

Concurrency Correctness Witnesses with Ghosts

Manuel Bentele^{1,2} Dominik Klumpp¹ <u>Frank Schüssele</u>¹
July 17, 2023

¹University of Freiburg, Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany

 $^{^2} Hahn\hbox{-} Schick ard\hbox{-} Gesells chaft, \ Villingen\hbox{-} Schwenningen, \ Germany$

State of witnesses

	Sequential		Concurrent	
	Correctness	Violation	Correctness	Violation
ReachSafety	✓	✓	<u> </u>	✓
NoOverflows	✓	\checkmark	<u> </u>	\checkmark
Memsafety	✓	\checkmark	<u> </u>	\checkmark
NoDataRace	-	-	???	???

Motivation

Concurrency correctness witness proposal¹:

- Thread-modular location invariants
 - Problem: thread-modular reasoning is incomplete
 - Thesis: Witness Format should be based on complete notion of proof
- Additional extension to reason about mutexes
 - Specific to language / pthread features
 - However: reasoning about mutual exclusion is crucial for concurrent program proofs

¹Simmo Saan and Julian Erhard. "Beyond Automaton-Based Witnesses and Location Invariants". 4th Workshop on Cooperative Software Verification (COOP 2023). Apr. 2023.

Incompleteness

```
int x;
thread inc() {
  int n = __VERIFIER_nondet_int();
  while (x < n) {
   x++;
    //@ invariant ???
thread main() {
  pthread_create(inc);
 x = 42:
  assert x >= 42:
```

- Goal: Give useful invariant at specified location
- Problem: depends on the interleaving
- Current witness format not expressive enough

Thread-Modular Proofs with Ghost Variables

- Proofs require interleaving information
 - "Good" proof: as little interleaving information as possible
 - "Good" witness: as little control flow information as possible
- Well-known approach: instrument program with *ghost variables*
- Thread-modular invariants + ghost variables: proof rule of Owicki and Gries²
 - Sound and (relatively) complete, even for unbounded threads³
 - ⇒ Theoretical basis for our witness proposal

²Susan Owicki and David Gries. "An Axiomatic Proof Technique for Parallel Programs I". In: *Acta Informatica* 6 (1976), pp. 319–340. DOI: 10.1007/BF00268134.

³Leonor Prensa Nieto. "Completeness of the Owicki-Gries System for Parameterized Parallel Programs". In: *IPDPS*. IEEE Computer Society, 2001, p. 150.

Witnesses based on Owicki-Gries

Owicki-Gries Proofs:

- Ghost Variables
 - record information about execution
 - do not influence execution
 - added to program text
- Location Invariants
 - use ghosts & program variables
 - inductive within a thread
 - interference-free wrt. other threads

Concurrency Witnesses with Ghosts:

- Ghost Variables
 - record information about execution
 - do not influence execution
 - specified in witness
- Location Invariants
 - use ghosts & program variables
 - must hold whenever program is in location

ProgramWitness with ghosts

```
int x;
int g = 0;
thread inc() {
  int n = __VERIFIER_nondet_int();
  while (x < n) {
    x ++ :
   //0 invariant g != 1 || x >= 42
thread main() {
  pthread_create(inc);
  atomic { g = 1; x = 42; }
  assert x >= 42;
```

```
- entry type: ghost variable
 name: g
 scope: global
 type: int
 initial: 0
- entry type: location invariant
 location: ...
 location_invariant:
   string: g != 1 || x >= 42
- entry_type: ghost_update
 variable: g
 expression: 1
 location: ...
```

Witness semantics

- Initialization of global ghosts after initialization of program variables
- Update atomically right before leaving the specified location
- Expression in updates must not have side-effects or undefined behaviour
 - Special handling for data races: Assume every ghost update happens-before (or happens-after) expression evaluations in the program
 - ⇒ Ghost updates do not introduce data races

Fancy ghost variables

```
int x:
int g = 0;
thread inc() {
  int n = __VERIFIER_nondet_int();
  while (x < n) {
    x++;
    //@ invariant x >= g
thread main() {
  int val = __VERIFIER_nondet_int();
  pthread_create(inc);
  atomic { g = val; x = val; }
  assert x >= val;
```

- Ghosts that are set to program variables
- Allows reasoning over more than just interleavings

Mutex reasoning with ghosts

```
int used = 0, g = 0;
mutex m:
thread producer() {
 while (1) {
   atomic { g = 1; lock(m); }
   used++: used--:
   atomic { g = 0; unlock(m); }
thread main() {
 pthread_create(producer);
 //@ invariant g != 0 || used == 0
  atomic { g = 1; lock(m); }
 assert used == 0;
  atomic { g = 0; unlock(m); }
```

- Ghost variables to reason about mutexes
- Invariants can relate program variables and mutexes (via ghosts)
- However: Validator has to find relation between m and g

Tool Implementation

Witness Generation:

- Standard Owicki-Gries approach: Encode program counters⁴
 - Optimization: only necessary interleaving info
- Many more possibilities beyond encoding interleaving

Witness Validation:

- Transformation of program to instrument with ghosts
- Verification of transformed program

⁴Leslie Lamport. "The 'Hoare Logic' of Concurrent Programs". In: *Acta Informatica* 14 (1980), pp. 21–37. DOI: 10.1007/BF00289062.

Strengths

- Based on complete proof notion
- General approach, not bound to tool-specific representation
- Covers many different language features / synchronization mechanisms
- Remains as (thread-)modular as possible, do not encode all interleavings
- Ghost variables: not restricted to concurrency

Limitations

- Proof format of approaches that use reductions (with meta-reasoning) still open research question
 - General problem of witnesses how to encode such meta-reasoning
 - Ghost variables could help with that encoding
- Allowed update locations? (e.g. where in loop, switch/case?)
 - Problem with the general format, not only with this extension
- Further extension for multiple instances of the same thread template needed?
 - thread-local ghost variables
 - quantification (ACSL)
 - unbounded ghost arrays

Conclusion

- Problem: Incomplete witnesses for concurrency
- Proposal of new extension with ghost variables
- General approach, possible to be used by different tools (generation/validation)

Additional materials



 $\verb|https://github.com/ultimate-pa/VEWIT2023-ConcurrencyGhosts|\\$