Local Nontermination Detection for Parallel C++ Programs

Vladimír Štill Jiří Barnat



Masaryk University

Brno, Czech Republic

20th Septempler 2019



"Would you trust a program which was verified, but not tested?"



"Would you trust a program which was verified, but not tested?"

DEMO: DIVINE



"Would you trust a program which was verified, but not tested?"

DEMO: DIVINE

... at the very least, we should not blindly trust safety checking



- targeting assertion violations, memory corruption, data races
- primarily caused by thread interleaving
- or by relaxed memory



- targeting assertion violations, memory corruption, data races
- primarily caused by thread interleaving
- or by relaxed memory
- if the program might not terminate...
 - the tool might not terminate
 - or it might report there are no safety violations



- targeting assertion violations, memory corruption, data races
- primarily caused by thread interleaving
- or by relaxed memory
- if the program might not terminate...
 - the tool might not terminate
 - or it might report there are no safety violations (correctly)



- targeting assertion violations, memory corruption, data races
- primarily caused by thread interleaving
- or by relaxed memory
- if the program might not terminate...
 - the tool might not terminate
 - or it might report there are no safety violations (correctly)
- not enough for parallel programs



• check that the whole program terminates



check that the whole program terminates

- or checks that certain parts of it terminate
 - critical sections
 - waiting for condition variables, threads...
 - user-defined parts



• we aim at nontermination caused by unintended parallel interactions

Local Nontermination Detection for Parallel Programs



we aim at nontermination caused by unintended parallel interactionsnot at complex control flow & loops



- we aim at nontermination caused by unintended parallel interactions
- not at complex control flow & loops
- should be easy to specify
- should not report nontermination spuriously
- should be useful for analysis of services/servers



- we aim at nontermination caused by unintended parallel interactions
- not at complex control flow & loops
- should be easy to specify
- should not report nontermination spuriously
- should be useful for analysis of services/servers
- build on explicit-state model checking \rightarrow finite-state programs (with possibly infinite behaviour)
- user can specify what to check

```
bool x = true;
while (true) { x = !x; }
```





```
mutex mtx;
void w() { mutex.lock(); x++; mutex.unlock(); }
int main() { thread t0(w), t1(w); t0.join(); t1.join(); }
```

Does this program terminate?



```
mutex mtx;
void w() { mutex.lock(); x++; mutex.unlock(); }
int main() { thread t0(w), t1(w); t0.join(); t1.join(); }
```



```
atomic< bool > spin_lock;
void w() {
   while (spin_lock.exchange(true)) { /* wait */ }
   x++;
   spin_lock = false;
}
int main() { thread t0(w), t1(w); t0.join(); t1.join(); }
```

Does this program terminate?



```
atomic< bool > spin_lock;
void w() {
   while (spin_lock.exchange(true)) { /* wait */ }
   x++;
   spin_lock = false;
}
int main() { thread t0(w), t1(w); t0.join(); t1.join(); }
```



```
atomic< bool > spin_lock;
void w() {
   while (spin_lock.exchange(true)) { /* wait */ }
   x++;
   spin_lock = false;
}
int main() { thread t0(w), t1(w); t0.join(); t1.join(); }
```

But there is an infinite run:
[t0: spin_lock.exchange(true) → false]
[t1: spin_lock.exchange(true) → true]^ω (repeats infinitely)



```
atomic< bool > spin_lock;
void w() {
   while (spin_lock.exchange(true)) { /* wait */ }
   x++;
   spin_lock = false;
}
int main() { thread t0(w), t1(w); t0.join(); t1.join(); }
```

But there is an infinite run: [t0: spin_lock.exchange(true) → false] [t1: spin_lock.exchange(true) → true]^ω (repeats infinitely) but only because t0 is not allowed to run



```
void w() {
   while (true) {
      while (spin_lock.exchange(true)) { /* wait */ }
      x++;
      spin_lock = false;
   }
}
```

Does every wait end?



```
void w() {
   while (true) {
     while (spin_lock.exchange(true)) { /* wait */ }
        x++;
        spin_lock = false;
   }
}
```

Does every *wait* end? yes



```
void w() {
    while (true) {
        while (spin_lock.exchange(true)) { /* wait */ }
        x++;
        spin_lock = false;
    }
}
```

Does every wait end? yes?



```
void w() {
    while (true) {
        while (spin_lock.exchange(true)) { /* wait */ }
        x++;
        spin_lock = false;
    }
}
Does every wait end? yes?
[t0: spin_lock.exchange(true) → false]
```

```
([t1: spin_lock.exchange(true) \rightarrow true]
```

```
[t0: x++]
```

```
[t0: spin_lock = false]
```

```
[t0: spin_lock.exchange(true) \rightarrow false])<sup>\omega</sup>
```

both threads can run



- [t0: spin_lock.exchange(true) \rightarrow false]
- ([t1: spin_lock.exchange(true) → true]
 - [t0: x++]
 - [t0: spin_lock = false]
 - [t0: spin_lock.exchange(true) \rightarrow false])^{ω}
 - this run requires a scheduler which allows t1 to run only if t0 is in the critical section



- [t0: spin_lock.exchange(true) \rightarrow false]
- ([t1: spin_lock.exchange(true) → true]
 - [t0: x++]
 - [t0: spin_lock = false]
 - [t0: spin_lock.exchange(true) \rightarrow false])^{ω}
 - this run requires a scheduler which allows t1 to run only if t0 is in the critical section
 - does not happen in reality



- [t0: spin_lock.exchange(true) \rightarrow false]
- ([t1: spin_lock.exchange(true) → true]
 - [t0: x++]
 - [t0: spin_lock = false]
 - [t0: spin_lock.exchange(true) \rightarrow false])^{ω}
 - this run requires a scheduler which allows t1 to run only if t0 is in the critical section
 - does not happen in reality
 - for realistic schedulers an infinite run does not imply nontermination

Nontermation

 a program does not terminate if it can reach a point from which it cannot reach its end



Nontermation

 a program does not terminate if it can reach a point from which it cannot reach its end

Resource Section

- a block of code with an identifier
- delimited in the source code



Nontermation

a program does not terminate if it can reach a point from which it cannot reach its end

Resource Section

- a block of code with an identifier
- delimited in the source code

Local Nontermation

a resource section does not terminate if the program can reach a point in the resource section from which it cannot reach the corresponding resource section end





 a program does not terminate if it can reach a point from which it cannot reach its end

- a program does not terminate if it can reach a point from which it cannot reach its end
- detect nontrivial terminal strongly connected components



믱

Going Local: Active Resource Section Instances





Going Local: Active Resource Section Instances





Going Local: Active Resource Section Instances







 a resource section does not terminate if the program can reach a point in the section from which it cannot reach the corresponding resource section end

- 日
- a resource section does not terminate if the program can reach a point in the section from which it cannot reach the corresponding resource section end
- mark edges in ARSIs as accepting
- detect fully accepting terminal strongly connected components (FATSCC)



Detection Algorithm

出

- modified Tarjan's algorithm for SCC decomposition: $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$
- global nontermination has no overhead
- for local nontermination the graph can get bigger

Detection Algorithm

- modified Tarjan's algorithm for SCC decomposition: $\mathcal{O}(|G|)$
- global nontermination has no overhead
- for local nontermination the graph can get bigger



Wall Time (in seconds)



- either built-in (mutexes, condition variables, thread joining, ...)
- or user-provided (in source code; block of code, function end, ...)



- either built-in (mutexes, condition variables, thread joining, ...)
- or user-provided (in source code; block of code, function end, ...)

Conclusion

 we have presented a novel technique which allows detecting bugs not captured by safety (or LTL/CTL*) analysis



- either built-in (mutexes, condition variables, thread joining, ...)
- or user-provided (in source code; block of code, function end, ...)

- we have presented a novel technique which allows detecting bugs not captured by safety (or LTL/CTL*) analysis
- \blacksquare built on explicit-state model checking \rightarrow finite state space required



- either built-in (mutexes, condition variables, thread joining, ...)
- or user-provided (in source code; block of code, function end, ...)

- we have presented a novel technique which allows detecting bugs not captured by safety (or LTL/CTL*) analysis
- \blacksquare built on explicit-state model checking \rightarrow finite state space required
- works also on programs which do not terminate



- either built-in (mutexes, condition variables, thread joining, ...)
- or user-provided (in source code; block of code, function end, ...)

- we have presented a novel technique which allows detecting bugs not captured by safety (or LTL/CTL*) analysis
- \blacksquare built on explicit-state model checking \rightarrow finite state space required
- works also on programs which do not terminate
- open-source implementation



- either built-in (mutexes, condition variables, thread joining, ...)
- or user-provided (in source code; block of code, function end, ...)

- we have presented a novel technique which allows detecting bugs not captured by safety (or LTL/CTL*) analysis
- \blacksquare built on explicit-state model checking \rightarrow finite state space required
- works also on programs which do not terminate
- open-source implementation
- performance is underwhelming, but it can detect new class of bugs
- https://divine.fi.muni.cz/2019/lnterm/

