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## Problem Statement

Reason about values in concurrent programs without reasoning about timing and without considering all interleavings

## Key Idea
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\section*{Abstractions}
return sort(shared)

Abstraction \(\mathbf{\alpha}\) : list \(\rightarrow\) multiset of elements
Abstraction \(\boldsymbol{\alpha}\) : list \(\rightarrow\) mean

\section*{Abstraction \(\boldsymbol{\alpha}\) : list \(\rightarrow\) sum}

Abstraction \(\boldsymbol{\alpha}:\) list \(\rightarrow\) length
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Abstraction \(\boldsymbol{\alpha}:\) map \(\rightarrow\) set of keys
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\section*{Precondition}

\section*{Postcondition}

Invariant
\(f v(K) \cap \operatorname{moa}(c)=\emptyset \quad 1_{\perp} \vdash\{P\} c\{Q\}\) \(P\) is precise or \(R\) is precise
\(\Gamma_{\perp} \vdash\{P * R\} c\{Q * R\}\)
\(\frac{x \notin f v(c) \quad \Gamma_{\perp}=\Gamma \Rightarrow x \notin f v(\Gamma) \quad \Gamma_{\perp} \vdash\{P\} c\{Q\}}{\Gamma_{\perp} \vdash\{\exists x \cdot P\} c\{\exists x \cdot Q\}}\) (ExisTs)
\(\Gamma=\left\langle\alpha, f_{a_{s}}, f_{a_{u}}, I(x)\right\rangle \quad \Gamma\) is valid \(\quad I(x)\) is unary and precise
\(\Gamma \vdash\left\{P * \operatorname{sguard}\left(1, \emptyset^{*}\right) * \operatorname{uguard}([])\right\} c\left\{Q * \operatorname{sg} \operatorname{uard}\left(1, x_{s}\right) * \operatorname{PRE}_{s}\left(x_{s}\right) * \operatorname{uguard}\left(x_{u}\right) * \operatorname{PRE}_{u}\left(x_{u}\right)\right\}\)
\(\perp \vdash\{I(x) * \operatorname{Low}(\alpha(x)) * P\} c\left\{\exists x^{\prime} . I\left(x^{\prime}\right) * \operatorname{Low}\left(\alpha\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right) * Q\right\}\)
\(\Gamma=\left\langle\alpha, f_{a_{s}}, f_{a_{u}}, I(x)\right\rangle \quad I\left(x_{v}\right)\) is unary and precise
\(x_{v} \notin f v(P, Q) \quad x_{s}, x_{a}, x_{v} \notin \bmod (c) \quad \operatorname{nog} u a r d(P) \quad \operatorname{noguard}(Q)\)
\(\perp \vdash\left\{P * I\left(x_{v}\right)\right\} c\left\{Q * I\left(f_{a_{s}}\left(x_{v}, x_{a}\right)\right)\right\}\)
\(\Gamma \vdash\left\{P * \operatorname{sguard}\left(r, x_{s}\right)\right\}\) atomic \(c\left\{Q * \operatorname{sg}\right.\) uard \(\left.\left(r, x_{s} \cup^{*}\left\{x_{a}\right\}^{\#}\right)\right\}\)
\(\Gamma=\left\langle\alpha, f_{a_{s}}, f_{a_{u}}, I(x)\right\rangle \quad I\left(x_{v}\right)\) is unary and precise
\(x_{v} \notin f v(P, Q) \quad x_{s}, x_{a}, x_{v} \notin \bmod (c) \quad\) noguard \((P) \quad\) noguard \((Q)\)
\(\perp \vdash\left\{P * I\left(x_{v}\right)\right\} c\left\{Q * I\left(f_{a_{u}}\left(x_{v}, x_{a}\right)\right)\right\}\)
\(\Gamma \vdash\left\{P * \operatorname{uguard}\left(x_{s}\right)\right\}\) atomic \(c\left\{Q * \operatorname{uguard}\left(x_{s}++\left[x_{a}\right]\right)\right\}\)
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- Relational concurrent separation logic
- Support for (abstract) commutativity-based information flow reasoning
- Thread-modular reasoning, mutable heaps
- Other features:
- Low events, standard output...
- More complete support for non-symmetric concurrency
- Formalized and proved sound in Isabelle/HOL
- Challenging soundness argument distinct from existing logics
- Available on the Archive of Formal Proofs
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- Relational concurrent separation logic
- Support for (abstract) commutativity-based information flow reasoning
- Thread-modular reasoning, mutable heaps
- Other features:
- Low events, standard output...
- More complete support for non-symmetric concurrency

Non-interference theorem
- Formalized and proved sound in Isabelle/HOL
- Challenging soundness argument distinct from existing logics
- Available on the Archive of Formal Proofs
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\section*{HyperViper}
- Automated, SMT-based verifier
- Based on Viper verification infrastructure and Z3
- Relational reasoning using Modular Product Programs
User provides abstractions, pre- and postconditions, invariants...
- Supports dynamic thread creation, multiple shared resources, ...
- https://github.com/viperproject/hyperviper

\section*{HyperViper}
- Automated, SMT-based verifier
- Based on Viper verification
infrastructure and \(\mathrm{Z3}\)
- Relational reasoning using Modular Product Programs
- User provides abstractions, pre- and postconditions, invariants...
- Supports dynamic thread creation, multiple shared resources, ...
- https://github.com/viperproject/hyperviper
```

ockType IntLock {
type Int
alpha(v): Int = 0 // we abstract to a constant, so everything commutes
actions = [(SetValue, Int, duplicable)]
action SetValue(v, arg)
{ arg }
noLabels = 2
}
method worker(l: Lock, lbl: Int
requires lowEvent \&\& sguard[IntLock,SetValue](l, Set(lbl))
sguardArgs[IntLock,SetValue](l, Set(lbl)) == Multiset[Int]()
sguard[IntLock,SetValue](l, Set(lbl))
allPre[IntLock, SetValue](sguardArgs[IntLock,SetValue](l, Set(lbl)))
{
var v: Int
v := lbl
with[IntLock] l performing SetValue(v) at lbl {
l.lockInt.val := v
}
}
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lockType IntLock
type Int
alpha(v): Int = 0 // we abstract to a constant, so everything commutes
actions = [(SetValue, Int, duplicable)]
action SetValue(v, arg)
{ arg }
noLabels = 2
```

\}

```
method worker(l: Lock, lbl: Int)
    requires lowEvent && sguard[IntLock,SetValue](l, Set(lbl))
        sguardArgs[IntLock,SetValue](l, Set(lbl)) == Multiset[Int]()
        sguard[IntLock,SetValue](l, Set(lbl))
        allPre[IntLock, SetValue](sguardArgs[IntLock,SetValue](l, Set(lbl)))
{
    var v: Int
    v := lbl
    with[IntLock] l performing SetValue(v) at lbl {
        l.lockInt.val := v
    }
}

\section*{HyperViper}
- Automated, SMT-based verifier

Based on Viper verification
infrastructure and Z3
- Relational reasoning using Modular Product Programs
- User provides abstractions, pre- and postconditions, invariants...
- Supports dynamic thread creation, multiple shared resources, ...
- https://github.com/viperproject/hyperviper
```

lockType IntLock {
type Int
alpha(v): Int = 0 // we abstract to a constant, so everything commutes
actions = [(SetValue, Int, duplicable)]
action SetValue(v, arg)
{ arg }
noLabels = 2
}

```
method worker(l: Lock, lbl: Int
        LowEvent \&\& sguard[IntLock,SetValue](l, Set(lbl))
        sguardArgs[IntLock,SetValue](l, Set(lbl)) == Multiset[Int]()
        sguard[IntLock, SetValue](l, Set(lbl))
        allPre[IntLock, SetValue](sguardArgs[IntLock,SetValue](l, Set(lbl)))
```

var v: In
v := lbl
with[IntLock] l performing SetValue(v) at lbl {
l.lockInt.val := v
}
}

## HyperViper

- Automated, SMT-based verifier

Based on Viper verification
infrastructure and Z3

- Relational reasoning using Modular Product Programs
- User provides abstractions, pre- and postconditions, invariants...
- Supports dynamic thread creation, multiple shared resources, ...
- https://github.com/viperproject/hyperviper

```
ockType IntLock
type Int
alpha(v): Int = 0 // we abstract to a constant, so everything commutes
actions = [(SetValue, Int, duplicable)]
action SetValue(v, arg)
{ arg }
noLabels = 2
}
method worker(l: Lock, lbl: Int
requires lowEvent && sguard[IntLock,SetValue](l, Set(lbl))
        sguardArgs[IntLock,SetValue](l, Set(lbl)) == Multiset[Int]()
        sguard[IntLock,SetValue](l, Set(lbl))
        allPre[IntLock, SetValue](sguardArgs[IntLock,SetValue](l, Set(lbl)))
{
    var v: Int
    v := lbl
    with[IntLock] l performing SetValue(v) at lbl {
        l.lockInt.val := v
    }
}

\section*{Evaluation}
\begin{tabular}{l|l|l|r|r|r} 
Examplef & Data structure & Abstraction & LOC & Ann, & T \\
Count-Vaccinated & Counter, increment & None & 10.15 \\
Figure 2 & Integer, add & None & 129 & 95 & 10.90 \\
Count-Sick-Days & Integer, add & None & 52 & 45 & 13.67 \\
Figure 1 & Integer, arbitrary & Constant & 29 & 20 & 1.52 \\
Mean-Salary & List, append & Mean & 80 & 84 & 14.10 \\
Email-Metadata & List, append & Multiset & 82 & 75 & 16.70 \\
Patient-Statistic & List, append & Length & 73 & 70 & 4.92 \\
Debt-Sum & List, append & Sum & 76 & 81 & 14.45 \\
Sick-Employee-Names & Treeset, add & None & 105 & 113 & 28.43 \\
Website-Visitor-IPs & Listset, add & None & 74 & 69 & 6.20 \\
Figure 3 & HashMap, put & Key set & 129 & 96 & 10.37 \\
Sales-By-Region & HashMap, disjoint put & None & 129 & 12.37 \\
Salary-Histogram & HashMap, increment value & None & 135 & 109 & 13.78 \\
Count-Purchases & HashMap, add value & None & 137 & 109 & 11.73 \\
Most-Valuable-Purchase & HashMap, conditional put & None & 140 & 118 & 17.87 \\
\hline 1-Producer-1-Consumer & Queue & Consumed sequence & 82 & 88 & 3.23 \\
Pipeline & Two queues & Consumed sequences & 122 & 100 & 3.66 \\
2-Producers-2-Consumers & Queue & Produced multiset & 130 & 134 & 8.45
\end{tabular}
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\section*{Evaluation}
\begin{tabular}{l|l|l|r|r|r|} 
Example & Data structure & Abstraction & LOC & Ann, & T \\
Count-Vaccinated & Counter, increment & None & 10.15 \\
Figure 2 & Integer, add & None & 129 & 95 & 10.90 \\
Count-Sick-Days & Integer, add & None & 52 & 45 & 13.67 \\
Figure 1 & Integer, arbitrary & Constant & 29 & 20 & 1.52 \\
Mean-Salary & List, append & Mean & 80 & 84 & 14.10 \\
\hline Email-Metadata & List, append & Multiset & 82 & 75 & 16.70 \\
\hline Patient-Statistic & List, append & Length & 73 & 70 & 4.92 \\
Debt-Sum & List, append & Sum & 76 & 81 & 14.45 \\
Sick-Employee-Names & Treeset, add & None & 105 & 113 & 28.43 \\
Website-Visitor-IPs & Listset, add & None & 74 & 69 & 6.20 \\
Figure 3 & HashMap, put & Key set & 129 & 96 & 10.37 \\
Sales-By-Region & HashMap, disjoint put & None & 129 & 104 & 12.37 \\
Salary-Histogram & HashMap, increment value & None & 135 & 109 & 13.78 \\
Count-Purchases & HashMap, add value & None & 137 & 109 & 11.73 \\
Most-Valuable-Purchase & HashMap, conditional put & None & 140 & 118 & 17.87 \\
\hline 1-Producer-1-Consumer & Queue & Consumed sequence & 82 & 88 & 3.23 \\
Pipeline & Consumed sequences & 122 & 100 & 3.66 \\
\hline 2-Producers-2-Consumers & Queue & Produced multiset & 130 & 134 & 8.45 \\
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\section*{Evaluation}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Example Count-Vaccinated & Data structure Counter, increment & Abstraction
None & \(\mathrm{LOC}_{44}\) & Ann \({ }_{46}\) & \[
{ }_{10.15}^{T}
\] \\
\hline Figure 2 & Integer, add & None & 129 & 95 & 10.90 \\
\hline Count-Sick-Days & Integer, add & None & 52 & 45 & 13.67 \\
\hline Figure 1 & Integer, arbitrary & Constant & 29 & 20 & 1.52 \\
\hline Mean-Salary & List, append & Mean & 80 & 84 & 14.10 \\
\hline Email-Metadata & List, append & Multiset & 82 & 75 & 16.70 \\
\hline Patient-Statistic & List, append & Length & 73 & 70 & 4.92 \\
\hline Debt-Sum & List, append & Sum & 76 & 81 & 14.45 \\
\hline Sick-Employee-Names & Treeset, add & None & 105 & 113 & 28.43 \\
\hline Website-Visitor-IPs & Listset, add & None & 74 & 69 & 6.20 \\
\hline Figure 3 & HashMap, put & Key set & 129 & 96 & 10.37 \\
\hline Sales-By-Region & HashMap, disjoint put & None & 129 & 104 & 12.37 \\
\hline Salary-Histogram & HashMap, increment value & None & 135 & 109 & 13.78 \\
\hline Count-Purchases & HashMap, add value & None & 137 & 109 & 11.73 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} & 17.87 \\
\hline & & & & & 3.23 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Pipeline swoqueues} & Consumed sequences & 122 & 100 & 3.66 \\
\hline 2-Producers-2-Consumers & Queue & Produced multiset & 130 & 134 & 8.45 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
- Modular reasoning about value sensitivity for concurrent programs
- Independently of timing
- Sound on real hardware
- Key idea is to exploit commutativity modulo abstraction
- Proved sound in Isabelle/HOL, automated in prototype verifier
- Will be presented at PLDI'23 by Marco
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\section*{Thank you for your attention!}
- Modular reasoning about value sensitivity for concurrent programs
- Independently of timing
- Sound on real hardware
- Key idea is to exploit commutativity modulo
abstraction
- Proved sound in Isabelle/HOL, automated in prototype verifier
- Will be presented at PLDI'23 by Marco
```

