

VOLATILE

Local variables in the thread.

If you are working with the multithreaded programming, the volatile keyword will be more useful. When multiple threads using the same variable, each thread will have its own copy of the local variable, cache for that variable. So when it is updating the value, it is actually updating in the local cache not in the main variable memory. The other thread which is using the same variable doesn't know anything about the values changed by the another thread.

To avoid this problem, if you declare a variable as volatile, then it ~~doesn't~~ will not be stored in local cache. Whenever thread ~~are~~ updating the values it is updated to the main memory. So, other threads can access the updated value.

- The Java 'volatile' keyword is used to mark a Java variable as "very stored in memory". More precisely that means means, that every read of the

volatile keyword variable will be read from the computer's main memory, and not the CPU cache, and that every write to a volatile variable will be written to main memory, not just the CPU cache.

Problem

Atomic

Program

```
public class TestAtomic
```

```
public static void main() throws InterruptedException
```

```
{
```

```
    ProcessingThread pt = new ProcessingThread();
```

```
    Thread t1 = new Thread(pt, "+1");
```

```
    t1.start();
```

```
    Thread t2 = new Thread(pt, "+2");
```

```
    t2.start();
```

```
    t1.join();
```

```
    t2.join();
```

```
Sop("Processing count=" + pt.getCount());
```

```
class ProcessingThread implements Runnable,
```

```
private volatile int count;
// int count;
```

```
@Override
```

```
public void run() {
    for (int i = 1; i < 5; i++) {
        Sop("hello");
        processSomething(i);
        count++;
    }
}
```

```
public int getCount() {
    return this.count;
}
```

```
public void processSomething(int i) {
    // processing some job
    try {
        Thread.sleep(1000);
    }
    catch (InterruptedException e) {
        e.printStackTrace();
    }
}
```


Atomic

To solve this issue, we will have to make sure that increment operation on count is atomic, we can do that using Synchronization but Java 5 `java.util.concurrent.atomic` provides wrapper classes for `int` & `long` that can be used to achieve this atomically without usage of Synchronization.

Here is the updated program that will always give count value as 8 becoz `AtomicInteger.incrementAndGet()` atomically increments current value by one.

Program

```
import java.util.concurrent.atomic.AtomicInteger;
```

```
public class TestAtomic {
```

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

```
        ProcessingThread pt = new ProcessingThread();
```

```
        Thread t1 = new Thread(pt, "t1");
        t1.start();
```

```
Thread t2 = new Thread(p1, "t2");  
t2.start();  
t1.join();  
t2.join();  
So p ("Processing Count = " + p1.getCount());
```

Class ProcessingThread implements Runnable
{
private AtomicInteger count = new
AtomicInteger();

```
public void run() {  
for (int i = 1; i <= 5; i++) {  
processSomething(i);  
count.incrementAndGet();  
}
```

```
public int getCount() {  
return this.count.get();  
}
```

```
private void processSomething(int i) {  
try {  
Thread.sleep(1000);  
}
```


catch (InterruptedException e)

{ e.printStackTrace(); }