Java Concurrency

Database Systems
DataLab, CS, NTHU
Spring, 2023

Starting a New Thread

```
public class HelloRunnable implements Runnable {
    @Override
    public void run() {
        System.out.println("Hello from a thread!");
    }
    public static void main(String args[]) {
        (new Thread(new HelloRunnable())).start();
}
                          or
 public class HelloThread extends Thread {
     @Override
     public void run() {
         System.out.println("Hello from a thread!");
     public static void main(String args[]) {
         (new HelloThread()).start();
```

What Happened?

```
public class HelloRunnable implements Runnable {
    @Override
    public void run() {
        System.out.println("Hello from a thread!");
    }

    public static void main(String args[]) {
            (new Thread(new HelloRunnable())).start();
     }
}
```

- A new stack is allocated for run(), in addition to that of main()
- Your CPU spends time on executing run() in parallel with main()

Multiple Stacks, Single Heap

- The heap in memory scheme?
 - Stores objects
 - Shared by all threads
- Can two threads access the same object? Yes
- How? Passing the same object to their constructors

```
public static void main(String args[]) {
    Counter counter = ...;
    (new Thread(new HelloRunnableA(counter))).start(); // thread A
        (new Thread(new HelloRunnableB(counter))).start(); // thread B
}
```

Concurrent Access

- Given the same object counter
- Suppose both threads execute in run ():

```
int c = counter.get();
c++; // c--;
counter.set(c);
```

- Thread A's result will be lost if
 - 1. Thread A: Get c
 - 2. Thread B: Get c
 - 3. Thread A: Increment retrieved value; result is 1
 - 4. Thread B: Decrement retrieved value; result is -1
 - 5. Thread A: Set result in c; c is now 1.
 - Thread B: Set result in c; c is now -1.

```
class Counter {
    private int c = 0;
    Public void set(int c) {
        This.c = c;
    }
    public int get() {
        return c;
    }
}
```

Synchronization

- Only one thread can enter sync. block of an obj. at a time
- Problem solved?

• Same as...

```
public class SynchronizedCounter {
    private int c = 0;
    public void set(int c) {
        synchronized (this) {
            this.c = c;
        }
    }
    public int get() {
        synchronized (this) {
            return c;
        }
    }
}
```

Still Wrong!

• Two threads in run():

```
... // counter is a SynchronizedCounter instance
int c = counter.get();
c++; // c--;
counter.set(c);
```

- Thread A's result will still be lost if
 - 1. Thread A: Get c
 - 2. Thread B: Get c
 - 3. Thread A: Increment retrieved value; result is 1
 - 4. Thread B: Decrement retrieved value; result is -1
 - 5. Thread A: Set result in c; c is now 1.
 - 6. Thread B: Set result in c; c is now -1.

Synchronization at Right Place

 Solution1: callers lock counter during the entire increment/decrement period:

```
synchronized(counter){
   int c = counter.get();
   c++; // or c--;
   counter.set(c);
}
```

Solution2: callee provides atomic methods

```
public class SynchronizedCounter {
    private int c = 0;
    public void synchronized increment() {
        C++;
    }
    public int get() {
        return c;
    }
}
```

Blocking and Waiting States

- Threads are blocked outside a critical section if someone is in
- Thread A in a critical section of o can stop and enter the waiting state by calling o.wait()
 - Gives up the lock, so some other blocking thread
 B can enter the critical section
 - If B calls o.notifyAll(), A competes for the lock again and resume

Wrap wait () in a Loop

- It's a good practice to wrap wait() in a loop to prevent bugs
- Queue length: 10

Threads A, B:

```
// enqueue
synchronized(queue) {
    While(queue.size() == 10) {
        queue.wait();
    }
    queue.add(...);
    queue.notifyAll();
}
```

Threads C, D:

```
// dequeue
synchronized(queue) {
    while(queue.size() == 0) {
        queue.wait();
    }
    ... = queue.remove();
    queue.notifyAll();
}
```

Assigned Reading

Java Concurrency Tutorial