Practical Concurrent and Parallel Programming - Exam 2016

Written by Rasmus Løbner Christensen (rloc@itu.dk)

Part 1

Question 1 (5%):

Running the class TestLockingO.java 10 times produces the following output:

Sum is 1564637,000000 and should be 2000000,000000

Sum is 1530436,000000 and should be 2000000,000000

Sum is 1623439,000000 and should be 2000000,000000

Sum is 1524630,000000 and should be 2000000,000000

Sum is 1581357,000000 and should be 2000000,000000

Sum is 1599967,000000 and should be 2000000,000000

Sum is 1555741,000000 and should be 2000000,000000

Sum is 1604552,000000 and should be 2000000,000000

Sum is 1640719,000000 and should be 2000000,000000

Sum is 1566290,000000 and should be 2000000,000000

The question now is whether the class is thread-safe or not. First of all, using *static synchronized* locks the whole class, while *synchronized* (non-static) only locks the method. Since we are discussing whether the _class_ is thread safe, the *synchronized* (non-static) method seems to be lackluster. Surprisingly enough, adding the *static* keyword to the *addinstance* method, produces the expected result:

Sum is 2000000,000000 and should be 2000000,000000

The above is my answer to the entire three questions in Question 1.

Question 2 (5%):

The simplest natural (depends on the interpretation I guess) way would be making the class variables volatile, combined with all the methods being *synchronized*. While this seems like a feasible solution, the problem is that declaring a volatile array (in this case a double array) does not give volatile access to the fields of the array. Therefore the solution would be to make the double array *atomic*, but java only support *AtomicIntegerArray* which obviously would not solve the problem (we are working with doubles not integers). In order to solve this visibility issue one could re-set the array reference to be itself *every* time we set an element in the array, but this would mean that all writes to the array would involve two writes instead of one.

Moving on the next question about scalability. Beside the above mentioned obnoxious double write solution, using *synchronized* means that all the threads are using locks, therefore waiting for each other. In lecture 6 (in this course), we saw a slide about the scalability speedup of different solutions, where it was showed that when reaching 16 threads and using *synchronized* as thread safety – the result would actually give almost no speedup. As already mentioned the whole *synchronized* approach would only be beneficial while using a limited number of threads.

Question 3 proposes a thread-safe scalable solution. The problem here is that while concurrent **add** or **set** calls might be safe, the situation with concurrent calls to **add** _and_ **set** might not be, since these could happen at the same time. In order to fix this, a version like the above mentioned **synchronized** one would fix this issue (but obviously would not be so scalable).

Question 3 (5%):

In order to maintain a correct value/count of **totalSize** one could simply **synchronize** the **add** method; since all updates to **totalSize** happens through **add**. To maintain visibility across threads, the **totalSize** field also has to be **volatile**.

Further in order to maintain the correctness of *allLists*, a solution would be to make the *allList.add(this)* call in the constructer synchronized (simply wrapping it in a *synchronized(this) {...}* statement). Furthermore making the *allLists* field *volatile*.

Part 2

Question 4 (10%):

See implementation (SortingPipeline.java).

Question 5 (10%)

The code for WrappedArrayDoubleQueue is as follows:

```
class WrappedArrayDoubleQueue implements BlockingDoubleQueue {
    final ArrayBlockingQueue<Double> myQueue = new ArrayBlockingQueue<Double>(50);
    @Override
    public double take() {
        try {
            return myQueue.take();
        } catch (InterruptedException e) {
            e.printStackTrace();
        }
        return 0;
    }
    @Override
    public void put(double item) {
        try {
            myQueue.put(item);
        } catch (InterruptedException e) {
            e.printStackTrace();
        }
    }
    @Override
    public int size() {
        return myQueue.size();
    }
}
```

The output for a 4-stage pipeline sorting 40 numbers (and debug turned on) is:

```
0.1 1.1 2.1 3.1 4.1 5.1 6.1 7.1 8.1 9.1 10.1 11.1 12.1 13.1 14.1 15.1 16.1 17.1 18.1 19.1 20.1 21.1 22.1 23.1 24.1 25.1 26.1 27.1 28.1 29.1 30.1 31.1 32.1 33.1 34.1 35.1 36.1 37.1 38.1 39.1
```

In order to measure the time used to sort an array of 100,000 numbers; the following were outputted from *SystemInfo()* as well as calling *mark7()*:

```
# OS: Windows 8.1; 6.3; amd64

# JVM: Oracle Corporation; 1.8.0_60

# CPU: Intel64 Family 6 Model 42 Stepping 7, GenuineIntel; 8 "cores"

# Date: 2016-01-12T00:10:12+0100

sortPipeline 219.6 ms 42.63 2
```

Question 6 (10%):

The following code is my implementation of *BlockingNDoubleQueue*.

```
BlockingNDoubleQueue implements BlockingDoubleQueue {
```

The above uses simple (*availableSpace* and *availableItems*) counters in order to keep track of the amount of numbers in the different queues. This way it is possible to update the *head* and *tail* pointers, furthermore, keeping the threads waiting correctly. Inspiration from the *StmQueues.java* from this course.

The time measured to sort an array of 100,000 numbers using a pipeline with P=4, including a *mark7* measurement:

sortPipeline 1.0 ms 0.02 512

Question 7 (10%):

Not implemented - due to being out of time. If I were to implement this, I would take the same approach as in the other *DoubleQueues* I've implemented. Obviously following the given hint, and storing *head* and *tail* values in dummies (exactly like these values are being stored as 0 in the other approaches!). Since this is unbounded, I think that besides using another data structure, this would look a lot like my *BlockingNDoubleQueue*, since I believe that an unbounded queue simply is a bounded queue with capacity *java.lang.Integer.MAX_VALUE*.

Question 8 (10%):

Not implemented.

Question 9 (10%):

Not implemented.

Question 10 (5%):

The code for **StmBlockingNDoubleQueue**:

```
this.availableTeems = newIxnInteger(c);
this.availableSpaces = newTxnInteger(capacity);
this.items = new double[capacity];
this.head = newTxnInteger(0);
this.tail = newTxnInteger(0);
```

The above is pretty much inspired 100% from this course *TestStmQueues.java*, and also reminds of the solution from Question 6. As long as the counters (*availableSpaces* and *availableItems*) is maintained correctly, the threads know when to access the queues, further the indexes are being correctly handled.

The time measured to sort an array of 100,000 numbers using a pipeline with P=4, including a *mark7* measurement:

OS: Windows 8.1; 6.3; amd64

JVM: Oracle Corporation; 1.8.0_60

CPU: Intel64 Family 6 Model 42 Stepping 7, GenuineIntel; 8 "cores"

Date: 2016-01-12T11:36:45+0100

sortPipeline 1003.0 ms 159.83 2

Question 11 (10%):

The below is my attempt to implement the two-stage actor-based sorting pipeline using the Java Akka library. This does not work though (I have included the code in the submission as well – *SortingPipelineAKKA.java*).

The whole *transmit* method in the Erlang code, was really hard to figure out. Furthermore some of the list operations done in the *Sorter* actor might also be wrong. Given a bit more time, I'm pretty sure I would be able to solve this problem. My approach regarding the setup of the two input arrays, is also wrong at the moment I believe.

```
public static void main(String args[]) throws InterruptedException {
```

Question 12 (10%):

Not implemented.

Appendixes

The code

```
final BlockingDoubleQueue[] queues = new BlockingDoubleQueue[P+1];
 queues[i] = new WrappedArrayDoubleQueue();
sortPipeline(arr, P, queues);
```

```
private static int sortPipeline(double[] arr, int P, BlockingDoubleQueue[]
      threads[i] = new Thread(new DoubleGenerator(arr, arr.length,
      threads[i].start();
```

```
public void run() {
  int heapSize = 0;
        e.printStackTrace();
```

```
this.infinites = infinites;
public void run() {
public SortedChecker(int itemCount, BlockingDoubleQueue input) {
```

```
public static double Mark7(String msg, IntToDoubleFunction f) {
  double dummy = 0.0, runningTime = 0.0, st = 0.0, sst = 0.0;
      Timer t = new Timer();
      runningTime = t.check();
  System.out.printf("%-25s %15.1f ms %10.2f %10d%n", msg, mean, sdev, count);
  System.out.printf("# OS: %s; %s; %s%n",
  System.getProperty("java.vendor");

// The processor identifier works only on MS Windows:
System.out.printf("# CPU: %s; %d \"cores\"%n",
                       Runtime.getRuntime().availableProcessors());
  public void pause() { spent += System.nanoTime()-start; }
```

```
int size();
boolean isEmpty();
boolean isFull();
public double take() {
  return myQueue.size();
public boolean isEmpty() {
```

```
public boolean isEmpty() {
public StmBlockingNDoubleQueue(int capacity) {
  this.availableItems = newTxnInteger(0);
  this.head = newTxnInteger(0);
public void put(double item) throws InterruptedException {
public int size() {
```

```
public boolean isEmpty() {
public boolean isFull() {
 double[] arr = fillDoubleArray(n);
 shuffle(arr);
private static double[] fillDoubleArray(int n) {
public static void minheapSiftdown(double[] heap, int i, int k) {
```

```
int child = 2 * i + 1;
if (child <= k) {
   if (child+1 <= k && heap[child] > heap[child+1])
      child++;
   if (heap[i] > heap[child]) {
      swap(heap, i, child);
      minheapSiftdown(heap, child, k);
   }
}

// In heap[0..k], move node heap[i] upwards by swapping with its
// parent until the heap invariant is reestablished.
public static void minheapSiftup(double[] heap, int i, int k) {
   if (0 < i) {
    int parent = (i - 1) / 2;
   if (heap[i] < heap[parent]) {
      swap(heap, i, parent);
      minheapSiftup(heap, parent, k);
   }
}
</pre>
```