Considerations for integrating virtual threads in a Java framework: a Quarkus example in a resource-constrained environment

A. Navarro[1,2] J. Ponge[1,2] F. Le Mouël[2] C. Escoffier[1]

[1]Red Hat
[2]CITI Laboratory-INSA Lyon



17th ACM International Conference on Distributed and Event-based Systems 2023

Monolithic application



The end of the monolith

- Difficult to maintain
- Dependency hell
- Reboot for every change
- Sub-optimal deployment
- Limit scalability
- Technology lock-in

from

Microservices: yesterday, today, and tomorrow - Dragoni & al

Microservices



Microservices

- *Difficult to maintain*

  Split in smaller entities
- *Dependency hell*

  Less dependencies per service
- *Reboot for every change*

  Reboot only impacted service
- *Sub-optimal deployment*

  Per-service deployment
- *Limits scalability*

  Scale each service
- *Technology lock-in*

  Per-service technology

Remark

Transitioning to cloud becomes cost efficient if done well.

Make microservices cheap

resource-efficiency

Make microservices cheap

resource-efficiency

resource-efficiency

Make microservices cheap

resource-efficiency

resource-efficiency

resource-efficiency

Make microservices cheap

resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency

Make microservices cheap

resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency

Make microservices cheap

resource-efficiency resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency resource-efficiency
resource-efficiency resource-efficiency resource-efficiency

Scaling and reactive programming

Problem

Communications over the network are unreliable and slow.

Goal

Achieving efficient and timely communication between services.

Blocking and Non-blocking programming





Code comparison - blocking

```
var names = getAll();
var quotes = getQuotes(names.size());
for(int i=0; i < names.size();i ++){
   names.get(i).surname+= "- "+quotes.get(i);
}
return names;
```

Code comparison - asynchronous callbacks

```
getAll( names => {
    getQuotes(names.size(), quotes => {
        for(int i=0; i < names.size();i ++){
            names.get(i).surname+= "- "+quotes.get(i);
        }
        //continuation
    })
});
```

Code comparison - reactive streams

```
var names = getAll().memoize().indefinitely();
var quotes = names.onItem().transformToUni(list ->
          getQuotes(list.size()));
return Uni.combine().all()
    .unis(names,quotes).asTuple()
    .onItem().transform(tuple -> {
       var nList=tuple.getItem1();
       //can await it since it is already resolved
       var qList = tuple.getItem2();
       for(int i=0; i < namesList.size();i ++){
          nList.get(i).surname += " - "+qList.get(i);
       }
       return namesList;
    });
```

Asynchronous programming abstractions

> *We should do (as wise programmers aware of our limitations) our utmost best to shorten the conceptual gap between the static program and the dynamic process, to* ***make the correspondence between the program (spread out in text space) and the process (spread out in time) as trivial as possible****.*

Go To Statement considered harmful. - Edgar. J. Dijkstra, 1968

Code comparison - virtual threads

```
var names = getAll();
var quotes = getQuotes(names.size());
for(int i=0; i < names.size();i ++){
   names.get(i).surname+= "- "+quotes.get(i);
}
return names;
```

Virtual threads



Table of Contents

A quick overview of Quarkus

```
@GET
@Path("/named_quotes")
Uni<List<Name>> myEndpoint() {
    var names = getAll().memoize().indefinitely();
    var quotes = names.onItem().transformToUni(list ->
          getQuotes(list.size()));
    return Uni.combine().all()
        .unis(names,quotes).asTuple()
        .onItem().transform(tuple -> {
           var nList=tuple.getItem1();
           var qList = tuple.getItem2();
           for(int i=0; i < namesList.size();i ++){
              nList.get(i).surname += " -
                 "+qList.get(i);
           }
           return namesList;
        });
}
```

A quick overview of Quarkus-virtual-thread

```
@GET
@Path("/named_quotes")
@RunOnVirtualThread
List<Name> myBetterEndpoint() {
    var names = getAll();
    var quotes = getQuotes(names.size());
    for(int i=0; i < names.size();i ++){
        names.get(i).surname+= "- "+quotes.get(i);
    }
    return names;
}
```

Three integration strategies

Forking the worker model.

Using event-loops as carriers.

”Virtualizing” Netty event-loops.

Forking the worker model



Reusing event-loops



"Virtualizing" Netty event-loops





Integration strategies summary

Strategy	Pros	Cons
Forking worker model	Simple, fits virtual threads model	Context switches
Using event-loop as carrier	No context-switch, Fewer threads overall	Potential deadlocks
Modifying Netty event-loops to be virtual threads	Integration done at the Netty level, Netty-based frameworks would benefit from it	Can't modify Netty up-stream, unpredictable effects

Table: Comparison of the different Quarkus-virtual-threads options

Final Choice: Forking the worker model



Table of Contents

The experiment

Goal

Measure how performance of the application is affected by replacing reactive endpoints with virtual-threads offloading

Hypothesis

Quarkus-virtual-threads should perform better than **Quarkus-blocking** but not as well as **Quarkus-reactive**

The environment

Limited resources

- 512MB memory
- 0.5 vCPU
- 256MB heap

Fault-inducing settings

- 200ms of delay between the DB and the server
- Hyperfoil to avoid Coordinated Omission

Elements of the experiment



Table of Contents

Results with 200ms delay









Garbage Collection detail

	Quarkus-virt-threads-0	Quarkus-virt-threads-200
Max-latency	1.44 s	31.54 s
GC count	275	709
Avg pause	18.662 ms	92.270 ms
Longest pause	89.723 ms	520.437 ms
Young Collection time	5.132 s	41.685 s
Old Collection time	N/A	23.734 s
Sum of pauses	5.132 s	65 s

	Quarkus-reactive-0	Quarkus-reactive-200
Max-latency	1.08 s	704.64 ms
GC count	192	183
Avg pause	15.169 ms	14.968 ms
Longest pause	32.898 ms	49.312 ms
Young Collection time	3.004	2.739s
Old Collection time	N/A	N/A
Sum of pauses	3.004 s	2.739 s

Explaining longer Garbage Collection

- Too many virtual threads exist in memory at the same time.
- Data structures generated by Quarkus/Netty pollute memory.

Explaining longer Garbage Collection

- Too many virtual threads exist in memory at the same time.
- Data structures generated by Quarkus/Netty pollute memory.

Generalizing the results

The integration of virtual threads in frameworks built on top of Netty or that rely heavily on ThreadLocals, presuming a small thread count, is likely to experience significant garbage collection (GC) pressure.

Conclusions

- *Quarkus-blocking* < *Quarkus-virtual-threads* < *Quarkus-reactive*.
- High Memory consumption.
- Virtual threads are not responsible for the high memory consumption.
- Data structures generated by *Quarkus*/*Netty* are the main memory consumers.

arnavarr@redhat.com

Deadlock situation

```
@GET
@RunOnVirtualThread
@NonBlocking
@Path("/print-both")
public List<Fortune> getAll() {
   System.out.println("outer - " +Thread.currentThread());
   var list =
     db.getPool().preparedQuery(SELECT_ALL)
        .execute()
        .map(item -> {
            System.out.println("inner - " + Thread.currentThread());
            return createListOfFortunes(item);
        });
   return list.await().indefinitely();
}
```

Deadlock explanation



Deadlock: sharing locks

Conclusion

The event-loop can’t reuse locks *as a carrier*

Results without delay