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Concurrency without Explicit Threads

- You can write concurrent applications that don’t use explicit threads or synchronization
- Use built-in abstractions that support coordination and parallel execution
Key Concepts

- thread-safe collections
- concurrent collections
- blocking queues
- synchronizers
- thread locals
- executors
Thread Safe Collections

- Standard collections or other abstractions that are intended to be thread safe
- Generally limited to one thread operating on them at a time (watch out for sequences that need to be atomic)
- Can use Collections wrapped methods
Concurrent Collections

- Designed to allow multiple simultaneous accesses and updates
  - Blocking only when they “conflict”
- Higher space overhead
  - Not much time overhead
- Many of the concurrent collections do not allow null keys or values
Concurrent HashMap

- Allows simultaneous reads, and by default up to 16 simultaneous writers
  - Can increase the number of simultaneous writers
- Use Collections.newSetFromMap to construct concurrent set
Special Methods

V putIfAbsent(K key, V value)
- Store the value only if the key has no mapping
- Return old value (null if none)

boolean remove(K key, V oldValue)
- Remove mapping only if it has the specified value

boolean replace(K key, V oldValue, V newValue)
- Update the mapping only if it has the specified value
**ConcurrentSkipLists**

- Skip Lists are a probabilistic alternative to balanced trees
- Invented in 1988 by Prof. Bill Pugh
- ConcurrentSkipLists provide a concurrent sorted set implementation and lots of other API improvements over TreeMaps
- Java 6 only
CopyOnWriteArrayList

- Using locking to ensure only one thread can update it at a time
- Any update copies the backing array thus, read only operations don’t need any locks
- Iteration uses a snapshot of the array
  - Allows concurrent modification and update
- Suitable only if updates rare
Important Use Case

- Keeping track of listeners to an Observable
- While iterating through list of listeners, one of them might ask to be unsubscribed
- A “concurrent update”, even though we only have one thread
Waiting for Something to Happen

- We briefly talk about join (waits for another thread to terminate)

- There are lots of ways to have a thread wait until things are right for it to do something
  - wait/notify were the way to do this before Java 5
  - But now we have new ways that are often better: blocking queues and synchronizers
A Queue is a first-in, first-out queue

A dequeue is a Double-Ended Queue

- Allows addition and removal at both ends
- A dequeue can also serve as a stack
What Happens When It Can’t Immediately Succeed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>throws exception</th>
<th>returns special value</th>
<th>blocks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>insert</td>
<td>add(e)</td>
<td>offer(e)</td>
<td>put(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remove</td>
<td>remove()</td>
<td>poll()</td>
<td>take()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>examine</td>
<td>element</td>
<td>peek()</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Queue Notes

Blocking queues also offer timed offer and poll methods

Several different implementations, each with its own advantages

- ConcurrentLinkedQueue
  - Doesn’t support blocking, but allows for simultaneous addition/deletion

- Array/Linked Blocking Dequeue/Queue
Synchronizers

- Other ways to wait for some condition to be true
- CountDownLatch
- Semaphore
CountDownLatch

- A variable that can be decremented
  - Never incremented
- You can wait for it to get to zero
- You can also find out the current value
  - Most of the time, you won’t need to find out the current value
Semaphore

- Contains a count of the number of permits available

- You can acquire or release permits
  - No checking that you are releasing permits you have
  - Really, just a counter

- Acquire blocks if not enough permits are available
Consider a Blocking queue where you atomically remove multiple elements. What happens if one person wants to atomically remove 10 elements from a queue that can contain up to 20 elements? But there is a constant stream of other threads that want to remove smaller number of elements? 

**Starvation!**
Some Abstractions Have Fair Variants

- For example, fair semaphores and fair reentrant locks
- Generally, fair guarantees first-come, first-served
- But fair almost always reduces throughput
  - Over and above implementation cost
  - Letting running threads run improves throughput
java.util.concurrent.atomic

From Java API:

A small toolkit of classes that support lock-free thread-safe programming on single variables.

http://java.sun.com/javase/6/docs/api/
AtomicInteger

- Encapsulates an integer
- Sort of like a volatile int
- But supports additional atomic operations:
  - int getAndIncrement()
  - int decrementAndGet()
  - boolean compareAndSet(int expect, int update)
Atomic Operations

- The atomic operations are very efficient
- Most processors provide some kind of atomic compare and swap instruction
  - Needed to efficiently implement locking
Lots of Atomic Classes

There is an AtomicX class for every primitive type, and for references.

There are also classes that let you atomically update volatile fields, and ones that encapsulate arrays and allow you to perform atomic operations on array elements.
Executor

- An object that executes submitted Runnable tasks

- Rather than starting a thread for each task
  
  ```java
  new Thread(new(RunnableTask())).start()
  ```

- You ask an executor to do it
  
  ```java
  Executor executor = anExecutor;
  executor.execute(new RunnableTask1());
  executor.execute(new RunnableTask2());
  ```
Executors Can Be Simple

- The execute method might just run the task
- Or create and start thread
- Or do something more complicated
java.util.concurrent.Executors

- Provides many factory and utility methods for executors
- newFixedThreadPool(int nThreads)
- newCachedThreadPool()  
  - creates threads as needed, reuses them
Why Thread Pools?

- Some overhead to starting a thread
- Running 100,000 threads is a bad idea
  - Unless you have a monster machine