

# COMP 322: Fundamentals of Parallel Programming

## Lecture 27: Java Locks

Mack Joyner  
mjoyner@rice.edu

<http://comp322.rice.edu>



# Worksheet #25 Solution: Bounded Buffer

Consider the case when multiple threads call `insert()` and `remove()` methods concurrently for a single `BoundedBuffer` instance with `SIZE >= 1`.

**NOTE:** the `BoundedBuffer` instance is the object used by the synchronized statements, not the objects being inserted/removed.

1) Can you provide an example in which the wait set includes a thread waiting at line 2 in `insert()` and a thread waiting at line 11 in `remove()`, in slide 8? If not, why not?

Yes, if notified threads in the wait set don't have higher priority over threads in the entry set

2) How would the code behave if all wait/notify calls (lines 2, 6, 11, 15) were removed from the `insert()` and `remove()` methods in slide 8?

`insert()` may overwrite existing elements when buffer is supposed to be full

`remove()` may return undefined values when buffer is supposed to be empty



# Locks

- Use of monitor synchronization is just fine for most applications, but it has some shortcomings
  - Single wait-set per lock
  - No way to interrupt or time-out when waiting for a lock
  - Locking must be block-structured
    - Inconvenient to acquire a variable number of locks at once
    - Advanced techniques, such as hand-over-hand locking, are not possible
- Lock objects address these limitations
  - But harder to use: Need **finally** block to ensure release
  - So if you don't need them, stick with **synchronized**

Example of hand-over-hand locking:

- L1.lock() ... L2.lock() ... L1.unlock() ... L3.lock() ... L2.unlock() ....



# java.util.concurrent.locks.Lock interface

```
1. interface Lock {  
2.     // key methods  
3.     void lock(); // acquire lock  
4.     void unlock(); // release lock  
5.     boolean tryLock(); // Either acquire lock (returns true), or return false if lock is not obtained.  
6.         // A call to tryLock() never blocks!  
7.  
8.     Condition newCondition(); // associate a new condition  
9. }
```

java.util.concurrent.locks.Lock interface is implemented by java.util.concurrent.locks.ReentrantLock class



# Simple ReentrantLock() example

- Used extensively within `java.util.concurrent`

```
final Lock lock = new ReentrantLock();  
...  
lock.lock();  
try {  
    // perform operations protected by lock  
}  
catch(Exception ex) {  
    // restore invariants & rethrow  
}  
finally {  
    lock.unlock();  
}
```

- **Must manually ensure lock is released**

**==> Importance of including call to `unlock()` in finally clause!**



# java.util.concurrent.locks.condition interface

- Can be allocated by calling `ReentrantLock.newCondition()`
- Supports multiple condition variables per lock
- Methods supported by an instance of condition
  - `void await()` // NOTE: like `wait()` in synchronized statement
    - Causes current thread to wait until it is signaled or interrupted
    - Variants available with support for interruption and timeout
  - `void signal()` // NOTE: like `notify()` in synchronized statement
    - Wakes up one thread waiting on this condition
  - `void signalAll()` // NOTE: like `notifyAll()` in synchronized statement
    - Wakes up all threads waiting on this condition
- For additional details see
  - <http://download.oracle.com/javase/1.5.0/docs/api/java/util/concurrent/locks/Condition.html>



# BoundedBuffer Example using Two Conditions: notFull and notEmpty

```
1. class BoundedBuffer {  
2.   final Lock lock = new ReentrantLock();  
3.   final Condition notFull = lock.newCondition();  
4.   final Condition notEmpty = lock.newCondition();  
5.  
6.   final Object[] items = new Object[100];  
7.   int putptr, takeptr, count;  
8.  
9.   ...
```



# BoundedBuffer Example using Two Conditions: notFull and notEmpty (contd)

```
1. public void put(Object x) throws InterruptedException
2. {
3.     lock.lock();
4.     try {
5.         while (count == items.length) notFull.await();
6.         items[putptr] = x;
7.         if (++putptr == items.length) putptr = 0;
8.         ++count;
9.         notEmpty.signal();
10.    } finally {
11.        lock.unlock();
12.    }
13. }
```



# BoundedBuffer Example using Two Conditions: notFull and notEmpty (contd)

```
1. public Object take() throws InterruptedException
2. {
3.     lock.lock();
4.     try {
5.         while (count == 0) notEmpty.await();
6.         Object x = items[takeptr];
7.         if (++takeptr == items.length) takeptr = 0;
8.         --count;
9.         notFull.signal();
10.        return x;
11.    } finally {
12.        lock.unlock();
13.    }
14. }
```



# Reading vs Writing

- Recall that the use of synchronization is to protect interfering accesses
  - Concurrent reads of same memory: Not a problem
  - Concurrent writes of same memory: Problem
  - Concurrent read & write of same memory: Problem

So far:

- If concurrent write/write or read/write might occur, use synchronization to ensure one-thread-at-a-time

But:

- This is unnecessarily conservative: we could still allow multiple simultaneous readers (as in object-based isolation)

Consider a hashtable with one coarse-grained lock

- Only one thread can perform operations at a time

But suppose:

- There are many simultaneous `lookup` operations and `insert` operations are rare



# java.util.concurrent.locks.ReadWriteLock interface

```
interface ReadWriteLock {  
    Lock readLock();  
    Lock writeLock();  
}
```

- Even though the interface appears to just define a pair of locks, the semantics of the pair of locks is coupled as follows
  - Case 1: a thread has successfully acquired `writeLock().lock()`
    - No other thread can acquire `readLock()` or `writeLock()`
  - Case 2: no thread has acquired `writeLock().lock()`
    - Multiple threads can acquire `readLock()`
    - No other thread can acquire `writeLock()`
- `java.util.concurrent.locks.ReadWriteLock` interface is implemented by `java.util.concurrent.locks.ReadWriteReentrantLock` class



# Hashtable Example

```
class Hashtable<K,V> {
    ...
    // coarse-grained, one lock for table
    ReadWriteLock lk = new ReentrantReadWriteLock();
    V lookup(K key) {
        int bucket = hasher(key);
        lk.readLock().lock(); // only blocks writers
        ... read array[bucket] ...
        lk.readLock().unlock();
    }
    void insert(K key, V val) {
        int bucket = hasher(key);
        lk.writeLock().lock(); // blocks readers and writers
        ... write array[bucket] ...
        lk.writeLock().unlock();
    }
}
```



# Announcements & Reminders

---

- The entire written + programming (Checkpoint #3) is due by Friday, April 3rd at 11:59pm
- Quiz for Unit 6 is available, due Monday, April 6th at 11:59pm



# Worksheet #27: Use of trylock()

Rewrite the transferFunds() method below to use j.u.c. locks with calls to tryLock (see slide 4) instead of synchronized.

Your goal is to write a correct implementation that never deadlocks, unlike the buggy version below (which can deadlock).

Assume that each Account object already contains a reference to a ReentrantLock object dedicated to that object e.g., from.lock() returns the lock for the from object. Sketch your answer using pseudocode.

```
1. public void transferFunds (Account from, Account to, int amount) {
2.     synchronized (from) {
3.         synchronized (to) {
4.             from.subtractFromBalance (amount) ;
5.             to.addToBalance (amount) ;
6.         }
7.     }
8. }
```

