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Basic taxonomy of concurrency bugs

- Data race condition (unsynchronized access)
- Deadlock caused by incorrectly nested locking
- Deadlock caused by missed notification (early)
- Atomicity violation (inconsistent data values)
- Ordering violation (method calls in two threads)
- Spurious wake-up (forgotten condition check)
Data race condition

```java
Producer.run() {
    while (true) {
        synchronized (buf) {
            buf.add(...);
        }
        count++;
    }
}

Consumer.run() {
    while (true) {
        if (count > 0) {
            synchronized (buf) {
                ... = buf.get(0);
            }
            --count;
        }
    }
}

public static List buf;

main() {
    (new Producer()).start();
    (new Consumer()).start();
}
```
Deadlock caused by incorrectly nested locks

```
Producer.run() {
    while (true) {
        synchronized (coord) {
            synchronized (buf) {
                buf.add(...);
            }
            count++;
        }
    }
}

Consumer.run() {
    while (true) {
        synchronized (buf) {
            synchronized (coord) {
                ...
            }
            --count;
        }
    }
}
```

```
public static List buf;

main() {
    (new Producer()).start();
    (new Consumer()).start();
}
```
Deadlock caused by missed notification

Subject.run() {
  ...
  synchronized (events) {
    events.add(...);
    events.notify();
  }
  ...
}

Observer.run() {
  ...
  synchronized (events) {
    events.wait();
    ... = events.get(0);
  }
  ...
}

public static List events = ...

main() {
  (new Subject()).start();
  (new Observer()).start();
}
Atomicity violation

Reader.run() {
  ...
  synchronized (db) {
    x = db.value1;
  }
  synchronized (db) {
    y = db.value2;
  }
  ...
}

Writer.run() {
  ...
  synchronized (db) {
    db.value1 = 10;
    db.value2 = 20;
  }
  ...
}

Database db = ...

main() {
  (new Reader(db)).start();
  (new Writer(db)).start();
}
Ordering violation

Server.run() {
  ...
  startInit();
  for (Worker w : workers) {
    w.start();
  }
  finishInit();
  ...
}

Worker.run() {
  while (true) {
    waitForRequest();
    openDatabase();
    executeDBQuery();
    processResults();
    sendResponse();
  }
}
Spurious wake-up

```java
Producer.run() {
    synchronized (buf) {
        while (count >= MAX) {
            buf.wait();
        }
        buf.add(...);
        count++;
        buf.notify();
    }
}

Consumer.run() {
    synchronized (buf) {
        if (count == 0) {
            buf.wait();
        }
        ... = buf.get(0);
        --count;
        buf.notify();
    }
}

public static List buf;

main() {
    (new Producer()).start();
    (new Consumer()).start();
    (new Consumer()).start();
}
```
Detecting concurrency bugs
Detecting concurrency bugs

- Basic approach
  - Exhaustive state space traversal with non-deterministic thread choices by a model checker (JPF)

- Selected variants of state space traversal
  - Using custom runtime to control thread scheduling and synchronization operations
  - Bounding the number of thread preemptions
  - Optimizations (e.g., preemption sealing)

- Other approaches
  - Computing the lock-set analysis
  - Happens-before relation (order)
Exhaustive state space traversal with thread choices (JPF)

- Single root node
  - Initial program state
- Thread choices
- State matching
- Backtracking
Using custom runtime

- Controls thread scheduler in the operating system
- Custom library for synchronization primitives
  - source code instrumentation, dynamic linking
- Tracking execution of statements accessing the global state (heap objects, locks)
  - source code instrumentation, dynamic monitoring

Q: is there any problem with this approach?
Executing program with different schedules

- Restart program execution many times
  - Each time with a different thread interleaving

- Keep track of explored thread schedules

- Stateless traversal
  - no set of visited states, no state matching
Bounded number of preemptions

- Motivation: errors triggered with few thread preemptions (2-5) and few threads (2)
  - General principle: *small scope hypothesis*

- Limit the number of thread preemptions

- Systematic exploration within the given bound

- Common alternative name: context bounding

Q: can we do even better (improve coverage)?
Bounded number of preemptions

- Motivation: errors triggered with few thread preemptions (2-5) and few threads (2)
  - General principle: *small scope hypothesis*

- Limit the number of thread preemptions

- Systematic exploration within the given bound

- Common alternative name: context bounding

  A: iteratively increasing the context bound
Bounded number of preemptions

- Method limitations
  - Ignores concurrency errors triggered by more context switches (preemptions)
  - Checks program behavior only for a single input
    - Remedy: symbolic execution

- Theoretical complexity: NP-complete
Preemption sealing

• Disable thread choices in
  ▪ System libraries (e.g., core and collections)
  ▪ Already explored state space fragments
    • Method tested during previous runs of the checker
    • Code triggering already known concurrency bugs
CHESS: Systematic Concurrency Testing

- **Main features**
  - Custom runtime with scheduler
  - Stateless traversal with fairness
  - Iterative context-bounding

- **Supported platforms**
  - C#, C/C++, Win32, .NET
  - Probably just 32-bit CPU

- **Further information & source code**
• Transforming concurrent programs to sequential programs
  - Approach: source-to-source translation

Q: how this can be done?
Context bounding done another way

- Transforming concurrent programs to sequential programs
  - Approach: source-to-source translation
- Model checking the sequential program

- Thread preemption
  - non-deterministic data choice
  - jump to another code location
  - set up execution context (stack)
- Program state: cross-product of local variables of all threads and global variables
Lock-set analysis

- Find the set of locks held at each access to a shared global variable

- Check whether accesses to shared variables follow a consistent locking discipline

- Two concurrent accesses to a global variable
  - Empty intersection of lock sets $\rightarrow$ data race

- Every access to a shared variable protected by the same lock
  - Thread using a different lock than before $\rightarrow$ data race
Happens-before ordering (relation)

- Relationships between synchronization events
  - causal, temporal, execution flow
- Partial happens-before ordering
- Example 1: wait – notify
- Example 2: lock release – lock acquire
- Ordering between field accesses ➞ no data race
Defining correctness of concurrent programs
Correctness conditions

- Example: LinkedList
  - Operations: add(o), get(i), remove(i), size()

- Data race freedom

- Serializability (atomicity)
  - No overlap between concurrent actions

- Linearizability
Linearizability

- Concurrent history $H$
  - Operation: invoke, result
  - Partial order: $e_1 <_H e_2$ if $\text{res}(e_1)$ precedes $\text{inv}(e_2)$

- Linearizable concurrent history $H$
  - Exists serial witness that respects partial order and every operation has the same result value as in $H$

- Set of concurrent operations
  - Every possible concurrent history is linearizable with respect to a sequential specification
Verifying linearizability

- Linearization points
  - Operations must appear to take their effect at some instant between the call and return

- State space traversal
  - Phase 1: find all possible sequential histories
  - Phase 2: explore concurrent histories
    - Identify corresponding serial witness for each

- More complicated algorithmic techniques
Relaxed memory models
Relaxed memory models

- Defines valid program transformations
  - System: compiler, virtual machine, hardware
- Motivation: optimizing performance

- Possible transformations
  - Reordering write accesses to a shared variable in a given thread
  - Delaying propagation of the new value of a global variable to other threads (shared memory)
Relaxed memory models

- Sequential consistency
- Data race free models

- Case study: Java Memory Model

- Case study: C++11 Memory Model
  - Various extensions: C++14/17/20
Sequential consistency

- Memory accesses execute one at a given time
- Total order of memory accesses (read, write)
- Reads observe the most recent written value
- Each thread must respect the program order
  - Order defined by the source code (developer)
Java Memory Model

- Data race free programs behave correctly
  - Guaranteed sequentially consistent semantics

- Program with data races ➔ up to the developer
  - Model provides only weak guarantees

- Memory barriers
  - Boundaries of synchronized blocks
  - Accessing volatile variables

- Defined formally using the happens-before ordering
  - Very complex (many rules): lot of research papers about it

- Used since J2SE 5.0
Hardware memory models

- **Total Store Order (TSO)**
  - Delaying writes (stores) relative to subsequent reads (loads) on the same processor
  - CPU architecture: x86

- **Partial Store Order (PSO)**
  - Additionally, delaying stores relative to other stores (to different memory locations) on the same processor

- **Partial Store Load Order (PSLO)**
  - Additionally, permits reordering loads to execute before previous loads and stores on the same processor
Relaxed memory models: verification support

- Java PathRelaxer
- CHESS: limited
- Some tools for checking program behavior on hardware memory models (especially TSO)
Data races

- **Benign**
  - Optimizing performance on multi-core CPUs
  - Exploiting properties of the memory model
  - Very hard to get the implementation right
  - **Case study:** java.util.concurrent

- **Erroneous**
  - Missing thread synchronization by a developer mistake

- **Some people call for a “total ban” on data races**
Q: can you tell me what it means?
ABA problem

- Idea: same value but something changed

- Typical for lock-free data structures
Further reading
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