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Abstract

Concurrent separation logics have had great success reasoning about concurrent data structures. This success stems from their application of modularity on multiple levels, leading to proofs that are decomposed according to program structure, program state, and individual threads. Despite these advances, it remains difficult to achieve proof reuse across different data structure implementations. For the large class of search structures, we demonstrate how one can achieve further proof modularity by decoupling the proof of thread safety from the proof of structural integrity. We base our work on the template algorithms of Shasha and Goodman that dictate how threads interact but abstract from the concrete layout of nodes in memory. Building on the recently proposed flow framework of compositional abstractions and the separation logic Iris, we show how to prove correctness of template algorithms, and how to instantiate them to obtain multiple verified implementations.

We demonstrate our approach by mechanizing the proofs of three concurrent search structure templates, based on link, give-up, and lock-coupling synchronization, and deriving verified implementations based on B-trees, hash tables, and linked lists. These case studies include algorithms used in real-world file systems and databases, which have been beyond the capability of prior automated or mechanized verification techniques. In addition, our approach reduces proof complexity and is able to achieve significant proof reuse.
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1 Introduction

Modularity is as important in simplifying formal proofs as it has been for the design and maintenance of large systems. There are three main types of modular proof techniques: (i) Hoare logic [32] enables proofs to be compositional in terms of program structure; (ii) separation logic [48, 54] allows proofs of programs to be local in terms of the state they modify; and (iii) thread modular techniques [30, 33, 50] allow one to reason about each thread in isolation. Concurrent separation logics [10, 11, 16, 18, 19, 21, 24, 27, 37, 46, 47, 58, 60] incorporate all of the above techniques and have led to great progress in the verification of practical concurrent data structures, including recent milestones such as a formal proof of the B-link tree [15]. Proofs of such real-world data structures, however, remain large, complex, paper-based, and verifiable only by hand.

An important reason why existing proofs, such as that of the B-link tree, are still so complicated is that they argue simultaneously about thread safety (i.e., how threads synchronize) and memory safety (i.e., how data is laid out in the heap). We contend that safety proofs should instead be decomposed so as to reason about these two aspects independently. When verifying thread safety we should abstract from the concrete heap structure used to represent the data and when verifying memory safety we should abstract from the concrete thread synchronization algorithm. Adding this form of abstraction as a fourth modular proof technique to our arsenal promises reusable proofs and simpler correctness arguments, which in turn aids proof automation.
works independently of how data is stored within each node. Consequently, existing proofs such as the one of the B-link technique of reasoning locally about modifications to the data structure indexed by keys, including implementations of sets, maps, and multisets (but not, e.g., queues and stacks). Our approach of separating concurrency templates and heap implementations requires the data structure to have an abstraction mechanism that allows one to reason about global inductive invariants of general graphs in a local manner. Using this framework, we can do SL-style reasoning about the correctness of a concurrent search structure template while abstracting from the specific low-level heap representation of the underlying data structure.

We note that our methodology generalizes to any data structure indexed by keys, including implementations of sets, maps, and multisets (but not, e.g., queues and stacks). Our approach of separating concurrency templates and heap implementations requires the data structure to have an abstract state (e.g. as mathematical set or map) with a certain algebraic structure: we need to be able to decompose the abstract state into local abstract states that are disjoint and how these are organized in memory (e.g. as a B-tree or hash table). Hence, it applies to vastly different concrete data structures. The latter crucially relies on the recently proposed flow framework [40, 41], the final ingredient of our methodology. The flow framework provides an SL-based abstraction mechanism that allows one to reason about global inductive invariants of general graphs in a local manner. Moreover, it yields a local proof technique that eliminates the need to reason explicitly about the global abstract state of the data structure. The latter crucially relies on the recently proposed flow framework [40, 41], the final ingredient of our methodology. The flow framework provides an SL-based abstraction mechanism that allows one to reason about global inductive invariants of general graphs in a local manner. Using this framework, we can do SL-style reasoning about the correctness of a concurrent search structure template while abstracting from the specific low-level heap representation of the underlying data structure.

We note that our methodology generalizes to any data structure indexed by keys, including implementations of sets, maps, and multisets (but not, e.g., queues and stacks). Our approach of separating concurrency templates and heap implementations requires the data structure to have an abstract state (e.g. as mathematical set or map) with a certain algebraic structure: we need to be able to decompose the abstract state into local abstract states that are disjoint in some sense. Moreover, composition of abstract states needs to be associative, commutative, and homomorphic to composition of heap graphs. For instance, consider a binary search tree representing a mathematical map where each tree node stores a single key/value pair. If one arbitrarily splits the tree’s heap graph into disjoint subgraphs, then these subgraphs represent disjoint mathematical maps whose union yields the map represented by the original composed heap.

**Template Proof Methodology.** This paper shows how to adapt and combine recent advances in compositional abstractions and separation logic in order to achieve the envisioned algorithmic proof modularity for the important class of concurrent search data structures.

We base our work on the template algorithms for concurrent search structures by Shasha and Goodman [57], who identified the key invariants needed for decoupling reasoning about synchronization and memory representation for such data structures. The second ingredient is the concurrent separation logic Iris [34, 35, 37, 39]. We show how to capture the high-level idea of [57] in terms of a new Iris resource algebra, yielding a general methodology for modular verification of concurrent search structures. This methodology independently verifies that (1) the template algorithm satisfies the (atomic) abstract specification of search structures assuming that node-level operations maintain certain shape-agnostic invariants and (2) the implementations of these operations for each concrete data structure maintains these invariants.

A key technical improvement over [57] is that our new resource algebra, in combination with Iris’ notion of atomic triples [16, 36, 37], avoids explicit reasoning about execution histories and low-level programming language semantics. Moreover, it yields a local proof technique that eliminates the need to reason explicitly about the global abstract state of the data structure. The latter crucially relies on the recently proposed flow framework [40, 41], the final ingredient of our methodology. The flow framework provides an SL-based abstraction mechanism that allows one to reason about global inductive invariants of general graphs in a local manner. Using this framework, we can do SL-style reasoning about the correctness of a concurrent search structure template while abstracting from the specific low-level heap representation of the underlying data structure.

We note that our methodology generalizes to any data structure indexed by keys, including implementations of sets, maps, and multisets (but not, e.g., queues and stacks). Our approach of separating concurrency templates and heap implementations requires the data structure to have an abstract state (e.g. as mathematical set or map) with a certain algebraic structure: we need to be able to decompose the abstract state into local abstract states that are disjoint in some sense. Moreover, composition of abstract states needs to be associative, commutative, and homomorphic to composition of heap graphs. For instance, consider a binary search tree representing a mathematical map where each tree node stores a single key/value pair. If one arbitrarily splits the tree’s heap graph into disjoint subgraphs, then these subgraphs represent disjoint mathematical maps whose union yields the map represented by the original composed heap.
graph. We conjecture that all search structure implementations follow these composition principles.

**Case Studies.** We demonstrate our methodology by mechanizing the correctness proofs of three template algorithms for concurrent search structures based on the link, the give-up, and the lock-coupling technique of synchronization (Fig. 1). For these, we derive concrete verified implementations based on B-trees, hash tables, and sorted linked lists, resulting in five different data structure implementations. §4 discusses the proof of the link template in detail. Section §5 presents a summary of the effort required by our verification approach.

A key advantage of our approach is that we can perform sequential reasoning when we verify that an implementation is a valid template instantiation. We therefore perform only the template proofs in Iris/Coq and verify the implementations using the automated deductive verification tool GRASShopper [51, 52]. The automation provided by GRASShopper enables us to bring the proofs of highly complicated implementations such as B-link trees within reach.

Our proofs include a mechanization of the meta-theory of the flow framework presented in [41], carried out independently in both GRASShopper and Iris/Coq. The verification efforts in the two systems are hence each fully self-contained. The template proofs done in Iris are parametric to any possible correct implementation of the node-level operations. The specifications assumed in Iris match those proved in GRASShopper. However, we note that there is no formal connection between the proofs done in the two systems. If one desires end-to-end certified implementations, one can perform both template and implementation proofs in Iris/Coq (albeit with substantial additional effort). Performing the proofs completely in GRASShopper or a similar SMT-based verification tool would require additional tooling effort to support reasoning about Iris-style resource algebras.

The proofs we obtain are more modular, simpler, and more reusable than existing proofs of such concurrent data structures. Our experience is that adapting our technique to a new template algorithm and instantiating a template to a new data structure takes only a few hours of proof effort.

**Summary.** The contributions of this paper are:

- We propose a new methodology for verifying concurrent search structure templates that enables proofs to be compositional in terms of program structure and state, and exploit thread and algorithmic modularity. The technique applies to any data structure that is indexed by keys, including implementations of sets, maps, and multisets.

- We mechanically prove several complex real-world data structures such as the B-link tree that are beyond the capability of existing techniques for mechanized or automated formal proofs. The resulting proofs are relatively simple and reusable.

- We mechanize the meta-theory of the flow framework [41] within Coq and GRASShopper, and show how to use it to construct a general parametric resource algebra for flow-based proofs in Iris. The possible uses of this effort go beyond the specific application considered in this paper.

## 2 Overview

A search structure is a key-based store that implements three basic operations: search, insert, and delete. We refer to a thread seeking to search for, insert, or delete a key \( k \) as an operation on \( k \), and to \( k \) as the operation key. For simplicity, the presentation here treats search structures as containing only keys (i.e. as implementations of mathematical sets), but all our proofs can be easily extended to consider search structures that store key-value pairs.

### 2.1 B-link Trees

The B-link tree (Fig. 2) is an implementation of a concurrent search structure based on the B-tree. A B-tree is a generalization of a binary search tree, in that a node can have more than two children. In a binary search tree, each node contains a key \( k_0 \) and up to two pointers \( y_l \) and \( y_r \). An operation on \( k \) takes the left branch if \( k < k_0 \) and the right branch otherwise. A B-tree generalizes this by having \( l \) sorted keys \( k_0, \ldots, k_{l-1} \) and \( l + 1 \) pointers \( y_0, \ldots, y_l \) at each node, such that \( B \leq l + 1 < 2B \) for some constant \( B \). At internal nodes, an operation on \( k \) takes the branch \( y_i \) if \( k_{i-1} \leq k < k_i \). In the most common implementations of B-trees (called B+ trees), the keys are stored only in leaf nodes; internal nodes contain “separator” keys for the purpose of routing only. When an operation arrives at a leaf node \( n \), it proceeds to insert, delete, or search for its operation key in the keys of \( n \). To avoid interference, each node has a lock that must be held by an operation before it reads from or writes to the node.

When a node \( n \) becomes full, a separate maintenance thread performs a split operation by transferring half its keys (and pointers, if it is an internal node) into a new node \( n' \), and adding a link to \( n' \) from the parent of \( n \). A concurrent algorithm needs to ensure that this operation does not cause concurrent operations at \( n \) looking for a key \( k \) that was transferred to \( n' \) to conclude that \( k \) is not in the structure. The B-link tree solves this problem by linking \( n \) to \( n' \) and storing a key \( k' \) (the key in the gray box in the figure) that indicates to concurrent operations that the key \( k \) can be reached by following the link edge if \( k > k' \). To reduce the time the parent node is locked, this split is performed in two steps: (i) a half-split step that locks \( n \), transfers half the keys to \( n' \), and adds a link from \( n \) to \( n' \) and (ii) a complete-split performed by a separate thread that takes half-split nodes \( n \), locks the parent of \( n \), and adds a pointer to \( n' \).

Fig. 2 shows the state of a B-link tree where node \( y_2 \) has been fully split, and its parent \( n \) has been half split. The full
The B-link tree in Fig. 2 labels each edge with its edgeset; the link technique is not restricted to B-trees: consider a 2.2 Abstracting Search Structures using Edgesets

The main operations of search, insert, and delete follow the same abstract algorithm. In both, there is some local rule by which operations are routed from one node to the next, and both introduce link edges when keys are moved to ensure that no other operation loses its way.

To concretize this intuition, let the edgeset of an edge \((n, n')\), written \(\text{es}(n, n')\), be the set of operation keys for which an operation arriving at a node \(n\) traverses \((n, n')\). The B-link tree in Fig. 2 labels each edge with its edgeset; the edgeset of \((n, y_1)\) is \([4, 5]\) and the edgeset of the link edge \((y_0, y_1)\) is \([4, \infty]\). Note that 4 is in the edgeset of \((y_0, y_1)\) even though an operation on 4 would not normally reach \(y_0\).

split of \(y_2\) moved keys \(\{8, 9\}\) to a new node \(y_3\), added a link edge, and added a pointer to \(y_3\) in its (old) parent \(n\). However, this caused \(n\) to become full, resulting in a half split that moved its children \(\{y_2, y_3\}\) to a new node \(n'\) and added a link edge to \(n'\). The key 5 in the gray box in \(n\) directs operations on keys \(k \geq 5\) via the link edge to \(n'\). The figure shows the state after this half split but before the complete-split when the pointer of \(n'\) will be added to \(r\).

2.2 Abstracting Search Structures using Edgesets

The link technique is not restricted to B-trees: consider a hash table implemented as an array of pointers, where the \(i\)th entry refers to a bucket node that contains an array of keys \(k_0, \ldots, k_i\) that all hash to \(i\). When a node \(n\) gets full, it is locked, its keys are moved to a new node \(n'\) with twice the capacity, and \(n\) is linked to \(n'\). Again, a separate operation locks the main array entry and updates it from \(n\) to \(n'\).

While these two data structures look completely different, the main operations of search, insert, and delete follow the same abstract algorithm. In both, there is some local rule by which operations are routed from one node to the next, and both introduce link edges when keys are moved to ensure that no other operation loses its way.

To concretize this intuition, let the edgeset of an edge \((n, n')\), written \(\text{es}(n, n')\), be the set of operation keys for which an operation arriving at a node \(n\) traverses \((n, n')\). The B-link tree in Fig. 2 labels each edge with its edgeset; the edgeset of \((n, y_1)\) is \([4, 5]\) and the edgeset of the link edge \((y_0, y_1)\) is \([4, \infty]\). Note that 4 is in the edgeset of \((y_0, y_1)\) even though an operation on 4 would not normally reach \(y_0\).

Figure 2. An example B-link tree state in the middle of a split. Node \(n\) was full, and has been half-split and children \(y_2\) and \(y_3\) have been transferred to new node \(n'\) (old edges are shown with dotted lines), but the complete-split has yet to add \(n'\) to the parent \(r\) (the dashed edge). Each node contains an array of keys \(k_0, \ldots, k_{l-1}\) in the middle, an array of pointers \(y_0, \ldots, y_l\) in the bottom, the inset (see §4.3) in the top left and the inreach (§4.3) in the top right. (The key in the gray box is not considered part of the contents and determines when to take the link edge.) Each edge is labelled by its edgeset (§2.2), and the label with a curved arrow to the top-left of the root is its inflow (explained in §4.3).

Figure 3. The link template algorithm, which can be instantiated to the B-link tree algorithm by providing implementations of helper functions \(\text{findNext}\) and \(\text{decisiveOp}\). \(\text{findNext} n k\) returns some \(n'\) if \(k \in \text{es}(n, n')\) and \(\text{None}\) if there exists no such \(n'\). \(\text{decisiveOp} n k\) performs the operation \(\omega\) (either search, insert, or delete) on \(k\) at node \(n\).

This is deliberate. In order to make edgeset a local quantity, we say \(k \in \text{es}(n, n')\) if an operation on \(k\) would traverse \((n, n')\) assuming it somehow found itself at \(n\). In the hash table, assuming there exists a global root node, the edgeset from the root to the \(i\)th array entry is \(\{k \mid \text{hash}(k) = i\}\). The edgeset from an array entry to the bucket node is the set of all keys KS, as is the edgeset from a deleted bucket node to its replacement.
the next node to visit given a current node \( n \) and an operation key \( k \), by looking for an edge \((n, n')\) with \( k \in \text{es}(n, n')\). For the B-link tree, \texttt{findNext} does a binary search on the keys in a node to find the appropriate pointer to follow. For the hash table, when at the root \texttt{findNext} returns the edge to the array element indexed by the hash of the key, and at bucket nodes it follows the link edge if it exists. The function \texttt{csslop} can be used to build implementations of all three search structure operations by implementing the helper function \texttt{decisiveOp} to perform the desired operation (read, add, or remove) of key \( k \) on the node \( n \).

An operation on key \( k \) starts at the root \( r \), and calls a function \texttt{traverse} on line 9 to find the node on which it should operate. \texttt{traverse} is a recursive function that works by following edges whose edgesets contain \( k \) (using the helper function \texttt{findNext} on line 3) until the operation reaches a node \( n \) with no outgoing edge having an edgeset containing \( k \). Note that the operation locks a node only during the call to \texttt{findNext}, and holds no locks when moving between nodes. \texttt{traverse} terminates when \texttt{findNext} does not find any \( n' \) such that \( k \in \text{es}(n, n') \), which, in the B-link tree case means it has found the correct leaf to operate on. At this point, the thread performs the decisive operation on \( n \) (line 10). If the operation succeeds, then \texttt{decisiveOp} returns some \( \text{res} \) and the algorithm unlocks \( n \) and returns \( \text{res} \). In case of failure (say an insert operation encountered a full node), the algorithm unlocks \( n \), gives up, and starts from the root again.

If we can verify this link template algorithm with a proof that is parameterized by the helper functions, then we can reuse the proof across diverse implementations. In the rest of this paper, we show how to do this using the flow framework in the Iris separation logic.

3 A Brief Introduction to Flows

This section describes the flow framework [40, 41], a separation logic based approach for specifying and reasoning about unbounded data structures. We give an informal description of the framework and demonstrate flow-based reasoning on a simple list example (for a more formal introduction, see [40, 41]). We use the fundamental flow framework [41] in this paper as it simplifies our proofs.

Separation logic is based on the powerful concept of local reasoning. However, many important properties of data structure graphs depend on non-local information. For instance, one cannot express the property that a graph is a tree by conjoining per-node invariants. The flow framework allows one to specify global graph properties in terms of node-local invariants by extending the graph with a flow – a function from nodes to values from some flow domain. These flow values are constrained to satisfy the flow equation, i.e. they must be a fixpoint of a set of algebraic equations induced by the entire graph (thereby allowing one to capture global constraints at the node level). When modifying a graph, the framework allows one to perform a local proof that flow-based invariants are maintained via the notion of a flow interface. This is an abstraction of a graph region that specifies the flow values entering and exiting the region; if these are preserved then the flow values of the rest of the graph will be unchanged.

The rest of this section illustrates these concepts by considering some simple examples. Suppose we have a graph \( G \) on a set of nodes \( N \) and we want to express the property that it is a list rooted at some node \( r \) as a local condition on each node. To do this, we need to know some global information at each node: for instance, suppose there existed a function \( \text{pc} \) that mapped each node \( n \) to the number of paths from \( r \) to \( n \). If for every node \( n \), \( \text{pc}(n) = 1 \) and \( n \) has at most one outgoing edge (both node-local assertions) then we know that \( G \) must be a list rooted at \( r \).

This path-counting function \( \text{pc} \) is an example of a flow because it can be defined as a solution to the flow equation:

\[
\forall n \in N. \text{fl}(n) = \text{in}(n) + \sum_{n' \in N} \text{es}(n', n) \cdot \text{fl}(n')
\]

This is a fixpoint equation on a function \( \text{fl} : N \to M \), where \( M \) is a flow domain, \( \text{in} \) is an inflow that specifies the default/initial flow value of each node, and \( \text{es} \) is a mapping from pairs of nodes to edge functions that determine how the flow of one node affects the flow of its neighbor. The flow framework works with directed partial graphs that are augmented with a flow, called flow graphs. A flow graph is a tuple \( H = (N, e, \text{fl}) \) consisting of a finite set of nodes \( N \subseteq \mathcal{R} \) (\( \mathcal{R} \) is potentially infinite), a mapping from pairs of nodes to edge functions \( e : N \times \mathcal{R} \to E \), and a function \( \text{fl} \) such that (FlowEqn) is satisfied for some inflow \( \text{in} \). Flow graph composition \( H_1 \circ H_2 \) is a partial operator that is a disjoint union of the nodes,

\[\text{We assume a definition of } \text{pc}(r) = 1 \text{ even in acyclic graphs, this is because typically we are interested in the reachability of heap nodes from an external stack pointer.}\]
edges, and flow values and is defined only if the resulting graph continues to satisfy (FlowEqn).

In the case of the path-counting flow, the flow domain $M$ is $\mathbb{N}$, the inflow is $in(n) := (n = r \ ? 1 : 0)$, and the edge function $e(n, n')$ is the identity function $\lambda_{mn} := (\lambda m, m)$ for all edges $(n, n')$ in $G$ and the zero function $\lambda_0 := (\lambda 0, 0)$ otherwise. The flow equation then reduces to the familiar constraint that the number of paths from $r$ to $n$, $\text{pc}(n)$, equals $1$ if $n = r$ else $0$, plus the sum of the number of paths to all $n'$ that have an edge to $n$.

The problem with assuming each node knows a flow value that satisfies some global constraint over the entire graph is that when a program modifies the graph, it can be hard to show that the flow-based invariants are maintained. In particular, when the program modifies a small part of the graph, say by modifying a single edge, we would ideally like to prove that the flow invariants are preserved by only reasoning about a small area around the modified edge. The flow framework enables such local proofs by means of an abstraction of flow (sub)graphs called flow interfaces.

Consider the simple example of a singly-linked list deletion procedure that unlinks a given node $n$ from the list (Fig. 4). The program swings the pointer from $n$’s predecessor $l$ to $n$’s successor $m$. We use the path-counting flow and the flow-based local constraints described above to express the invariant that the graph is a list (we show how to formally express this later). For a flow graph $H$ over the path-counting flow domain, modifying a single edge $(n, n')$ can potentially change the flow (the path-count) of every node reachable from $n$. However, notice that the modification shown in Fig. 4 changes $(l, n)$ to $(l, m)$ where $m$ is the successor of $n$. This preserves the flow of every node outside the modified subgraph $H_1 = H_{l \rightarrow n}$ (shown in blue in Fig. 4) because there was one path coming out of $H_1$ and going to $m$ both before and after the modification.

Flow interfaces build on this intuition; the interface $I = (in, out)$ of a flow graph $H$ with domain $N$ is a tuple consisting of the inflow $in: N \rightarrow M$ (e.g., how many incoming paths each node in $H$ has) and the outflow $out: (\mathbb{N} \setminus N) \rightarrow M$ (e.g., how many outgoing paths $H$ has to each external node). Formally, the inflow of $H = (N, e, fl)$ is the $in$ that satisfies (FlowEqn) (this is unique, see [41]) and the outflow is defined as $out(n) := \sum_{n' \in N} e(n', n) (fl(n'))$. For example, the flow interface of $\{l\}$ in the left of Fig. 4 is $\{(l \rightarrow 1), \lambda_0[n \rightarrow 1]\}$ because $l$ has one incoming path from outside $\{l\}$ and the subgraph $\{l\}$ has one outgoing path to $n$. The interface of $\{l, n\}$ in the left and center of Fig. 4 is $\{(l \rightarrow 1, n \rightarrow 0), \lambda_0[m \rightarrow 1]\}$, which is depicted abstractly on the right. The flow framework tells us that if we have $H = H_1 \circ H_2$ and we modify $H_1$ to some $H'_1$ with the same interface, then $H' = H'_1 \circ H_2$ exists. This means that the flow of all nodes in $H_2$ is unchanged; thus it suffices to check that $H'_1$ satisfies the flow-based invariant and has the same interface as $H_1$, which are both local checks.

Interfaces are also a convenient abstraction for expressing specifications. As we have seen, the flow framework requires expressing graph properties as a combination of global constraints (e.g., in path-counting the inflow of the entire graph determines the root node) and node-local constraints (e.g., the path-count of every node is 1). The global constraints can be expressed in terms of the global interface (of the entire graph or data structure), for instance in the list case:

\[ \varphi(l) := l.in = (\lambda n. (n = r \ ? 1 : 0)) \land l.out = \lambda_0 \]

We use $l.in$ and $l.out$ to denote, respectively, the inflow and outflow of an interface $l$. Note that, saying the outflow is uniformly zero makes it a closed list (no pointers leave the structure) as opposed to a list segment. The node-local constraints can be expressed on the singleton interfaces of each node; as the inflow of a node that does not have a self edge is equal to its flow, and most constraints on the edges of a node can also be expressed in terms of its outflow. For instance, to encode a list, one can say that each node and its singleton interface satisfy the following predicate:

\[ \psi_\nu(n, I_n) := I_n.in(n) = 1 \land (I_n.out = \lambda_0 \lor I_n.out = \lambda_0[\_\rightarrow 1]) \]

By instantiating the flow domain and specifying $\varphi$ and $\nu$ appropriately, one can construct flows and flow interfaces that capture any graph property of interest [41]. Formally, flow interfaces form an algebra with a notion of interface composition $I_1 \oplus I_2$ that can be defined independently of flow graphs. The connection to flow graphs is needed only to interpret the specifications that we write in terms of flow interfaces. We can define an abstraction relation between flow graphs and interfaces and show that interfaces define a congruence relation on flow graphs. Additionally, flow interfaces form a separation algebra [12], which means they can be used in any abstract separation logic (and, as we show in this paper, in Iris).

In our proofs in §4, we specify data structure invariants in terms of constraints on singleton and global interfaces as described above. We then tie the concrete heap representation of each node to its singleton interface and say that the global interface is the composition of all singleton interfaces in the separation logic. The main proof obligation is showing that the program maintains the per-node condition $\nu$ in its footprint (i.e. the set of nodes it modifies), and that it preserves the interface of the footprint, which will imply that all other nodes have unchanged flows.

4 Verifying Search Structure Templates

This section shows how to tie together the edge set framework and flow interfaces in Iris in order to verify template

---

2We assume a garbage-collected setting in this paper.

3Krishna et al. [41] use $\psi$ for this node-local predicate, but we use $\nu$ since the former is used for ghost locations by Iris.
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\[ \{ \text{CSS}(r, C) \} \text{cssOp} \omega k \{ \text{res. CSS}(r, C') \} \]
\[ \Psi_\omega(k, C, C', \text{res}) \Gamma \]

Figure 5. Abstract specification of cssOp.

We specify the concurrent behavior of search structures using atomic triples \([16, 36, 37]\). A specification \( R \rightarrow (P) e \{Q\} \)

We consider, are described in the next section. For space reasons, we provide only the intuition for Iris’ key logical constructs and reasoning steps as and when they are used; for a more detailed introduction see [35].

4.1 High-level Proof Idea

As our template algorithms are parameterized by concrete data structure implementation, their proofs cannot use any data-structure-specific invariants (such as that the array of keys in a B-tree is sorted). This also means that the specifications for helper functions like findNext and decisiveOp assumed by the templates must be data-structure-agnostic. Furthermore, if we are able to give local specifications to these helper functions then, since they operate on locked nodes, we will be able to verify their implementations using sequential reasoning. The key challenge is that we need to find a postcondition for decisiveOp that speaks only about the node \( n \) that it is called on, yet lets us prove that it also updates the global contents \( C \) appropriately.

Here is a first attempt at such a specification. Let us for the moment abstract from the data layout of the implementation and reason about mathematical graphs whose nodes are labelled with sets of keys (their contents). For example in the B-link tree in Fig. 2, the contents of \( y_0 \) are \{(1, 2), \}, while the contents of internal nodes like \( n \) are \( \emptyset \). We could say that decisiveOp \( \omega n k \) takes in a node \( n \) with contents \( C_n \) and returns \( n \) with updated contents \( C_n' \) such that \( \Psi_\omega(k, C_n, C_n', \text{res}) \)

We intuitively, we know that this is true because the rules defining a B-link tree ensure that \( y_0 \) is the only node where \( 3 \) can be present. Let the keyset of a node \( n \) be the set of keys \( ks(n) \) that, if present in the structure, must be in \( n \). For example, the rules of a B-tree dictate that the keyset of node \( y_0 \) is \((-\infty, 4)\), and the keyset of \( y_2 \) is \([5, 8)\). Notice that every pair of distinct nodes have disjoint keysets; this means given any key \( k \) there is exactly one node where \( k \) could be present. If we have a data structure where all keysets are disjoint and the contents of each node \( n \) are a subset of the keyset of \( n \), then we can show that it is sufficient for decisiveOp to ensure that \( \Psi_\omega \) holds on the node \( n \) such that \( k \in ks(n) \). In our example, the delete operation was looking for \( 3 \) and called decisiveOp on \( y_0 \). As \( 3 \in ks(y_0) \) and all keysets in the structure are disjoint, we know that if \( 3 \) is not in \( y_0 \) then \( 3 \) cannot be anywhere else in the structure.

To implement this high-level proof idea, we need to answer the following questions: (1) How do we formalize the proof argument in a separation logic? (2) How do we specify and reason locally about keysets (a quantity that depends on the entire graph)? (3) How do we show that the template algorithm finds the node \( n \) with \( k \) in its keyset? We solve (1) using a novel Iris resource algebra in §4.2 and use flows to encode keysets to solve (2) and (3) in §4.3.

4.2 Ghost State and Disjoint Keysets

Iris models both the knowledge of threads about the shared state (e.g. \( k \in ks(n) \)) and protocols for modifying the shared state (e.g. only locked nodes can be modified) using the notion of ghost state. Ghost state, also known as logical or auxiliary state, is program state that helps with the proof but has no effect on run-time behavior. A proof about a program using ghost state transfers to a proof of the original program via “erosure” of the ghost state. Ghost state can be allocated by the prover at any time at unused ghost names, the analogue of memory addresses for concrete locations, and will...
contain values drawn from a user-specified resource algebra (RA). A resource algebra is a generalization of the partial commutative monoid (PCM) algebra commonly used by separation logics. It consists of a set $M$, a validity predicate $\overline{V}(\cdot)$, a core function $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ that maps elements to their core (a generalization of units), and a binary operation $(\cdot): M \times M \rightarrow M$ (see [35] for formal definitions). Iris expresses ownership of ghost state by the proposition $\gamma$, which asserts that ownership of a piece $a \in M$ of the ghost location $\gamma$ (analogous to the points-to predicate from standard separation logics). Ghost state can be split and combined according to the rules of the underlying RA $\gamma \vdash a \gamma \ast b \gamma \ast \vdash a \gamma \ast b \gamma$. Furthermore, Iris maintains the invariant that the composition of all the pieces of ghost state at a particular location is valid (as given by $\overline{V}$). To do this, Iris restricts updates to ghost locations to only frame-preserving updates $a \rightsquigarrow b$, i.e., pairs such that $b$ composes with any frame (other element) that $a$ could have composed with.

For instance, given an RA $M$, the authoritative RA $\text{AUTH}(M)$ (see [35] for the formal definition) can be used to model situations where one thread owns an authoritative element $a \in M$ and other parties are allowed to own fragments $b \in M$, with the invariant that all fragments $b \preceq a$ (shorthand for $\exists e: a = b \cdot e$). This can be used to model, for example, a shared heap, where there is a single authoritative heap $a$ and each thread owns a fragment of it. The invariant that all fragments $b \preceq a$ implies that the parts owned by all threads are consistent. We write $\bullet a$ for ownership of the authoritative element and $\bullet b$ for fragmental ownership.

In order to talk about the keysets and contents of nodes, we use an authoritative RA of pairs of sets of keys $(X, Y)$ such that $Y \subseteq X$ (a constraint we can enforce in the validity predicate $\overline{V}$). We call this the keyset RA and define the RA operator to be component-wise disjoint union. We can then denote the abstract state of the search structure by $\gamma \circ (\text{KS}, C) \gamma$ (where KS is the key space, or set of all keys, and $C$ is the global contents), and denote the local abstract state (see §1) of each node by $\gamma \circ (K_n, C_n) \gamma$ (where $K_n$ and $C_n$ are the keyset and contents, respectively, of $n$). By the definition of the authoritative RA, the assertion $\gamma \circ (\text{KS}, C) \gamma \ast \ast_{n \in N} \gamma \circ (K_n, C_n) \gamma$ expresses that the sets $K_n$ for each $n \in N$ are disjoint and their union is included in KS. Moreover, $C_n \subseteq K_n$ and similarly $C_n$ sets are disjoint and are included in $C$. If we can tie each $C_n$ and $K_n$ to the contents and keyset, respectively, of $n$, then an assertion like the one above gives us the desired disjoint decomposition of abstract state into local states.

The keyset RA has frame-preserving updates such as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{KS-DEL} & \quad \overline{V}(K, C) \quad \overline{V}(K_n, C_n) \\
\bullet (K, C), \circ (K_n, C_n) & \rightsquigarrow \bullet (K, C \setminus \{k\}), \circ (K_n, C_n \setminus \{k\})
\end{align*}
\]

This rule says that if $\bullet (K, C) \gamma$ and $\circ (K_n, C_n) \gamma$ are valid resources such that $k \in K_n$, then we can update the fragment to $(K_n, C_n \setminus \{k\})$ (for instance when we remove $k$ from the contents of a node $n$) and the authoritative resource to $(K, C \setminus \{k\})$ (meaning $k$ is also removed from the global contents). Combining this with a similar rule for insertions, we get the following lemma:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{KS-INS} & \quad \overline{V}(K, C) \quad \overline{V}(K_n, C_n) \\
\bullet (K, C), \circ (K_n, C_n) & \rightsquigarrow \bullet (K, C \setminus \{k\}), \circ (K_n, C_n \setminus \{k\})
\end{align*}
\]

This lemma is expressed in terms of Iris’ basic update modality $\triangledown$. The intuitive meaning of $P \models Q$ is that if we have the resource $P$ then we can do a ghost state update and get $Q$.

### 4.3 Encoding Keysets using Flows

We now turn to the question of how to tie the sets used in the keyset RA to the concrete nodes, and reason locally about graph updates and their effects on keysets using flows (§3).

To define keysets using flows, we build on the concept of edgesets. Recall that the edgeset $\text{es}(n, n')$ is the set of edges for which an operation arriving at a node $n$ traverses $(n, n')$. Let the *inset* of a node $n$, written $\text{ins}(n)$, be defined by the following fixpoint equation

\[
\forall n \in N, \text{ins}(n) = \text{in}(n) \cup \bigcup_{n' \in N} \text{es}(n', n) \cap \text{ins}(n')
\]

where $\text{in}(n) := (n = r \; \text{KS} : \emptyset)$. The inset of a node $n$ is thus KS if $n$ equals the root $r$, else the set of keys $k$ that are in the inset of a predecessor $n'$ such that $k \in \text{es}(n', n)$. Intuitively, $\text{ins}(n)$ is the set of keys for which operations could potentially arrive at $n$ in a sequential setting. For example, in Fig. 2 insets are shown in the top-left of each node; $\text{ins}(y_2) = \{5, 8\}$ and $\text{ins}(n') = \{5, \infty\}$. Let the *outset* of $n$, $\text{outs}(n)$, be the keys in the union of edgesets of edges leaving $n$. The keyset can then be defined as $\text{ks}(n) = \text{ins}(n) \setminus \text{outs}(n)$.

If the equation defining the inset looks familiar, the reason is that it is just $\text{FlowEqn}$ in disguise using sets and set operations, and edge functions that take the intersection with the appropriate edgeset. This means we can define a flow domain where the flow at each node is the inset of that node. This will allow us to talk about the keyset in node-local conditions: in particular, we can now give meaning to the ghost state storing the keysets that were described in §4.2.

Encoding the inset as a flow requires using multisets of keys\footnote{We cannot use sets of keys because a flow domain is a cancellative commutative monoid [41], and set union is not cancellative.} as the flow domain. We label each edge of $(\lambda n. (n = r \; \text{KS} : \emptyset)) \cap X$. If the global inflow is $\text{in} = (\lambda n. (n = r \; \text{KS} : \emptyset))$, which encodes the fact that operations on all keys $k$ start at the root $r$, then the flow equation implies that $\text{fl}(n)$ is the inset of $n$.

How does the link template ensure that $k \in \text{ks}(n)$ when $\text{DecisiveOp}$ is called? In the absence of concurrent operations
(particularly concurrent split operations), this follows because we start off at the root \( r \), where by definition \( k \in \text{ins}(r) \), and traverse an edge \((n, n')\) only when \( k \in \text{es}(n, n')\), maintaining the invariant that \( k \in \text{ins}(n) \). When there does not exist an outgoing edge with \( k \) in the edgset, we know by definition that \( k \notin \text{ks}(n) \).

In the presence of concurrent split operations, the \( k \in \text{ins}(n) \) invariant no longer holds because the inset of a node \( n \) shrinks after a split. For example, when the split operation shown in Fig. 2 completes and \( r \) is linked to \( n' \), then the inset of \( n \) will reduce from \((-\infty, \infty)\) to \((-\infty, 5)\) as all keys larger than 5 will go from \( r \) directly to \( n' \). This means that an operation looking for a key \( k > 5 \) which was on \( n \) before the split will now find itself at a node such that \( k \notin \text{ins}(n) \).

Fortunately, the operation is not lost: if it traverses the link edge, it will arrive at a node with \( k \) in its inset (namely, \( n' \)). This means that if we add \( k \) back to the inset of \( n \), then we would not be changing the keyset of any node: \( k \) will not be in \( n \)'s keyset as it is in the edgset of the link edge, and \( k \) is already in the inset of \( n' \). Because this quantity is no longer the inset (as \( k \) would not arrive at \( n \) in a sequential setting), we call this the **inreach** of \( n \), written \( \text{inr}(n) \) (intuitively, this is the set of keys \( k \) that can start at \( n \) and reach the node containing \( k \) in its keyset). Fig. 2 shows the inreach of each node in its top-right corner; the inreach of \( y_2 \) is \([5, \infty)\) despite its inset’s being only \([5, 8)\) because it can still reach nodes with keys in \([8, \infty)\) in their keyset via link edges.

Formally we define the inreach to be the solution to the following fixpoint equation

\[
\forall n \in N. \text{inr}(n) = \text{in}(n) \cup \bigcup_{n' \in N} \text{es}(n', n) \cap \text{inr}(n')
\]

where \( \text{in} \) is any inflow such that \( \text{in}(r) = \text{KS} \). This may look identical to the definition of inset, but there is a subtle, but vital, difference: by not constraining the inflow of non-root nodes, we enable the split operation to add flow to nodes it has split to ensure that their inreach records the fact that they can still reach keys \( k \) that were moved to other nodes. For example, in Fig. 2 when the full-split adds the edge \((r, n')\) and re-routes keys in \([5, \infty)\) to take \((r, n')\) instead of \((r, n)\), then \( n \)'s inset reduces from \((-\infty, \infty)\) to \((-\infty, 5)\). However, the full-split can instead increase \( \text{in}(n) \) from 0 to \([5, \infty)\), thereby preserving its inreach of \((-\infty, \infty)\). As the newly added keys \([5, \infty)\) are propagated via the link edge to a node that has them in its inset \( (n')\), this increase in inflow does not change any keysets.

We have one final issue to solve: as it stands, the full-split does not preserve the interface of \( \{r, n, n'\} \) because the outflow to \( y_2 \) and \( y_3 \) has increased. The reason is that the flow domain is *multisets* of keys, and since we increased \( \text{in}(n) \) by \([5, \infty)\) there are now two copies of these keys leaving \( n' \). Our solution is to tweak the edge functions to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{inr}(I_n, n) )</td>
<td>( \text{in}(I_n, n) \cup \bigcup_{n' \in \text{dom}(I_n)} \text{es}(n', n) \cap \text{inr}(n') )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{outs}(I_n, n') )</td>
<td>( \text{outs}(I_n, n') )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{ks}(I_n, n) )</td>
<td>( \text{inr}(I_n, n) \setminus \text{outs}(I_n, n) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{inFP}(n) & \triangleq \exists n'. \mathbf{es}(n, n') \cap n \in N \\
\text{inlr}(k, n) & \triangleq \exists k'. \mathbf{es}(k, k') \cap k \in R \\
\mathbf{N}(I_n, C_n) & \triangleq \text{node}(n, I_n, C_n) \cup \mathbf{es}(I_n, \text{ks}(I_n, n), C_n) \cup \text{inFP}(n) \cup \text{dom}(I_n) = \{ n \} \\
\varphi(r, I) & \triangleq \mathbf{T}(I) \land \text{in}(r) = \text{KS} \land \text{out} = \lambda_0 \\
\text{CSS}(r, C) & \triangleq \exists \ell. \mathbf{T}(r, \ell) \land \varphi(r, I) \lor \left( \mathbf{T}(r, C) \land \mathbf{CSS}(r, C) \lor \mathbf{CSS}(r, C) \lor \mathbf{CSS}(r, C) \right) \\
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 6. The invariant for the link template proof.**

\( \gamma_{\mathbf{es}(n, n')} \triangleq (\lambda X. \{ k \mapsto (k \in \mathbf{es}(n, n') \land X ? 1 : 0) \}) \), essentially projecting the multiset intersection back to a set, and preventing multiple copies of keys from being propagated.

We now have an invariant for **traverse**: \( k \in \text{inr}(n) \). This is true at the root, because \( \text{KS} = \text{in}(r) \subseteq \text{inr}(r) \), and it is preserved during traversal since \( \text{findNext} \) follows edges with \( k \) in the edgset. We will ensure that no concurrent operations reduce the inreach of any node by adding an appropriate constraint to the search structure predicate \( \text{CSS} \) in §4.4. The keyset of each node \( n \) that is stored in the keyset RA is defined to be \( \text{inr}(n) \setminus \text{outs}(n) \). This means that when \( \text{findNext} \) returns \( \text{None} \), \( k \in \text{inr}(n) \) by the traversal invariant and \( k \notin \text{outs}(n) \) by the specification of \( \text{findNext} \). Thus \( k \in \text{ks}(n) \), which by §4.2 is sufficient to ensure correctness of the decisive operation.

### 4.4 An Invariant for the Link Template

Fig. 6 contains our definition of the search structure predicate \( \text{CSS} \) that captures the link template invariant.\(^5\) \( \text{CSS} \) is parameterized by a *heap representation* predicate \( \text{node}(n, I_n, C_n) \) whose definition is implementation-specific, and provided by the user for implementation proofs (more on this later). Our definition of \( \text{CSS} \) captures both the invariant maintained by the shared state as well as the protocol threads follow for modifying it:

- We use an authoritative RA of flow interfaces at location \( y_2 \) for the flow-based reasoning. Like the keyset RA from §4.2, \( \text{CSS} \) contains the assertion \( \left( \mathbf{T}(r, C) \land \mathbf{CSS}(r, C) \lor \mathbf{CSS}(r, C) \right) \) which makes \( I \) the global interface, i.e. the composition of \( I_n \) for all fragments \( I_n \). This allows threads to modify the structure as long as they preserve the flow interface of

\(^5\)The top part of Fig. 6 introduces some shorthand notation, which overload some symbols used before they express the same quantities.
the modified region (see §3). We require that \( I \) satisfies \( \varphi(r, I) \) (see Fig. 6), which says that the global interface is valid, the global inflow at the root \( r \) is the key space KS (as per the inreach equation from §4.3), and that the search structure is closed. The former is used to prove that the traversal invariant \( k \in \text{inr}(n) \) holds initially, when \( n = r \), and the latter is used to prove that operations do not leave the structure during traversal.

- We use the keyset RA described in §4.2 at ghost location \( \gamma_k \). Note that the N predicate ties the fragments to each node’s contents and keysets.
- We use an authoritative RA of sets of nodes at location \( \gamma_f \) to encode the footprint, i.e. the domain of the search structure’s global interface. CSS owns the authoritative version \( \bullet \text{dom}(I) \), and the following properties of authoritative sets allow threads to take snapshots of the footprint and assert locally that a given node is in the footprint:

\[
\text{AUTH-SET-UPD} \quad X \subseteq Y \quad \text{AUTH-SET-VALID} \quad \nabla X \implies \forall Y \exists \bullet X \cdot \circ Y \quad Y \subseteq X
\]

The inFP predicate in Fig. 6 uses this RA to express the fact that we have a pointer to a node in the footprint (e.g., to prove that lockNode is called on an allocated node).

- We assume that every node \( n \in \text{dom}(I) \) has a lock bit at location \( \ell(n) \) that is set to True iff node \( n \) is locked. This lock protects the node predicate \( \text{N} \), which can be removed from CSS by threads when locking the node (and hence, transfer the node into local state).

- We use fractional RAs at locations \( \gamma_{\text{fn}}(n) \) for each node \( n \) to store one half of the node’s singleton interface \( I_n \) inside and outside \( N \). Since fractional RAs can only be updated when both halves are together, this prohibits other threads from modifying the interface of \( n \) when one thread has locked \( n \) and removed \( N(n, I_n, C_n) \) from CSS.

- Finally, we use an authoritative RA of sets of keys, at locations \( \gamma_{\text{fk}}(n) \) for each node \( n \), to encode the inreach of each node. This RA has similar rules as the authoritative RA of sets of nodes at location \( \gamma_f \), hence threads can take snapshots of a node \( n \)’s inreach and assert that a given key is in it even when they have not locked \( n \) (using the inlr predicate from Fig. 6).

### 4.5 Proof of the Link Template

Before we describe the link template proof, we start by presenting the assumptions it makes about its implementation (summarized in Fig. 7). Recall that we need local specifications for the helper functions \( \text{findNext} \) and \( \text{decisiveOp} \). Our specifications say that \( \text{findNext} \) is given a node \( n \) satisfying \( \text{node}(n, I_n, C_n) \) and returns None if \( k \) is not in the outset of \( n \) else Some(\( n' \)) such that \( k \) is in the outflow to \( n' \) (by our definition of edge functions, this means \( k \in \text{es}(n, n') \)). Similarly, \( \text{decisiveOp} \) expects a node \( \text{node}(n, I_n, C_n) \) such that \( k \) is in the keyset of \( n \). If \( \text{decisiveOp} \) returns None then it returns the

\[
\{ \text{node}(n, I_n, C_n) \cdot k \in \text{inr}(I_n, n) \}
\]

\[
\text{findNext n k}
\]

\[
\{ \circ \cdot \text{node}(n, I_n, C_n) \cdot (\circ = \text{None} \cdot k \notin \text{outs}(I_n))
\]

\[
\{ \circ \cdot \text{node}(n, I_n, C_n) \cdot (\circ = \text{Some}(n') \cdot k \in \text{outs}(I_n, n')) \}
\]

\[
\{ \text{decisiveOp} n k \}
\]

\[
\{ \circ \cdot \text{node}(n, I_n, C_n) \cdot (\circ = \text{None} \cdot C_n = C'_n)
\]

\[
\{ \circ \cdot \text{node}(n, I_n, C_n) \cdot (\circ = \text{Some}(v') \cdot \Psi_{\circ}(k, C_n, C'_n, v')) \}
\]

\[
\text{node}(n, I_n, C_n) = \text{node}(n, I'_n, C'_n) \rightarrow \text{False}
\]

**Figure 7.** Assumptions the link template proof makes on helper functions and implementation-specific predicates. These are defined and proved by implementations.

node unchanged. On the other hand, if it returns Some(\( v' \)) then the node is now \( \text{node}(n, I_n, C'_n) \), and the return value satisfies the search structure specification with respect to the old and new contents of the node \( n \) (\( \Psi_{\circ}(k, C_n, C'_n, v') \)). Note that these specifications use standard Hoare triples \( \{ P \} e \{ Q \} \) instead of atomic triples \( P \rightarrow (P \circ e Q) \). This is because our definition of CSS and the use of node-level locks mean that they operate on local state that is not shared. Finally, we assume that the heap representation predicate \( \text{node}(n, I_n, C_n) \) implies that we have ownership of the heap location \( n \); in particular, we need the property that it cannot be duplicated, hence owning two copies of it implies False.³

We now turn to the template proof: recall that our objective is to prove the atomic triple for \( \text{cssOp} \) from Fig. 5. Unlike standard Hoare triples, when proving a triple \( P \rightarrow (P \circ e Q) \), we cannot use \( P \) throughout the proof of program \( e \). We can “peek” into the precondition \( P \), but only for the duration of an atomic step, and after the step we must either “commit” and establish the postcondition \( Q \) (this will be at the linearization point) or “abort” and re-establish \( P \).

Fig. 8 presents a proof outline of the link template algorithm, where the intermediate assertions in braces show the context of the proof (the premises that are currently available). All free variables in the intermediate assertions are implicitly existentially quantified. We use a standard lock module with specs given in lines 1 and 2. For our case studies, we used a simple spin lock and proved this specification, but note that we can swap it out with a more complex lock implementation if necessary. The specification of \( \text{traverse} \) is shown in the lines above and below the procedure. In the precondition, the assertions before the magic wand are resources that one needs in order to call \( \text{traverse} \) and use its atomic specification; these will be available in our proof context when \( \text{traverse} \) is called.

The \( \text{cssOp} \) operation begins with a call to \( \text{traverse} \) on line 20. To satisfy \( \text{traverse} \)'s precondition, we need to peek

³The magic wand operator \( \rightarrow \) is the SL analogue of implication.
We then look at the two possible outcomes of `decisiveOp`. In the case where it returns `None`, our context is unchanged, so we execute `unlockNode` using the `N(n, I_n, C_n)` in our context. We can use the specification of `cssOp` on the recursive call on line 25 to complete this branch of the proof.

On the other hand, if `decisiveOp` succeeds, we get back a modified node `node(n, I_n, C_n')` with new contents `C_n'` that satisfies the search structure specification `Ψ_n(k, C_n, C_n', res)` locally (line 27). We now need to show that this modification results in `cssOp`'s postcondition; this is essentially the linearity point of this algorithm.

To do this, we again open the atomic precondition `CSS(r, C)`. We now have the context in line 29 (we have also expanded `N(n, I_n, C_n')`), and now we can apply our ghost update `ks-upd` to update the global contents and get the context in line 30. In particular, we have `Ψ_n(k, C', I', res)` and `CSS(r, C')`, which allows us to "commit" and establish the postcondition. We finally execute the call to `unlockNode` using the remaining `N(n, I_n, C_n')` predicate, and complete the proof.

The proof of `traverse` follows a similar line-by-line reasoning using the appropriate specifications of helper functions; the intermediate contexts are shown in Fig. 8.

### 4.6 Proofs of Template Implementations

To obtain a verified implementation of the link template, one needs to specify the concrete representation of a node by defining the node predicate and provide code for the helper functions that satisfies the specifications in Fig. 7. As mentioned before, these specifications use sequential Hoare triples and have access only to the heap representation of the given node. Thus, if their implementations are sequential code, we can verify them using an off-the-shelf separation logic tool that can verify sequential heap-manipulating code.

### 5 Proof Mechanization and Automation

In addition to the link template presented in the previous section, we have also verified the give-up and lock-coupling template algorithms from [57], as depicted in Fig. 1. For the link and give-up templates, we have derived and verified implementations based on B-trees and hash tables. For the lock-coupling template we have considered a sorted linked list implementation. The lock-coupling template also captures the synchronization performed by maintenance operations on algorithms such as the split operation on B+ and B-link trees when they traverse the data structure.

The proofs of the template algorithms have been mechanized using the Coq proof assistant, building on the formalization of Iris [37]. These proofs parameterize over the implementation of the helper functions (e.g., `decisiveOp`, `findFirst`, etc.) and the heap representation predicate node. The concrete implementations of these helper functions have been

---

3Technically, we perform the linearization at the same time as executing `unlockNode`, but we omit the details here for space reasons.
Table 1. Summary of templates and instantiations verified in Iris/Coq and GRASShopper. For each algorithm or library, we show the number of lines of code, lines of proof annotation (including specification), total number of lines, and the proof-checking / verification time in seconds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Proof</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Templates (Iris/Coq)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow library</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link template</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give-up template</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock-coupling template</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4660</td>
<td>4718</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementations (GRASShopper)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow library</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Array library</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+ tree</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-link (core)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-link (half split)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-link (full split)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hash table (link)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hash table (give-up)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock-coupling list</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>515</td>
<td>2167</td>
<td>2682</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The implementations of half and full splits, we verify that the operation preserves the flow interface of the modified region as well as its contents. The full development of our mechanization effort is available online.

Table 1 provides a summary of our development. Experiments have been conducted on a laptop with an Intel Core i7-5600U CPU and 16GB RAM. We split the table into one part for the templates (proved in Coq) and one part for the implementations (proved in GRASShopper). We note that for the B-link tree, B+ tree and hash table implementations, most of the work is done by the array library, which is shared between all these data structures. The size of the proof for the lock-coupling list and maintenance operations is relatively large. The reason is that these involve the calculation of a new flow interface for the region obtained after the modification. This requires the expansion of the definitions of functions related to flow interfaces, which are deeply nested quantified formulas. GRASShopper enforces strict rules that limit quantifier instantiation so as to remain within certain decidable logics [4, 51]. Most of the proof in this case involves auxiliary assertions that manually unfold definitions. The size of the proof could be significantly reduced with a few simple tactics for quantifier expansion.

It is difficult to assess the overall time effort spent on verifying the link template algorithm, which was the first algorithm that we considered. The reason is that we designed our verification methodology as we verified the template. However, with all the machinery now in place, our experience is that verifying a new template algorithm is a matter of a few hours of proof effort. In fact, adapting the link template proof to the give-up template was straightforward and required only minor changes. Our experience with adapting implementation proofs is similar.

We believe that our case studies are representative of real-world applications and that our methodology can be widely applied. The template algorithms that we have verified focus on lock-based techniques with fixed linearization points inside a decisive operation. In fact, many real-world applications perform better using lock-based algorithms instead of lock-free algorithms as the latter tend to copy data more. On the other hand, our methodology does not require locking, and can be extended to prove lock-free algorithms such as the Bw-tree [42]. While our methodology can, in theory, be applied to any search structure implementation, there are implementations that use very specific concurrency techniques that cannot be used by other heap representations.

verified using the separation logic based deductive program verifier GRASShopper [52]. As the tool uses SMT solvers to largely automate the verification process, this provided us with a substantial decrease in effort.

Our verification effort includes a mechanization of the meta-theory of flows [41] (i.e. that flow interfaces form an RA). Our formalization is parametric in the flow domain (i.e. the underlying cancellative, commutative monoid). We also provide instantiation of the meta-theory for the specific flow domains used in our proofs (e.g. multisets). We have duplicated this effort in Iris/Coq and GRASShopper in order to make the two parts of our verification self-contained. The formalization is available as two standalone libraries that can be reused for other flow-based proofs in these systems.

In addition to the helper functions of each data structure that are assumed by the templates, we have also verified the split operations for B-link trees. The B-link tree uses a two-part split operation: a half-split that creates a new node, transfers half the contents from a full node to this new node, and adds a link edge; and a full-split that completes the split by linking the original node’s parent to the new node. For the split operations, we assume a harness template for a maintenance thread that traverses the data structure graph to identify nodes that are amenable to half splits. While we have not verified this harness, we note that it is a variation of our lock-coupling template where the abstract specification leaves the contents of the data structure unchanged. For

---

8https://github.com/nyu-acsys/template-proofs/tree/pldi_2020
9For instance, Apache’s CouchDB uses a B+ tree with a global write lock; BerkeleyDB, which has hosted Google’s account information, uses a B+ tree with page-level locks in order to trade-off concurrency for better recovery; and java.util.concurrent’s hash tables lock the entire list in a bucket during writes, which is more coarse-grained than the one we verify.
(e.g. Harris’ list [29]). Our technique would give us a “single-use” template in such cases, but this would still structure the proof and make it simpler to construct and verify.

6 Related Work

Our work builds on the search structure templates of [57], the Iris separation logic [35], and the flow framework [40, 41]. Our main technical contributions relative to these works are a new proof technique for verifying template algorithms of concurrent search structures that relies on the integration of the flow framework into Iris. The notion of edgesets and keyssets are taken from [57] but we show how to reason locally about them using flows. Specifically, we capture the essence of the Keyset Theorem of [57] in terms of an Iris RA, thereby eliminating any dependencies on a specific programming language semantics, and allowing us to easily mechanize the proof in Iris. We also provide a full mechanization of the meta-theory of the flow framework presented in [41] in Coq/Iris and GRASShopper. We note that Krishna et al. [40] use the flow framework to verify a template algorithm based on the give-up technique. However, their proof is only on paper, still depends on a meta-level Keyset Theorem like [57] and uses a bespoke program logic that is difficult to mechanize due to limitations of the original flow framework (cf. [41]).

To our knowledge, we are the first to provide a mechanized proof of a concurrent B-link tree. Unlike the proof of da Rocha Pinto et al. [15], which is not mechanized, our proof does not assume node-level operations to be given as primitives. In particular, we also verify the challenging split operation. The only other comparable proof is that of a B+ tree in [44]. However, this work only considers a sequential B-tree implementation and the proof is considerably more complex than ours (encompassing more than 5000 lines of proof for roughly 500 lines of code). Moreover, much of our proof can be reused to verify other concurrent search structures that rely on linking, such as the concurrent hash table implementation that we consider.

Feldman et al. [23] show how to simplify linearizability proofs of concurrent data structures with unsynchronized searches by reasoning purely sequentially about the traversal performed by the search. Their contribution is orthogonal to ours as they do not aim to parameterize the concurrency proof by the heap representation of the data structure.

Iris does not support reasoning about deallocation. Therefore our proofs assume a garbage collected environment. However, Meyer and Wolff [45] demonstrate a similar proof modularity by decoupling the proof of data structure correctness from that of the underlying memory reclamation algorithm, allowing the correctness proof to be carried out under the assumption of garbage collection. An alternative approach to extending our proofs to deal with memory reclamation is to use Iron [5], a recent extension of Iris that allows proving absence of memory leaks. It is a promising direction of future work to integrate these approaches and our technique in order to obtain verified data structures where the user can mix-and-match the synchronization technique, memory layout, and the memory reclamation algorithm.

There exist many other program logics that help modularize the correctness proofs of concurrent systems [6, 16, 19, 24, 28, 31, 46, 53, 60, 61]. Like Iris, their main focus is on modularizing proofs along the interfaces of components of a system (e.g. between the client and implementation of a data structure) and accounting for differences in the concurrency semantics across different abstraction layers [28]. Instead, we focus on modularizing the proof of a single component (a concurrent search structure) so that the parts of the proof can be reused across many diverse implementations.

As discussed in §5, lock-free implementations of search structures often have non-fixed as well as external linearization points. Much work has been dedicated to addressing this challenge [7, 9, 14, 17, 20, 26, 38, 43, 49, 62]. However, we note that these papers do not aim to separate the proof of thread safety from the proof of structural integrity. In fact, we see our contributions as orthogonal to these works. For example, we can build on the recent work of supporting prophesy variables in Iris [56] to extend our methodology to non-blocking algorithms.

Note, our approach does not critically depend on the use of Iris. For example, our proof methodology can be replicated in other separation logics that support user-defined ghost state, such as FCSL [55], which would also be useful if one wanted to extend this work to non-linearizable data structures [56].

Fully automated proofs of linearizability by static analysis and model checking have been mostly confined to simple list-based data structures [1, 3, 8, 13, 22, 59]. Recent work by Abdulla et al. [2] shows how to automatically verify more complex structures such as concurrent skip lists that combine lists and arrays. However, it is difficult to devise fully automated techniques that work over a broad class of diverse heap representations. In particular, structures like the B-link tree considered here are still beyond the state of the art.

7 Conclusion

We have presented a proof technique for concurrent search structures that separates the reasoning about thread safety from memory safety. We have demonstrated our technique by formalizing and verifying three template algorithms, and showed how to derive verified implementations with significant proof reuse and automation. The result is fully mechanized and partially automated proofs of linearizability and memory safety for concurrent search structures.
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