiting design admits spurious wakeups, so either the waiting primitives or their caller
// must reevaluate the condition before determining the wait is satisfied.
//
// The key operators on the concurrent stack are push-one and detach-all.
// We observe that a "pop-stack" structure, which supports push and detach-all operations,
// is well-known : https://mathscinet.ams.org/mathscinet/relay-station?mr=0624050.
// We implement our waiting chains as a specialized _concurrent pop-stack.
// We use a wait-one wake-all notification policy.
//
// In lieu of a full park-unpark interface, we could also use linux kernel "Futex" waiting.
// on the WaitElement "Gate" fields or on the channel "Sequence" fields.
//
// We note that our waiting chain design is applicable and could be used in TWA itself
// as an improvement to that algorithm.
//
// Our waiting chain construction converts global spinning (where multiple threads might
// busy-wait on one location) into local 1-to-1 spinning where at most one thread waits
// on a given location.
// In turn, this transformation makes waiting amenable to blocking primitives such
// as park-park facilities, or linux kernel futex operators.
//
// Given that we always wake _all threads on the chain, the mechanism exhibits quadratic
// wakeup complexity. We expect, however, that the number of threads even found
// concurrently on a chain to be extremely small.

// Harmonize C++ std::atomic API with conventions in the academic literature :
// The following lets us write compare-and-swap cas()
template <typename T> class Atomic : public std::atomic<T> {
public :
    T cas (T cmp, T set) { this->compare_exchange_strong (cmp, set) ; return cmp ; }
    T operator=(T rhs) { this->store(rhs); return rhs; }
};

// We impose alignment on WaitElement to reduce on-stack false sharing
// We use 128 instead of 64 to avoid adjacent sector prefetch issues on x86.
// WaitElement instances are thread-specific.
// That is, at most one thread is associated with or waiting on a WaitElement
// at any given time.

struct alignas(128) WaitElement {
    std::atomic<int> Gate {0} ; // made ready -- notified
    uintptr_t who ; // thread identity for park-unpark
};

// The Waiting table is an array of WaitChain elements -- implemented as a flat hashtable.
// These WaitChain instances are the "buckets" (slots or cells) in the hashtable.
// In turn, each WaitChain holds a pointer to the front of a list of WaitElements.
// Individual threads wait on those WaitElements.
// We hash into the Waiting table via an address to select a specific WaitChain instance.
// As noted, those slots contain a pointer to a list of waiting threads that are currently
// monitoring addresses that happen to map to that table index.

struct WaitChannel {
    Atomic<WaitElement *> Chain {nullptr} ;
    Atomic<uint64_t > Sequence {0} ;
};

// TableSize is a tunable parameter ...
// A sensible policy would be to set TableSize to be proportional to the number
// of logical CPUs in the system.
// We force alignment to reduce the number of virtual pages underlying the
// table in order to reduce TLB (translation lookaside buffer) misses.
// Ideally, we would place the table on large pages, if available.
// We note that an excessively large table might sound appealing, as that
// design will reduce hash collisions and false wakeups, but a large
// table will also result in cache pollution as the ticket values
// march over the table.
// Empirically, 4096 elements is a reasonable choice for most systems.

static WaitChannel * KeyToChannel (uintptr_t A) {
    // If desired, we could also apply an optional secondary hash to A
    constexpr int TableSize = 4096 ;

```

```

static_assert (TableSize > 0 && (TableSize & (TableSize-1)) == 0) ;
static WaitChannel WaitSlots [TableSize] __attribute__((aligned(4096))) ;
const int ix = A & (TableSize-1) ;
return &WaitSlots [ix] ;
}

static void Poke (WaitElement * e) {
    if (e == nullptr) return ;
    auto who = e->Who ;
    assert (e->Gate == 0) ;
    e->Gate.store(1, std::memory_order_release);
    // Once we set e->Gate=1, it is possible e will fall immediately out of scope.
    // That is, once we set e->Gate=1, it is no longer safe to access e.
    // It is safe, however, to unpark a stale thread reference.
    Unpark (who) ;
}

static void KeySignal (WaitChannel * ch) {
    ch->Sequence.fetch_add (1) ;
    Poke (ch->Chain.exchange(nullptr)) ;
}

// The "polite" form avoids mutating the chain pointer if it is already empty,
// reducing coherence traffic if there are no waiting threads.

static void KeySignalPolite (WaitChannel * ch) {
    ch->Sequence.fetch_add (1) ;
    if (ch->Chain.load() != nullptr) {
        Poke (ch->Chain.exchange(nullptr)) ;
    }
}

// KeyMonitor-KeyWait is inspired in part by the MONITOR-MWAIT instructions.
// The KeyMonitor-KeyWait API is convenient fairly easy to use within applications.
// As KeyMonitor is "passive", does not write, and does emplace a waiting element,
// there is no need for an explicit abort operator.
// But on the other hand we add a level of indirection on wait via the sequence
// number.
//
// Instead of evaluating and checking the condition of interest, we
// check the update "Sequence" value which serves as a proxy for the condition of interest.
// We wait indirectly on the sequence values instead of directly by polling the condition.
// This is similar conceptually to hardware transitional memory (HTM) or
// Intel x86 hardware MONITOR-MWAIT, or ARMv8 WFET, where the implementation uses the
// underlying MESI/MOESI/MESIF cache line state as a conservative proxy indicator for potential modification.
//
// Indirection and "proxy" waiting :
// Location Value -> WaitChannel Sequence -> WaitElement.Gate
//
// Dekker duality pivot point
// Signal : ST Condition; ST Sequence; LD Chain
// Waiting : LD Sequence; LD Condition; ST Chain; LD Condition

static uint64_t KeyMonitor (WaitChannel * ch) {
    return ch->Sequence.load (std::memory_order_acquire) ;
}

static int KeyWait (WaitChannel * ch, uint64_t sequence) {
    for (;;) {
        // Optional optimization to help reduce the mis-queue rate and
        // futile coherence traffic and flushing on the chain
        uint64_t us = ch->Sequence.load (std::memory_order_acquire) ;
        if (us != sequence) return 0 ;

        // Emplace candidate element E on the wait chain -- start monitoring A.
        // At this point our thread becomes a "visible" waiter and has "published" E
        // which expresses our interest in updates to locations covered by the chain "ch".
        // We now wait via E instead of busy-waiting directly on the location.
        // Pass thread identity from waiter to wakee via the "who" field
        WaitElement E {} ;
        E.who = Self() ;
        const auto prv = ch->Chain.exchange (&E) ;
        assert (prv != &E) ;

        // Recheck the condition -- ratify and confirm we still need to wait
        // This closes a race condition where a thread in KeyWait()
        // concurrently races against one in KeySignal().
        // We recheck to avoid lost or missed wakeup pathologies.
        // Dekker Duality and "pivot" :

        if (ch->Sequence.load(std::memory_order_acquire) != sequence) {
            // We mis-queueded ourself -- need to recover
            // We expect this path to be rarely taken

```



```

// Abort the waiting operation and get E off the chain.
// While the condition of interest is satisfied, we can't yet return
// until E is off the chain and our successors have been notified.
// We must ensure E is off-list and thus privatized/localized before we return.
//
// It is tempting to try to optimize this path by trying to recover with an atomic CAS.
// See if we can simply "undo" the push, above by using CAS to try to replace &E with prv.
// That is, we try to restore prv.
// This optimization succeeds if no other threads have pushed or flushed in the
// exchange-CAS window. This is safe and immune to ABA pathologies as no other
// thread can emplace &E.
// Threads only enqueue themselves, not others.
// And the chain suffix is stable if the head refers to our same element, E.
// Ultimately, while safe, this optimization isn't profitable as prv suffers from
// an updated sequence number will itself need to return and reevaluate the condition,
// so we saved nothing by using the CAS.

// optional optimization : try to avoid redundant full flush if it happens
// that we've already been flushed from the chain.
// If E is found already off-list then we can dispense with and avoid
// the full flush
if (E.Gate != 0) {
    Poke (prv) ;
    return 0 ;
}

// We need to use a full chain flush ...
// Eject and wake all the elements
// QoI : we can wake the chain elements in any order, but it's more polite to wakeup
// the older elements in the suffix (identified via prv) before the newer elements
// in the just detached prefix.
//
// prv points to the suffix
// ch→Chain points to the prefix
// It is safe to wake the prefix and suffix segments in either order.
// But if we use "Poke(Prv); Poke(ch→Chain.exchange(null))" then the suffix elements
// may race our thread and simply re-queue or migrate back onto s→Chain,
// before we execute the exchange(), resulting in futile concurrent chain activity.
// This is benign but may impact performance.
const auto Prefix = ch→Chain.exchange (nullptr) ;
assert ((prv != Prefix) || (prv == nullptr && Prefix == nullptr)) ;
Poke (prv) ;
Poke (Prefix) ;
while (E.Gate == 0) {
    Park () ;
}
return 0 ;
}

// We are properly enqueued on the chain and can now just wait politely
// We expect this to be the normal dominant case
while (E.Gate == 0) {
    Park () ;
}

// propagate the wakeup through the remainder of the stack, if any ...
Poke (prv) ;

// Cases :
// @ We were correctly signaled
// @ We were purged by a flush operation
// @ We were purged by a hash collision
//
// Our thread is now off the chain and it is safe for E to fall out of scope.
// There will be no subsequent concurrent accesses to E.
// E is privatized.
// We need to reevaluate the condition as we might have been ejected from the
// chain via false or spurious wakeups arising from hash collisions.
// If necessary, we will re-push ourselves on the stack and resume waiting.
// False wakeups are benign and a performance concern, not a correctness issue.
// As the ticket values and their hash (TWAHash) disperse waiting over the
// set of chains, we expect false wakeups to be rare.
// And specifically we expect that having more than one element on a given chain
// to be a rare condition.
// A lazy implementation might return here and let the higher level
// decide whether to re-evaluate the condition and then loop or not.
// Our implementation happens to be strict and persistent.
}

// KeyWaitLazy() provides a somewhat more easy-to-use programming interface.
// We make "sequence" a reference parameter and KeyWait() passes back last observed
// sequence value through that reference.

```

```

// If desired, this can avoid or completely eliminate calls to KeyMonitor()
//
// Usage could devolve to the following where we could avoid calls to KeyMonitor :
//   auto ch = KeyToChannel (Key)
//   auto seq = uint64_t(0)
//   for (;;) {
//       if (ConditionSatisfied()) break ;
//       keyWait (ch, seq) ;
//   }
//
// Note that in the first iteration, KeyWaitLazy() intentionally returns immediately
// but fetches the update sequence.

static int KeyWaitLazy (WaitChannel * ch, uint64_t & sequence) {
    // Optional optimization to help reduce the mis-queue rate and
    // futile coherence traffic and flushing on the chain
    uint64_t us = sequence ;
    sequence = ch->Sequence.load (std::memory_order_acquire) ;
    if (us != sequence) return 0 ;

    // Emplace candidate element E on the wait chain -- start monitoring A.
    // At this point our thread becomes a "visible" waiter and has "published" E
    // which expresses our interest in updates to locations covered by the chain "ch".
    // We now wait via E instead of busy-waiting directly on the location.
    // Pass thread identity from waiter to wakee via the "who" field
    WaitElement E {} ;
    E.who = Self() ;
    const auto prv = ch->Chain.exchange (&E) ;
    assert (prv != &E) ;

    // Recheck the condition -- ratify and confirm we still need to wait
    // This closes a race condition where a thread in KeyWait()
    // concurrently races against one in KeySignal().
    // We recheck to avoid lost or missed wakeup pathologies.
    // Dekker Duality and "pivot" :
    sequence = ch->Sequence.load (std::memory_order_acquire) ;
    if (us != sequence) {
        // We mis-queued ourselves -- need to recover
        // We expect this path to be rarely taken
        // Abort the waiting operation and get E off the chain.
        // While the condition of interest is satisfied, we can't yet return
        // until E is off the chain and our successors have been notified.
        // We must ensure E is off-list and thus privatized/localized before we return.
        //
        // It is tempting to try to optimize this path by trying to recover with an atomic CAS.
        // See if we can simply "undo" the push, above by using CAS to try to replace &E with prv.
        // That is, we try to restore prv.
        // This optimization succeeds if no other threads have pushed or flushed in the
        // exchange-CAS window. This is safe and immune to ABA pathologies as no other
        // thread can emplace &E.
        // Threads only enqueue themselves, not others.
        // And the chain suffix is stable if the head refers to our same element, E.
        // Ultimately, while safe, this optimization isn't profitable as prv suffers from
        // an updated sequence number will itself need to return and reevaluate the condition,
        // so we saved nothing by using the CAS.

        // optional optimization : try to avoid redundant full flush if it happens
        // that we've already been flushed from the chain.
        // If E is found already off-list then we can dispense with and avoid
        // the full flush
        if (E.Gate != 0) {
            Poke (prv) ;
            return 0 ;
        }

        // We need to use a full chain flush ...
        // Eject and wake all the elements
        // QoI : we can wake the chain elements in any order, but it's more polite to wakeup
        // the older elements in the suffix (identified via prv) before the newer elements
        // in the just detached prefix.
        //
        // prv points to the suffix
        // ch->Chain points to the prefix
        // It is safe to wake the prefix and suffix segments in either order.
        // But if we use "Poke(prv); Poke(ch->Chain.exchange(nullptr))" then the suffix elements
        // may race our thread and simply re-queue or migrate back onto s->Chain,
        // before we execute the exchange(), resulting in futile concurrent chain activity.
        // This is benign but may impact performance.
        const auto Prefix = ch->Chain.exchange (nullptr) ;
        assert ((prv != Prefix) || (prv == nullptr && Prefix == nullptr)) ;
        Poke (prv) ;
        Poke (Prefix) ;
        prv = nullptr ;
    }
}

```

```

    }

    // We are properly enqueued on the chain and can now just wait politely
    // We expect this to be the normal dominant case
    while (E.Gate == 0) {
        | Park () ;
    }

    // propagate the wakeup through the remainder of the stack, if any ...
    Poke (prv) ;

    // Cases :
    // @ We were correctly signaled
    // @ We were purged by a flush operation
    // @ We were purged by a hash collision
    //
    // Our thread is now off the chain and it is safe for E to fall out of scope.
    // There will be no subsequent concurrent accesses to E.
    // E is privatized.
    // We need to reevaluate the condition as we might have been ejected from the
    // chain via false or spurious wakeups arising from hash collisions.
    // If necessary, we will re-push ourselves on the stack and resume waiting.
    // False wakeups are benign and a performance concern, not a correctness issue.
    // As the ticket values and their hash (TWAHash) disperse waiting over the
    // set of chains, we expect false wakeups to be rare.
    // And specifically we expect that having more than one element on a given chain
    // to be a rare condition.
    // A lazy implementation might return here and let the higher level
    // decide whether to re-evaluate the condition and then loop or not.
    // Our implementation happens to be lazy and relaxed
    return 0 ;
}

// For ticket-based waiting, however, we are clever and instead of using an simple address,
// we can compose the Ticket value into an abstract "key" which we use in lieu of the
// address of a shared global variable. This confers a distinct performance advantage,
// as AddressSignal(), absent any hash collisions, will selectively wake up and notify
// just the single waiting thread that is interested in that particular ticket value.
// We use TWAHash() to map the address of the semaphore instance and ticket value to
// such abstract keys.
//
// As noted, these "synthetic" ticket-based keys disperse waiting over the slots in the table and
// act to keep the chains short, which improves performance and reduces the rate of
// futile wakeups that would otherwise occur if we just forced all waiting to
// use a single address.

static uint32_t TWAHash (Semaphore * L, uint32_t Ticket) {
    | return uintptr_t(L) + (Ticket * 17) ;
}

static void SemaTake (Semaphore * S) {
    const auto tx = S->Ticket.fetch_add(1) ;
    int64_t dx = S->Grant.load() - tx ;

    // Fast-path uncontended return
    if (dx > 0) return ;

    // slow-path contention -- need to wait
    // Compose the address of the semaphore and the ticket value into a key
    // A simple XOR or "+" of the semaphore's address and the ticket value suffices.
    auto Key = TWAHash(S, tx) ;
    auto ch = KeyToChannel (Key) ;
    for (;;) {
        auto seq = KeyMonitor (ch) ;
        if (S->Grant.load() > tx) break ;
        KeyWait (ch, seq) ;
    }
}

static void SemaPost (Semaphore * S) {
    auto g = S->Grant.fetch_add(1) ;
    auto Key = TWAHash (S, g) ;
    KeySignal (Key) ;
}

```