

## Exercises week 1

### Friday 31 August 2018

Last update 2018-08-30

#### Goal of the exercises

The goal of this week's exercises is to make sure that you can use Java threads and `synchronized` methods and statements; that you have an initial understanding of using multiple threads for better performance; a good understanding of visibility of field updates between threads; and the advantages of immutability.

The following abbreviations are used in the exercise sheets:

- “Goetz” means Goetz et al.: *Java Concurrency in Practice*, Addison-Wesley 2006. Mandatory reading.
- “Bloch” means Bloch: *Effective Java*. Second edition, Addison-Wesley 2008. Recommended reading.
- “Herlihy” means Herlihy and Shavit: *The Art of Multiprocessor Programming*. Revised reprint, Morgan Kaufmann 2012. A few chapters are mandatory reading.

The exercises let you try yourself the ideas and concepts that were introduced in the lectures. Some exercises may be challenging, but they are not supposed to require days of work.

If you get stuck with an exercise outside the exercise sessions, you may use the News Forum for the course in LearnIT to ask for help. This is better than emailing the teaching assistants individually.

Exercises may be solved and solutions handed in in groups of 1, 2 or 3 students.

Exercise solutions have to be **handed in through LearnIT** no later than 23:55 on the Thursday following the exercise date.

#### How to hand in

You should make hand-ins as simple as possible for you and for the teaching assistants. Please submit precisely two files:

- one file (`yourName.pdf`) containing all your answers. This is what we grade.
- a single zipped (`*.zip`) file containing precisely all your source code (only `*.java` files). Essentially the very same code provided to you, but with your additions. Please **do not** create extra directories or reorganize the files, keep it simple (as the code is given to you!).

Please do **not** submit:

- Microsoft Word documents (`*.doc` or `*.docx` files) or LibreOffice or OpenOffice documents (`.odt`).
- Eclipse or Netbeans project metafiles (`*.proj` files and other junk).
- Compiled Java classes (`*.class` files).
- Exotic archive formats such as `.rar` files.
- Screenshots that just show code or text output. Better submit those as `.java` or `.txt` files.

#### Do this first

Make sure you have the Java Development Kit installed; **you will need Java version 8 for this course**. Type `java -version` in a console on Windows, MacOS or Linux to see what version you have. From inside Eclipse you may instead inspect Preferences > Java > Installed JREs.

You may want to install a recent version of an integrated development environment such as Eclipse Neon (4.6). Get and unpack this week's example code in zip file `pcpp-week01.zip` on the course homepage.

**Exercise 1.1** Consider the lecture's LongCounter example found in file TestLongCounterExperiments.java, and **remove** the `synchronized` keyword from method `increment` so you get this class:

```
class LongCounter {
    private long count = 0;
    public void increment() {
        count = count + 1;
    }
    public synchronized long get() {
        return count;
    }
}
```

1. The `main` method creates a LongCounter object. Then it creates and starts two threads that run concurrently, and each increments the `count` field 10 million times by calling method `increment`.

What kind of final values do you get when the `increment` method is **not** synchronized?

2. Reduce the `counts` value from 10 million to 100, recompile, and rerun the code. It is now likely that you get the correct result (200) in every run. Explain how this could be. Would you consider this software correct, in the sense that you would guarantee that it always gives 200?
3. The `increment` method in LongCounter uses the assignment

```
count = count + 1;
```

to add one to `count`. This could be expressed also as `count += 1` or as `count++`.

Do you think it would make any difference to use one of these forms instead? Why? Change the code and run it. Do you see any difference in the results for any of these alternatives?

4. Extend the LongCounter class with a `decrement()` method which subtracts 1 from the `count` field. Change the code in `main` so that `t1` calls `decrement` 10 million times, and `t2` calls `increment` 10 million times, on a LongCounter instance. In particular, initialize `main`'s `counts` variable to 10 million as before. What should the final value be, after both threads have completed? Note that `decrement` is called only from one thread, and `increment` is called only from another thread. So do the methods have to be `synchronized` for the example to produce the expected final value? Explain why (or why not).
5. Make four experiments: (i) Run the example without `synchronized` on any of the methods; (ii) with only `decrement` being synchronized; (iii) with only `increment` being synchronized; and (iv) with both being synchronized. List some of the final values you get in each case. Explain how they could arise.

**Exercise 1.2** Consider this class, whose `print` method prints a dash “-”, waits for 50 milliseconds, and then prints a vertical bar “|”:

```
class Printer {
    public void print() {
        System.out.print("-");
        try { Thread.sleep(50); } catch (InterruptedException exn) { }
        System.out.print("|");
    }
}
```

1. Write a program that creates a Printer object `p`, and then creates and starts two threads. Each thread must call `p.print()` forever. You will observe that most of the time the dash and bar symbols alternate neatly as in `-|-|-|-|-|-|-|-`.

But occasionally two bars are printed in a row, or two dashes are printed in a row, creating small “weaving faults” like those shown below:



3. Now remove the `synchronized` modifier from the `get` methods. Does thread `t` terminate as expected now? If it does, is that something one should rely on? Why is `synchronized` needed on **both** methods for the reliable communication between the threads?
4. Remove both `synchronized` declarations and instead declare field `value` to be `volatile`. Does thread `t` terminate as expected now? Why should it be sufficient to use `volatile` and not `synchronized` in class `MutableInteger`?

**Exercise 1.4** Consider the small artificial program in file `TestLocking0.java`. In class `Mystery`, the single mutable field `sum` is private, and all methods are synchronized, so superficially the class seems to be thread-safe.

1. Compile the program and run it several times. Show the results you get. Do they indicate that class `Mystery` is thread-safe or not?
2. Explain why class `Mystery` is not thread-safe. Hint: Consider (a) what it means for an instance method to be synchronized, and (b) what it means for a static method to be synchronized.
3. Explain how you could make the class thread-safe, *without* changing its sequential behavior. That is, you should not make any static field into an instance field (or vice versa), and you should not make any static method into an instance method (or vice versa). Make the class thread-safe, and rerun the program to see whether it works.

**Exercise 1.5** Consider class `DoubleArrayList` in `TestLocking1.java`. It implements an array list of numbers, and like Java's `ArrayList` it dynamically resizes the underlying array when it has become full.

1. Explain the simplest natural way to make class `DoubleArrayList` thread-safe so it can be used from multiple concurrent threads.
2. Discuss how well the thread-safe version of the class is likely scale if a large number of threads call `get`, `add` and `set` concurrently.
3. Now your notorious colleague Ulrik Funder suggests to improve the code by introducing a separate lock for each method, roughly as follows:

```
private final Object sizeLock = new Object(), getLock = new Object(),
    addLock = new Object(), setLock = new Object(), toStringLock = ...;
public boolean add(double x) {
    synchronized (addLock) {
        if (size == items.length) {
            ...
        }
        items[size] = x;
        size++;
        return true;
    }
}
public double set(int i, double x) {
    synchronized (setLock) {
        if (0 <= i && i < size) {
            double old = items[i];
            items[i] = x;
            return old;
        } else
            throw new IndexOutOfBoundsException(String.valueOf(i));
    }
}
```

Would this achieve thread-safety? Explain why not. Would it achieve visibility? Explain why not.

**Exercise 1.6** Consider the extended class `DoubleArrayList` in `TestLocking2.java`. Like the class in the previous exercise it implements an array list of numbers, but now also has a static field `totalSize` that maintains a count of all the items ever added to any `DoubleArrayList` instance.

It also has a static field `allLists` that contains a hashset of all the `DoubleArrayList` instances created. There are corresponding changes in the `add` method and the constructor.

1. Explain how one can make the class thread-safe enough so that the `totalSize` field is maintained correctly even if multiple concurrent threads work on multiple `DoubleArrayList` instances at the same time. You may ignore the `allLists` field for now.
2. Explain how one can make the class thread-safe enough so that the `allLists` field is maintained correctly even if multiple concurrent threads create new `DoubleArrayList` instances at the same time.

**Exercise 1.7** Consider the small artificial program in file `TestLocking3.java`. Since the single field and the three methods in classes `MysteryA` and `MysteryB` are all static, there is no confusion of locks on class and instance, so superficially the classes seem to be thread-safe.

```
class MysteryA {
    protected static long count = 0;
    public static synchronized void increment() {
        count++;
    }
    public static synchronized long get() {
        return count;
    }
}

class MysteryB extends MysteryA {
    public static synchronized void increment4() {
        count += 4;
    }
}
```

1. Explain why after 10 million calls to `MysteryB.increment()` and 10 million concurrent calls to `MysteryB.increment4()`, the resulting value of `count` is rarely the expected 50,000,000.  
Hint: Consider the actual meaning of the `synchronized` modifier when used on a static method.
2. Explain how one can use an explicit lock object and `synchronized` statements (not `synchronized` methods) to change the locking scheme, so that the result is always the expected 50,000,000.