

Note: The assignment is written in landscape mode to make reading of Figure 1 easier on a computer screen.

The program in questions produces varying output depending on the order of execution. There are termination and non-termination scenarios as well as scenarios in which the order of execution affects the final values of x and y . Let us label the thread containing the `while` loop *Thread-A* and let us label the thread containing `<await (x==y)>` *Thread-B*. Initially, there is only possible interleaving of the threads - *Thread-A* executes 10 iterations decrementing the value of x by one each iteration. When the value of x is decremented to 0, a first 'interesting' interleaving of the two threads can begin. The scenarios discussed below will assume this stage as the starting point. *Figure 1* outlines the tree of executions, labels such as **A** and **B** are used to refer to individual subtrees and simplify explanation.

Firstly, an interesting interleaving happens at **A**, where the program can decide to execute *Thread-A* and exit the loop or *Thread-B* and unblock. Let us consider the scenario where the `while` loop is exited (**B**). At **B**, if we choose to increment the value of y , the program will not be able to terminate as the values of x and y are (0, 1) respectively (**C**). Alternatively, executing the `await` and unblock *Thread-B* leads to termination scenarios.

Secondly, starting **D**, the execution can proceed by setting the value of x without any impact on the final state. At **E**, after the value of x is set to 8, we need to sequentially set values of y . This can lead to four different outcomes. Executing $y = 2$ first will result in final values (8, 3). Choosing to execute $y = y + 1$ first, we are presented with a race condition issue where the above statement may require multiple instructions to execute - exposing itself to a race condition. Depending on the order of execution, shown as the subtrees of **F**, we can end up with the following final values: (8, 1), (8, 2), (8, 3).

Thirdly, following the execution of the `await` from the root (**A**), we effectively unblock *Thread-B* execution. At **G**, we can either execute the condition check of the `while` loop or set the value of x to 8. Deciding to execute the `while` loop, we arrive at a previously discussed tree **D**. Choosing to execute $x = 8$ leaves us at subtree **H**.

Starting at **H**, if we choose to execute $y = 2$, we can proceed with execution of the `while` loop in *Thread-A* until x and y are (2, 2) respectively. At this point, the only instruction to execute is to increment y , arriving at final values (2, 3). Choosing to execute the condition check of the `while` loop first (at **H**), we reach a slightly more complicated execution pattern. We can either keep decrementing x as part of the `while` loop, or at any time we may set the value of y to 2. If setting the value of y to 2 is executed before x is 2 or less, we reach **J**. At this stage, we keep decrementing the value of x until it is equal to 2. At this stage, we only increment the value of y and arrive at (2, 3).

Choosing to set the value of y to 2 when the value of x is 2 or less inside the loop, we can arrive at two scenarios. Either we are still executing the `while` loop, in which case the program never terminates (**L**) or the value of y is set only after we have exited the `while` loop, in which case we reach **M**. At this point, depending on the precise order of execution of $y = y + 1$ and $y = 2$, we can arrive at final values (0, 1), (0, 2), (0, 3).

To conclude, there are 2 non-termination scenarios, and a 9 interesting sequentially consistent outcomes of execution. The main reason for the large number of outcomes is due to race conditions arising from non-atomic operations such as $x \neq y$ and $y = y + 1$. Furthermore, deadlock and a `while`-loop run off are another reasons for the large number of outcomes.

Figure 1

