Verification of Fine-Grained Concurrent Programs

Christian J. Bell

Verification of Fine-Grained Concurrent Programs

Concurrent programs can be simple
 – threads work independently of each other

- Concurrent programs can be complex
 - use locks, semaphores, CAS, shared stacks, shared queues, etc. to communicate
 - threads follow some protocol

Verification of Fine-Grained Concurrent Programs

 Easiest when we can reason about one thread at a time: local reasoning

 Most powerful when we can reason about all threads at once: global reasoning

Local Reasoning

• Example: Concurrent Separation Logic

• Advantage: modularity

Disadvantage: cannot reason about many kinds of concurrency

Global Reasoning

• Example: Rely-guarantee

• Disadvantage: not very modular

Can reason about complex protocols between threads

Examples

$$\{x=v\}$$
acquire(l)
$$x:=x+n$$

$$release(l)$$

$$\{x=v+m+n\}$$

parallel increment

Examples



monotonically increasing shared variable

Finding a Balance

- Promising approach is to use a protocol to govern the shared state between threads
 - state machines
 - linear logic
 - "concurroids"
 - concurrent abstract predicates

Research Questions

• Representing protocols?



Research Questions

• Representing protocols?

• Composition?



Research Questions

• Representing protocols?

• Composition?

• Encapsulation?



Our Approach

- Formalize our proofs and techniques in a theorem prover *from the start*
 - harness higher-order logic
 - automate ugly technical details away
 - easy to use in practice **vs** looking good on paper



Our Approach

- Formalize our proofs and techniques in a theorem prover *from the start*
 - harness higher-order logic
 - automate ugly technical details away
 - easy to use in practice **vs** looking good on paper
- We call our protocols "monitors":
 - they observe the actions of all threads
 - detect "bad" actions
 - and evolve in response to actions



End

Thanks!