Proof of mutual-exclusion and nonstarvation of a program with weak memory model: PostgreSQL

Patrick Cousot (NYU, Emer. ENS, PSL) (joint work with Jade Alglave)

International joint research project ``Analysis and verification of of dependable cyber physical software'' National Natural Science Foundation of China Changsha, December 9, 2016

### PostgreSQL

```
\{0: latch0 = 0; flag0 = 0; latch1 = 1; flag1 = 1; \}
1: do
                                           21:do
                                               do
2:
     do
                                           22:
                                           23: r[] Rl1 latch1
24: while (Rl1=0)
3:
       r[] Rl0 latch0
4: while (R10=0)
                                          25: w[] latch1 0
26: r[] Rf1 flag1
27: if (Rf1\neq0) then
5: w[] latch0 0
6:
   r[] RfO flagO
7: if (Rf0 \neq 0) then
                                           28: (* critical section *)
8: (* critical section *)
                                                 w[] flag1 0
      w[] flag0 0
                                           29: w[] flag0 1
9: w[] flag1 1
                                           30: w[] latch0 1
10: w[] latch1 1
                                           31: fi
11: fi
                                           32:while true
12:while true
13:
                                           33:
```













# Conditional invariance proof: Mutual exclusion





1

= 1

= 1

 $y_{11}$ 

1=1

1

1 1<sub>1</sub>=1

© P. Cousot

### PostgreSQL

```
{0: latch0 = 0; flag0 = 0; latch1 = 1; flag1 = 1; }
1: do \{i\}
   do \{j_i\}
2:
       r[] Rl0 latch0 {\rightsquigarrow L0^i_{j_i}}
3:
   while (R10=0) \{k_i\}
4:
5: w[] latch0 0
  r[] RfO flagO {\rightsquigarrow F0^i}
6:
7: if (Rf0 \neq 0) then
8: (* critical section *)
      w[] flag0 0
9: w[] flag1 1
10:
    w[] latch1 1
11:
    fi
12:while true
13:
                                             33:
```

```
 \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} 21:do \ \{\ell\} \\ 22: & do \ \{m_{\ell}\} \\ 23: & r[] \ \texttt{Rl1 latch1} \ \{ \rightsquigarrow \ L1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell} \} \\ 24: & \texttt{while (Rl1=0)} \ \{n_{\ell}\} \\ 25: & \texttt{w[] latch1 0} \end{array} 
 \begin{vmatrix} 26: & r[] & Rf1 & flag1 & \{ \rightsquigarrow F1^{\ell} \\ 27: & if & (Rf1 \neq 0) & then \end{vmatrix} 
 28: (* critical section *)

w[] flag1 0

29: w[] flag0 1

30: w[] latch0 1

21. fi
         31: fi
         31: fi
32:while true
```

### Stamps

```
{0: latch0 = 0; flag0 = 0; latch1 = 1; flag1 = 1; }
1: do \{i\}
  do \{j_i\}
2:
       r[] Rl0 latch0 {\rightsquigarrow L0^i_{j_i}}
3:
  while (R10=0) \{k_i\}
4:
5: w[] latch0 0
6: r[] RfO flag0 {\rightsquigarrow F0^i}
7: if (Rf0 \neq 0) then
8: (* critical section *)
     w[] flag0 0
9: w[] flag1 1
10:
   w[] latch1 1
11: fi
12:while true
13:
```

```
 \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} & 21: \text{do } \{\ell\} \\ & 22: & \text{do } \{m_{\ell}\} \\ & 23: & \text{r[] Rl1 latch1 } \{ \rightsquigarrow L1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell} \} \end{array} 
  24: while (Rl1=0) \{n_{\ell}\}
25: w[] latch1 0
 \left\| \begin{array}{ccc} 26: & r[] \ \text{Rf1 flag1} \left\{ \rightsquigarrow F1^{\ell} \right\} \\ 27: & \text{if (Rf1 \neq 0) then} \end{array} \right. 
  28: (* critical section *)
 w[] flag1 0
29: w[] flag0 1
30: w[] latch0 1
31: fi
32:while true
        33:
```

#### Ensure that events are unique (your choice)

### Variables in Hoare logic & L/O-G

- program variables: int x;
- in predicates you need to name the value of variable x to express properties of this value of x:
  - value of(x)
  - *x*
- WCM: no notion of "the" value of a shared variable x
- The only way to know something about "the" value of a shared variable x is to read it
- Pythia variable: name given to the read value
- Not necessary in the semantics, only in assertions (but we put them in the semantics)

#### Pythia variables

```
{0: latch0 = 0; flag0 = 0; latch1 = 1; flag1 = 1; }
1: do \{i\}
    do \{j_i\}
2:
       r[] Rl0 latch0 {\rightsquigarrow L0^i_{j_i}}
3:
   while (RlO=0) \{k_i\}
4:
5: w[] latch0 0
   r[] RfO flagO \{ \rightsquigarrow FO^i \}
6:
7: if (Rf0 \neq 0) then
8: (* critical section *)
       w[] flag0 0
9: w[] flag1 1
10:
    w[] latch1 1
11:
     fi
12:while true
13:
```

```
 \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} & 21: \text{do } \{\ell\} \\ & 22: & \text{do } \{m_{\ell}\} \\ & 23: & r[] \text{ Rl1 latch1 } \{ \rightsquigarrow L1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell} \} \end{array} 
   24: while (Rl1=0) \{n_\ell\}
25: w[] latch1 0
 \begin{vmatrix} 26: & r[] & Rf1 & flag1 & \{ \rightsquigarrow F1^{\ell} \\ 27: & if & (Rf1 \neq 0) & then \end{vmatrix} 
                      (* critical section *)
    28:
   w[] flag1 0
29: w[] flag0 1
30: w[] latch0 1
      31: fi
      32:while true
      33:
```

# Invariant specification $S_{inv}$



 $\pi_5$ 

= 1

= 1

 $y_{11}$ 

1 = 1

1=1

1

#### Mutual exclusion

```
{0: latch0 = 0; flag0 = 0; latch1 = 1; flag1 = 1; }
1: do \{i\}
2: do \{j_i\}
       r[] RlO latchO {\rightsquigarrow L0^i_{j_i}}
hile (RlO=O) {k_i}
3:
   while (R10=0) \{k_i\}
4:
   w[] latch0 0
5:
   r[] RfO flagO {\rightsquigarrow F0^i}
6:
7: if (Rf0 \neq 0) then
8: \neg at \{28\}
        (* critical section *)
       w[] flag0 0
9: w[] flag1 1
10:
    w[] latch1 1
11: fi
12:while true
13:
```

```
29: w[] flag0 1
30: w[] latch0 1
31: fi
32:while true
  33:
```

#### (invariant Sinv is elsewhere true)

# Analytic semantics = Anarchic semantics + communication constraints

Proof of mutual exclusion and non-starvation of a program: PostgreSQL Chansha, China, 9 December 2016

#### Analytics semantics with cuts

- 0:{ x = 0; y = 0; } PO || P1 ; 1:r[] r1 x || 11:r[] r2 y; 2:w[] y 1 || 12:w[] x 1 ; 3: || 13: ;
- Anarchic semantics: set of executions:
  - $\pi = \varsigma \times \pi \times \mathbf{rf}$ 
    - $\varsigma$  is the *computation*
    - $\pi$  is the *cut sequence*
    - rf is the *communication*
- Communication semantics: restrictions on rf in cat



#### 



 $\pi_5$ 

= 1

= 1

 $y_{11}$ 

1=1

1=1

1

#### Dessespanceases are also

væræðbles at all. nhtariance proof of weakly consistent parallel pr n-1 $\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{T}_{p}^{i} \mathbf{t}_{p} \neq \mathbf{T}_{p}^{i} \neq \mathbf{T}_{p}^{i} \neq \mathbf{T}_{p}^{i} \neq \mathbf{T}_{p}^{i} \neq \mathbf{T}_{p}^{i} \in \mathcal{A} \end{array}$ 

 $\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{H} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{H} \\ \mathbf$  $\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{f}_{i} \mathbf{f}$ 

 $\mathfrak{s}\langle\kappa,\, heta,\,
ho,\,
u
angle\in au\,\triangleq\,\exists au_1,\epsilon,$ 

**óses**ossible to

zi alli, Zgjopentie Party LISA P

#### Communication relation rf

- rf: relation between write and read events
- Each rf is encoded by  $\Gamma$ , a set of pairs



•  $\Gamma \in \Gamma$  (the set of all possible communications rf)

## Anarchic communications

Proof of mutual exclusion and non-starvation of a program: PostgreSQL Chansha, China, 9 December 2016

#### Anarchic communications

Any read can read from any write on the same shared variable (location)

 $\mathsf{RL0}_{j_i}^i \triangleq \{ \mathfrak{rf} \langle L0_{j_i}^i, \langle 0:, -, 0 \rangle \rangle, \mathfrak{rf} \langle L0_{j_i}^i, \langle 5:, i_5, 0 \rangle \rangle, \mathfrak{rf} \langle L0_{j_i}^i, \langle 30:, \ell_{30}, 1 \rangle \rangle \mid i_5 \in \mathbb{N} \land \ell_{30} \in \mathbb{N} \}$ 

```
\{0: \text{latch0} = 0; \text{flag0} = 0; \text{latch1} = 1; \text{flag1} = 1; \}
1: do \{i\}
                                                   21:do \{\ell\}
                                                   22: do \{m_\ell\}
      do \{j_i\}
2:
        r[] Rl0 latch0 {\rightsquigarrow L0^i_{i_i}}
                                                   23: r[] Rl1 latch1 {\rightsquigarrow L1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell}}
3:
                                                   24: while (Rl1=0) \{n_{\ell}\}
    while (R10=0) \{k_i\}
4:
5:
    w[] latch0 0 ┥
                                                   25: w[] latch1 0
    r[] RfO flag0 {\rightsquigarrow F0^i}
                                                   26: r[] Rf1 flag1 {\rightsquigarrow F1^{\ell}}
6:
    if (Rf0 \neq 0) then
                                                   27: if (Rf1\neq0) then
7:
                                                            (* critical section *)
8:
    (* critical section *)
                                                   28:
        w[] flag0 0
                                                            w[] flag1 0
                                                           w[] flag0 1
9:
        w[] flag1 1
                                                   29:
                                                            w[] latch0 1
        w[] latch1 1
                                                   30:
10:
                                                   31:
11: fi
                                                         fi
                                                   32:while true
12:while true
                                                   33:
13:
```

#### Anarchic communications

 Possible communications for each read at each stamp (point in the execution):

$$\begin{split} & \operatorname{RL0}_{j_i}^i \triangleq \{ \mathfrak{rf} \langle L0_{j_i}^i, \langle 0:, .., 0 \rangle \rangle, \mathfrak{rf} \langle L0_{j_i}^i, \langle 5:, i_5, 0 \rangle \rangle, \mathfrak{rf} \langle L0_{j_i}^i, \langle 30:, \ell_{30}, 1 \rangle \rangle \mid i_5 \in \mathbb{N} \land \ell_{30} \in \mathbb{N} \} \\ & \operatorname{RF0}^i \triangleq \{ \mathfrak{rf} \langle F0^i, \langle 0:, .., 0 \rangle \rangle, \mathfrak{rf} \langle F0^i, \langle 8:, i_8, 0 \rangle \rangle, \mathfrak{rf} \langle F0^i, \langle 29:, \ell_{29}, 1 \rangle \rangle \mid i_8 \in \mathbb{N} \land \ell_{29} \in \mathbb{N} \} \\ & \operatorname{RL1}_{m_\ell}^\ell \triangleq \{ \mathfrak{rf} \langle L1_{m_\ell}^\ell, \langle 0:, .., 1 \rangle \rangle, \mathfrak{rf} \langle L1_{m_\ell}^\ell, \langle 25:, \ell_{25}, 0 \rangle \rangle, \mathfrak{rf} \langle L1_{m_\ell}^\ell, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \rangle \mid \ell_{25} \in \mathbb{N} \land i_{10} \in \mathbb{N} \} \\ & \operatorname{RF1}^\ell \triangleq \{ \mathfrak{rf} \langle F1^\ell, \langle 0:, .., 1 \rangle \rangle, \mathfrak{rf} \langle F1^\ell, \langle 28:, \ell_{28}, 0 \rangle \rangle, \mathfrak{rf} \langle F1^\ell, \langle 9:, i_9, 1 \rangle \rangle \mid \ell_{28} \in \mathbb{N} \land i_9 \in \mathbb{N} \} \end{split}$$

#### • Anarchic communications:

- $\overline{\Gamma} = \{ \{ \mathrm{rl0}_{j_i}^i, \mathrm{rf0}^i, \mathrm{rl1}_{m_\ell}^\ell, \mathrm{rf1}^\ell \mid i \in \mathbb{N} \land j_i \in [0, k_i] \land \ell \in \mathbb{N} \land j \in [0, n_\ell] \} \mid \forall i \in \mathbb{N} . \forall j_i \in [1, k_i] . \\ \mathrm{rl0}_{j_i}^i \in \mathrm{RL0}_{j_i}^i \land \mathrm{rf0}^i \in \mathrm{RF0}^i \land \forall \ell \in \mathbb{N} . \forall m_\ell \in [1, m_\ell] . \\ \mathrm{rl1}_{m_\ell}^\ell \in \mathrm{RL1}_{m_\ell}^\ell \land \mathrm{rf1}^\ell \in \mathrm{RF1}^\ell \}$
- Anarchic semantics:  $\Gamma \in \overline{\Gamma}$
- WCM semantics:  $\Gamma \in \Gamma, \Gamma \subseteq \overline{\Gamma}$

#### 



 $\pi_5$ 

= 1

= 1

 $y_{11}$ 

1 = 1

1=1

1

- $S_{ind}$  is inductive under hypothesis  $S_{com}$  iff, assuming  $S_{com}$ , we have:
  - $S_{ind}$  is true at the beginning of an execution
  - If  $S_{ind}$  is true during execution is remains true after one more computation or communication step

$$S_{inv}$$
 holds under hypothesis  $S_{com}$   
 $S_{ind} \Rightarrow S_{inv}$ 

$$S_{com} \Rightarrow S_{inv}$$

```
{0: latch0 = 0; flag0 = 0; latch1 = 1; flag1 = 1; }
1: \{\Gamma \in \Gamma\}
                                                                                                                 21: \{ \Gamma \in \Gamma \}
                                                                                                                do \{\ell\}
22: \{\Gamma \in \Gamma\}
      do \{i\}
2: \{\Gamma \in \Gamma\}
          do \{j_i\}
                                                                                                                           do \{m_\ell\}
                                                                                                                23: \{\Gamma \in \Gamma\}
         \{\Gamma \in \Gamma\}
3:
                                                                                                                  r[] Rl1 latch1 {\rightsquigarrow L1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell}}
              r[] Rl0 latch0 {\rightsquigarrow L0_{i_i}^i}
                                                                                                                24: \{\Gamma \in \Gamma \land \mathtt{Rl1} = L1^{\ell}_{m_{\ell}} \land (\mathtt{rORl1}^{\ell}_{m_{\ell}}[\Gamma] \lor \mathtt{r1Rl1}^{\ell}_{m_{\ell}}[\Gamma])\}
             \{\Gamma \in \Gamma \land \mathtt{Rl0} = L0^i_{j_i} \land (\mathtt{r0Rl0}^i_{j_i}[\Gamma] \lor \mathtt{r1Rl0}^i_{j_i}[\Gamma])\}
4:
          while (R10=0) \{k_i\}
                                                                                                                           while (Rl1=0) \{n_\ell\}
        \{\Gamma \in \Gamma \land r1 \operatorname{Rl0}_{k_i}^i[\Gamma]\}
                                                                                                                 25: {\Gamma \in \Gamma \wedge r1Rl1_{n_\ell}^{\ell}[\Gamma]}
5:
          w[] latch0 0
                                                                                                                            w[] latch1 0
       \{\Gamma \in \Gamma \land r1Rl0^i_{k_i}[\Gamma]\}
                                                                                                                 26: {\Gamma \in \Gamma \land r1Rl1_{n_\ell}^{\ell}[\Gamma]}
6:
          r[] RfO flag0 {\rightsquigarrow F0^i}
                                                                                                                           r[] Rf1 flag1 {\rightsquigarrow F1^{\ell}}
                                                                                                                  \mathbf{27:} \quad \{ \Gamma \in \Gamma \wedge \mathbf{r1Rl1}_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma] \wedge \mathtt{Rf1} = F1^{\ell} 
          \{\Gamma \in \Gamma \wedge r1 \operatorname{Rl0}_{k_i}^i[\Gamma] \wedge \operatorname{Rf0} = F0^i
7:
                                                                                                                                                                          \wedge (r0Rf1<sup>\ell</sup>[\Gamma] \vee r1Rf1<sup>\ell</sup>[\Gamma])
                                                         \wedge (r0Rf0<sup>i</sup>[\Gamma] \vee r1Rf0<sup>i</sup>[\Gamma])}
           if (Rf0\neq0) then
                                                                                                                            if (Rf1 \neq 0) then
                                                                                                                 28: \{\Gamma \in \Gamma \land r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma] \land r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma]\}
            \{\Gamma \in \Gamma \land r1 Rl0^i_{k_i}[\Gamma] \land r1 Rf0^i[\Gamma]\}
8:
                                                                                                                                (* critical section *)
               (* critical section *)
                                                                                                                                w[] flag1 0
               w[] flag0 0
           \{\Gamma \in \Gamma \land \mathbf{r}1\mathsf{Rl0}_{k_i}^i[\Gamma] \land \mathbf{r}1\mathsf{Rf0}^i[\Gamma]\}
                                                                                                                 29: \{\Gamma \in \Gamma \land r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma] \land r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma]\}
9:
               w[] flag1 1
                                                                                                                               w[] flag0 1
             \{\Gamma \in \Gamma \land r1 Rl0^{i}_{ki}[\Gamma] \land r1 Rf0^{i}[\Gamma]\}
                                                                                                                 30: \{\Gamma \in \Gamma \land r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma] \land r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma]\}
10:
                                                                                                                                w[] latch0 1
               w[] latch1 1
                                                                                                                               \{\Gamma \in \Gamma \land r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma] \land r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma]\}
              \{\Gamma \in \Gamma \land r1Rl0^i_{k_i}[\Gamma] \land r1Rf0^i[\Gamma]\}
                                                                                                                 31:
11:
           fi
                                                                                                                            fi
12: \{\Gamma \in \Gamma\}
                                                                                                                 32: \{\Gamma \in \Gamma\}
      while true
                                                                                                                        while true
13:\{false\}
                                                                                                                 33:\{false\}
```





{0: latch0 = 0; flag0 = 0; latch1 = 1; flag1 = 1;	}	
1: $\{\Gamma \in \Gamma\}$	$\parallel$ 21: { $\Gamma \in \Gamma$ }	
do $\{i\}$	do $\{\ell\}$	
2: $\{\Gamma \in \Gamma\}$	$22: \{\Gamma \in \Gamma\}$	
do $\{j_i\}$	do $\{m_\ell\}$	
$3: \qquad \{\Gamma \in \Gamma\} \qquad \blacklozenge$	$23: \{\Gamma \in \Gamma\}$	
<code>r[] RlO latchO <math>\{ \leadsto \ LO^i_{j_i} \}</math></code>	r[] Rl1 latch1 { $\rightsquigarrow L1^{\ell}_{m_{\ell}}$ }	
4: $\{\Gamma \in \Gamma \land \mathtt{Rl0} = L0^i_{j_i} \land (\mathrm{r0Rl0}^i_{j_i}[\Gamma] \lor \mathtt{r1Rl0}^i_{j_i}[\Gamma])\}$	<b>24:</b> $\{\Gamma \in \Gamma \land Rl1 = L1^{\ell}_{m_{\ell}} \land (rORl1^{\ell}_{m_{\ell}}[\Gamma] \lor r1Rl1^{\ell}_{m_{\ell}}[\Gamma])\}$	
while (R10=0) $\{k_i\}$	while (Rl1=0) $\{n_\ell\}$	
5: $\{\Gamma \in \Gamma \wedge r1 \operatorname{Rl0}_{k_i}^i[\Gamma]\}$	<b>25:</b> $\{\Gamma \in \Gamma \wedge r1 \operatorname{Rl1}_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma]\}$	
w[] latch0 0	w[] latch1 0	

Possible values of Pythia variables depending on communications  $r0Rl0_{j_i}^i[\Gamma] \triangleq (rf\langle L0_{j_i}^i, \langle 0:, ..., 0 \rangle) \in \Gamma \land L0_{j_i}^i = 0) \lor (\exists i_5 \in \mathbb{N} . rf\langle L0_{j_i}^i, \langle 5:, i_5, 0 \rangle) \in \Gamma \land L0_{j_i}^i = 0)$  $r1Rl0_{j_i}^i[\Gamma] \triangleq (\exists \ell_{30} \in \mathbb{N} . rf\langle L0_{j_i}^i, \langle 30:, \ell_{30}, 1 \rangle) \in \Gamma \land L0_{j_i}^i = 1)$ 

wljf	lag0 0		w[] flag1 0
9: $\{\Gamma \in I\}$	$\Gamma \wedge \mathrm{r1Rl0}^i_{k_i}[\Gamma] \wedge \mathrm{r1Rf0}^i[\Gamma] \}$	29:	$\{\Gamma\in \Gamma\wedge \mathrm{r1Rl1}_{n_\ell}^\ell[\Gamma]\wedge \mathrm{r1Rf1}^\ell[\Gamma]\}$
w[] f	lag1 1		w[] flag0 1
10: $\{\Gamma \in I\}$	$\Gamma \wedge r1 \mathrm{Rl0}^i_{k_i}[\Gamma] \wedge r1 \mathrm{Rf0}^i[\Gamma] \}$	30:	$\{\Gamma \in \Gamma \wedge r1Rl1^{\ell}_{n_{\ell}}[\Gamma] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma]\}$
w[] l	atch1 1	ļ	w[] latch0 1
11: $\{\Gamma \in$	$\Gamma \wedge r1 Rl0_{k_i}^i[\Gamma] \wedge r1 Rf0^i[\Gamma] \}$	31:	$\{\Gamma \in \Gamma \wedge \mathbf{r1Rl1}_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma] \wedge \mathbf{r1Rf1}^{\ell}[\Gamma]\}$
fi		ļ	fi
12: $\{\Gamma \in \Gamma\}$		32:	$\{\Gamma\in\Gamma\}$
while tru	.e	wł	hile true
$13:{false}$		33:{ <b>f</b>	<sup>c</sup> alse}

#### **Communicated values**



$$\begin{split} \operatorname{rORlo}_{j_i}^i[\Gamma] &\triangleq (\mathfrak{rf}\langle L0_{j_i}^i, \langle 0:, .., 0\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge L0_{j_i}^i = 0) \vee (\exists i_5 \in \mathbb{N} \, .\, \mathfrak{rf}\langle L0_{j_i}^i, \langle 5:, i_5, 0\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge L0_{j_i}^i = 0) \\ \operatorname{r1Rlo}_{j_i}^i[\Gamma] &\triangleq (\exists \ell_{30} \in \mathbb{N} \, .\, \mathfrak{rf}\langle L0_{j_i}^i, \langle 30:, \ell_{30}, 1\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge L0_{j_i}^i = 1) \\ \operatorname{rORf0}^i[\Gamma] &\triangleq (\mathfrak{rf}\langle F0^i, \langle 0:, .., 0\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge F0^i = 0) \vee (\exists i_8 \in \mathbb{N} \, .\, \mathfrak{rf}\langle F0^i, \langle 8:, i_8, 0\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge F0^i = 0) \\ \operatorname{r1Rf0}^i[\Gamma] &\triangleq (\exists \ell_{29} \in \mathbb{N} \, .\, \mathfrak{rf}\langle F0^i, \langle 29:, \ell_{29}, 1\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge F0^i = 1) \\ \operatorname{rORl1}_{m_\ell}^\ell[\Gamma] &\triangleq (\exists \ell_{25} \in \mathbb{N} \, .\, \mathfrak{rf}\langle L1_{m_\ell}^\ell, \langle 25:, \ell_{25}, 0\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge L1_{m_\ell}^\ell = 0) \\ \operatorname{r1Rl1}_{m_\ell}^\ell[\Gamma] &\triangleq (\mathfrak{rf}\langle L1_{m_\ell}^\ell, \langle 0:, .., 1\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge L1_{m_\ell}^\ell = 1) \vee (\exists i_{10} \in \mathbb{N} \, .\, \mathfrak{rf}\langle L1_{m_\ell}^\ell, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge L1_{m_\ell}^\ell = 1) \\ \operatorname{rORf1}^\ell[\Gamma] &\triangleq (\exists m_{28} \in \mathbb{N} \, .\, \mathfrak{rf}\langle F1^\ell, \langle 28:, m_{28}, 0\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge F1^\ell = 0) \\ \operatorname{r1Rf1}^\ell[\Gamma] &\triangleq (\mathfrak{rf}\langle F1^\ell, \langle 0:, .., 1\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge F1^\ell = 1) \vee (\exists i_9 \in \mathbb{N} \, .\, \mathfrak{rf}\langle F1^\ell, \langle 9:, i_9, 1\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge F1^\ell = 1) \end{split}$$

# Communication <sup>π<sub>6</sub> π<sub>6</sub> <sup>π<sub>6</sub></sup> specification</sup>



 $\pi_6$ 

= 1

= 1

 $y_{11}$ 

1 = 1

1=1

1

#### Calculational design of the communication specification

 $(\neg S_{inv}(\Gamma,\Gamma)) \land S_{ind}(\Gamma,\Gamma)$ 

$$\triangleq at\{8\} \land at\{28\} \land S_{ind}(\Gamma, \Gamma) \qquad (def. invariance specification S_{inv})$$

 $\Rightarrow \ \mathsf{at}\{8\} \land \mathsf{at}\{28\} \land (\exists i, k_i, \ell, n_\ell \in \mathbb{N} \ . \ \Gamma \in \Gamma \land \mathsf{r1Rl0}_{k_i}^i[\Gamma] \land \mathsf{r1Rf0}^i[\Gamma] \land \mathsf{r1Rf1}_{n_\ell}^\ell[\Gamma] \land \mathsf{r1Rf1}^\ell[\Gamma])$  (by invariant  $S_{\mathit{ind}}(\Gamma, \Gamma)$ )

$$\Rightarrow \operatorname{at}\{8\} \wedge \operatorname{at}\{28\} \wedge (\exists i, k_i, \ell, n_\ell, \ell_{30}, \ell_{29} \in \mathbb{N} : \Gamma \in \Gamma \wedge (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L0_{k_i}^i, \langle 30:, \ell_{30}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma) \wedge (\mathfrak{rf} \langle F0^i, \langle 29:, \ell_{29}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma) \wedge (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1_{n_\ell}^\ell, \langle 0:, -, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma) \wedge (\mathfrak{rf} \langle F1^\ell, \langle 0:, -, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma)) \vee$$

$$\begin{array}{l} (\exists i, k_i, \ell, n_\ell, \ell_{30}, \ell_{29}, i_9 \in \mathbb{N} \ . \ \Gamma \in \Gamma \wedge (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L0^i_{k_i}, \ \langle 30:, \ \ell_{30}, \\ 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma) \wedge (\mathfrak{rf} \langle F0^i, \ \langle 29:, \ \ell_{29}, \ 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma) \wedge (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \ \langle 0:, \ ., \\ \end{array}$$

$$1\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf}\langle F1^{\ell}, \langle 9:, i_9, 1\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma)) \lor$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \left( \exists i, k_i, \ell, n_\ell, \ell_{30}, \ell_{29}, i_{10} \in \mathbb{N} \ . \ \Gamma \in \Gamma \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L0^i_{k_i}, \ \langle 30:, \ \ell_{30}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle F0^i, \ \langle 29:, \ \ell_{29}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \ \langle 10:, \ i_{10}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle F1^\ell, \ \langle 0:, \ ., \ 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma) \right) \lor$$

$$(\exists i, k_i, \ell, n_\ell, \ell_{30}, \ell_{29}, i_{10}, i_9 \in \mathbb{N} . \Gamma \in \Gamma \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L0^i_{k_i}, \langle 30:, \ell_{30}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle F0^i, \langle 29:, \ell_{29}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, 1 \rangle \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, 1 \rangle \otimes \Gamma) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, 1 \rangle \land (\mathfrak{rf} \backslash \Lambda)) \land (\mathfrak{rf} \langle L1^\ell_{n_\ell}, 1 \rangle \land (\mathfrak{r$$

$$1/\langle \in I \rangle \land (\mathfrak{t} | I \circ , \langle 2\mathfrak{s} \cdot, \langle 2\mathfrak{s} \cdot, \langle 2\mathfrak{s} \cdot, \langle \mathfrak{s} \mathfrak{s} \mathfrak{s}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in I) \land (\mathfrak{t} | L \mathfrak{l}_{n_{\ell}}, \langle \mathfrak{l} \circ ., \langle \mathfrak{l} \mathfrak{l} \rangle \in I) \land (\mathfrak{t} | L \mathfrak{l}_{n_{\ell}}, \langle \mathfrak{l} \circ ., \langle \mathfrak{l} \mathfrak{l} \rangle \in I))$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \langle \operatorname{def.} r1\operatorname{Rl0}_{k_{i}}^{i}[\Gamma], r1\operatorname{Rf0}^{i}[\Gamma], r1\operatorname{Rl1}_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma], \operatorname{and} r1\operatorname{Rf1}^{\ell}[\Gamma], \mathfrak{rf}\langle x_{\theta}, \\ \langle \ell :, \, \theta', \, v \rangle \rangle \text{ implies that } x_{\theta} = v, A \wedge (B \vee C) = (A \wedge B) \vee \\ (A \wedge C), \exists \text{ distributes over } \lor, \text{ and } (\exists x \cdot A(x)) \wedge B = \exists x \cdot \\ (A(x) \wedge B) \text{ when } x \text{ is not free in } B \\ \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \Rightarrow \quad \operatorname{at}\{8\} \wedge \operatorname{at}\{28\} \wedge (\neg S_{com_{1}}(\Gamma, \Gamma) \vee \neg S_{com_{2}}(\Gamma, \Gamma) \vee \neg S_{com_{3}}(\Gamma, \Gamma) \vee \\ \neg S_{com_{4}}(\Gamma, \Gamma)) \\ \Rightarrow \quad \neg S_{com}(\Gamma, \Gamma) \end{array}$$

#### Calculational design of the communication specification

#### • where

 $S_{com}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma}) \triangleq (\mathsf{at}\{8\} \land \mathsf{at}\{28\}) \Longrightarrow (S_{com_1}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma}) \land S_{com_2}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma}) \land S_{com_3}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma}) \land S_{com_4}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma}))$  $S_{com_1} \triangleq \neg (\exists i, k_i, \ell, n_\ell, \ell_{30}, \ell_{29} \in \mathbb{N} : \Gamma \in \Gamma \land \mathfrak{rf} \langle L0^i_{k_i}, \langle 30 \rangle$  $|\ell_{30}, 1\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge \mathfrak{rf}\langle F0^i, \langle 29:, \ell_{29}, 1\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge \mathfrak{rf}\langle L1_{n_\ell}^\ell,$  $\langle 0:, -, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma \wedge \mathfrak{rf} \langle F1^{\ell}, \langle 0:, -, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma$  $S_{com_2} \triangleq \neg (\exists i, k_i, \ell, n_\ell, \ell_{30}, \ell_{29}, i_9 \in \mathbb{N} : \Gamma \in \Gamma \land \mathfrak{rf} \langle L0^i_{k_i}, \langle 30 :, \rangle$  $|\ell_{30}, 1\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge \mathfrak{rf}\langle F0^i, \langle 29:, \ell_{29}, 1\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge \mathfrak{rf}\langle L1_{n_\ell}^\ell,$  $\langle 0:, -, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma \wedge \mathfrak{rf} \langle F1^{\ell}, \langle 9:, i_9, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma$  $S_{com_3} \triangleq \neg (\exists i, k_i, \ell, n_\ell, \ell_{30}, \ell_{29}, i_{10} \in \mathbb{N} : \Gamma \in \Gamma \land \mathfrak{rf} \langle L0^i_{k_i}, \langle 30 : ,$  $|\ell_{30}, 1\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge \mathfrak{rf}\langle F0^i, \langle 29:, \ell_{29}, 1\rangle\rangle \in \Gamma \wedge \mathfrak{rf}\langle L1_{n_\ell}^\ell,$  $\langle \mathbf{10:}, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma \wedge \mathfrak{rf} \langle F1^{\ell}, \langle \mathbf{0:}, .., 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma$  $S_{com_4} \triangleq \neg (\exists i, k_i, \ell, n_\ell, \ell_{30}, \ell_{29}, i_{10}, i_9 \in \mathbb{N} : \Gamma \in \Gamma \land \mathfrak{rf} \langle L0^i_{k_i},$  $\langle 30:, \ell_{30}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma \wedge \mathfrak{rf} \langle F0^i, \langle 29:, \ell_{29}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma \wedge$  $\mathfrak{rf}\langle L1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}, \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma \wedge \mathfrak{rf}\langle F1^{\ell}, \langle 9:, i_{9}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma$ 

- This proves  $S_{com}$  sufficient for correctness
- Counter-examples prove  $S_{com}$  necessary  $\Rightarrow S_{com}$  is the weakest WCM requirement for correctness

#### Example of counter-example to $S_{com_1}$



#### Proof of mutual exclusion

•  $S_{com}$  implies mutual exclusion (for any  $\Gamma$ )

$$(\neg S_{inv}(\Gamma,\Gamma) \land S_{ind}(\Gamma,\Gamma)) \Longrightarrow \neg (S_{com}(\Gamma,\Gamma))$$
  
$$\implies S_{com}(\Gamma,\Gamma) \Longrightarrow (S_{inv}(\Gamma,\Gamma) \lor \neg S_{ind}(\Gamma,\Gamma)) \quad \text{(contraposition)}$$
  
$$\implies S_{com}(\Gamma,\Gamma) \Longrightarrow (S_{ind}(\Gamma,\Gamma) \Longrightarrow S_{inv}(\Gamma,\Gamma)) \quad \text{(implication)}$$
  
$$\implies (S_{com}(\Gamma,\Gamma) \land S_{ind}(\Gamma,\Gamma)) \Longrightarrow S_{inv}(\Gamma,\Gamma) \quad \text{(implication)}$$
  
$$\implies S_{com}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma}) \Rightarrow S_{inv}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma}) \quad \text{(since } S_{com}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma}) \Rightarrow S_{ind}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma})$$
# Conditional invariance



= 1

= 1

 $y_{11}$ 

1 = 1

1=1

1

1

### Sequential proof $\ell = \kappa$ and p = q



### Sequential proof $\ell = \kappa$ and p = q



Proof of mutual exclusion and non-starvation of a program: PostgreSQL Chansha, China, 9 December 2016

### Sequential proof $\ell = \kappa$ and p = q



### Non-interference proof



### **Communication proof**



### **Communication proof**



### **Communication proof**



#### 



cclusion and non-starvation of a program: PostgreSQL Chansha, China, 9 December 2016

 $\pi_5$ 

= 1

= 1

 $y_{11}$ 

1=1

1=1

1

1

### Method

• The communication specification is

 $\mathcal{S}_{\textit{com}}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma}) \triangleq (\mathsf{at}\{8\} \land \mathsf{at}\{28\}) \Longrightarrow (\mathcal{S}_{\textit{com}_1}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma}) \land \mathcal{S}_{\textit{com}_2}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma}) \land \mathcal{S}_{\textit{com}_3}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma}) \land \mathcal{S}_{\textit{com}_4}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma}))$ 

• The consistency specification must satisfy

 $H_{com}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma}) \Rightarrow S_{com}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma})$  i.e.  $\neg S_{com}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma}) \Rightarrow \neg H_{com}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma})$ 

• So the design of  $H_{com}(\Gamma,\overline{\Gamma})$  must forbid the erroneous communications specified by the communication specification

$$\left(\mathsf{at}\{8\} \land \mathsf{at}\{28\} \land \bigvee_{i=1}^{4} \neg S_{\mathit{com}_{i}}(\Gamma, \overline{\Gamma})\right) \Longrightarrow \bigvee_{i=1}^{4} \neg H_{\mathit{com}_{i}}(\Gamma, \overline{\Gamma})$$

$$\begin{split} & S_{com_3} \triangleq \neg (\exists i, k_i, \ell, n_\ell, \ell_{30}, \ell_{29}, i_{10} \in \mathbb{N} . \Gamma \in \Gamma \land \mathrm{tf} \langle L0_{k_i}^i, \langle 30:, \\ \ell_{30}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma \land \mathrm{tf} \langle F0^i, \langle 29:, \ell_{29}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma \land \mathrm{tf} \langle L1_{n_\ell}^\ell, \\ \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma \land \mathrm{tf} \langle F1^\ell, \langle 0:, ..., 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma \end{split}$$

$$\begin{cases} 0: \ \operatorname{latch0} = 0; \ \operatorname{flag0} = 0; \ \operatorname{latch1} = 1; \ \operatorname{flag1} = 1; \\ 1: \ \operatorname{do} \ \{i\} \\ 2: \ \operatorname{do} \ \{j_i\} \\ 3: \ r[] \ \operatorname{Rl0} \ \operatorname{latch0} \ (\longrightarrow \ L0_{j_i}^i) \\ 4: \ \operatorname{while} \ (\operatorname{Rl0=0}) \ \{k_i\} \\ 5: \ w[] \ \operatorname{latch0} \ 0 \\ 6: \ r[] \ \operatorname{Rf0} \ \operatorname{flag0} \ (\longrightarrow \ F0^i) \\ 7: \ \operatorname{if} \ (\operatorname{Rf0\neq0} \ \operatorname{then} \\ 8: \ \cdots \ (* \ \operatorname{critical} \ \operatorname{section} \ *) \\ w[] \ \operatorname{flag0} \ 0 \\ 9: \ w[] \ \operatorname{flag1} \ 1 \\ 10: \ w[] \ \operatorname{latch1} \ 1 \\ 11: \ \operatorname{fi} \\ 12: while \ \operatorname{true} \\ 13: \ & 33: \\ \end{cases} \end{split}$$

$$\begin{split} S_{com_{4}} &\triangleq \neg (\exists i, k_{i}, \ell, n_{\ell}, \ell_{30}, \ell_{29}, i_{10}, i_{9} \in \mathbb{N} : \Gamma \in \Gamma \land \mathfrak{rf} \langle L0_{k_{i}}^{i}, \\ \langle 30:, \ell_{30}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma \land \mathfrak{rf} \langle F0^{i}, \langle 29:, \ell_{29}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma \land \mathfrak{rf} \langle L1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}, \\ \langle 10:, i_{10}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma \land \mathfrak{rf} \langle F1^{\ell}, \langle 9:, i_{9}, 1 \rangle \rangle \in \Gamma \end{split}$$

$$\begin{cases} 0: | \operatorname{latch0} = 0; \ \operatorname{flag0} = 0; \ \operatorname{latch1} = 1; \ \operatorname{flag1} = 1; \ \rangle \\ 1: \ \operatorname{do} \ \{i\} \\ 2: \ \operatorname{do} \ \{j_{i}\} \\ 3: \ r[] \ \operatorname{Rl0} \ \operatorname{latch0} \ (\longrightarrow \ L0_{j_{i}}^{i}] \\ 4: \ \operatorname{while} \ (\operatorname{Rl0=0}) \ \{k_{i}\} \\ 5: \ w[] \ \operatorname{latch0} \ 0 \\ 6: \ r[] \ \operatorname{Rf0} \ \operatorname{flag0} \ (\longrightarrow \ F0^{i}) \\ 7: \ \operatorname{if} \ (\operatorname{Rf0\neq0}) \ \operatorname{then} \\ -8: \cdots (* \operatorname{critical} \ \operatorname{section} \ *) \\ w[] \ \operatorname{flag0} \ 0 \\ 9: \ w[] \ \operatorname{flag1} \ 1 \\ 10: \ w[] \ \operatorname{latch1} \ 1 \\ 11: \ \operatorname{fi} \\ 12: \operatorname{while} \ \operatorname{true} \\ 13: \end{aligned}$$

### Conclusion on mutual exclusion

 PostgreSQL is correct on architectures satisfying the ``no prophecy beyond cut during execution'' property



 Intuition on necessity: when waiting for a spinlock, you should look at its current value, not at later ones!

### in cat

#### A static condition to impose a dynamic condition:



### Prevents valid executions



Proof of mutual exclusion and non-starvation of a program: PostgreSQL Chansha, China, 9 December 2016

## Non-starvation

### Difference with Lamport/Owicki-Gries

 The communications in L/O-G are fixed in the semantics (SC) for <u>all</u> executions:





 $\Rightarrow$  entangled with the verification conditions  $\Rightarrow$  impossible to reason on one execution trace only

### Reasoning on only one execution

- An execution is entirely determined by its read-from relation rf
- The verification conditions depend on a set  $\,\Gamma$  of verification conditions
- By choosing  $\Gamma = \{rf\}$ , we can reason on this execution
- This execution satisfies the inductive invariant  $S_{ind}({rf})$
- To prove that this execution is impossible it is sufficient to prove that S<sub>ind</sub>({rf}) cannot hold (according to the verification conditions)
- Since the method is sound, if the verification conditions are not satisfied, the execution is excluded by the semantics

### 9 cases of starvation



### (I) Both processes starve in spin loops



- let rf be the communication for such a trace (encoded in  $\Gamma_{\rm rf})$
- invariant false after both spin loops
- so latch1 in 23: can only be read from initialization
- so latch1 is I not 0, a contradiction

{0: latch0 = 0; flag0 = 0; latch1 = 1; flag1 = 1; } 1: {true} do  $\{i\}$ {true} 2: do  $\{j_i\}$ {true} 3: r[] Rl0 latch0 { $\rightsquigarrow L0^i_{j_i}$ }  ${R10 = L0^{i}_{i} \land}$ 4:  $(r0Rl0_{j_{i}}^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}] \vee r1Rl0_{j_{i}}^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}]) \}$ while (R10=0)  $\{k_i\}$  $\{r1Rl0^i_{k_i}[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}]\}$ 5: w[] latch0 0  ${r1Rl0_{k_i}^i[\Gamma_{rf}]}$ 6: r[] RfO flag0 { $\rightsquigarrow F0^i$ }  $\{r1Rl0^{i}_{k_{i}}[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}] \wedge \texttt{Rf0} = \texttt{F0}^{i} \wedge$ 7:  $(r0Rf0^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}] \vee r1Rf0^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}])$ if  $(Rf0 \neq 0)$  then  ${r1Rl0_{k_{i}}^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}] \wedge r1Rf0^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}]}$ 8: (\* critical section \*) w[] flag0 0  $\{r1Rl0^i_{k_i}[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf0^i[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}]\}$ 9: w[] flag1 1  $\{r1Rl0^i_{k_i}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\wedge r1Rf0^i[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}$ 10: w[] latch1 1  $\{r1Rl0^i_{k_i}[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf0^i[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}]\}$ 11: fi 12: {true} while true  $13: \{ false \} \}$ 

```
21:{true}
       do \{\ell\}
22: {true}
23:
                 {true}
                r[] Rl1 latch1 {\rightsquigarrow L1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell}}
                \{\mathtt{Rl1}=\mathtt{L1}^\ell_{\mathtt{m}_\ell}\wedge
24:
                  (r0Rl1^{\ell}_{m_{\ell}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \vee r1Rl1^{\ell}_{m_{\ell}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}])\}
           while (Rl1=0) \{n_\ell\}
25: \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}]\}
           w[] latch1 0
26: \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}]\}
           r[] Rf1 flag1 {\rightsquigarrow F1^{\ell}}
         \{ r1Rl1^{\ell}_{n_{\ell}}[\Gamma_{rf}] \land Rf1 = F1^{\ell} \land \\ (r0Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}] \lor r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}]) \} 
27:
           if (Rf1 \neq 0) then
                \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
28:
                 (* critical section *)
                w[] flag1 0
                \{r1Rl1^{\ell}_{n_{\ell}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
29:
                w[] flag0 1
                \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
30:
                w[] latch0 1
                \{r1Rl1^{\ell}_{n_{\ell}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
31:
           fi
32: {true}
33:{false
```

• let rf be the communication for such a trace (encoded in  $\Gamma_{rf}$ )

{0: latch0 = 0; flag0 = 0; latch1 = 1; flag1 = 1; } 1: {true} do  $\{i\}$ {true} 2: do  $\{j_i\}$ {true} 3: r[] Rl0 latch0 { $\rightsquigarrow L0^i_{j_i}$ }  ${R10 = L0^{i}_{i} \land}$ 4:  $(r0Rl0_{j_{i}}^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}] \vee r1Rl0_{j_{i}}^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}]) \}$ while (R10=0)  $\{k_i\}$  $\{r1Rl0^i_{k_i}[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}]\}$ 5: w[] latch0 0  ${r1Rl0_{k_i}^i[\Gamma_{rf}]}$ 6: r[] RfO flag0 { $\rightsquigarrow F0^i$ }  $\{r1Rl0^{i}_{k_{i}}[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}] \wedge \texttt{Rf0} = \texttt{F0}^{i} \wedge$ 7:  $(r0Rf0^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}] \vee r1Rf0^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}])$ if  $(Rf0 \neq 0)$  then  $\{r1Rl0^{i}_{k_{i}}[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf0^{i}[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}]\}$ 8: (\* critical section \*) w[] flag0 0  $\{r1Rl0^i_{k_i}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\wedge r1Rf0^i[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}$ 9: false w[] flag1 1  $\{r1Rl0^i_{k_i}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\wedge r1Rf0^i[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}$ 10: w[] latch1 1  $\{r1Rl0^{i}_{k_{i}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf0^{i}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}$ 11: fi 12: {true} while true  $13:\{false\}$ 

```
21:{true}
       do \{\ell\}
22: {true}
23:
                 {true}
                r[] Rl1 latch1 {\rightsquigarrow L1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell}}
                {Rl1 = L1_{m_\ell}^\ell \land}
24:
                  (r0Rl1^{\ell}_{m_{\ell}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \vee r1Rl1^{\ell}_{m_{\ell}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}])\}
           while (Rl1=0) \{n_\ell\}
25: \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}]\}
           w[] latch1 0
26: \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}]\}
           r[] Rf1 flag1 {\rightsquigarrow F1^{\ell}}
           \{ r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}] \land Rf1 = F1^{\ell} \land \\ (r0Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}] \lor r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}]) \} 
27:
           if (Rf1 \neq 0) then
                \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
28:
                (* critical section *)
                w[] flag1 0
                \{r1Rl1^{\ell}_{n_{\ell}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
29:
                w[] flag0 1
                                                                             false
                \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
30:
                w[] latch0 1
                \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
31:
           fi
32: {true}
33: { false }
```

- let rf be the communication for such a trace (encoded in  $\Gamma_{\rm rf})$
- the invariant inside critical sections must be false

```
{0: latch0 = 0; flag0 = 0; latch1 = 1; flag1 = 1; }
1: {true}
     do \{i\}
        {true}
2:
         do \{j_i\}
             {true}
3:
            r[] Rl0 latch0 {\rightsquigarrow L0^i_{j_i}}
            {R10 = L0^{i}_{i} \land}
4:
              (r0Rl0_{j_{i}}^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}] \vee r1Rl0_{j_{i}}^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}]) \}
         while (R10=0) \{k_i\}
         \{r1Rl0^i_{k_i}[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}]\}
5:
         w[] latch0 0
         \{r1Rl0^i_{k_i}[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}]\}
6:
         r[] RfO flag0 {\rightsquigarrow F0^i}
         {\rm r1Rl0_{k:}^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}] \wedge Rf0 = F0^{i} \wedge}
7:
           (r0Rf0^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}] \vee r1Rf0^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}])
         if (Rf0 \neq 0) then
            \{r1Rl0^i_{k_i}[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf0^i[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}]\}
8:
             (* critical section *)
             w[] flag0 0
             \{r1Rl0^{i}_{k_{i}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf0^{i}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
9:
  false
             w[] flag1 1
             \{r1Rl0^i_{k_i}[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf0^i[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}]\}
10:
            w[] latch1 1
           \{r1Rl0^{i}_{k_{i}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf0^{i}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
11:
         fi
12: {true}
     while true
13:\{false\}
```

```
21:{true}
       do \{\ell\}
22: {true}
23:
                 {true}
                r[] Rl1 latch1 {\rightsquigarrow L1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell}}
                {\tt Rl1 = L1^\ell_{m_\ell} \land}
24:
                   (r0Rl1^{\ell}_{m_{\ell}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \vee r1Rl1^{\ell}_{m_{\ell}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]) \}
           while (Rl1=0) \{n_\ell\}
25: \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}]\}
           w[] latch1 0
26: \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}]\}
           r[] Rf1 flag1 {\rightsquigarrow F1^{\ell}}
           \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \land \mathtt{Rf1} = \mathtt{F1}^{\ell} \land
27:
               (\mathrm{r0Rf1}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathrm{rf}}] \vee \mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{1Rf1}^{\ell}}[\Gamma_{\mathrm{rf}}])
            if (Rf1 \neq 0) then
                \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
28:
                 (* critical section *)
                w[] flag1 0
                \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
29:
                w[] flag0 1
                                                                               false
                \{r1Rl1^{\ell}_{n_{\ell}}[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\text{rf}}]\}
30:
                w[] latch0 1
                \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
31:
           fi
        {true}
32:
33: { false }
```

- let rf be the communication for such a trace (encoded in  $\Gamma_{rf}$ )
- the invariant inside critical sections must be false
- tests (Rf0≠0) and (Rf1≠0) must be false (written ×××)



```
21:{true}
        do \{\ell\}
22: {true}
            do \{m_{\ell}\}
23:
                  {true}
                r[] Rl1 latch1 {\rightsquigarrow L1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell}}
24:
                 {\tt Rl1 = L1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell} \land}
                   (\mathrm{r0Rl1}_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \vee \mathrm{r1Rl1}_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]) \}
            while (Rl1=0) \{n_\ell\}
25: \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}]\}
            w[] latch1 0
           \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
26:
            r[] Rf1 flag1 {\rightsquigarrow F1^{\ell}}
            \{r_{\mathrm{RII}_{n}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathrm{rf}}] \wedge \mathrm{Rf1} = \mathrm{F1}^{\ell} \wedge
27:
               (r0Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}] \vee r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rr}])
            if (Rf1 \neq 0) then
                  \{ r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}] \} 
(* critical section *)
28:
                 w[] flag1 0
                 \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
29:
                                                                                false
                 w[] flag0 1
                 \{r1Rl1^{\ell}_{n_{\ell}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
30:
                 w[] latch0 1
                 \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
31:
           fi
         {true}
32:
        while true
33: \{false\}
```

- let rf be the communication for such a trace (encoded in  $\Gamma_{rf}$ )
- the invariant inside critical sections must be false
- tests (Rf0≠0) and (Rf1≠0)
   must be false (written ×××)
- so read of Rf0 and Rf1 is 0 from a reachable write



```
21:{true}
       do \{\ell\}
22: {true}
            do \{m_{\ell}\}
23:
                 {true}
                r[] Rl1 latch1 {\rightsquigarrow L1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell}}
24:
                 {\tt Rl1} = {\tt L1}^{\ell}_{\tt m_{\ell}} \land
                   (r0Rl1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}] \vee \frac{r1Rl1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}]}{})\}
            while (Rl1=0) \{n_\ell\}
            \{r_{1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}}[\Gamma_{r_{f}}]\}
25:
            w[] latch1 0
            \left\{ \frac{r_1 R_{11}^{\ell} \left[ \Gamma_{\mathsf{f}} \right]}{n_{\ell} \left[ \Gamma_{\mathsf{f}} \right]} \right\}
26:
           r[] Rf1 flag1 {\rightsquigarrow F1^{\ell}}
                               [\Gamma_{\rm rf}] \wedge {
m Rf1} = {
m F1}^{\ell} \wedge
            \{r_1R_11^\ell\}
27:
                (\frac{r0Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rr}]}{r} \vee r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rr}])
            if (Rf1 \neq 0) then
                 \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
28:
                 (* critical section *)
                 w[] flag1 0
29:
                 \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
                w[] flag0 1
                                                                                 false
                 \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}]\}
30:
                 w[] latch0 1
31:
                 \{r1Rl1_{n\ell}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
           fi
32:
         {true}
       while true
33: \{false\}
```

- let rf be the communication for such a trace (encoded in  $\Gamma_{rf}$ )
- the invariant inside critical sections must be false
- tests (Rf0≠0) and (Rf1≠0)
   must be false (written ×××)
- so read of Rf0 and Rf1 is 0 from a reachable write
- impossible for Rf1 so loop 23
  —24 is never exited
  - $\Rightarrow$  we are in case (3), PI stuck in spin loop

#### (3) Process P1 stuck in spin loop (no hypothesis on P0)

{0: latch0 = 0; flag0 = 0; latch1 = 1; flag1 = 1; } 1: {true} do  $\{i\}$ {true} 2: do  $\{j_i\}$ {true} 3: r[] Rl0 latch0 { $\rightsquigarrow L0^i_{j_i}$ }  ${R10 = L0^{i}_{i}} \land$ 4:  $(r0Rl0_{j_{i}}^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}] \vee r1Rl0_{j_{i}}^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}])\}$ while (R10=0)  $\{k_i\}$  $\{r1Rl0_{k}^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}]\}$ 5: w[] latch0 0  ${r1Rl0_{k}^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}]}$ 6: r[] RfO flag0 { $\rightsquigarrow$   $F0^i$ }  $\{r1Rl0_{k_{i}}^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}] \land \texttt{Rf0} = \texttt{F0}^{i} \land$ 7:  $(r0Rf0^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}] \vee r1Rf0^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}])$ if  $(Rf0 \neq 0)$  then  ${r1Rl0_{k_{i}}^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}] \wedge r1Rf0^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}]}$ 8: (\* critical section \*) w[] flag0 0  $\{r1Rl0_{k}^{i}, [\Gamma_{rf}] \wedge r1Rf0^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}]\}$ 9: false w[] flag1 1  ${r1Rl0_{k}^{i}}[\Gamma_{rf}] \wedge r1Rf0^{i}[\Gamma_{rf}]$ 10: w[] latch1 1  $\{r1Rl0^{i}_{k_{i}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf0^{i}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}$ 11: fi 12: {true} while true  $13:\{false\}$ 



- let rf be the communication for such a trace (encoded in  $\Gamma_{rf}$ )
- the invariant after 25: must be false
- read of latch1 in 23: must be a 0  $\,$
- only possibility if from 25:
- A contradiction since 25: is unreachable

#### (4) Process P0 starves in spin loop, no hypothesis on P1



```
21:{true}
       do \{\ell\}
22: {true}
           do \{m_{\ell}\}
                {true}
23:
               r[] Rl1 latch1 {\rightsquigarrow L1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell}}
24:
               {Rl1 = L1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell} \land}
                  (r0Rl1^{\ell}_{m_{\ell}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \vee r1Rl1^{\ell}_{m_{\ell}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]) \}
           while (Rl1=0) \{n_\ell\}
           {r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]}
25:
           w[] latch1 0
26: \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}]\}
           r[] Rf1 flag1 {\rightsquigarrow F1^{\ell}}
           \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge \mathtt{Rf1} = \mathtt{F1}^{\ell} \wedge
              (r0Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}] \vee r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}])
           if (Rf1 \neq 0) then
                \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
28:
                (* critical section *)
                w[] flag1 0
                \{r1Rl1^{\ell}_{n_{\ell}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
29:
                w[] flag0 1
               \{ r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \}
30:
                w[] latch0 1
                \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
31:
           fi
32: {true}
       while true
33: \{ false \}
```

- let rf be the communication for such a trace (encoded in  $\Gamma_{rf}$ )
- the invariant after 5: must be false so P0 never enters its critical section
- read of latch0 in 3: must be a 0, with 2 possibilities
- cannot be from write at 5: which is unreachable
- so is from initial write 0:
- but PI enters its critical section (otherwise see case I)
- so w[] latch0 1 will be executed later in co order
- so all 3:r[] R10 latch0 are fr to all 30: w[] latch0 1
- by fairness of communications, this write of I to latch0 will eventually be read at 3:
- in contradiction with always reading 0
   65

#### (4) Process P0 starves in spin loop, P1 does not



### **Communication fairness hypothesis**(\*)

- All writes eventually hit the memory:
  - If, at a cut of the execution, all the processes infinitely often write the same value v to a shared variable x and only that value v
  - and from a later cut point of that execution, a process infinitely often repeats reads to that variable x
  - $\bullet\,$  then the reads will end up reading that value  $\upsilon\,$

<sup>(\*)</sup> The SPARC Architecture Manual, Version 8, Section K2, p. 283: ``if one processor does an S, and another processor repeatedly does L is to the same location, then there is an L that will be after the S''.

### (5) Process P1 never enters its CS



- let rf be the communication for such a trace (encoded in  $\Gamma_{rf}$ )
- P1 exits loop 23:-24: (else see cases (1) or (3))
- must read Rl1 = I from 0: or
  I0:
- read of Rf1 at 26: must be 0
- only possibility is from 28:
- impossible from unreachable code

#### (5) Process P0 leaves spin loop but always fails entering its CS



```
21: {true}
do {\ell}
22: {true}
do {m_{\ell}}
23: {true}
r[] Rl1 latch1 {\rightsquigarrow L1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell}}
24: {Rl1 = L1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell} \land
(r0Rl1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}] \lor r1Rl1_{m_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}])}
while (Rl1=0) {n_{\ell}}
25: {r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}]}
w[] latch1 0
```

```
{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}]}
26:
           r[] Rf1 flag1 {\rightsquigarrow F1^{\ell}}
           \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{rf}] \land Rf1 = F1^{\ell} \land
27:
             (r0Rf1^{\hat{\ell}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \vee r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}])\}
           if (Rf1 \neq 0) then
                {r1Rl1_{n\ell}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]}
28:1
                (* critical section *)
               w[] flag1 0
            \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
29:
               w[] flag0 1
                \{r1Rl1^{\ell}_{n_{\ell}}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rfi^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
               f[f1w] {29} {30}
                \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
30:
                w[] latch0 1
                                                                  fences
                \{r1Rl1_{n_{\ell}}^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}] \wedge r1Rf1^{\ell}[\Gamma_{\mathsf{rf}}]\}
31:
           fi
           {true}
32:
       while true
33: \{ false \}
```

- let rf be the communication for such a trace (encoded in  $\Gamma_{rf}$ )
- loop 2:-4: exited
- read of R10 = I at 3: is from 30:
- invariant false in critical section
  8:-11:
- read of Rf0 = 0 at 6: is from 0: (8: not reachable)

#### withco

```
let l-fencerel(S) =
          ((po&(_*S));po)&fromto(S)
let Fdep = F & tag2events('fdep)
let deps = l-fencerel(Fdep) & (R*_)
let Flw = F & tag2events('flw)
let flw = l-fencerel(Flw)
let fences = deps | flw
let fre = (rf^-1;co) & ext
irreflexive fre;fences;rfe;fences
```

In TSO there is no need for a fence since it is MP. For weaker than PSO, a fence is needed.

Proof of mutual exclusion and non-starvation of a program: PostgreSQL Chansha, China, 9 December 2016

#### (6) Both processes eventually starve in spin loop

		• {0:	w latch0 0;		w latch1 1;
	ź		w flag0 0;		w flag1 1;}
		•••			
		3:	r RlO latchO 1	23: r	Rl1 latch1 1
		5:	w latch0 0	25: w	/ latch1 0 👝
		6:	r RfO flag0 1	26 <b>;</b> r	Rf1 flag1 1
		8:	(* critical section *)	28: (	(* critical section *)
			w flag0 0		flag1 0
			Ŭ	f	[bar] {25:} {29:}
		9:	w flag1 1	29: w	n t⊥agU 1
			f[bar] {5:} {10:} CO		
		10:	w latch1 1	30: w	/ latch0 1
	bai				
		3:	r RlO latchO 1	23: r	Rl1 latch1 1 Dar
		5:	w latch0 0	25: w	/ latch1 0 🛺
	. ere	6:	r RfO flag0 1	26: r	Rf1 flag1 1
	k.	8:	(* critical section *)	28: (	(* critical section *)
			w flag0 0	W	/flag1 0
			J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J J	f	$[bar] \{25:\} \{29:\}$
		9:	w flag1 1	29: w	flag01
		-	$f[bar] \{5\cdot\} \{10\cdot\}$		
		10.	w latch1 1	30 · W	v latch0 1
		10.			
		 3.	r Bl0 latch0 0	··· · 23• т	Bl1 latch1 0
		3.	r Bl0 latch0 0	$23 \cdot r$	$\sim$ Bl1 latch1 0
		0.		20. 1	
		•••	•••	• • • •	• •

- let rf be the communication for such a trace (encoded in  $\Gamma_{rf}$ )
- so latch0 is always 0 and latch1 is always 0
- so latch0 in 23 is always read from 25:
- so 10: w latch1 1 was cobefore (since otherwise by the communication hypothesis it would be eventually read)
- and 3: R10 latch0 0 is from 0: or 5:
- so 30: w latch0 1 is cobefore them (since otherwise by the communication hypothesis it would be eventually read)
- impossible by fences
- irreflexive co; bar; co; bar

#### (7) Eventually, P0 starves in spin loop, P1 never enters its CS

```
{0:; w latch0 0;
                  w flag0 0;
                 r RlO latchO 1
                 w latch0 0
                 r RfO flag0 1
                 (* critical section *)
                 w flag0 0
Process
                 w flag1 1
  P0
                 w latch1 1
             10:
enters &
             3:
                 r RlO latchO 1
exits CS
            5:
                 w latch0 0
multiple
                 r RfO flag0 1
 times
                 (* critical section *)
                 w flag0 0
                 w flag1 1
                 w latch1 1
  then.
                 r RlO latchO O
  never
                 r RlO latchO O
  exits
             3
   the
             3:
                 r RlO latchO O
 waiting
   loop
```

```
w latch1 1;
     w flag1 1;}
                      last
                      CS
    r Rl1 latch1 1
                      entr-
25: w latch1 0
                      ance
26: r Rf1 flag1 1
28: (* critical section *)
    w[] flag1 0
29: w[] flag0 1
    w[] latch0 1 *
30
. . . . . . .
23: r Rl1 latch1 1
25: w latch1 0
26: r Rf1 flag1 0
. . . . . . .
23: r Rl1 latch1 1
25: w latch1 0
26: r Rf1 flag1 0
```

- P1 does not eventually starves in spin loop (otherwise case 6)
- case P1 eventually never starves and never enters its critical section
- P1 then does a last write of I to latch0
- P0 eventually makes infinitely many reads of latch0
- A contradiction (since otherwise by the communication hypothesis, this I would be eventually read)

(8) Eventually, P1 starves in spin loop, P0 never enters its CS

#### symmetric of (7)
#### (9) P0 and P1 always leave spin loop and never enter their CS

{0: w[] latch0 0; w[] flag0 0;	w[] latch1 1; w[] flag1 1;}
<pre>3: r[] Rl0 latch0 1 5: w[] latch0 0 6: r[] Rf0 flag0 1 8: (* critical section *)     w[] flag0 0 9: w[] flag1 1 10: w[] latch1 1</pre>	<pre> 23: r[] Rl1 latch1 1 25: w[] latch1 0 26: r[] Rf1 flag1 1 28: (* critical section *)     w[] flag1 0 29: w[] flag0 1 30 w[] latch0 1</pre>
<pre>3: r Rl0 latch0 1 5: w[] latch0 0 6: r[] Rf0 flag0 1 8: (* critical section *) w[] flag0 0 9: w[] flag1 1 10: w[] latch1 1</pre>	<pre> 23: r[] Rl1 latch1 1 25: w[] latch1 0 26: r[] Rf1 flag1 0 28: (* critical section *) 23: w[] flag1 0 29: w[] flag0 1 30: w[] latch0 1</pre>
<pre>3: r[] Rl0 latch0 1 5: w[] latch0 0 6: r[] Rf0 flag0 0 3: r[] Rl0 latch0 1 5: w[] latch0 0 6: r[] Rf0 flag0 0 3: r[] Rl0 latch0 1 5: w[] latch0 0 6: r[] Rf0 flag0 0</pre>	<pre></pre>

- P0 and P1 eventually never starve and never enter their critical sections
- They both have a last entrance in their critical sections
- This last write of I to the latches will, by communication fairness, eventually reach the memory
- Then we only have infinitely many writes of 0 to the latches
- So the read of the latches in the spin loops will eventually always read 0
- So from then on, by communication fairness, all the reads will be from 0, in reads of the latch will be zero
- In contradiction with the fact that the spin loop is always exited
- The barrier prevents infinitely postponing the write 0 actions

# Conclusion

#### Conclusion

- The proof method is parameterized by consistency hypotheses, expressed in
  - Invariance form: *S*<sub>com</sub>
  - Consistency form:  $H_{com}$  (e.g. in cat)
- Program not logic/architecture/consistency model dependent (hence the proof is portable)
- Can reason on *arbitrary* subsets of anarchic executions (hence flexible e.g. non-starvation)

## Proposed design methodology

- I. Design the algorithm A and its specification  $S_{inv}$  (e.g. in the sequential consistency model of parallelism)
- 2. Consider the anarchic semantics of algorithm A
- 3. Add communication specifications  $S_{com}$  to restrict anarchic communications and ensure the correctness of A with respect to specification  $S_{inv}$
- 4. Do the invariance proof under WCM with  $S_{com}$
- 5. Infer  $H_{com}$  (in cat) from invariant  $S_{com}$
- 6. Prove that the machine memory model M in cat implies  $H_{cm}$

## Challenges

- Modern machines have complex memory models
  - $\Rightarrow$  portability has a price (refencing)
  - ⇒ debugging is very hard/quasi-impossible
  - $\Rightarrow$  proofs are much harder than with sequential consistency (but still feasible?, mechanically?)
  - $\Rightarrow$  static analysis parameterized by a WCM will be a challenge
  - $\Rightarrow$  but we can start with  $S_{com}$

77

#### Thanks

• Patrick Cousot thanks Luc Maranget for his precious help at Dagstuhl on the non-starvation part.

# The End, Thank You