

---

Subject: Re: Use same variable in different threads  
Posted by [koldo](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2011 00:12:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hello Didier

Trying to use the code like this I get a "error C2955: 'ScopedLock' : use of class template requires template argument list". What am I doing wrong?

Why ScopedLock has to be templated?

Didier wrote on Mon, 13 December 2010 22:48Hi Koldo,

I would add just one last thing:  
DEADLOCKS ==> what MT programs dread the most.

In practice, there is a case in C++ where deadlocks can appear without notice : when an exception occurs.

Imagine an exception occurs in the middle of you're "slow operation" ==> the mutex doesn't get released ==> a deadlock will come up soon enough

To avoid this I use, what I call a ScopedLock class:

```
template<class MUTEX>
class ScopedLock
{
private:
    MUTEX& mutex;

private:
    // The following constructor/operators are explicitly FORBIDDEN
    // because they have no meaning
    ScopedLock(void) {};
    ScopedLock(const ScopedLock& ) {};
    ScopedLock& operator=(ScopedLock& ) { return *this; };

public:
    inline ScopedLock(MUTEX& mut)
    : mutex(mut)
    {
        mutex.lock();
    }

    inline ~ScopedLock(void)
    {
        mutex.unlock();
    }
}
```

```
}  
};
```

The point is to create a 'ScopedLock' object when entering a protected zone of code, and when the scope ends ==> the unlock is automatically done IN ALL POSSIBLE CASES !! even exceptions: The compiler handles all for you

so your code would become:

```
void ThreadFunction(){  
    for(int i = 0; i < 10; i++){  
        Thread::Sleep(Random(10)); // Pretend some work...  
        {  
            ScopedLock(data.m); // Enter the section that accesses the shared data  
            data.a = i;  
            data.c << data.a << "\n";  
            Thread::Sleep(20); // Let's pretend that some slow operation happens here (for example file  
access)  
            data.b = data.a;  
        } // implicit release  
    }  
}
```

You don't have any more "mutex leaks" possible

---