

Exercises, 14 January 2010

Separation logic

- The following axiom schemata are not sound: for each, give an instance which is not valid along with a description of a state in which the instance is false.

$$p_0 * p_1 \Rightarrow p_0 \wedge p_1 \qquad (p_0 * p_1) \vee q \Rightarrow (p_0 \vee q) * (p_1 \vee q) \qquad (p_0 * q) \wedge (p_1 * q) \Rightarrow (p_0 \wedge p_1) * q$$

- Prove that

$$(x \mapsto y * x' \mapsto y') * \mathbf{true} \Rightarrow ((x \mapsto y * \mathbf{true}) \wedge (x' \mapsto y' * \mathbf{true})) \wedge x \neq x'.$$

- Fill in the postconditions in

$$\{(e_1 \mapsto -) * (e_2 \mapsto -)\} [e_1] := e'_1; [e_2] := e'_2 \quad \{?\}$$

$$\{(e_1 \mapsto -) \wedge (e_2 \mapsto -)\} [e_1] := e'_1; [e_2] := e'_2 \quad \{?\}$$

- A braced list segment is a list segment with an interior pointer j to its last element; in the special case where the list segment is empty, j is **nil**. Formally,

$$\mathbf{brlseg} \ \epsilon \ (i, j, k) = \mathbf{emp} \wedge i = k \wedge j = \mathbf{nil}$$

$$\mathbf{brlseg} \ \alpha \cdot a \ (i, j, k) = \mathbf{lseg} \ \alpha \ (i, j) * j \mapsto a, k$$

- Write a procedure **lookuppt** that returns the final pointer of a braced list segment:

$$\{\mathbf{brlseg} \ \alpha \ (i, j, k_0)\} \mathbf{lookuppt} \ \{\mathbf{brlseg} \ \alpha \ (i, j, k_0) \wedge k = k_0\}$$

lookuppt accepts i, j as arguments and returns k .

- Write a procedure **appright** that appends an element to the right:

$$\{\mathbf{brlseg} \ \alpha \ (i, j, k_0)\} \mathbf{appright} \ \{\mathbf{brlseg} \ \alpha \cdot a \ (i, j, k_0)\}$$

appright accepts i, j and a as arguments and returns i, j .

Concurrent separation logic

- Consider the program

```

init() { c := nil }

resource buf(c);

while (true) {
  with buf do {
    x := new(c);    ||
    c := x;
  }
}

while (true) {
  with buf when not(c=nil) {
    t := [c];
    dispose(t);
    c := t;
  }
}

```

- Describe informally the behaviour of the program.
- Prove that $\{\mathbf{empty}\} \text{ program } \{\mathbf{true}\}$ (and explain the invariant you picked up for **buf**).

Owicki-Gries and rely/guarantee

1. Consider the program

```
x := x-1; x := x+1  ||  y := y+1; y := y-1
```

Prove that $\{x = y\} \text{ program } \{x = y\}$ is a theorem (detail the non-interference proofs).

2. Reformulate your solution to 1. using rely-guarantee reasoning.

Weak-memory models

1. Peterson algorithm is a classic solution to the *mutual exclusion* problem: in all executions, the instructions of the critical sections of the two threads are not interleaved.

```
flag0 := false;
flag1 := false;

flag0 := true;          flag1 := true;
turn := 1;              turn := 0;
while (flag1 && turn = 1);  ||  while (flag0 && turn == 0);
// critical section      // critical section
...
// end of critical section  ...
// end of critical section
flag0 := false;         flag1 := false;
```

- (a) Explain informally why the two threads cannot be inside the critical section at the same time.
- (b) Does Peterson algorithm guarantee mutual exclusion if executed on a multiprocessor machine where store buffers are observable (e.g. x86)?
- (c) Implement the Peterson algorithm in your favourite language, and verify experimentally if it guarantees mutual exclusion.