

# An Abort-Aware Model of Transactional Programming

Kousha Etessami<sup>\*1</sup>      Patrice Godefroid<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Edinburgh, [kousha@inf.ed.ac.uk](mailto:kousha@inf.ed.ac.uk)

<sup>2</sup> Microsoft Research, [pg@microsoft.com](mailto:pg@microsoft.com)

**Abstract.** There has been a lot of recent research on transaction-based concurrent programming, aimed at offering an easier concurrent programming paradigm that enables programmers to better exploit the parallelism of modern multi-processor machines, such as multi-core microprocessors. We introduce *Transactional State Machines* (TSMs) as an abstract finite-data model of transactional shared-memory concurrent programs. TSMs are a variant of concurrent boolean programs (or concurrent extended recursive state machines) augmented with additional constructs for specifying potentially nested transactions. Namely, some procedures (or code segments) can be marked as *transactions* and are meant to be executed “atomically”, and there are also explicit *commit* and *abort* operations for transactions. The TSM model is non-blocking and allows interleaved executions where multiple processes can simultaneously be executing inside transactions. It also allows nested transactions, transactions which may never terminate, and transactions which may be aborted explicitly, or aborted automatically by the run-time environment due to memory conflicts.

We show that concurrent executions of TSMs satisfy a correctness criterion closely related to serializability, which we call *stutter-serializability*, with respect to shared memory. We initiate a study of model checking problems for TSMs. Model checking arbitrary TSMs is easily seen to be undecidable, but we show it is decidable in the following case: when recursion is exclusively used inside transactions in all (but one) of the processes, we show that model checking such TSMs against all stutter-invariant  $\omega$ -regular properties of shared memory is decidable.

## 1 Introduction

There has been a lot of recent research on transaction-based concurrent programming, aimed at offering an easier concurrent programming paradigm that enables programmers to better exploit the parallelism of modern multi-processor machines, such as multi-core microprocessors. Roughly speaking, transactions are marked code segments that are to be executed “atomically”. The goal of such research is to use transactions as the main enabling construct for shared-memory concurrent programming, replacing more conventional but low-level constructs

---

\* The work of this author was done partly while visiting Microsoft Research.

such as locks, which have proven to be hard to use and highly error prone. High-level transactional code could in principle then be compiled down to machine code for the shared memory-machine, as long as the machine provides certain needed low-level atomic operations (such as atomic *compare-and-swap*). Already, a number of languages and libraries for transactions have been implemented (see, e.g., [18] which surveys many implementations).

Much of this work however lacks precise formal semantics specifying exactly what correctness guarantees are provided by the transactional framework. Indeed, there often appears to be a tension between providing strong formal correctness guarantees and providing an implementation flexible and efficient enough to be deemed useful, the latter being usually the main concern of the transactional-memory (TM) research community. When formal semantics is discussed, it is usually to offer an abstract characterization of some specific low-level TM implementation details: such semantics are *distinguishing low-level semantics* in the sense that they typically distinguish some newly proposed implementation from all other previous implementations. Even if transactional constructs were themselves given clear semantics, there would remain the important task of verifying specific properties of specific transactional programs.

The aim of this paper is to provide a state-machine based formal model of transactional concurrent programs, and thus to facilitate an abstract framework for reasoning about them. In order for such a model to be useful, firstly, it must be close enough to existing transactional paradigms so that, in principle, such models could be derived from actual transactional programs via a process of abstraction akin to that for ordinary programs. Secondly, the model should be simple enough to enable (automated) reasoning about such programs. Thirdly, the model should be abstract enough to allow verification of properties of transactional programs independently of any specific TM implementation; the model should thus capture a *unifying high-level semantics* formalizing the view of transactional programmers (unlike most distinguishing low-level semantics discussed in the TM research literature, which represent views of TM implementers).

So, what is a “transaction”? Syntactically, transactions are marked code segments, e.g., demarcated by “`atomic {..}`”, or, more generally, they are certain procedures which are marked as `transactional`. (Simple examples of transactional concurrent shared-memory programs are given in Figure 1. These examples will be discussed later.) But what is the semantics? The most common unifying high-level semantics is the so-called “*single-lock semantics*” (see, e.g., [18]), which says that during concurrent execution each executed transaction should appear “as if” it is executing serially without any interleaving of the operations of that transaction with other transactions occurring on other processes. In other words, it should appear “as if” executing each transaction requires every process to acquire a single global transaction lock and to release that lock only when the transaction has completed. The problem with this informal semantics has to do with precisely what is meant by “as if”. A semantics which literally assumes that every concurrent execution proceeds via a single lock, rules out any interleaving of transactions on different processes. It also violates the intended

non-blocking nature of the transactional paradigm, and ignores other features, such as the fact that transactions may not terminate, and that typically transactions can be *aborted* either explicitly by the program or automatically by the run-time system due to memory conflicts.

Of course, designers of transactional frameworks would object to this literal interpretation of “as if”. Rather, a weaker semantics is intended, but phrasing a simple unifying high-level formal semantics which captures precisely what is desired and leaves sufficient flexibility for an efficient implementation is itself a non-trivial task. Standard correctness notions such as *serializability*, which are used in database concurrency control, are not directly applicable to this setting without some modification. This is because in full-fledged concurrent programming it is no longer the case that every operation on memory is done via a transaction consisting of a block of (necessarily terminating) straight-line code. The “transactional program” running on each process may consist of a mix of transactional and non-transactional code, transactions may be nested, and moreover some transactions (which are programs themselves) may never halt. When adapting correctness criteria to this setting, one needs to take careful account of all these subtle differences.

The key role that aborts play in transactional programming should not be underestimated. Consider a transactional program for reserving a seat on a flight. The program starts a transaction, reads shared memory to see if seats are available and if so, attempts to write in shared memory to reserve a specific seat. If the flight is full or if there is a runtime memory conflict to reserve that specific seat, the transaction must be aborted, and the transactional program must be notified of this abort in order to take appropriate recovery actions. In particular, always forcing each abort to trigger a retry is not a viable option in practice (if the flight is full there is no point retrying forever to book a seat on that flight). So there *must* be some abort mechanism, either through explicit aborts or automatic aborts (or both), which is *not* equivalent to a retry. In other words, those aborts *must be visible* to the transactional programmer and therefore they *must be given a semantics*. As another example, consider transactional programs operating under stringent timing constraints. The programmer may not wish to do arbitrarily many retries after an automatic abort, depending on the current program state. We emphasize these points because earlier feedback we have received suggests that some people in the TM community believe it is adequate to provide the transactional programmer with a high-level semantic model (e.g., single-lock semantics) which does not at all expose them to the possibility of aborts. We believe this is an oversimplification that will only lead to greater confusion for programmers.

In this paper, we propose *Transactional State Machines* (TSMs) as an abstract finite-data model of transactional shared-memory concurrent programs. The TSM model is non-blocking and allows interleaved executions where multiple processes can simultaneously be executing inside transactions. It also allows nested transactions and transactions which may never terminate.

Using TSMs as a formalization vehicle, we propose a new *abort-aware* unifying high-level semantics which extends the traditional single-lock semantics by allowing the modeling of transactions aborted either explicitly in the program or automatically by the underlying TM implementation. Our abort-aware semantics exposes both explicit and automatic aborts, but it can easily be adjusted to treat automatic aborts as retries.

We define *stutter-serializability*, which we feel captures in a clean and simple way a desired correctness criterion, namely *serializability with respect to committed transactions*, which is (trivially) enjoyed by the single-lock semantics (since no transactions ever abort). We show that our abort-aware TSM semantics preserves this property, while also accommodating aborted transactions.

Finally, we also study model checking of TSMs. We show that, although model checking for general TSMs is easily seen to be undecidable, it is decidable for an interesting fragment. Namely, when recursion is exclusively used inside transactions in all (but one) of the processes, we show that model checking such TSMs against all stutter-invariant  $\omega$ -regular properties of shared memory is decidable. This decidability result also holds for several other variants of the abort-aware TSM semantics.

## 2 Overview of the Abort-Aware TSM Semantics

Our abort-aware TSM semantics is based on two natural assumptions which are close in spirit to assumptions used in transactional memory systems. First, we implicitly assume the availability of an atomic (hardware or software implemented) multi-word *compare-and-swap* operation,  $CAS(\bar{x}, \bar{x}', \bar{y}, \bar{y}')$ , which compares the contents of the vector of memory locations  $\bar{x}$  to the contents of the vector of memory locations  $\bar{x}'$ , and if they are the same, it assigns the contents of the vector of memory locations  $\bar{y}'$  to the vector of memory locations  $\bar{y}$ . How such an atomic CAS operation is implemented is irrelevant to the semantics. (It can, for instance, be implemented in software using lower-level constructs such as locks blocking other processes.) Second, we assume a form of *strong isolation (strong atomicity)*. Specifically, there must be minimal atomic operation units on all processes, such that these atomic units are indivisible in a concurrent execution, meaning that a concurrent execution must consist precisely of some interleaved execution of these atomic operations from each process. Thus “atomicity” of operations must hold at some level of granularity, however small. Without such an assumption, it is impossible to reason about asynchronous concurrent computation via an interleaving semantics, which is what we wish to do.

Based on these two assumptions, we can now give an informal description of the abort-aware TSM semantics. TSMs are concurrent boolean programs with procedures, except that some procedure calls may be *transactional* (and such calls may also be nested arbitrarily). Transactional calls are treated differently at run time. After a transactional call is made, the first time any part of shared memory is used in that transaction, it is copied into a *fixed* local copy on the stack frame for that transaction. A separate, *mutable*, copy (valuation) of shared

Initially, x = 0		Initially, x = y = 0		Initially, x = y = 0	
Process 1	Process 2	Process 1	Process 2	Process 1	Process 2
atomic { x = 1; x = 2; }	r1 = x;	atomic { y = 1; if (x == 0) abort; }	r1 = y; atomic { x = 1; }	atomic { x = 1; y = 1; }	r1 = x; r2 = y;
Can r1 == 1? No.		Can r1 == 1? No.		Can r1 == 1, r2 == 0? No.	

**Fig. 1.** Examples

variables is also kept on the transactional stack frame. All read/write accesses (after the first use) of shared memory inside the transaction are made to the mutable copy on the stack, rather than to the universal copy. Each transaction keeps track (on its stack frame) of those shared memory variables that have been *used* or *written* during the execution of the transaction. Finally, if and when the transaction terminates, we use an atomic *compare-and-swap* operation to check that the current values in (the used part of) the universal copy of shared memory are exactly the same as their fixed copy on the stack frame, and if so, we copy the new values of *written* parts of shared memory from the mutable copy on the stack frame to their universal copy. Otherwise, i.e., if the universal copy of used shared memory is inconsistent with the fixed copy for that transaction, we have detected a memory conflict and we abort that transaction.

The key point is this: if the compare-and-swap operation at the end of a transaction succeeds and the transaction is not aborted, then we can in fact “schedule” the entire activity of that transaction inside the “infinitesimal time slot” during which the atomic compare-and-swap operation was scheduled. In other words, there exists a serial schedule for non-aborted transactions, which does not interleave the operations of distinct non-aborted transactions with each other. This allows us to establish the *stutter-serializability* property for TSMs.

The above description is over-simplified because, e.g., TSMs also allow nested transactions and there are other technicalities, but it does describe some key aspects of the model. We describe the model in a bit more detail in Section 3. Due to space constraints, the full formal model is described in the tech report [12]. We show that TSMs are stutter-serializable in Section 4. We study model checking for TSMs in Section 5, and show that, although model checking for general TSMs is undecidable, there is an interesting fragment for which it remains decidable.

**Examples.** Figure 1 contains simple example transactional programs (adapted from [13]). Transactions are syntactically defined using the keyword `atomic`. With each example, we describe the possible effect, in our TSM model, on the variables  $r_1$  (and  $r_2$ ) at the end of the example’s execution. As mentioned, in the TSM model the execution of transactions on multiple processes can interleave, and moreover the execution of transactional and non-transactional code can also interleave. So, in the leftmost example, what happens if the non-transactional code executed by Process 2 executes before the transaction on Process 1 has

completed? In the TSM model, Process 2 would read the value of the shared variable  $x$  from a *universal copy* of shared memory which has not yet been touched by the executing transaction on Process 1. If Process 1 completes its transaction and commits successfully, then the final value 2 is written to this universal copy of  $x$ , and thereafter Process 2 could read this copy and thus it is possible that  $r1 == 2$  after this program has finished. However,  $r1 == 1$  is not possible. We note that  $r1 == 1$  would be possible at the end under forms of *weak atomicity*, e.g., if `atomic` was implemented as a *synchronized* block in Java (see [13]). The middle example in Figure 1 contains an explicit abort. In the TSM model, all write operations on shared variables performed by a transaction only have an effect on (the universal copy of) shared memory if the transaction successfully commits. Otherwise they have no effect, and are not visible to anyone after the transaction has been aborted. Thus  $r1 == 1$  is not possible at the end of this program. This is a form of *deferred update* as opposed to *direct update* ([18]), where writes in an aborted transaction do take effect, but the abort overwrites them with the original values. In that case, such a write might be visible to non-transactional code and `r1` might have the value 1 at the end of execution of this example. Note that our semantics for TSMs does not take into account possible re-orderings that may be performed by standard compilers or architectures. For instance, compilers are usually allowed to reorder read operations, such as those performed by Process 2 in the rightmost example in Figure 1. Such reordering issues [13] are not addressed in this paper. One could extend TSMs to incorporate notions of reordering in the model, but we feel that would complicate the model too much and detract from our main goal of having a clean abstract reference model which brings to light the salient aspects of transactional concurrent programs.

### 3 Definition of Transactional State Machines

In this section we define *Transactional State Machines* (TSMs). The definition resembles that of (concurrent) boolean programs and (concurrent) extended recursive state machines (see, e.g., [5, 2, 3]), but with additional constructs for transactions. Our definition will use some standard notions (e.g., *valuations* of variables, expressions, types, etc.) which are defined formally in the full tech report [12].

#### 3.1 Syntax of TSMs

A *Transactional State Machine*  $\mathcal{A}$  is a tuple  $\mathcal{A} = \langle S, \sigma_{init}, (P_r)_{r=1}^n \rangle$ , where  $S$  is a set of *shared* variables,  $\sigma_{init}$  is an initial valuation of  $S$ , and  $P_1, \dots, P_n$ , are processes. Each process is given by  $P_r = (L_r, \gamma_{init}^r, p_r, (A_i^r)_{i=1}^{k_r})$  where  $L_r$  is a finite set of (non-shared) *thread-local*<sup>1</sup> variables for process  $r$ ,  $\gamma_{init}^r$  is an initial valuation of  $L_r$ ,  $p_r \in \{1, \dots, k_r\}$  specifies the index of the *initial (main) procedure*,

<sup>1</sup> We note that these thread-local variables are used by all procedures running on the process. For simplicity, we do not include procedure-local variables, and we assume

$A_{p_r}^r$ , for process  $r$  (where runs of that process begin). The  $A_i^r$ 's are the *procedures* (or *components* in the RSM terminology) for process  $r$ . We assume that the first  $d_r$  of these are *ordinary* and the remaining  $k_r - d_r$  are *transactional* procedures. The two types of procedures have a very similar syntax, with the slight difference that transactional procedures have access to an additional *abort* node,  $ab_i$ . Specifically, each procedure  $A_i^r$  is formally given by:  $\langle N_i^r, en_i^r, ex_i^r, ab_i^r, \delta_i^r \rangle$ , whose parts we now describe (for less cluttered notation, we omit the process superscript,  $r$ , when it is clear from the context):

- a finite set  $N_i$  of nodes (which are control locations in the procedure)
- special nodes:  $en_i, ex_i \in N_i$ , known respectively as the *entry node* and *exit node*, and (only for transactional components) also an *abort node*  $ab_i \in N_i$ .
- A set  $\delta_i$  of *edges*, where an edge can be one of two forms:
  - *Internal edge*: A tuple  $(u, v, g, \alpha)$ . Here  $u$  and  $v$  are nodes in  $N_i$ ,  $g \in BoolExp(S \cup L_r)$  is a *guard*, given by a boolean expression over variables from  $S \cup L_r$  (see the full tech report [12]).  $\alpha \in Assign(S \cup L_r)$  is a (possibly simultaneous) *assignment* over these variables (again, see [12] for formal definitions). We assume that  $u$  is neither  $ex_i$  nor  $ab_i$  (because there are no edges out of the exit or abort nodes), and that  $v$  is not the entry node  $en_i$ . Intuitively, the above edge defines a possible transition that can be applied if the guard  $g$  is true, and if it is applied the simultaneous assignments are applied to all variables (all done atomically), and the local control node (i.e., program counter) changed from  $u$  to  $v$ . The set of internal edges in procedure  $A_i$  is denoted by  $\delta_i^I$ .
  - *Call edge*: A tuple  $(u, v, g, c)$ .  $u$  and  $v$  are nodes in  $N_i$ ,  $g \in BoolExp(S \cup L_r)$  is a guard,  $c \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  is the index of the procedure being *called*. Again, we assume  $u \notin \{ex_i \cup ab_i\}$ , and  $v \neq en_i$ . Calls are either *transactional* or *ordinary*, depending on whether the component  $A_c$  that is called is transactional or not (i.e., whether  $c > d_r$  or  $c \leq d_r$ ). Intuitively, a call edge defines a possible transition that can be taken when its guard  $g$  is true, and the transition involved calling procedure  $A_c$  (which of course involves appropriate call stack manipulation, as we'll see). Upon returning (if at all) from the call to  $A_c$ , control resumes at control node  $v$ . The set of call edges in component  $i$  is denoted by  $\delta_i^C$ .

### 3.2 Abort-Aware Semantics of TSMs

A full formal semantics of TSMs is given in [12] (due to space constraints). Here we give an informal description to facilitate intuition and describe salient features. TSMs model concurrent shared memory imperative procedural programs with bounded data and transactions. A *configuration* of an TSM consists of a call stack for each of the  $r$  processes, a current node (the program counter) for each process, as well as a *universal valuation* (or *universal copy*),  $\mathcal{U}$ , of shared

---

procedures take no parameter values and pass no return values. This is done only for clarity, and we lose nothing essential by making this simplification.

variables. Crucially, during execution the “view” of shared variables may be different for different processes that are inside transactions. In particular, different processes, when executing inside transactions, will have their own local copies (valuations) of shared variables on their call stack, and will evaluate and manipulate those valuations in the middle of transactions, rather than the single universal copy.

A transaction keeps track (on the stack) of what shared variables have been *used* and *written*. If a shared variable is written by one of the processes inside the scope of one of the transactions, the universal copy  $\mathcal{U}$  is not modified. Instead, an in-scope *mutable* copy of that shared variable is modified. The *mutable* copy resides on the stack frame of the innermost transaction on the call stack for that process. The first time a shared variable is read (i.e., used) inside a transaction, unless it was already written to in the transaction, its value is copied from  $\mathcal{U}$  to a *fixed* local copy for that transaction and also to a separate *mutable* local copy, both on the stack. Thereafter, both reads and writes inside the transaction will be to this mutable copy.

At the end of a transaction, the written values will either be committed or aborted. The transaction is automatically aborted if a shared memory conflict has arisen, which is checked using an atomic compare-and-swap operation as follows. We compare the values of variables in the fixed copy of shared memory with the values of those same shared variables in the universal copy  $\mathcal{U}$ , and if these are all equal, then for the *written* variables, we copy their valuations in the mutable copy on the stack frame to the universal copy  $\mathcal{U}$ . If, on the other hand, the *compare-and-swap* fails, i.e., the compared values are not all equal then we *abort* the transaction, discard any updates to shared variables, pop the transactional stack frame and restore the calling context. (How this all works is described in detail in [12]).

If we have nested transactions, and values are committed inside an inner nested transaction, then their effect will only be immediately visible in the next outer nested transaction (i.e., this follows the semantics of *closed* nested transactions), and the committed values will only be placed in the mutable copy of shared variables of the next outer transaction. Otherwise, if the inner transaction aborts, then its effect on shared variables is discarded before control returns to the calling context.

Again, see [12] for detailed semantics. We highlight here some other salient features of the semantics which will be pertinent in other discussions:

- The universal valuation  $\mathcal{U}$  is only updated upon a successful commit of outermost (non-nested) transactions, not of inner (nested) transactions.
- There are two distinct ways in which an abort can occur. One is an explicit abort, which occurs if a transaction reaches a designated abort node. The other is an automatic abort, carried out by the memory system due to conflicts with universal memory. (For nested transactions, the only possible abort is an explicit one, because no conflict is possible.)

## 4 Correctness: Stutter-Serializability

In this section we discuss a correctness property that TSMs possess. Informally, the correctness property relates to “atomicity” and serializability of transactions, but such notions have to be defined carefully with respect to the model. What we wish to establish is the following fact: if there exists any run  $\pi$  of a TSM which witnesses a (possibly infinite) sequence of changes to the universal copy (valuation) of memory, there must also exist a run  $\pi'$  which witnesses exactly the same sequence of changes to the universal copy, but such that all transactions which start *and which do not abort and do terminate* in  $\pi'$  must execute entirely serially without any interleaving of steps on other processes in the execution of the terminating transaction. Formally, this requires us to consider *stutter-invariant* temporal properties over atomic predicates that depend only on the universal valuation of shared variables in a state of the TSM, and stutter-equivalence (see [12] for definitions).

We say a run  $\rho$  of a TSM contains *only serialized successful transactions* if every transaction on any process in the run  $\rho$  that starts and successfully commits, executes serially without any interleaving of steps by other processes. In other words, the entire execution of each successful transaction occupies some contiguous sequence  $\rho_i\rho_{i+1}\dots\rho_{i+m}$  in the run. For a run  $\rho$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ , let  $\rho[\mathcal{U}]$  denote a new word, over the alphabet of shared variable valuations, such that  $\rho[\mathcal{U}]$  is obtained from  $\rho$  by retaining only the universal valuation of shared variables at every position of the run (i.e., replacing each state  $\rho$  by the universal valuation in that state). We say that a TSM,  $\mathcal{A}$ , is *stutter-serializable* if: for every run  $\rho$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ , there exists a (possibly different) run  $\rho'$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\rho[\mathcal{U}]$  is stutter-equivalent to  $\rho'[\mathcal{U}]$ , and such that  $\rho'$  contains only serialized successful transactions.

**Theorem 1.** *All TSMs are stutter-serializable.*

*Proof. (Sketch)* A full proof is [12]. Here we sketch the basic intuition. If at the end of a non-nested transaction which is about to attempt to commit, the atomic compare-and-swap operation succeeds, then at exactly the point in “time” when the compare-and-swap operation executed, the values in the universal copy of shared variables used inside the transaction are exactly the same as the values that were read from the universal copy the first time these variables were encountered in the transaction. Each shared variable is read from the universal copy at most once inside any transaction. All subsequent accesses to shared variables are to the local mutable copy on the transactional stack frame. Consequently, since the values of shared variables are the only input to the transaction from its “environment” (i.e., from other processes), the entire execution of that transaction can be “delayed” and “rescheduled” in the same “infinitesimal time slot” just before the atomic compare-and-swap operation occurred, and the resulting effect of the transaction on the universal copy of memory after it commits would be identical (because it would have identical input). The only visible effect on the universal copy of memory during the run that this rescheduling has is that of adding or removing “stuttering” steps, because the rescheduled steps do not change values in the universal copy of shared memory.  $\square$

Note that TSMs can reach new states due to transactions being aborted by the run-time environment due to memory conflicts. In other words, even aborted transactions have side effects. For instance, a TSM can use a thread-local variable to test/detect that its last (possibly nested) transaction was aborted, and take appropriate measures accordingly, including reaching new states that are reachable only following such an abort. This fact does not contradict the above correctness assertion about TSMs, because the correctness assertion does not rule out the possibility that in order for a certain feasible sequence of changes to universal memory  $\mathcal{U}$  to be realized some transactions might necessarily have to abort during the run. In general, it does not seem possible to devise a reasonable model of imperative-style transactional programs where transactions that are aborted will have no side effects. Anyway, there are good reasons not to want this. One useful consequence of side effects is that one can easily implement a “retry” mechanism in TSMs which repeatedly tries to execute the transaction until it succeeds. Some transactional memory implementations offer “retry” as a separate construct (see [18]).

## 5 Model Checking

It can be easily observed (via arguments similar to, e.g., [23]) that model checking for general TSMs, even with 2 processes, is at least as hard as checking whether the intersection of two context-free languages is empty. We thus have:

**Proposition 1.** *Model checking arbitrary TSMs, even those with 2 processes, even against stutter-invariant LTL properties of shared memory is undecidable.*

On the other hand, we show next that there is an interesting class of TSMs for which model checking remains decidable. Let the class of *top-transactional* TSMs be those TSMs with the property that the *initial* (*main*) procedure for every process makes only transactional calls (but inside transactions we can execute arbitrary recursive procedures). Let us call a TSM *almost-top-transactional* if one process is entirely unrestricted, but all other processes must have main procedures which make only transactional calls, just as in the prior definition.

**Theorem 2.** *The model checking problem for almost-top-transactional TSMs against all stutter-invariant linear-time (LTL or  $\omega$ -regular) properties of (universal) shared memory is decidable.*

*Proof.* Given a TSM,  $\mathcal{A}$ , our first task will be to compute the following information. For each process  $r$  (other than the one possible process,  $r'$ , which does not have the property that all calls in its main procedure are transactional) we will compute, for every transactional procedure,  $A_c$  on process  $r$ , certain *generalized summary paths*. A *generalized summary path* (GSP) for a transactional procedure  $A_c$  is a tuple  $G = (\gamma_{start}, R, \gamma_{finish}, status, \sigma)$ .  $\gamma_{start}$  and  $\gamma_{finish}$  are valuations of the thread-local variables  $L_c$ . *status* is a flag that can have either the value `commit` or `abort`.  $\sigma$  is a *partial valuation* of shared variables, meaning

it is a set of pair  $(x, w)$  where  $x$  is a shared variable and  $w$  is a value in  $x$ 's domain (and there is at most one such pair in  $\sigma$  for every shared variable  $x$ ).  $R = R_1, \dots, R_d$  is a sequence of distinct partial valuations of shared variables, where furthermore, different  $R_i$ 's do not evaluate the same variable. In other words, for each shared variable  $x$ , there is at most one pair of the form  $(x, w)$  in the entire sequence  $R$ . Such a sequence  $R$  yields a partial valuation  $\sigma_R = \cup_{i=1}^d R_i$  (and we shall need to refer both to the sequence  $R$  and to  $\sigma_R$ ).

We now define what it means for a GSP,  $G$ , to be *valid* for the transactional procedure  $A_c$ . Informally, this means that  $G$  summarizes one possible *terminating* behavior of the transaction  $A_c$  if it is run in sequential isolation (with no other process running). More formally, we call a GSP,  $G = (\gamma_{start}, R, \gamma_{finish}, status, \sigma)$ , *valid* for the transactional procedure  $A_c$ , if it satisfies the following property. Suppose a call to  $A_c$  is executed in sequential isolation (i.e., with no other process running). Suppose, furthermore that in the starting state  $\psi_0$  in which this call is made  $\gamma_{start}$  is the valuation of thread-local variables  $L_r$  on process  $r$ , and that the universal copy of shared memory  $\mathcal{U}$  is *consistent* with the partial valuation  $\sigma_R$  (in other words it agrees with  $\sigma_R$  on all variables evaluated in  $\sigma_R$ ). Then there exists some sequential run of  $A_c$  from such a start state  $\psi_0$  where during this run:

1. The sequence of reads of the universal copy of shared memory variables executed during the run corresponds precisely to the  $d$  partial valuations  $R_1, \dots, R_d$ . For example, if  $R_3 = \{(x_1, w_1), (x_2, w_2)\}$ , then the third time during the run in which the universal copy of shared memory is accessed (i.e., third time when shared variables are used that have not been used or written before) requires a simultaneous read<sup>2</sup> of shared variables  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  from the universal copy  $\mathcal{U}$ , and clearly the values read will be  $w_1$  and  $w_2$ , because  $\mathcal{U}$  is by definition consistent with  $\sigma_R$ . (Note that  $\mathcal{U}$  does not change in the middle of the sequential execution of  $A_c$ , because it is run in sequential isolation, with no other process running.)
2. After these sequences of reads, the run of  $A_c$  terminates in a state where the valuation of local variables is  $\gamma_{finish}$  and either commits or aborts, consistent with the value of *status*.
3. Moreover, if it does commit, then the partial valuation of shared variables that it writes to the universal copy  $\mathcal{U}$  (via *compare-and-swap*) at the commit point is  $\sigma$ . (And otherwise,  $\sigma$  is by default the empty valuation.)

Let  $\mathcal{G}_c$  denote the set of all valid GSPs for transactional procedure  $A_c$ . It is clear that for any transactional procedure, every GSP  $G$  is a finite piece of data, and furthermore that there are only finitely many GSPs. This is because the universal valuation of every shared variable can be read at most once during the life of the transaction, and of course there are only finitely many variables, and each variable can have only finitely many distinct values.

---

<sup>2</sup> Again, recall that the reason there may be simultaneous reads from universal shared variables is an artifact of the strong isolation assumption combined with our formulation of (potentially simultaneous) assignment statements.

**Lemma 1.** *The set  $\mathcal{G}_c$  is computable for every transactional procedure  $A_c$ .*

See [12] for a proof of the Lemma. We shall compute the set  $\mathcal{G}_c$  for every transactional procedure  $A_c$  and use this information to construct a finite-state summary state-machine  $B_r$ , for every process  $r$ , which summarized that process’s behavior. We will also describe the behavior of the single unrestricted process  $r'$  using a Recursive State Machine (RSM),  $B_{r'}$ . We shall then use these  $B_r$ ’s and  $B_{r'}$  to construct a new RSM  $B = (\otimes_{r \neq r'} B_r) \otimes B_{r'}$  which is an appropriate *asynchronous product* of all the  $B_r$ ’s and  $B_{r'}$ . The RSM  $B$  essentially summarizes (up to stutter-equivalence) the behavior of the entire TSM with respect to shared memory. The construction of the  $B_r$ ’s,  $B_{r'}$ , and  $B$  is described in [12].

It follows from the construction that  $B$  has the following properties. For every run  $\rho$  of the entire TSM,  $\mathcal{A}$ , there is a run  $\pi$  of  $B$  such that  $\pi$  is stutter-equivalent to the restriction  $\rho[\mathcal{U}]$  of the run  $\rho$  to its sequence of universal shared memory valuations. And likewise, for every run  $\pi$  of  $B$ , there is a run  $\rho$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\rho[\mathcal{U}]$  is stutter-equivalent to  $\pi$ . (Again, see [12] for definitions pertaining to stutter-equivalence.) Thus, once the RSM  $B$  is constructed, we can use the model checking algorithm for RSMs ([2]) on  $B$  to check any given stutter-invariant LTL, or stutter-invariant  $\omega$ -regular, property of universal shared memory of  $\mathcal{A}$ .  $\square$

We remark that the complexity of model checking can be shown to be singly-exponential in the encoding size of the TSM, under a natural encoding of TSMs. (Note that TSMs are compactly encoded: they are *extended* concurrent recursive state machines, with variables that range over bounded domains. )

Finally, we note that a similar decidability result can be obtained with other variant semantics where (1) automatic aborts are systematically considered as retries, (2) terminating transactions nondeterministically commit or abort, or (3) never more than one transaction executes concurrently (this is equivalent to the single-lock semantics). Indeed, those variant semantics are simpler to define and can be viewed as particular cases of the abort-aware TSM semantics.

## 6 Related Work

There is an extensive literature on Transactional Memory and there are already many prototype implementations (see the online bibliography [8], and see the recent book by Larus and Rajwar [18]). Most of this work discusses how to implement transactional memory either in hardware or software, from a systems point of view with the main emphasis on performance. Some researchers have formalized and studied the semantics of transactional memory implementations, in order to clarify subtle semantics distinctions between various implementations and the interface between these implementations and higher-level “transactional programs” running on top of them. Such distinguishing low-level semantics are quite complicated, and are not suitable for higher-level transactional program verification.

Recent work [20, 1] discuss transaction semantics in the difficult setting of *weak* isolation/atomicity, where implementations do not detect conflicting accesses to shared memory between non-transactional and transactional code, and

thus these may interfere unpredictably. By contrast, we assume a form of strong isolation, as described earlier. We aim for a clean model that can highlight the issues which are specific to transactions, and we do not want to obfuscate them with difficult issues that arise by introducing weak memory models, weak consistency, out-of-order execution, and weak isolation. Such notions are somewhat orthogonal, and are problematic semantically even in settings without transactions. Our goal is to define an abstract, idealized, yet relevant, model of transactional programming that could in principle serve as a foundation for verification. There are various design choices in the implementation of a transactional memory framework (see [18] for a taxonomy of choices), and our TSM model reflects several such choices. For instance, our definition of nested transactions is a form of *closed* nested transactions. We do not consider so-called *open* nested transactions, where an inner transaction may commit while an outer one aborts (because we can not see any sensible semantics for them, even in the single-process purely sequential setting). Some of these choices are adjustable in the model, as discussed in the previous section.

Independently, [14] has recently proposed the notion of “opacity” as an alternative semantics criterion for transactions. Loosely speaking, opacity also requires serializability of aborted transactions in addition to serializability of committed transactions, with the goal of preventing aborted transactions from reading “inconsistent” values. In contrast, our abort-aware semantics does not require the stronger opacity criterion. Instead, it assumes that programmers can deal with automatically aborted transactions as they currently handle runtime exceptions in other programming languages. Of course, opacity could be formalized using an alternate TSM semantics.

Mechanisms other than transactions, such as locks, have been proposed to enforce “atomicity” and have been studied from a verification point of view. For instance, concurrent reactive programs where processes synchronize with locks were studied in [22] where a custom procedure exploiting “atomicity” (based on Lipton’s reduction) is used to simplify the computation of “summaries” for such programs. Also, several verification problems are shown to be decidable in [16] for a restricted class of programs where locks are nested. Several other restrictions of concurrent pushdown processes for which verification problems are decidable have also been identified (e.g., [9], among others). There are some high-level similarity between these prior results and our results in Section 5, but the details are substantially different due to the specifics of the TSM model.

Other related work discusses how to check the correctness of implementations of transactional memory, based on lower level constructs, using testing ([19]) or model checking ([10]). By contrast, we do not address the problem of analyzing the correctness of implementations of transactional memory, but rather the correctness of transactional programs running on top of (correct) implementations.

Notions of serializability have been studied in database concurrency control for decades ([6]). However, there are subtle distinctions between the semantics of serializability in different setting. [4] systematically studied automata-based formalization of serializability and other related concepts. We formulate a clean

and natural notion of *stutter-serializability* for TSMs, and show it is satisfied by them. The notion arose from our considerations of the abort-aware TSM model, and does not appear to have been studied before in the literature.

## 7 Conclusions

This work initiates a study of transactional programming from a program analysis and verification point of view. Our goal is to provide a formal foundation for high-level reasoning about transactional programs, which nevertheless does not ignore the meaning of manual aborts nor automatic aborts in such programs, and facilitates building program analysis and verification tools for transactional programs. In contrast with prior semantics work on transactional memory systems, we do not consider the (lower-level) verification of transactional-memory implementations but instead focus on the (higher-level) abstract semantics of transactional programs running on top of those implementations. The paper makes two main contributions.

- We propose Transactional State Machines as an abstract finite-data model for transactional programs. TSMs are essentially concurrent extended recursive state machines augmented with constructs to specify transactions. Their significant expressiveness allows the modeling of interleaved executions of concurrent and potentially nested and/or non-terminating transactions. However, we show that, provided recursion is confined to occurring inside transactions, the expressiveness of TSMs is reduced and model checking of a large class of properties becomes decidable.
- We offer a critique of the current dominant high-level semantics for transactional programming, namely the single-lock semantics, and extend it with an alternative abort-aware semantics which captures important features of real transactional programs such as explicit and automatic aborts. We identify stutter-serializability as a key formal property (enjoyed, e.g., under single-lock semantics), and we show that our abort-aware semantics still enjoys this property and provides a clean and precise high-level semantics also for explicit and automatic aborts.

TSMs are concurrent state machines so it is natural to study them under fairness assumptions that insure progress on all processes. Note that for model checking, such fairness assumptions can be specified within LTL specifications.

**Acknowledgements:** We thank Jim Larus for several helpful discussions and encouragements, and Martin Abadi, Tom Ball, Sebastian Burckhardt, Dave Detlefs, Tim Harris, Madan Musuvathi, Shaz Qadeer and Serdar Tasiran for helpful comments.

## References

1. M. Abadi, A. Birrell, T. Harris, and M. Isard. Semantics of Transactional Memory and Automatic Mutual Exclusion. In *Proceedings of POPL'08*, 2008.

2. R. Alur, M. Benedikt, K. Etessami, P. Godefroid, T. Reps, and M. Yannakakis. Analysis of recursive state machines. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 27(4):786–818, 2005.
3. R. Alur, S. Chaudhuri, K. Etessami, and P. Madhusudan. On-the-fly reachability and cycle detection for recursive state machines. In *TACAS*, pages 61–76, 2005.
4. R. Alur, K. L. McMillan, and D. Peled. Model-checking of correctness conditions for concurrent objects. *Inf. Comput.*, 160(1-2):167–188, 2000.
5. T. Ball and S. Rajamani. Bebop: A symbolic model checker for boolean programs. In *SPIN'2000*, volume 1885 of *LNCS*, pages 113–130, 2000.
6. P. Bernstein, V. Hadzilacos, and N. Goodman. *Concurrency control and Recovery in Database Systems*. Addison-Wesley, 1987.
7. C. Blundell, E. C. Lewis, and M. M. K. Martin. Subtleties of Transactional Memory Atomicity Semantics. *IEEE Computer Architecture Letters*, 5(2), 2006.
8. J. Bobba, R. Rajwar, and M. Hill (editors). Transactional memory bibliography (online). <http://www.cs.wisc.edu/trans-memory/biblio/index.html>.
9. A. Bouajjani, J. Esparza, and T. Touili. A Generic Approach to the Static Analysis of Concurrent Programs with Procedures. In *Proceedings of POPL'03*, 2003.
10. A. Cohen, J. W. O'Leary, A. Pnueli, M. R. Tuttle, and L. D. Zuck. Verifying Correctness of Transactional Memories. In *Proceedings of FMCAD'2007 (Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design)*, 2007.
11. K. Etessami. Stutter-invariant languages,  $\omega$ -automata, and temporal logic. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification*, pages 236–248, 1999.
12. K. Etessami and P. Godefroid. An Abort-Aware Model of Transactional Programming. Technical Report MSR-TR-2008-159, Microsoft Research, 2008.
13. D. Grossman, J. Manson, and W. Pugh. What Do High-Level Memory Models Mean for Transactions? In *Memory System Performance and Correctness (MSPC'06)*, pages 62–69, 2006.
14. R. Guerraoui and M. Kapalka. On the correctness of transactional memory., In *Proc. 13th ACM PPoPP*, pages 175–184, 2008.
15. M. Herlihy, V. Luchangco, M. Moir, and W. N. Scherer III. Software transactional memory for dynamic-sized data structures. In *Proc. of 22nd Symp. on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 92–101, 2003.
16. V. Kahlon, F. Ivancic, and A. Gupta. Reasoning About Threads Communicating via Locks. In *Proceedings of CAV'05*, 2005.
17. L. Lamport. What good is temporal logic. In R. E. A. Mason, editor, *Information Processing '83: Proc. IFIP 9th World Computer Congress*, pages 657–668, 1983.
18. J. Larus and R. Rajwar. *Transactional Memory*. Morgan & Claypool, 2007.
19. C. Manovit, S. Hangal, H. Chafi, A. McDonald, C. Kozyrakis, and K. Olukotun. Testing Implementations of Transactional Memory. In *Proceedings of the 15th international conference on Parallel architectures and compilation techniques*, 2007.
20. K. F. Moore and D. Grossman. High-Level Small-Step Operational Semantics for Transactions. In *Proceedings of POPL'08*, 2008.
21. D. Peled and Th. Wilke. Stutter-invariant temporal properties are expressible without the next-time operator. *Information Processing Letters*, 63:243–246, 1997.
22. S. Qadeer, S. K. Rajamani, and J. Rehof. Summarizing Procedures in Concurrent Programs. In *Proceedings of POPL'04*, 2004.
23. G. Ramalingam. Context-sensitive synchronization-sensitive analysis is undecidable. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 22(2):416–430, 2000.
24. N. Shavit and D. Touitou. Software transactional memory. *Distributed Computing*, 10(2):99–116, 1997.