

Programming Language Concepts: Lecture 13

Madhavan Mukund

Chennai Mathematical Institute

`madhavan@cmi.ac.in`

`http://www.cmi.ac.in/~madhavan/courses/pl2009`

PLC 2009, Lecture 13, 09 March 2009

An exercise in concurrent programming

- ▶ A narrow North-South bridge can accommodate traffic only in one direction at a time.

An exercise in concurrent programming

- ▶ A narrow North-South bridge can accommodate traffic only in one direction at a time.
- ▶ When a car arrives at the bridge
 1. Cars on the bridge going in the same direction \Rightarrow can cross
 2. No other car on the bridge \Rightarrow can cross (implicitly sets direction)
 3. Cars on the bridge going in the opposite direction \Rightarrow wait for the bridge to be empty

An exercise in concurrent programming

- ▶ A narrow North-South bridge can accommodate traffic only in one direction at a time.
- ▶ When a car arrives at the bridge
 1. Cars on the bridge going in the same direction \Rightarrow can cross
 2. No other car on the bridge \Rightarrow can cross (implicitly sets direction)
 3. Cars on the bridge going in the opposite direction \Rightarrow wait for the bridge to be empty
- ▶ Cars waiting to cross from one side may enter bridge in any order after direction switches in their favour.

An exercise in concurrent programming

- ▶ A narrow North-South bridge can accommodate traffic only in one direction at a time.
- ▶ When a car arrives at the bridge
 1. Cars on the bridge going in the same direction \Rightarrow can cross
 2. No other car on the bridge \Rightarrow can cross (implicitly sets direction)
 3. Cars on the bridge going in the opposite direction \Rightarrow wait for the bridge to be empty
- ▶ Cars waiting to cross from one side may enter bridge in any order after direction switches in their favour.
- ▶ When bridge becomes empty and cars are waiting, yet another car can enter in the opposite direction and makes them all wait some more.

An example . . .

- ▶ Design a class `Bridge` to implement consistent one-way access for cars on the highway synchronization primitives
 - ▶ Should permit multiple cars to be on the bridge at one time (all going in the same direction!)

An example . . .

- ▶ Design a class `Bridge` to implement consistent one-way access for cars on the highway synchronization primitives
 - ▶ Should permit multiple cars to be on the bridge at one time (all going in the same direction!)

- ▶ `Bridge` has a public method

```
public void cross(int id, boolean d, int s)
```

- ▶ `id` is identity of car
- ▶ `d` indicates direction
 - ▶ `true` is `North`
 - ▶ `false` is `South`
- ▶ `s` indicates time taken to cross (milliseconds)

An example ...

```
public void cross(int id, boolean d, int s)
```

► Method `cross` prints out diagnostics

1. A car is stuck waiting for the direction to change
Car 7 going North stuck at Thu Mar 13 23:00:11 IST 2009
2. The direction changes
Car 5 switches bridge direction to North at Thu Mar 13 23:00:14 IST 2009
3. A car enters the bridge.
Car 8 going North enters bridge at Thu Mar 13 23:00:14 IST 2003
4. A car leaves the bridge.
Car 16 leaves at Thu Mar 13 23:00:15 IST 2003

An example ...

```
public void cross(int id, boolean d, int s)
```

- ▶ Method `cross` prints out diagnostics

1. A car is stuck waiting for the direction to change

```
Car 7 going North stuck at Thu Mar 13 23:00:11 IST  
2009
```

2. The direction changes

```
Car 5 switches bridge direction to North at Thu  
Mar 13 23:00:14 IST 2009
```

3. A car enters the bridge.

```
Car 8 going North enters bridge at Thu Mar 13  
23:00:14 IST 2003
```

4. A car leaves the bridge.

```
Car 16 leaves at Thu Mar 13 23:00:15 IST 2003
```

- ▶ Use `java.util.Date` to generate time stamps

Analysis

- ▶ The “data” that is shared is the [Bridge](#)

Analysis

- ▶ The “data” that is shared is the `Bridge`
- ▶ State of the bridge is represented by two quantities
 - ▶ Number of cars on bridge — an `int`
 - ▶ Current direction of bridge — a `boolean`

Analysis

- ▶ The “data” that is shared is the `Bridge`
- ▶ State of the bridge is represented by two quantities
 - ▶ Number of cars on bridge — an `int`
 - ▶ Current direction of bridge — a `boolean`
- ▶ The method

```
public void cross(int id, boolean d, int s)
```

changes the state of the bridge

Analysis

- ▶ The “data” that is shared is the `Bridge`
- ▶ State of the bridge is represented by two quantities
 - ▶ Number of cars on bridge — an `int`
 - ▶ Current direction of bridge — a `boolean`
- ▶ The method

```
public void cross(int id, boolean d, int s)
```

changes the state of the bridge

- ▶ Concurrent execution of `cross` can cause problems ...

Analysis

- ▶ The “data” that is shared is the `Bridge`
- ▶ State of the bridge is represented by two quantities
 - ▶ Number of cars on bridge — an `int`
 - ▶ Current direction of bridge — a `boolean`
- ▶ The method

```
public void cross(int id, boolean d, int s)
```

changes the state of the bridge

- ▶ Concurrent execution of `cross` can cause problems ...
- ▶ ...but making `cross` a synchronized method is too restrictive
 - ▶ Only one car on the bridge at a time
 - ▶ Problem description explicitly disallows such a solution

Analysis . . .

- ▶ Break up `cross` into a sequence of actions

Analysis . . .

- ▶ Break up `cross` into a sequence of actions
 - ▶ `enter` — get on the bridge
 - ▶ `travel` — drive across the bridge
 - ▶ `leave` — get off the bridge

Analysis . . .

- ▶ Break up `cross` into a sequence of actions
 - ▶ `enter` — get on the bridge
 - ▶ `travel` — drive across the bridge
 - ▶ `leave` — get off the bridge
 - ▶ `enter` and `leave` can print out the diagnostics required

Analysis . . .

- ▶ Break up `cross` into a sequence of actions
 - ▶ `enter` — get on the bridge
 - ▶ `travel` — drive across the bridge
 - ▶ `leave` — get off the bridge
 - ▶ `enter` and `leave` can print out the diagnostics required
- ▶ Which of these affect the state of the bridge?

Analysis . . .

- ▶ Break up `cross` into a sequence of actions
 - ▶ `enter` — get on the bridge
 - ▶ `travel` — drive across the bridge
 - ▶ `leave` — get off the bridge
 - ▶ `enter` and `leave` can print out the diagnostics required
- ▶ Which of these affect the state of the bridge?
 - ▶ `enter` : increment number of cars, perhaps change direction
 - ▶ `leave` : decrement number of cars

Analysis . . .

- ▶ Break up `cross` into a sequence of actions
 - ▶ `enter` — get on the bridge
 - ▶ `travel` — drive across the bridge
 - ▶ `leave` — get off the bridge
 - ▶ `enter` and `leave` can print out the diagnostics required
- ▶ Which of these affect the state of the bridge?
 - ▶ `enter` : increment number of cars, perhaps change direction
 - ▶ `leave` : decrement number of cars
- ▶ Make `enter` and `leave` synchronized

Analysis . . .

- ▶ Break up `cross` into a sequence of actions
 - ▶ `enter` — get on the bridge
 - ▶ `travel` — drive across the bridge
 - ▶ `leave` — get off the bridge
 - ▶ `enter` and `leave` can print out the diagnostics required
- ▶ Which of these affect the state of the bridge?
 - ▶ `enter` : increment number of cars, perhaps change direction
 - ▶ `leave` : decrement number of cars
- ▶ Make `enter` and `leave` synchronized
- ▶ `travel` is just a means to let time elapse — use `sleep`

Analysis ...

Code for `cross`

```
public void cross(int id, boolean d, int s){

    // Get onto the bridge (if you can!)
    enter(id,d);

    // Takes time to cross the bridge
    try{
        Thread.sleep(s);
    }
    catch(InterruptedException e){}

    // Get off the bridge
    leave(id);
}
```

Analysis . . .

Entering the bridge

- ▶ If the direction of this car matches the direction of the bridge, it can enter

Analysis . . .

Entering the bridge

- ▶ If the direction of this car matches the direction of the bridge, it can enter
- ▶ If the direction does not match but the number of cars is zero, it can reset the direction and enter

Analysis . . .

Entering the bridge

- ▶ If the direction of this car matches the direction of the bridge, it can enter
- ▶ If the direction does not match but the number of cars is zero, it can reset the direction and enter
- ▶ Otherwise, `wait()` for the state of the bridge to change

Analysis . . .

Entering the bridge

- ▶ If the direction of this car matches the direction of the bridge, it can enter
- ▶ If the direction does not match but the number of cars is zero, it can reset the direction and enter
- ▶ Otherwise, `wait()` for the state of the bridge to change
- ▶ In each case, print a diagnostic message

Code for enter

```
private synchronized void enter(int id, boolean d){
    Date date;

    // While there are cars going in the wrong direction
    while (d != direction && bcount > 0){

        date = new Date();
        System.out.println("Car "+id+" going "+direction_name(d)+"

        // Wait for our turn
        try{
            wait();
        }
        catch (InterruptedException e){}
    }

    ...

}
```

Code for enter

```
private synchronized void enter(int id, boolean d){
    ...
    while (d != direction && bcount > 0){ ... wait() ...}
    ...

    // Switch direction, if needed
    if (d != direction){
        direction = d;
        date = new Date();
        System.out.println("Car "+id+" switches bridge direction
            to "+direction_name(direction)+" at "+date);
    }

    // Register our presence on the bridge
    bcount++;

    date = new Date();
    System.out.println("Car "+id+" going "+direction_name(d)+"
        enters bridge at "+date);
}
```

Analysis . . .

Leaving the bridge is much simpler

- ▶ Decrement the car count

Analysis . . .

Leaving the bridge is much simpler

- ▶ Decrement the car count
- ▶ `notify()` waiting cars

Analysis . . .

Leaving the bridge is much simpler

- ▶ Decrement the car count
- ▶ `notify()` waiting cars
... provided car count is zero

Analysis ...

Leaving the bridge is much simpler

- ▶ Decrement the car count
- ▶ `notify()` waiting cars
...provided car count is zero

```
private synchronized void leave(int id){
    Date date = new Date();
    System.out.println("Car "+id+" leaves at "+date);

    // "Check out"
    bcount--;

    // If everyone on the bridge has checked out, notify the
    // cars waiting on the opposite side
    if (bcount == 0){
        notifyAll();
    }
}
```


The challenge of concurrent programming

- ▶ Concurrent programming is difficult
- ▶ Over the years, semaphores, monitors . . . to lock and unlock shared data

The challenge of concurrent programming

- ▶ Concurrent programming is difficult
- ▶ Over the years, semaphores, monitors . . . to lock and unlock shared data
- ▶ Thesis
 - ▶ Lock based programming is difficult to design and maintain
 - ▶ Lock based programs do not compose well

The challenge of concurrent programming

- ▶ Concurrent programming is difficult
- ▶ Over the years, semaphores, monitors ... to lock and unlock shared data
- ▶ Thesis
 - ▶ Lock based programming is difficult to design and maintain
 - ▶ Lock based programs do not compose well
- ▶ With multicore architectures, concurrent programming will become more ubiquitous
- ▶ Goal
 - ▶ Design a new mechanism for reliable, modular concurrent programming with shared data

The challenge of concurrent programming

- ▶ Concurrent programming is difficult
- ▶ Over the years, semaphores, monitors ... to lock and unlock shared data
- ▶ Thesis
 - ▶ Lock based programming is difficult to design and maintain
 - ▶ Lock based programs do not compose well
- ▶ With multicore architectures, concurrent programming will become more ubiquitous
- ▶ Goal
 - ▶ Design a new mechanism for reliable, modular concurrent programming with shared data
 - ▶ Software Transactional Memory!

The problem with locks

A bank account class

```
class Account {  
    Int balance;  
  
    synchronized void withdraw( int n ) {  
        balance = balance - n;  
    }  
  
    synchronized void deposit( int n ) {  
        withdraw( -n );  
    }  
}
```

- ▶ Each object has a lock
- ▶ **synchronized** methods acquire and release locks

The problem with locks . . .

How do we transfer money from one account to another?

The problem with locks ...

How do we transfer money from one account to another?

```
void transfer( Account from,  
              Account to, Int amount ) {  
    from.withdraw( amount );  
    to.deposit( amount );  
}
```

The problem with locks ...

How do we transfer money from one account to another?

```
void transfer( Account from,
              Account to, Int amount ) {
    from.withdraw( amount );
    to.deposit( amount );
}
```

Is there a problem?

The problem with locks ...

How do we transfer money from one account to another?

```
void transfer( Account from,
              Account to, Int amount ) {
    from.withdraw( amount );
    to.deposit( amount );
}
```

Is there a problem?

- ▶ Intermediate state when money has left `from` and not been deposited in `to` should not be visible!
- ▶ Having `withdraw` and `deposit` synchronized does not help

The problem with locks ...

To fix this, we can add more locks

```
void transfer( Account from,
               Account to, Int amount ) {
    from.lock(); to.lock();
    from.withdraw( amount );
    to.deposit( amount );
    from.unlock(); to.unlock();
}
```

The problem with locks ...

To fix this, we can add more locks

```
void transfer( Account from,
              Account to, Int amount ) {
    from.lock(); to.lock();
    from.withdraw( amount );
    to.deposit( amount );
    from.unlock(); to.unlock();
}
```

Is there a problem?

The problem with locks ...

To fix this, we can add more locks

```
void transfer( Account from,
               Account to, Int amount ) {
    from.lock(); to.lock();
    from.withdraw( amount );
    to.deposit( amount );
    from.unlock(); to.unlock();
}
```

Is there a problem?

- ▶ Two concurrent transfers in opposite directions between accounts *i* and *j* can deadlock!

The problem with locks ...

Order the locks

```
void transfer( Account from,
              Account to, Int amount ) {
    if (from < to)
        then {from.lock(); to.lock(); }
        else {to.lock(); from.lock(); }

    from.withdraw( amount );
    to.deposit( amount );
    from.unlock(); to.unlock();
}
```

The problem with locks ...

Order the locks

```
void transfer( Account from,
              Account to, Int amount ) {
    if (from < to)
        then {from.lock(); to.lock(); }
        else {to.lock(); from.lock(); }

    from.withdraw( amount );
    to.deposit( amount );
    from.unlock(); to.unlock();
}
```

Is there a problem?

The problem with locks ...

Order the locks

```
void transfer( Account from,
              Account to, Int amount ) {
    if (from < to)
        then {from.lock(); to.lock(); }
        else {to.lock(); from.lock(); }

    from.withdraw( amount );
    to.deposit( amount );
    from.unlock(); to.unlock();
}
```

Is there a problem?

- Need to know all possible locks in advance

The problem with locks ...

```
void transfer( Account from,
              Account to, Int amount ) {
    if (from < to)
        then {from.lock(); to.lock(); }
        else {to.lock(); from.lock(); }
    from.withdraw( amount );
    to.deposit( amount );
    from.unlock(); to.unlock();
}
```

- What if **from** is a Super Savings Account in which most of the money is in a medium term fixed deposit **fromFD**?

The problem with locks ...

```
void transfer( Account from,
              Account to, Int amount ) {
    if (from < to)
        then {from.lock(); to.lock(); }
        else {to.lock(); from.lock(); }
    from.withdraw( amount );
    to.deposit( amount );
    from.unlock(); to.unlock();
}
```

- ▶ What if `from` is a Super Savings Account in which most of the money is in a medium term fixed deposit `fromFD`?
- ▶ `from.withdraw(amt)` may require an additional transfer from `fromFD` to `from`
 - ▶ `transfer` may not know anything about `fromFD`
 - ▶ Even if it did, it has to acquire a third lock

The problem with locks ...

```
void transfer( Account from,
              Account to, Int amount ) {
    if (from < to)
        then {from.lock(); to.lock(); }
        else {to.lock(); from.lock(); }
    from.withdraw( amount );
    to.deposit( amount );
    from.unlock(); to.unlock();
}
```

- ▶ What if **transfer** can block in case of insufficient funds?
 - ▶ **Wait** on a condition variable (monitor queue)
 - ▶ Becomes more complex as number of locks increase

The problem with locks . . .

- ▶ **Take too few locks** — data integrity is compromised
- ▶ **Take too many locks** — deadlocks, lack of concurrency
- ▶ **Take wrong locks, or in wrong order** — connection between lock and data it protects is informal
- ▶ **Error recovery** — how to recover from errors without leaving system in an inconsistent state?
- ▶ **Lost wake-ups, erroneous retries** — Easy to forget to signal a waiting thread, recheck condition after wake-up

The problem with locks . . .

- ▶ **Take too few locks** — data integrity is compromised
- ▶ **Take too many locks** — deadlocks, lack of concurrency
- ▶ **Take wrong locks, or in wrong order** — connection between lock and data it protects is informal
- ▶ **Error recovery** — how to recover from errors without leaving system in an inconsistent state?
- ▶ **Lost wake-ups, erroneous retries** — Easy to forget to signal a waiting thread, recheck condition after wake-up

Lack of modularity

Cannot easily make use of smaller programs to build larger ones

- ▶ Combining **withdraw** and **deposit** to create **transfer** requires exposing locks

Transactions

- ▶ Import idea of transactions from databases
 - ▶ Hardware support for transactions in memory [Herlihy, Moss 1993]
- ▶ Instead, move transaction support to run time software
 - ▶ Software Transactional Memory [Shavit, Touitou 1995]
- ▶ An implementation in Haskell
 - [Harris, Marlow, Peyton Jones, Herlihy 2005]
 - ▶ Tutorial presentation
Simon Peyton Jones: Beautiful concurrency,
in *Beautiful code*, ed. Greg Wilson, OReilly (2007)

Transactions ...

- ▶ A **transaction** is an indivisible unit
- ▶ Execute a transaction as though it was running sequentially

Transactions ...

- ▶ A **transaction** is an indivisible unit
- ▶ Execute a transaction as though it was running sequentially
- ▶ Check at the end of the transaction if any shared variables touched by the transaction have changed (due to external updates)

Transactions ...

- ▶ A **transaction** is an indivisible unit
- ▶ Execute a transaction as though it was running sequentially
- ▶ Check at the end of the transaction if any shared variables touched by the transaction have changed (due to external updates)
 - ▶ Maintain a **transaction log** for each transaction, noting down values that were written and read
 - ▶ If a value is written in a transaction and read later, look it up in the log
 - ▶ At the end of the transaction, use log to check consistency

Transactions ...

- ▶ A **transaction** is an indivisible unit
- ▶ Execute a transaction as though it was running sequentially
- ▶ Check at the end of the transaction if any shared variables touched by the transaction have changed (due to external updates)
 - ▶ Maintain a **transaction log** for each transaction, noting down values that were written and read
 - ▶ If a value is written in a transaction and read later, look it up in the log
 - ▶ At the end of the transaction, use log to check consistency
- ▶ If no inconsistency was seen, **commit** the transaction
- ▶ Otherwise, **roll back** and retry

Transactions ...

Use `atomic` to indicate scope of transactions

```
void withdraw( int n ) {  
    atomic{ balance = balance - n; }  
}
```

```
void deposit( int n ) {  
    atomic{ withdraw( -n ); }  
}
```

Transactions ...

Use `atomic` to indicate scope of transactions

```
void withdraw( int n ) {  
    atomic{ balance = balance - n; }  
}
```

```
void deposit( int n ) {  
    atomic{ withdraw( -n ); }  
}
```

Now, building a correct version of `transfer` is not difficult

```
void transfer( Account from, Account to, Int amount ) {  
    atomic { from.withdraw( amount );  
            to.deposit( amount ); }  
}
```

Transaction interference

Independent transactions updating the same object

```
atomic{                                     // Transaction 1
    if a.getName().equals("B")
        a.setVal(8);
}
```

```
atomic{                                     // Transaction 2
    int previous = a.getVal();
    a.setVal(previous+1);
}
```

Transaction interference

Independent transactions updating the same object

```
atomic{                                // Transaction 1
    if a.getName().equals("B")
        a.setVal(8);
}
```

```
atomic{                                // Transaction 2
    int previous = a.getVal();
    a.setVal(previous+1);
}
```

- ▶ If Transaction 1 executes between first and second instruction of Transaction 2, transaction log shows that value of `previous` is inconsistent
- ▶ Transaction 2 should roll back and reexecute

Transactions ...

What else do we need?

Transactions ...

What else do we need?

- ▶ **Blocking**

- ▶ If amount to be withdrawn is more than current balance, wait

```
void transfer( Account from, Account to, Int amount ) {  
    atomic {  
        if (amount < from.balance) retry;  
        from.withdraw ( amount );  
        to.deposit( amount );  
    }  
}
```

Transactions ...

What else do we need?

- ▶ **Blocking**

- ▶ If amount to be withdrawn is more than current balance, wait

```
void transfer( Account from, Account to, Int amount ) {  
    atomic {  
        if (amount < from.balance) retry;  
        from.withdraw ( amount );  
        to.deposit( amount );  
    }  
}
```

- ▶ **retry** suspends transaction without any partial, inconsistent side-effects
- ▶ Transaction log indicates possible variables that forced **retry**
- ▶ Wait till one of these variables changes before attempting to rerun transaction from scratch

Transactions ...

What else do we need?

Transactions ...

What else do we need?

- ▶ Nested `atomic` allows sequential composition
- ▶ How about choosing between transactions with `alternatives`
 - ▶ If amount to be withdrawn is more than current balance, move money from linked fixed deposit

Transactions ...

What else do we need?

- ▶ Nested `atomic` allows sequential composition
- ▶ How about choosing between transactions with **alternatives**
 - ▶ If amount to be withdrawn is more than current balance, move money from linked fixed deposit

```
void transfer( Account from, Account to, Int amount ) {  
    atomic {  
        atomic{ from.withdraw ( amount ); }  
        orElse  
        atomic{ LinkedFD[from].withdraw ( amount ); }  
  
        to.deposit( amount );  
    }  
}
```

What could go wrong?

```
void b( Account from, Account to, Int amount ) {  
    atomic {  
        x = a.getVal();  
        y = b.getVal();  
        if (x > y){ launchMissiles(); }  
        ...  
    }  
}
```

What could go wrong?

```
void b( Account from, Account to, Int amount ) {  
    atomic {  
        x = a.getVal();  
        y = b.getVal();  
        if (x > y){ launchMissiles(); }  
        ...  
    }  
}
```

- ▶ If an inconsistency is found later, the transaction should roll back and retry
- ▶ How do we recall the missiles that have been launched?
- ▶ Need a strong type system to ensure that transactions affect only **transactional memory**

Dealing with exceptions

```
atomic{  
    a = q1.extract();  
    q2.insert(a);  
}
```

Dealing with exceptions

```
atomic{  
    a = q1.extract();  
    q2.insert(a);  
}
```

- Suppose `q2.insert(a)` fails because `q2` is full

Dealing with exceptions

```
atomic{  
    a = q1.extract();  
    q2.insert(a);  
}
```

- ▶ Suppose `q2.insert(a)` fails because `q2` is full
- ▶ Reasonable to expect that value in `a` is pushed back into `q1`.

Dealing with exceptions

```
atomic{  
    a = q1.extract();  
    q2.insert(a);  
}
```

- ▶ Suppose `q2.insert(a)` fails because `q2` is full
- ▶ Reasonable to expect that value in `a` is pushed back into `q1`.

How about

```
try { atomic{  
    a = q1.extract(); q2.insert(a);  
}  
catch (QueueFullException e) { a = q3.extract() } ;
```

- ▶ What is the state of `q1`?

STM summary

- ▶ Mechanism for delimiting transactions (`atomic`)
 - ▶ Programmer writes “sequential” code
 - ▶ Implementation determines granularity of concurrency — e.g. using transaction logs

STM summary

- ▶ Mechanism for delimiting transactions (`atomic`)
 - ▶ Programmer writes “sequential” code
 - ▶ Implementation determines granularity of concurrency — e.g. using transaction logs
- ▶ Transactions can be sequentially composed — nesting of transactions

STM summary

- ▶ Mechanism for delimiting transactions (**atomic**)
 - ▶ Programmer writes “sequential” code
 - ▶ Implementation determines granularity of concurrency — e.g. using transaction logs
- ▶ Transactions can be sequentially composed — nesting of transactions
- ▶ Transactions can block — **retry**

STM summary

- ▶ Mechanism for delimiting transactions (`atomic`)
 - ▶ Programmer writes “sequential” code
 - ▶ Implementation determines granularity of concurrency — e.g. using transaction logs
- ▶ Transactions can be sequentially composed — nesting of transactions
- ▶ Transactions can block — `retry`
- ▶ Choice between transactions – `orElse`

STM summary

- ▶ Mechanism for delimiting transactions (`atomic`)
 - ▶ Programmer writes “sequential” code
 - ▶ Implementation determines granularity of concurrency — e.g. using transaction logs
- ▶ Transactions can be sequentially composed — nesting of transactions
- ▶ Transactions can block — `retry`
- ▶ Choice between transactions – `orElse`
- ▶ Need to restrict what transactions can encompass — `LaunchMissiles()`

STM summary

- ▶ Mechanism for delimiting transactions (`atomic`)
 - ▶ Programmer writes “sequential” code
 - ▶ Implementation determines granularity of concurrency — e.g. using transaction logs
- ▶ Transactions can be sequentially composed — nesting of transactions
- ▶ Transactions can block — `retry`
- ▶ Choice between transactions – `orElse`
- ▶ Need to restrict what transactions can encompass — `LaunchMissiles()`
- ▶ Exceptions and transactions interact in a complex manner