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ABSTRACT

We present a technique for automatically verifying atomicity of composed concurrent operations. The main observation behind our approach is that many composed concurrent operations which occur in practice are data-independent. That is, the control-flow of the composed operation does not depend on specific input values. While verifying data-independence is undecidable in the general case, we provide succinct sufficient conditions that can be used to establish a composed operation as data-independent. We show that for the common case of concurrent maps, data-independence reduces the hard problem of verifying linearizability to a verification problem that can be solved efficiently with a bounded number of keys and values.

We implemented our approach in a tool called VINE and evaluated it on all composed operations from 57 real-world applications (112 composed operations). We show that many composed operations (49 out of 112) are data-independent, and automatically verify 30 of them as linearizable and the rest 19 as having violations of linearizability that could be repaired and then subsequently automatically verified. Moreover, we show that the remaining 63 operations are not linearizable, thus indicating that data independence does not limit the expressiveness of writing realistic linearizable composed operations.

Categories and Subject Descriptors:
D.2.4 [Software/Program Verification]; D.1.3 [Concurrent Programming]

General Terms:
Verification
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1. INTRODUCTION

Modern programming languages such as Java and C# provide efficient concurrent library implementations that allow developers to build scalable applications. The basic intention is to free the programmer from having to deal with complex concurrency issues by providing a well-defined interface to commonly used operations.

However, applications using modern libraries often require functionality which involves a combination of several library operations. This functionality is typically achieved by building a new operation which is intended to behave atomically, with the new operation built of several existing library operations. Ironically, well-designed libraries are more likely to increase the number of complex composed concurrent operations as more applications are using the library.

Unfortunately, building correct and efficient composed concurrent operations is tricky and error-prone. A recent study of composed operations found in real-world applications reported a large number of atomicity violations [27]. This study influenced the interface of Java concurrent collections, which are being enriched to avoid common programming pitfalls [1, 2]. While the library interface can be extended to support certain common composed operations, it is impossible to include all possible combinations (the set is potentially infinite). Hence, despite the best of intentions by library designers, the fundamental problem of building correct and efficient application-specific composed operations is unlikely to go away. Indeed, the example shown in Figure 1, taken from Apache Tomcat [4] is a custom composed operation that is atomic and is unsupported by the enriched library [1].

Our Approach

We have built a tool, called VINE, which verifies atomicity (linearizability) of composed operations. For instance, our tool verifies that the operation in Figure 1 is linearizable. Our tool enables programmers to use the existing library interface by ensuring that the

```
1 Attribute removeAttribute(String name) {
2   Attribute val = attr.get(name);
3   if (val != null) {
4     val = attr.remove(name);
5   }
6   return val;
7 } : Figure 1: Linearizable version of a composed operation taken from Apache Tomcat [4]. This operation is not supported by the enriched Java library [1]. This composed operation’s semantics is equivalent to attr.remove(name), however, it is more efficient in the general case due to Java’s ConcurrentHashMap internal locking mechanism.
```
composed operation is linearizable. We show that for most practical composed operations, our tool is able to verify the correctness of the composed operation in seconds. This is surprising as checking linearizability is generally considered a hard problem [11].

The key observation behind our approach is that in practice, many composed concurrent operations are data-independent. That is, the control-flow of the composed operation is independent of specific input values. While verifying data-independence is generally undecidable, we provide succinct sufficient conditions which ensure that the composed operation is data-independent.

Further, we conducted an empirical study using code search engines [8] and discovered that the majority of composed operations are based on concurrent maps. To address this case, we present a novel reduction-based verification approach for linearizability of data-independent composed operations build on top-of concurrent maps. The basic idea of our approach is to show a reduction from an operation that can use arbitrary keys and values to an operation that uses a bounded number of keys and values. That is, if we verify the operation with some keys and values, our method guarantees that it will be correct for any keys and values. The actual bounded verification of linearizability for data-independent composed operations can be done using standard techniques (e.g. [27]).

Evaluation.
We used static analysis to extract composed operations from applications and prove that they are data-independent. Our linearizability verifier is implemented in Promela, and verifies the extracted operations using the SPIN model checker [24]. We also implemented the composed operations extractor using the WALA [10] static analyzer. We extracted 112 composed operations from 57 applications and atomically checked which of these satisfy the data-independence requirement. We found that 63 (56%) of these are not data-independent and cannot be handled with our technique. However, a close inspection revealed that these 63 operations are in fact non-linearizable! Of the 49 operations that can be handled by our technique, 44 are data-independent and 5 depend on fixed input keys. SPIN checked the extracted models for these 49 operations in less than a second each, verifying correctness of 30 operations and identifying a linearizability violation in the remaining 19 operations. We manually fixed the linearizability violations in these 19 operations and our tool then successfully proved all of the repaired operations linearizable.

Contributions.
The contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We define a notion of data-independence for composed operations. This notion is inspired by Wolper [31] and can be established via a simple static analysis.
- We conduct a thorough empirical study proving that many realistic composed operations are indeed data-independent and all of the data-dependent composed operations are non-linearizable.
- We proved that for data-independent composed operations, checking linearizability can be performed by using a single key and two values. In particular, for programs with finite local state, verifying linearizability becomes decidable.
- We show that in practice checking linearizability for data-independent composed operations can be performed efficiently (in about a second).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 motivates the problem by showing a linearizable data-independent composed operation taken from [3]. Section 3 describes a data-centric checking for linearizability of composed operations. Section 4 defines data-independent composed operations and shows that proving linearizability of data-independent composed operations can be done with fixed map entries. Section 5 describes our implementation and a classification of real-world composed operations. Section 6 reviews related work and Section 7 concludes.

2. MOTIVATION

Figure 2 shows a composed operation taken from Apache ServiceMix [3] named getLock. This operation uses the underlying ConcurrentHashMap locks to memoize the ReentrantLock allocated at line 4. When the value for a given id is cached in the collection it is returned immediately; when the ReentrantLock for a given id is not available, it is allocated and inserted into the collection. This function handles concurrency in an optimistic manner. The code in lines 5–8 guarantees that even if the update fails when other threads succeed in the update, the return value of the operation is consistent.

This implementation is correct but tricky. It is worth noting that this implementation is not conflict-serializable [20] since there exists an execution of the operation with two memory accesses at lines 2 and 6 and an intervening operation by another thread that mutates the environment.

The method getLock appears to occur automatically to clients i.e., it is linearizable according to [23]. There are two cases that can occur. The first case, handled on line 2, is when locks.get(id) returns a non-null value (“id” is in locks) as then getLock returns the value extracted from locks. In the second case, handled at line 5, if putIfAbsent returns null (indicating the update succeeded) then lock is returned, and otherwise, the current collection value corresponding to id is assigned to oldLock, which is then assigned to lock at line 8 and returned. Checking any safety properties of such operations is potentially hard due to the unbounded number of potential collection values. Moreover, concurrency drastically increases the state space that must be considered.

Interestingly, we observed that composed operations in the real-world follow a common control structure. Indeed, these are “essentially finite-state programs” in the sense that linearizability can be proven by investigating a fixed number of input values. Next, we briefly summarize the main ideas which enable verification of linearizability for composed operations.

Data Independent Composed Operations.
We first formulate the notion of data-independence, inspired by Wolper [31]. Informally, Wolper requires that the control-flow of the composed operation does not depend on its input values and provides syntactic notions which guarantee data-independence. Unfortunately, in practice, Wolper’s notion of data-independence is too restrictive for composed operations. An analysis of 112 composed operations shows that none of them are data-independent according to Wolper’s definition.

To address this issue, we define a notion of data-independence which takes into account the meaning of the collection (i.e., a map). We define a class of composed operations such that their control flow is independent of the actual collection values being manipulated. We refer to this class of programs as Singleton Collection Methods (SCM). The operation getLock is an example of an SCM: it takes as input an id, which is used only as a key inside the locks collection. The return value from the locks operations is checked in getLock only for equality with null, meaning whether there

27
public Lock getLock(String id) {
    Lock lock = locks.get(id); // @LP lock != null
    if (lock == null) {
        lock = new ReentrantLock();
        Lock oldLock = locks.putIfAbsent(id, lock); // @LP
        if (oldLock != null) {
            lock = oldLock;
        }
    }
    return lock;
}

Figure 2: Linearizable data-independent composed operation taken from Apache ServiceMix [3]

exists a key id inside locks. Further, all branches are of the same kind (equality with null). Note that according to Wolper, this operation is not data-independent since its control flow is dependent on the results of operations at lines 3 and 7.

Bounding the number of inputs.
We prove that data-independent composed operations that are linearizable w.r.t one input key must be linearizable with respect to any input key. In getLock this means that if getLock is linearizable for a specific id, then it is linearizable for any input id. Thus, the specific choice of input key is irrelevant to the verification. Our results also extend to operations which depend on a fixed number of input keys.

Bounding the global state size.
Finally, we also prove that the number of map entries needed to expose linearizability violations in data-independent composed operations is bounded. Thus, for programs with bounded local states such as getLock, checking linearizability is actually decidable even though it potentially manipulates unbounded inputs (String id), number of map entries, and number of threads.

3. THREAD-CENTRIC LINEARIZABILITY CHECKING

In this section, we describe a simple thread-centric procedure for checking linearizability of composed concurrent operations, taken from [27].

A local state \( l \in \mathcal{L} \) describes the values of the local variables. For simplicity we assume that there is an extra local variable \( pc \) denoting the current program location. We also assume that the stack is part of the local state.

Let \( \mathcal{C} \) be the set of base collection values and let \( \mathcal{A} \) be the set of values for actual arguments and return values of the collection. Let \( \Sigma = \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{A} \) denote the set of program states.

Let C.M be a composed operation in the custom map C. We say that a method of C.M is a base method if it is not C.M. We use Stmt to denote the set of possible program statements.

3.1 Transition Relation

Given a method of interest C.M, we define the transition relation \( \Pi \subseteq \Sigma \times \text{Stmt} \times \Sigma \) as a small-step operational semantics. We define two kinds of transitions:

- **Local Transition:**
  \[ l, c \xrightarrow{l,c} l', c \]
  That is, executing a local statement in C.M on state \( l, c \) yields a state \( l', c \). It is essential that the stack be part of the local state. Here, \( s \) can be any statement except those that invoke C.M methods.

- **Collection Transition:** This transition always invokes base methods of C. We assume that invocation (calling and returning) of a base method is atomic. Depending on how the local state is affected and who performs the transition, we define two kinds of collection transitions:
  - **Main Transition:**
    \[ \langle l, c_i \rangle \xrightarrow{x = \text{C.b}(\text{args})} \langle l[p_0 \mapsto q, x \mapsto r], c_o \rangle \]
    Here, \( x = \text{C.b}(\text{args}) \) is always a statement of C.M at \( l, c_i \) and the statement is followed by a label \( q \) in C.M. Thus, executing the transition from state \( l, c_i \) involves: (i) evaluating \( \text{args} \) to \( a \) in \( l \); (ii) invoking method \( b \) with \( a \), which produces a new collection \( c_o \); and (iii) setting return value \( r \in \mathcal{A} \) to the local variable \( x \). Note that main transitions always invoke methods that return a value.
  - **Environment Transition:**
    \[ \langle l, c_i \rangle \xrightarrow{\text{C.b}(\text{args})} \langle l, c'_i \rangle \]
    An environment transition does not access local state and always modifies the collection state, i.e., \( c_i \neq c'_i \).
    An environment transition is enabled if:
    \[ * \exists c_o, c'_o \in \mathcal{C} \text{ and } \exists l', l'' \in \mathcal{L} \text{ s.t. the following two main transitions exist:} \]
    \[ \langle l, c_i \rangle \xrightarrow{x = \text{C.b}(\text{args})} \langle l'[p_0 \mapsto q, x \mapsto r], c_o \rangle \]
    \[ \langle l, c'_i \rangle \xrightarrow{y = \text{C.b}(\text{args})} \langle l''[p_0 \mapsto q, x \mapsto r], c'_o \rangle \]
    where \( r_1 \) is the return value of \( b_i \)'s invocation, \( r_2 \) is the return value of \( b_j \)'s invocation, and \( b_i \neq b_j \).
    \[ * r_1 \neq r_2. \]
    Note that the environment transition \( \text{C.b}(\text{args}) \) influences the return value of \( x = \text{C.b}(\text{args}) \) in state \( c_i \). For example, if \( c_i = \emptyset \) and \( x = \text{C.b}(\text{args}) \) is \( x = \text{C.get(2)} \) then \( \text{C.b}(\text{args}) \) could be a \( \text{C.put(2, 4)} \).

3.2 Traces and Exploration Procedure

A trace \( \pi = \langle l_0, c_0 \rangle \xrightarrow{s_1} \langle l_1, c_1 \rangle \ldots \xrightarrow{s_n} \langle l_n, c_n \rangle \) is a sequence of transitions such that:

- \( \langle l_0, c_0 \rangle \) is an initial state.
- \( \forall 0 \leq i < n. \langle l_i, c_i \rangle \xrightarrow{s_i} \langle l_{i+1}, c_{i+1} \rangle \in \Pi. \)
- \( \langle l_{n-1}, c_{n-1} \rangle \xrightarrow{\text{return}} \langle l_n, c_n \rangle \) is a main transition (denoting completion of C.M).

We denote the set of traces as \( [\Pi] \).
A program trace is **sequential** if does not include environment transitions. The following provides a constructive linearizability check performed directly on traces.
**DEFINITION 3.1 (LINEARIZABLE TRACE).**
A trace \( \langle l_0, c_0 \rangle \cdots \langle l_i, c_i \rangle \cdots \langle l_n, c_n \rangle \) is linearizable if there exists a unique \( i \) s.t. the only possible update of the collection by a main transition occurs in transition \( \langle l_i, c_i \rangle \leadsto \langle l_{i+1}, c_{i+1} \rangle \), and for every sequential run \( \pi_s \) starting in a state \( \langle l_0, c_0 \rangle \) and ending with a state \( \langle l', c' \rangle \) it is the case that \( c' = c_{i+1} \) and the return values of \( \pi_s \) and \( \pi \) are equal.

We refer to \( \langle l_0, c_0 \rangle \leadsto \langle l_{i+1}, c_{i+1} \rangle \) from Definition 3.1 as linearization point.

**Checking vs. Verification.**

In [26], the authors show that for the map interface, a composed operation using only `put`, `get`, and `putIfAbsent` operations is non-linearizable if and only if there exists a non-linearizable run of the presented approach. Unfortunately, while useful for checking, the procedure cannot be used to verify linearizability of an arbitrary C.M. The reason is that for verification, one needs to explore an unbounded number of inputs and unbounded number of environment operations, clearly infeasible.

In the next section, we show that verifying linearizability of a data-independent method C.M can be done by only considering a bounded number of inputs and a bounded number of collection entries.

**4. DATA-INDEPENDENT COMPOSED OPERATIONS**

In this section we define data-independent classes of composed operations. The advantage of such restricted operations is that they can be verified for linearizability by considering a bounded number of inputs and a bounded number of collection entries. While verifying data-independence is undecidable in general [31], we provide simple sufficient restrictions that can establish a composed operation as data-independent.

The main idea is to restrict the inputs and the control-flow of the composed operation C.M to guarantee that the operation treats all keys uniformly. First, we limit the parameters of C.M to a key parameter and an optional value parameter. Then, we restrict the effect of these parameters on the control flow inside C.M. Since the control flow should not depend on specific input values, we also limit how the return values of basic operations are used. Finally, we preclude certain basic operations such as `replace(k,v,v')` and `remove(k,v)`, whose effect depends on \( v \) and the state of the collection. Later, we relax some of these restrictions to capture a wider set of composed operations.

In this section we define data-independent composed operations and a set of restrictions that guarantee data-independence. We start by defining the notion of `trace renaming`.

**DEFINITION 4.1 (TRACE RENAMING).** Given a composed operation \( C.M \) with key and value parameters, a trace \( \pi \) of \( C \), and values \( k, v, v' \neq v \), we define a trace \( \pi_{[k,v,v']} \) obtained from \( \pi \) by: (i) replacing the input key for each operation in \( \pi \) by \( k \); (ii) replacing the input value for the C.M operation and for each base operation of a main transition in \( \pi \) by \( v \); (iii) replacing the input value for each base operation of the environment transition in \( \pi \) by \( v' \); (iv) calculating the return value of operations using the specification of \( C \); (v) calculating the local transitions using C.M.

**4.1 Singleton Collection Method (SCM)**

We start by defining the class of data-independent composed operations referred to as Singleton Collection Methods (SCM). This is the class of operations that is most prevalent in practice.

**DEFINITION 4.2 (SCM).** A composed operation \( C.M \) with parameter \( k \) and optional parameter \( v \), is SCM data-independent (from now on referred to as SCM) if:

1. \( k \) is used as a key in all basic collection operations.
2. \( k \) and \( v \) are immutable: no statement in C.M can assign to \( k \) or \( v \).
3. C.M can only invoke the following methods on \( C \) : `get(k)`, `put(k,val)`, `remove(k)`, and `putIfAbsent(k,val)` (here, \( k \) is the parameter \( k \), but \( v \) need not be the \( v \)).
4. if a return value \( r \) of a collection operation is used in a condition, then the condition can only check the (in)equality of \( r \) to `null` (this also applies when the return value is assigned to other variables).
5. exit statements such as `return` and `throw` can only depend on the return value of collection operations.

Restrictions 1 and 2 guarantee that the composed operation only accesses a single key in the map and in a uniform way. Restriction 3 limits the basic operations used in composed operations. The effect on the state and the return value of operations `put(k,val)`, `get(k)`, `remove(k)`, and `putIfAbsent(k,val)` does not depend on a specific value (regardless of the input value, the operation behaves identically). Note that `putIfAbsent(k,v)` depends only on the existence of \( k \) in the map and does not depend on a specific value. The challenge is to guarantee that these operations are composed in a way that preserves data-independence. This motivates restrictions 4 and 5 limit control-flow decisions to those that depend on the existence of a value in the collection without referring to a specific value.

**Examples.**

Table 1 shows a composed operation, named `compute`, and a composed operation named `Replace`, together with their update and return value. Both the update and return value of `compute` do not depend on a specific value. However, in `Replace`, both the update and return value depend on the input argument \( v' \). Indeed, `compute` satisfies the restrictions from Definition 4.2, while `Replace` does not satisfy Restriction 4 due to condition `get(k) == v'` inside the `if` statement.

Consider again the `getLock` operation in our running example in Figure 2. This composed operation meets all of the conditions of Definition 4.2 and is therefore an SCM. The operation uses the underlying `ConcurrentHashMap` methods to memoize the `ReentrantLock` allocated at line 4. When the value for a given `id` is cached in the collection it is returned immediately; when the `ReentrantLock` for a given `id` is not available, it is allocated and inserted into the collection. It has a single input `id` which is used only as a key in the `ConcurrentHashMap` locks. And the return value of the collection operation is only checked for (in)equality to `null` (lines 3 and 7).

Next, based on the restrictions from Definition 4.2, the map specification, and the non-commutativity specification of maps, we state the main reduction theorem. We use the simple case of SCM where \( k \) is used as a key and \( v \) is used as a value in all operations. Theories for composed operations satisfying other restrictions can be stated and proved in a similar way. Due to space limitation we omit the proofs from the paper. The full details can be found in [26].

**THEOREM 4.1.** If \( C \) is a collection where \( C.M \) is an SCM operation, and \( \pi \) is a linearizable trace of \( C \), then for any input key \( k \) and values \( v, v' \neq v \), \( \pi_{[k,v,v']} \) is a linearizable trace of \( C \).
Table 1: Sample composed operations and their specifications. compute is an SCM operation and Replace is not an SCM operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Updated Map Value</th>
<th>Return Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>compute(k, v)</td>
<td>M[k → v]</td>
<td>M(k) ≠ null o/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if (nv ≠ null)</td>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M[k → v]</td>
<td></td>
<td>M(k) ≠ null o/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k, v, v'</td>
<td></td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if (get(k) == v')</td>
<td></td>
<td>M(k) ≠ v'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>return replace(k, v, v');</td>
<td></td>
<td>M(k) ≠ v'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M(k) ≠ v'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The algorithm generated the trace as follows: The run starts at the initial state \( pc = 1, K = 1, C = \emptyset \) and runs sequentially until state \( pc = 7, C = \{(1, 2)\} \). This state is a linearization point, therefore, at this point, a sequential run starts from the state \( pc = 1, K = 1, C = \emptyset \). While \( pc = 1, K = 1 \) is the initial local state of doubleNonLin(K) (the input argument), \( C = \emptyset \) is copied from the state previous to the linearization point. The sequential run continues without intervening environment operations until termination (sequential trace represented by circles). Upon termination, the map entries at the sequential trace’s last state and at the linearization point’s state are compared and in this case are equivalent (otherwise, a linearization violation was found). At this point, the run continues and an environment operation, m.put(1, 3), that influences the next to come operation m.get(3) is performed. Then, the run continues until the return statement. In this case, the linearizability violation is revealed due to a different return value at the concurrent trace’s last state \( val = 3 \) and at the last sequential trace’s state \( val = 2 \).

Figure 3a: (a) an example of a non-Boolean method inspired by bugs from Adobe BlazeDS, Vo Urp and Ehcache-spring-annotations. (b) a possible linearizable fix for the example from (a). Both examples are SCMs.
4.4 Fixed Collection Method (FCM)

We also generalize the class of SCM operations to deal with programs that are dependent on a finite number of values. We refer to this more general class as Fixed Collection Methods (FCM). We generalize SCM by weakening the restriction that exit statements and collection operations are not control-dependent on expressions using $k$. In FCM, exit statements and collection operations may be control-dependent on expressions using $k$ when the expression compares $k$ to a constant value. We use these expressions to build a set of inputs $I$ for the FCM by adding all constants, as well as, one additional value that is not in $I$.

Figure 4: Runs generated by our algorithm. A state is represented by a box, a linearization point is represented by a black box, A state of the sequential run is represented by a circle, arrow represents a transition, and a dashed arrow represents an environment transition together with its operation. (a) shows a run, generated by our algorithm, of doubleNonLin method from Figure 3a showing a linearizability violation. The violation revealed by the different return value (val) at the end of the sequential trace. (b) shows all the traces, generated by our algorithm, for doubleLin method from Figure 3b.

Figure 5: VCM example, taken from OpenJDK [9]

```java
1  void inc(Class<?> key) {
2   for (; ;) {
3       Integer i = get(key);
4       if (i == null) {
5           if (putIfAbsent(key, 1) == null)
6               return;
7       } else {
8           if (replace(key, i, i + 1))
9               return;
10       }
11   }
12 }
```

Figure 6: FCM example, taken from AutoAndroid [5]

```java
1  AndroidTools forOsFamily(String osFamily) {
2      AndroidTools instance = androidTools.get(osFamily);
3  
4      if (instance == null) {
5          AndroidTools newInstance = null;
6          if (osFamily.equals("windows")) {
7              newInstance = new WindowsAndroidTools();
8          } else if (osFamily.equals("unix")) {
9              newInstance = new UnixAndroidTools();
10          } else {
11              throw new UnsupportedOperationException("...");
12          }
13      }
14      instance = androidTools.putIfAbsent(osFamily, newInstance);
15      if (instance == null)
16          instance = newInstance;
17  }
18  return instance;
19 }
```
```java
FxValueRenderer getInstance(FxLanguage language) {
    if (language == null) {
        return renderers.get(DEFAULT);
    }
    if (!renderers.containsKey(language)) {
        renderers.putIfAbsent(language, new FxValueRendererImpl(language));
    }
    return renderers.get(language);
}
```

Figure 7: A data-dependent method example, taken from fleXive [7]

Figure 6 shows a composed operation forOsFamily taken from AutoAndroid [5]. This operation returns an instance of AndroidTools suitable for the given operating system. This operation either returns a new instance and updates the ConcurrentHashMap androidTools or returns an existing instance extracted from the map. AutoAndroid supports only tools for the “unix” and “windows” operating systems, therefore, lines 6 – 13, check whether the input string is either “unix” or “windows” and throws an exception otherwise.

Clearly, this function is not an SCM because there is an abnormal exit statement (throw at line 11) that is control dependent on the input key osFamily (lines 6 and 8). However, the input key osFamily is only compared to the constants “unix” and “windows”. Moreover, forOsFamily meets all the other SCM requirements. Therefore, osFamily is an FCM and the fixed input set is the set {“unix”, “windows”, X} s.t. X is any value other than “unix” and “windows”.

Note that Theorem 4.1 can also be generalized to deal with FCM operations. Unlike SCM and VCM, FCM operations are dependent only on a fixed set of inputs. Therefore, they can be verified as linearizable by exploring all traces generated by the transition relation from Section 3 using this fixed set of inputs. Verifying forOsFamily for example, can be done using the set of input [“unix”, “windows”, “*”], where “*” can be replaced with any string different that “unix” and “windows”.

4.5 Example of a Data-Dependent Composed Operation

Figure 7 shows part of a composed operation getInstance taken from fleXive [7]. This operation takes an input language and when the input is null returns a predefined FxValueRenderer corresponding to the key DEFAULT in the ConcurrentHashMap renderers (lines 2 – 3). Otherwise, the method either returns a new object FxValueRenderer and updates the renderers or returns an existing FxValueRenderer from renderers (lines 5 – 9).

This composed operation is not linearizable, but can be repaired to be linearizable, as shown in Figure 8. However, even its linearizable version is neither SCM nor FCM. The reason is that in line 3 there is an access to renderers with the key DEFAULT which might be other than the value of language.

5. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

In this section we outline the implementation of our tool and evaluate its effectiveness for checking linearizability of composed operation on a wide range of real-world applications. Using our approach, we show that all linearizable real-world composed operations we identified can be categorized as one of SCM, VCM, or FCM and can be handled by our technique. We also classify those operations which do not fall in these classes (we refer to those operations as data-dependent).

5.1 Implementation

An outline of the tool implementation is shown in Figure 9. The programmer provides a multithreaded program to the Composed Operation Extractor (referred to as CO Extractor). The CO Extractor uses the WALA [10] static analyzer to identify composed operations which include multiple base collection operations.

The extracted composed operation (CO) is then provided to the VERIFIER module. This module checks whether the given composed operation is SCM, FCM or VCM. If it is either of these three, then it is considered to be data-independent, otherwise the operation is considered data-dependent. If it is an FCM, the VERIFIER module also provides a set of inputs. Further, to simplify checking, our tool takes as input additional specification in the form of (potentially conditional) linearizability points of the composed operation. When VERIFIER returns a data-dependent result the composed operation is returned to the user since it cannot be handled by our approach.

When the VERIFIER returns an SCM, an FCM, or a VCM, we automatically generate Promela models, which are fed to the SPIN model checker in order to verify linearizability. This can be done for composed operations with primitive keys and values. However, for composed operations with more complex keys or values (e.g. of type String), we require that the programmer provides an input driver for generating the actual values for keys and values. In addition, in this case, the user provides an influence driver that gets an input object and returns a single different object. This driver is used by the environment of our technique.

Note that for SCM, the input driver needs to provide only an arbitrary key and an arbitrary value and the influence driver needs to provide another value which differs from the one provided by the input driver. Also note that the sequential specification we used for checking linearizability is by executing the custom collection operations in an atomic manner.

5.2 Applications

Table 2 lists 57 real-world applications using Java’s concurrent collections. In many applications, concurrent collections were introduced to address observed scalability problems, replacing manual locking of a sequential map. Each of the applications contains at least one method that was extracted and tested by our tool. In 33 out of the 112 extracted methods, the CO Extractor identified a composed operation inside a large method and we manually extracted and generated the composed operation. The extracted methods together with explanations for each method can be found at [6].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AndroidTools</td>
<td>For Android operating systems, returns an instance of AndroidTools for the given operating system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConcurrentHashMap</td>
<td>Supports concurrent access to a collection of key-value pairs, ensuring linearizability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArrayList</td>
<td>Provides a linearizable collection of type T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConcurrentHashMap</td>
<td>Allows concurrent access to a collection of key-value pairs, ensuring linearizability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TreeSet</td>
<td>Provides a linearizable set of type T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedHashSet</td>
<td>Provides a linearizable set of type T.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table is a simplified representation of the actual data. The complete documentation can be found in the referenced source [6].
Table 2: 57 applications used for experiments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Planning</td>
<td>1,103,453</td>
<td>Automated budgeting tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe BlazeDS</td>
<td>180,822</td>
<td>Server-based Java remoting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amf-serializer</td>
<td>4,553</td>
<td>AMF3 messages serialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annor</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>Runtime annotation processor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache Cassandra</td>
<td>54,470</td>
<td>Distributed Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache Derby</td>
<td>618,532</td>
<td>Relational database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache MyFaces</td>
<td>201,130</td>
<td>JSF framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache ServiceMix</td>
<td>78,340</td>
<td>Enterprise Service Bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache Struts</td>
<td>110,710</td>
<td>Java app framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache Tomcat</td>
<td>103,206</td>
<td>Java Servlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache Wicket</td>
<td>132,908</td>
<td>Web application framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ApacheCXF</td>
<td>311,285</td>
<td>Services Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autoandroid</td>
<td>19,764</td>
<td>Tools for automating android projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beannlib</td>
<td>42,693</td>
<td>Java Bean library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonado</td>
<td>53,455</td>
<td>Java abstraction layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBB</td>
<td>16,934</td>
<td>Concurrent Building Blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clojure</td>
<td>23,421</td>
<td>Dynamic programming language for the JVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cometdim</td>
<td>5,571</td>
<td>A WebIM project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy</td>
<td>334,337</td>
<td>Content and information management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWR</td>
<td>26,094</td>
<td>Ajax for Java</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dyuproject</td>
<td>26,593</td>
<td>Java REST framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehcache Annotations</td>
<td>3,184</td>
<td>Automatic integration of Ehcache in spring projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ektorp</td>
<td>6,261</td>
<td>Java API for CouchDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EntityJWS</td>
<td>79,820</td>
<td>Oo lite system API</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eXo</td>
<td>13,298</td>
<td>Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findbugs</td>
<td>106,031</td>
<td>Static analysis tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fleXive</td>
<td>910,780</td>
<td>Java EE 5 content repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GlassFish</td>
<td>290,461</td>
<td>JavaServer faces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>28,932</td>
<td>Data services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gridkit</td>
<td>8,346</td>
<td>Kit of data grid tool and lib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWTEventService</td>
<td>17,113</td>
<td>Remote event listening for GWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelcast</td>
<td>59,139</td>
<td>Data grid for Java</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>14,991</td>
<td>Automatic build system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwajin</td>
<td>4,371</td>
<td>A Struts plugin for Java</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jIw2</td>
<td>54,888</td>
<td>Web application framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack4j</td>
<td>4,477</td>
<td>Interface to Jack library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBoss AOP</td>
<td>1,013,073</td>
<td>Aspect oriented framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jetty</td>
<td>64,039</td>
<td>Java HTTP servlet server</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jexin</td>
<td>11,012</td>
<td>Functional testing platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRipple</td>
<td>148,745</td>
<td>Program analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSele</td>
<td>27,208</td>
<td>Object serialization library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keyczar</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>Cryptography Toolkit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>memcache-client</td>
<td>4,884</td>
<td>Memcache client for Java</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModuleGlassfish</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>Module for Glassfish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenJDK</td>
<td>1,634,818</td>
<td>Jdk 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-GRaDE</td>
<td>1,154,884</td>
<td>P-GRaDE Grid Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Tammi</td>
<td>163,915</td>
<td>Java development framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Track</td>
<td>5,160</td>
<td>Example application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTEasy</td>
<td>81,586</td>
<td>Java REST framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrofitranslator</td>
<td>27,315</td>
<td>Automatic compatibility tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamy</td>
<td>483,418</td>
<td>Audio/video recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tersus</td>
<td>163,100</td>
<td>Visual Programming Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>torque-spring</td>
<td>2,526</td>
<td>Torque support classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo Urp</td>
<td>24,996</td>
<td>UML data models translator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WebMill</td>
<td>57,161</td>
<td>CMS portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xbird</td>
<td>196,893</td>
<td>XQuery processor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasca</td>
<td>326,502</td>
<td>Program analysis tool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Results

We tested 112 methods in 57 applications. All of our experiments were carried out using an AMD Opteron 2.4GHz dual hyper threaded CPUs, 8GB RAM platform running on a 64 bit Linux. The runtime for analyzing each method was less than a second.

Figure 10 (a) shows that 49 methods are data-independent. Out of these, 43 are SCM, 1 is VCM, and 5 depend on fixed input keys (FCM). Furthermore, 30 methods were verified as linearizable, and a linearizability violation was detected in the other 19 methods. We then manually fixed the linearizability violations in all of these 19 methods and verified their fixed versions are linearizable.

Figure 10 (a) also shows that 63(56%) of the tested methods are data-dependent. The data-dependent methods cannot be verified by our technique. However, a close inspection revealed that all the data-dependent methods are non-linearizable. Moreover, it is not obvious if these methods can be rewritten as equivalent linearizable methods because, as Section 5.3.1 shows, the results of most of these methods depend on the values of global variables. In summary, all of the linearizable methods were verified with our technique.

Figure 10 (b) shows the distribution of the data-independent methods that are linearizable, or can be fixed to be linearizable in each of our benchmarks. In 21 out the 57 application we automatically verified the linearizability of all composed operations. The remaining 36 applications also include data-dependent methods that cannot be verified by our technique.

5.3.1 Benchmark Classification

Figure 11 shows the classification of our 63 data-dependent composed operations according to the rules they falsify. The largest group, marked “Globals”, has 43 operations that use global variables and are therefore not encapsulated. These operations are non-linearizable in an open environment. Moreover, it is not obvious whether these methods can be rewritten as equivalent linearizable methods because the result of these methods depends on the values of the globals. For example, Figure 12 shows a method from the Granite benchmark, where the result depends on the global variables _proxy, and _noproxy(note the condition in line 10). An environment that changes the value of _proxy affects the value of destination, calculated in line 12.

In 2 of the data-dependent operations there is a remove(k,v) operation (marked as “Remove”), 6 may exit not based on collection result (marked as “Exit”), and 3 access the map with two different keys (marked as “Keys”). An example of the last case
Figure 10: Benchmark results. (a) classification of 112 benchmark methods into SCM, VCM, FCM, and data dependent methods, and classification of the 49 data-independent methods into linearizable and non-linearizable. The rest 63 data-independent methods are non-linearizable (b) data-independent methods that are either linearizable or can be fixed to be linearizable in each one of our benchmarks.

Figure 12: A non-linearizable composed operation from GRANITE. The result of the operation depends on the global variables _proxy and _noProxy.
is the function getInstance shown in Figure 7. This method accesses the DEFAULT key in line 3 and the language key at lines 6 and 10. Finally, in 2 of the data-dependent composed operations there exists a branch on collection return value other than null (“Branch”), 4 have a size (“Size”), and in 3 the composed operation has more than two input arguments (“Inputs”).

6. RELATED WORK

Next, we survey some of the work that is most closely related to our approach.

6.1 Dynamic Analysis of Linearizability

Dynamic atomicity checkers such as [20, 19] check for violations of conflict serializability. As noted earlier, conflict-serializability is inappropriate in our setting as typically the underlying base collection is linearizable and programmers simply want to add other linearizable methods. Hence, we focus on checking linearizability.

Linearizability checking tools have proven quite effective in finding bugs. Line-Up [14] is a dynamic linearizability checker that learns the sequential specification dynamically and then checks it for linearizability. [27] is a dynamic tool for checking linearizability of composed collection operations.

All of the above techniques can effectively find bugs in general programs, however, these methods may produce false negatives. In this paper, we focus on data-independent programs manipulating maps and present a procedure that can prove linearizability for that class.

6.2 Linearizability Verification

A manual proof of correctness of several interesting concurrent data structure implementations using rely-guarantee reasoning is presented in [29].

The PVS system has been successfully used to semi-automatically verify linearizability [18, 16, 21] of several programs. These proofs provide crucial insights on essential points of the algorithm. However, this is a very time consuming task that needs to be repeated for each new program. In contrast, our approach works on a restricted class of programs but is much more automatic.

The work of [12] introduced the idea of using abstract interpretation [17] to develop an automatic over-approximation for checking linearizability. Thus, the algorithm can prove linearizability in certain programs but may fail due to overly conservative abstraction. The algorithm assumes that the concurrent and sequential runs differ by at most one element, thereby drastically simplifying the task of checking linearizability. The work in [13, 25] generalizes [12] using a thread-centric approach to verify programs with an unbounded number of threads. In [28], the idea of bounded differences is combined with rely guarantee reasoning and shape abstractions to perform fast linearizability checks. In contrast, the work in this paper is not only sound but also guaranteed to be complete for data independent collection manipulations. Note that we prove that linearizability violations can be observed using maps with at most one key which implies bounded differences.

Works such as [30] focus on model checking individual collections. Our work operates at a higher level, as a client of already verified collections, and leverages the specifications of the underlying collections and the composed operation’s data-independent characteristics to reduce the search space. Also, we bound the global state without using any approximation.

In [15] is shown that checking linearizability is decidable for programs with simple linked-list manipulations. We focus on collections that hide the internal representation and use data-independence to show that the state space reduces to the state space of the local state. This implies decidability for finite-state local states and is effective for all the data-independent programs we have encountered.

6.3 Effective Techniques for State Space Reduction

This paper uses data-independence which was inspired by [31] to bound the size of the global state space.

Partial order reduction techniques, such as [22], utilize commutativity of individual memory operations to filter out execution paths which cannot lead to new violations. While this technique has proven to be very effective for drastically reducing the state space in explicit state model checking, it is in general difficult to infer commutativity for real life software. This paper uses the fact that the abstract interface of the collection is known at library design time to build a tool which incorporates commutativity checking.

7. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

Proliferation of concurrent libraries combined with desire for increased performance has led to the current situation where programmers build applications that create custom composed concurrent operations. These composed concurrent operations consist of multiple invocations of underlying library operations and are meant to be linearizable. Unfortunately, implementing such composed concurrent operations correctly and efficiently has proven to be quite difficult.

In this paper, we identified a class of data-independent composed concurrent operations that frequently arises in practice. Then, we presented a novel automatic linearizability verification procedure for that class. The basic insight is to leverage the restricted structure of the composed concurrent operations by defining a reduction procedure which enables us to verify the composed operation by only considering a small bounded number of values. We implemented the reduction in a tool and used it to prove linearizability of practical composed collections which were automatically extracted from a large variety of open source projects.

As future work, we plan to extend the class of data-independent composed operations as well as to study their use in other programming languages.
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