

Optimal Concurrency for List-Based Sets

Vitaly Aksenov
ITMO University
Saint-Petersburg, Russia

Vincent Gramoli
University of Sydney and EPFL
Lausanne, Switzerland

Petr Kuznetsov
LTCI, Télécom Paris
Institut Polytechnique Paris
Paris, France

Srivatsan Ravi
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, USA

Di Shang
University of Sydney
Sydney, Australia

Abstract—Designing an efficient concurrent data structure is an important challenge that is not easy to meet. Intuitively, efficiency of an implementation is defined, in the first place, by its ability to process applied operations *in parallel*, without using unnecessary synchronization. As we show in this paper, even for a data structure as simple as a linked list used to implement the *set* type, the most efficient algorithms known so far are *not concurrency-optimal*: they may reject correct concurrent schedules.

We propose a new algorithm for the list-based set based on a *value-aware try-lock* that we show to achieve *optimal* concurrency: it only rejects concurrent schedules that violate correctness of the implemented set type. We show empirically that reaching optimality does not induce a significant overhead. In fact, our implementation of the concurrency-optimal algorithm outperforms both the Lazy Linked List and the Harris-Michael state-of-the-art algorithms.

I. INTRODUCTION

Multicore applications require highly concurrent data structures. Yet, the very notion of concurrency is vaguely defined, to say the least. What do we mean by a “highly concurrent” data structure? Generally speaking, one could compare the concurrency of algorithms by running a game where the adversary decides on the schedules of shared memory accesses from different processes. At the end of the game, the more schedules the algorithm would accept without hampering high-level correctness, the more concurrent it would be. The algorithm that accepts all correct schedules would then be considered *concurrency-optimal*.

To illustrate the difficulty of optimizing concurrency, let us consider one of the most “concurrency-friendly” data structures [1]: the sorted linked list used to implement the integer set type. Since any modification on a linked list affects only a small number of contiguous list nodes, most of update operations on the list could, in principle, run concurrently without conflicts. For example, one of the most efficient concurrent list-based set to date, the Lazy Linked List [2], achieves high concurrency by holding locks on only two consecutive nodes when updating, thus accepting modifications of non contiguous nodes to be scheduled in any order. The Lazy Linked List is known to outperform the Java variant [3] of the CAS-based Harris-Michael algorithm [4], [5] under low contention because all its traversals, be they for read-only look-ups or for locating the nodes to be updated, are *wait-free*, i.e., they ignore

locks and logical deletion marks. As we show below, the Lazy Linked List implementation is however not concurrency-optimal, raising two questions: Is there a more concurrent list-based set algorithm? And if so, does higher concurrency induce an overhead that precludes higher performance?

The concurrency limitation of the Lazy Linked List is caused by the locking strategy of its update operations: both $\text{insert}(v)$ and $\text{remove}(v)$ traverse the structure until they find a node whose value is larger or equal to v , at which point they acquire locks on two consecutive nodes. Only then is the existence of the value v checked: if v is found (resp. not found), then the insertion (resp., removal) releases the locks and returns without modifying the structure. By modifying metadata during lock acquisition without necessarily modifying the structure itself, the Lazy Linked List over conservatively rejects certain correct schedules. To illustrate that the concurrency limitation of the Lazy Linked List may lead to poor scalability, consider Figure 1 that depicts the performance of a 25-node Lazy Linked List (red curve) under a workload of 20% updates (insert/removals) and 80% contains on a 72-core machine. The list is comparatively small, hence all updates (even the failed insertions and removals) are likely to contend. We can see that when we increase the number of threads beyond 40, the performance drops significantly. This observation suggests a desirable property that concurrent operations should conflict on metadata only when they conflict on data, for which we need to exploit the semantics of the high-level data type. Note that this property refines the original notions of disjoint access parallelism (DAP) [6], trivially ensured by most linked-list implementations simply because all their operations “access” the *head* node and, thus, are allowed to conflict on the metadata.

Our main contribution is the Value-Based List (VBL), the most concurrent (in fact, *optimally* concurrent, as we formally prove) and probably the most efficient list-based set algorithm to date. It exploits the logical deletion technique of Harris-Michael that divides the removal of a node into a logical step (marking the node for deletion) and a physical step (unlinking the node from the list), and the wait-free traversal of the Lazy Linked List. In addition, our approach relies on a novel *value-aware* synchronization technique: first the lock, implemented using *compare-and-swap*, is taken, then the procedure checks




Fig. 1. The throughput of Lazy Linked List (red square curve) and VBL (blue circle curve). We consider the load with only 20% updates. Lazy Linked List behaves worse, as its operations potentially contend on meta-data even when they do not modify the data structure.

whether the *value* in the next node has changed, if the validation is successful then the operation continues, otherwise, the operation restarts. Compared to the Lazy Linked List, this approach allows for the improvement of performance and even provides scalability in the highly contended cases (Figure 1). We show that the resulting algorithm rejects a concurrent schedule only if otherwise the high-level correctness of the implemented *set* type (linearizability [7]) is violated. Our algorithm is thus concurrency-optimal: no correct list-based set algorithm can accept more schedules.

The evaluation of VBL shows that achieving optimal concurrency does not necessary result in a costly overhead. Extensive experiments on two x86-64 architectures machines, 72-way Intel machine and 64-way AMD machine, confirmed that VBL outperforms the state-of-the-art algorithms [2], [3]. In particular, VBL outperforms the Lazy Linked List performance by $1.6\times$ for 72 threads on the 20%-update workload of Figure 1, which can be explained by the fact that our algorithm validates list data *before* locking, and not after. In addition, as our algorithm differs from Harris-Michael by avoiding metadata accesses during traversals, it outperforms it by up to $1.6\times$ on read-only workloads.

We report the performance of the Java variant of Harris-Michael list-based set with wait-free contains as presented in Shavit and Herlihy’s book [3] and the Java optimised implementation with RTTI [2], and, in the technical report [8], on the performance of our own C++ translations of the Lazy algorithm (without memory management).

Roadmap. The rest of this paper is structured as follows. We present our methodology on modelling concurrency and prove the suboptimal concurrency of the Lazy and Harris-Michael linked lists in Section II. In Section III, we present our VBL list implementation. Section IV presents the methodology for performance evaluation of concurrent list implementations and Section V presents a discussion of concurrency w.r.t list-based sets. The optional appendix contains the full proofs of linearizability and deadlock-freedom. Synchrobench benchmark

suite [9] contains the code for all the lists considered in this paper.

II. CONCURRENCY ANALYSIS OF LIST-BASED SETS

A. Preliminaries

We consider a standard asynchronous shared-memory system, in which $n > 1$ processes (or *threads* of computation) p_1, \dots, p_n communicate by applying operations on shared *objects*.

B. Sequential list-based set

An *abstract data type* τ is a tuple $(\Phi, \Gamma, Q, q_0, \delta)$ where Φ is a set of operations, Γ is a set of responses, Q is a set of states, $q_0 \in Q$ is an initial state and $\delta \subseteq Q \times \Phi \times Q \times \Gamma$ is a transition relation that determines, for each state and each operation, the set of possible resulting states and produced responses [10]. Here, $(q, \pi, q', r) \in \delta$ implies that when an operation $\pi \in \Phi$ is applied on an object of type τ in state q , the object may move to state q' and return a response r .

An object of the *set* type stores a set of integer values, initially empty, and exports operations $\text{insert}(v)$, $\text{remove}(v)$, $\text{contains}(v)$ where $v \in \mathbb{Z}$. The update operations, $\text{insert}(v)$ and $\text{remove}(v)$, return a boolean response, *true* if and only if v is absent (for $\text{insert}(v)$) or present (for $\text{remove}(v)$) in the list. After $\text{insert}(v)$ is complete, v is present in the list, and after $\text{remove}(v)$ is complete, v is absent from the list. The $\text{contains}(v)$ returns a boolean *true* if and only if v is present in the list.

The sequential implementation *LL* of the *set* type is presented in Algorithm 1. The implementation uses a *sorted linked list* data structure in which each node (except the *tail*) maintains a *next* field to provide a pointer to the successor node. Initially, the *next* field of the *head* node points to *tail*; *head* (resp. *tail*) is initialized with values $-\infty$ (resp. $+\infty$) that is smaller (resp. greater) than any other value in the list.

Executions. An *event* of a process p_i is an invocation or response of an operation performed by p_i on a high-level object (in this paper, a set) implementation, or a *primitive* applied by p_i to a base object b along with its response. A *configuration* specifies the value of each base object and the state of each process. The *initial configuration* is the configuration in which all base objects have their initial values and all processes are in their initial states. An *execution fragment* is a (finite or infinite) sequence of events. An *execution* of an implementation I is an execution fragment where, starting from the initial configuration, each event is issued according to I and each response of a primitive matches the state of b resulting from all preceding events. Let $\alpha|p_i$ denote the subsequence of an execution α restricted to the events of process p_i . Executions α and α' are *equivalent* if for every process p_i , $\alpha|p_i = \alpha'|p_i$. An operation π *precedes* another operation π' in an execution α , denoted $\pi \rightarrow_\alpha \pi'$, if the response of π occurs before the invocation of π' in α . Two operations are *concurrent* if neither precedes the other.

```

1: Shared variables:
2:   class Node: head, tail
3:     head.val =  $-\infty$ 
4:     tail.val =  $+\infty$ 
5:     head.next = tail

6: insert(v):
7:   prev  $\leftarrow$  head
8:   curr  $\leftarrow$  read(prev.next)
9:   while (tval  $\leftarrow$  read(curr.val)) < v do
10:    prev  $\leftarrow$  curr
11:    curr  $\leftarrow$  read(curr.next)
12:   if tval  $\neq$  v then
13:     X  $\leftarrow$  new-node(v, prev.next)
14:     write(prev.next, X)
15:   return (tval  $\neq$  v)

16: remove(v):
17:   prev  $\leftarrow$  head
18:   curr  $\leftarrow$  read(prev.next)
19:   while (tval  $\leftarrow$  read(curr.val)) < v do
20:    prev  $\leftarrow$  curr
21:    curr  $\leftarrow$  read(curr.next)
22:   if tval = v then
23:     tnext  $\leftarrow$  read(curr.next)
24:     write(prev.next, tnext)
25:   return (tval = v)

26: contains(v):
27:   curr  $\leftarrow$  head
28:   curr  $\leftarrow$  read(prev.next)
29:   while (tval  $\leftarrow$  read(curr.val)) < v do
30:    curr  $\leftarrow$  read(curr.next)
31:   return (tval = v)

```

An execution is *sequential* if it has no concurrent operations. An operation is *complete* in α if the invocation event is followed by a *matching* response; otherwise, it is *incomplete* in α . Execution α is *complete* if every operation is complete in α .

High-level histories and linearizability. A *high-level history* \tilde{H} of an execution α is the subsequence of α consisting of all invocations and responses of (high-level) operations. A complete high-level history \tilde{H} is *linearizable* with respect to an object type τ if there exists a sequential high-level history S equivalent to \tilde{H} such that (1) $\rightarrow_{\tilde{H}} \subseteq \rightarrow_S$ and (2) S is *consistent with the sequential specification of type τ* . Now a high-level history \tilde{H} is linearizable if it can be *completed* (by adding matching responses to a subset of incomplete operations in \tilde{H} and removing the rest) to a linearizable high-level history [7].

C. Concurrency as admissible schedules of sequential code

Schedules. Informally, a *schedule* of a list-based set algorithm specifies the order in which concurrent high-level operations access the list nodes. Consider the *sequential* implementation, *LL*, of operations *insert*, *remove* and *contains*. Suppose that we treat this implementation as a *concurrent* one, i.e., simply run it in a concurrent environment, without introducing any synchronization mechanisms, and let \mathcal{S} denote the set of the resulting executions, we call them *schedules*. Of course, some schedules in \mathcal{S} will not be linearizable. For example, concurrent inserts operating on the same list nodes may result in “lost updates”: an inserted element disappears from the list due to a concurrent insert operation. But, intuitively, as no synchronization primitives are used, this (incorrect) implementation is as concurrent as it can get.

We measure the concurrency properties of a linearizable list-based set via its ability to accept all *correct* schedules in \mathcal{S} . Intuitively, a schedule is *correct* if it respects the sequential implementation *LL* *locally*, i.e., no operation in it can distinguish the schedule from a sequential one. Furthermore, the schedule must be linearizable, even when we consider its extension in

which all update operations are completed and followed with a *contains*(*v*) for any $v \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let us denote this extension of schedule σ by $\bar{\sigma}(v)$.

Definition 1 (Correct schedules). *We say that a schedule σ of a concurrent list-based set implementation is locally serializable (with respect to the sequential implementation of list-based set LL) if for each of its operations π , there exists a sequential schedule S of LL such that $\sigma|\pi = S|\pi$. We say that a schedule is correct if (1) σ is locally serializable (with respect to LL), (2) for all $v \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\bar{\sigma}(v)$ is linearizable (with respect to the **set** type).*

Note that the last condition is necessary for filtering out schedules with “lost updates”. Consider, for example a schedule in which *insert*(1) and *insert*(2) are applied to the initial empty set. Imagine that they first both read *head*, then both read *tail*, then both perform writes on the *head.next* and complete. The resulting schedule is, technically, linearizable and locally serializable but, obviously, not acceptable. However, in the schedule, one of the operations, say *insert*(1), overwrites the effect of the other one. Thus, if we extend the schedule with a complete execution of *contains*(2), the only possible response it may give is *false* which obviously does not produce a linearizable high-level history.

Note also that, as linearizability is a safety property [11], if $\bar{\sigma}(v)$ is linearizable, σ is linearizable too. (In the following we omit mentioning **set** and *LL* when we talk about local serializability and linearizability.)

Concurrency-optimality. A concurrent list-based set generally follows *LL*: every high-level operation, *insert*, *remove*, or *contains*, *reads* the list nodes, one after the other, until the desired fragment of the list is located. The update operation (*insert* or *remove*) then *writes*, to the *next* field of one of the nodes, the address of a new node (if it is *insert*) or the address of the node that follows the removed node in the list (if it is *remove*). Note that the (sequential) write can be implemented using a CAS primitive [4].

Let α denote an execution of a concurrent implementation of a list-based set. We define the *schedule* σ exported by α as the subsequence of α consisting of reads, writes and node creation events (corresponding to the sequential implementation *LL*) of operations insert, remove and contains that “take effect”. Intuitively, taking effect means that they affect the outcome of some operation. The exact way an execution α is mapped to the corresponding schedule σ is implementation specific.

An implementation I *accepts* a schedule σ if there exists an execution of I that exports σ .

Definition 2 (Concurrency-optimality). *An implementation is concurrency-optimal if it accepts every correct schedule.*

D. Concurrency analysis of the Lazy and Harris-Michael Linked Lists

In this section, we show that even state-of-the-art implementations of the list-based set, namely, the Lazy Linked List and the Harris-Michael Linked list are suboptimal w.r.t exploiting concurrency. We show that each of these two algorithms rejects some correct schedules of the list-based set. In order to give an intuition for concurrency analysis, we first describe why the classic *hand-over-hand* locking technique for list-based sets is not concurrency optimal.

Hand-over-hand locking. In hand-over-hand locking, each read or write on the list node involves acquiring the *exclusive lock* on the node; the process reads the next field of the node before releasing the lock on the predecessor node in a hand-over-hand manner.

Consider the following simple example. Let the list contain values $\{1, 2\}$. For $i = 1, 2$, let X_i denote the list node used to store i . Let us now apply a correct schedule in which two operations insert(2) and insert(3) are applied concurrently: both operations first read X_1 , then X_2 and then insert(2) returns *false*, while insert(3) creates a new node and links it to X_2 .

The schedule is correct, but no execution of the hand-over-hand linked list implementation can export it. This is because insert(2) must read the value of node X_2 prior to releasing the lock on node X_1 ; however insert(3) cannot read X_1 prior to acquiring the lock on the node. Consequently, there is no execution in which insert(3) can read X_1 after insert(2) reads X_1 , but before insert(2) reads X_2 .

This example illustrates how concurrent implementations might preclude certain simple classes of interleavings of the steps of the sequential implementation. We now show that the Lazy Linked List and Harris-Michael Linked List are *concurrency sub-optimal*.

Lazy Linked List. In this deadlock-free algorithm [2], the list is traversed in the wait-free manner and the locks are taken by update operations only when the desired interval of the list is located. A remove operation first marks a node for *logical* deletion and then *physically* unlinks it from the list. To take care of conflicting updates, the locked nodes are *validated*, which involves checking if they are not logically deleted. If

validation fails, the traversal is repeated. The schedule of an execution of this algorithm is naturally derived by considering only the *last* traversal of an operation.

Figure 2 illustrates how the post-locking validation strategy employed by the Lazy Linked List makes it concurrency sub-optimal. As explained in the introduction, the insert operation of the Lazy Linked List acquires the lock on the nodes it writes to, prior to the check of the node’s state.

One can immediately see that the Lazy Linked List is not concurrency optimal. Indeed, consider the schedule depicted in Figure 2. Two operations, insert(1) and insert(2) are concurrently applied to the list containing a single node X_1 storing value 1. Both operations first read h , the head of the list, then operation insert(2) reads node X_1 and creates a new node, X_2 , storing 2. Immediately after that, operation insert(1) reads X_1 and returns *false*.

The schedule is correct: it is linearizable and locally serializable. However, it cannot be accepted by the Lazy Linked List, as insert(1) needs a lock on X_1 previously acquired by insert(2). Thus, the implementation is concurrency sub-optimal: an operation may engage in synchronization mechanisms even if it is not going to update the list.

Harris-Michael Linked List. Like the Lazy Linked List, the *lock-free* Harris-Michael algorithm (cf. [3, Chapter 9]) separates logical deletion of a node from its physical removal (both steps use CAS primitives). If a CAS associated with logical deletion fails, the operation is restarted. Unlike the Lazy Linked List, however, if the physical removal fails (e.g., a concurrent update performed a successful CAS on the preceding node) the operation completes, and unlinking the logically deleted node from the list is then left for a future operation. Every update operation, as it traverses the list, attempts to physically remove such nodes. If the attempt fails, the operation is restarted. The delegation of physical removals to future operations is crucial for lock-freedom: an operation may only be restarted if there is a concurrent operation that took effect, i.e., global progress is made. But, as we show below, this delegation precludes some legitimate schedules.

Strictly speaking, this algorithm is not locally serializable with respect to the sequential implementation (Algorithm 1). Indeed, if a remove operation completes after logical deletion, we may not be able to map its steps to a write to a next field of the preceding node without “over-writing” a concurrent update. Therefore, for the sake of concurrency analysis, we consider a variant of Algorithm 1 in which remove operations only remove nodes *logically* and physical removals are put to the traversal procedure of future update operations. Now to define the schedule incurred by an execution of the algorithm, we consider the read and write steps that are part of the last traversal of an operation, node creation steps by insert operations, and successful logical deletions by remove operations. However, the Harris-Michael Linked List is not concurrency-optimal even with respect to this adjusted sequential specification.

Consider the schedule depicted in Figure 3. Two operations,




Fig. 2. A schedule rejected by the Lazy Linked List; initial list state is $\{X_1\}$ that stores value 1; $R(X_1)$ refers to reads of both *val* and *next* fields; $new(X_2)$ creates a new node storing value 2




Fig. 3. A schedule rejected by the Harris-Michael Linked List; the initial state of the list is $\{X_2, X_3, X_4\}$; each X_i stores value i ; note that not all schedules are depicted for succinctness.

$insert(1)$ and $remove(2)$ are concurrently applied to the list containing three nodes, X_2 , X_3 and X_4 , storing values 2, 3 and 4, respectively. Note that operation $remove(2)$ marks node X_2 for deletion but does not remove it physically by unlinking it from h . (Here we omit steps that are not important for the illustration.) Note that so far the schedule is accepted by the Harris-Michael algorithm: an earlier update of h by operation $insert(1)$ causes the corresponding CAS primitive performed on h by $remove(2)$ to fail.

After the operation completes, we schedule two concurrent operations, $insert(4)$ and $insert(3)$. Suppose that the two operations concurrently read head, X_1 and X_2 . As they both witness X_2 to be marked for logical deletion, they both will try to physically remove it by modifying the next field of X_1 . We let $insert(3)$ to do it first and complete by reading X_3 and returning *false*. In the schedule depicted in Figure 3, $insert(4)$ also writes to X_1 , and then successfully reads X_3 and X_4 , and returns *false*. However, in the execution of the Harris-Michael algorithm, the attempt of $insert(4)$ to physically remove X_2 will fail, causing it to restart traversing the list from the head. Thus, this schedule cannot be accepted.

III. THE VBL LIST

In this section, we address the challenges of extracting maximum concurrency from list-based sets and present our VBL list.

A. Extracting maximum concurrency from list-based sets

As we have shown in the previous section, the Lazy Linked List acquires the lock on a node it is about to modify prior to checking the node's state. Thus, it may reject a correct schedule that does not modify the list. The schedule rejected by the Harris-Michael Linked List (Figure 3) is a bit more intricate: it exploits the fact that Harris-Michael List involves *helping* which in turn induces additional synchronization steps leading to rejection of correct schedules.

Deriving a concurrency-optimal list requires introducing pre-locking node validation for the Lazy Linked List along with the combination of the logical deletion from the Harris-Michael Linked List. One possible solution for this is to

leverage a *versioning* mechanism (hinted earlier in the TM context [12]) that allows validating (checking if a node's state has been modified by a concurrent operation) before acquiring the lock.

However, even seemingly optimal versioning-based techniques for list-based sets fall short of providing concurrency optimality. Even though we could present a simple schedule that exhibits sub-optimality of a versioned list, let us consider a somewhat trickier schedule that is not accepted by any known implementation. Suppose that the initial state of the list is $\{1, 2, 3\}$ to which operation $\pi = remove(2)$ is applied. After π reads nodes X_1 and X_2 , a concurrent $\pi' = remove(2)$ executes sequentially to completion returning *true* following immediately by a sequential execution of $insert(2)$ that returns *true*. Following this, π sets *next* pointer of X_1 to X_3 and returns *true* (effectively, removing the just inserted element). This is a correct schedule of the list-based set, however, a versioning-based algorithm that tracks writes to nodes using version numbers would reject this schedule preventing π from running to completion and causing it to restart.

This observation inspired our *value-aware try-lock*, used to implement the VBL list. This try-lock helps our list to accept schedules similar to the one described above.

B. Value-aware try-lock

The class Node now contains the fields: (i) *val* for the value of the node; (ii) *next* providing a reference to the next node in the list; (iii) a boolean *deleted* to indicate a node to be marked for deletion and (iv) a lock to indicate a mutex associated with the node.

The value-aware try-lock (Algorithm 2) supports the following operations:

- (1) $lockNextAt(Node\ node)$ first acquires the lock on the invoked node, checks if the node is marked for deletion or if the next field does not point to the node passed as an argument, then releases the lock and returns *false*; otherwise, the operation returns *true*.
- (2) $lockNextAtValue(V\ val)$ acquires the lock on the invoked node, checks if the node is marked for deletion or if the

value of the next node is not val, then releases the lock and returns *false*; otherwise returns *true*.

C. VBL list

We now describe our VBL implementation. The list is initialized with 2 nodes: *head* (storing the minimum sentinel value) and *tail* (storing the maximum value), *head.next* stores the pointer to *tail*, both *deleted* flags are set to *false*. The pseudo-code is presented in Figure 3.

Contains. The *contains(v)* algorithm starts from the *head* node and follows *next* pointers until it finds a node with the value that is equal to or bigger than *v*. Then, the algorithm simply compares the value in the found node with *v*.

Inserting a node. The algorithm of *insert(v)* starts with the traversal (Line 24) to find a pair of nodes $\langle prev, curr \rangle$ such that *prev.val* is less than *v* and *curr.val* is equal to or bigger than *v*. The traversal is simple: it starts from *head* and traverses the list in a wait-free manner until it finds the desired nodes. If *curr.val* is equal to *v* (Line 25) then there is no need to insert. Otherwise, the new node with value *v* should be between *prev* and *curr*. We create a node with value *v* (Lines 26-27). Then, the algorithm locks *prev* and checks that it still can insert the node correctly (Line 28): *prev.next* still equals to *curr* and *prev* is not marked as deleted. If both of these conditions are satisfied, the new node can be linked. Otherwise, it cannot: the correctness of the algorithm (namely, linearizability) would be violated; so the operation restarts from the traversal (Line 24). Note that to improve the performance, the algorithm starts the traversal not from *head* but from *prev*.

Removing a node. The algorithm of *remove(v)* follows the lines of *insert(v)*: first it finds the desired pair of nodes $\langle prev, curr \rangle$. If *curr.val* is not equal to *v* then there is nothing to remove (Line 36). Otherwise, the algorithm has to remove the node with value *v*. At first, it takes the lock on *prev* and checks two conditions (Line 39): *prev.next.val* equals to *v* and *prev* is not marked as deleted. The first condition ensures concurrency-optimality by taking care of the scenario described above: one could have removed and inserted *v* while the thread was asleep. The second condition is necessary to guarantee correctness, i.e., the node *next* is not linked to *deleted* node, which might result in a “lost update” scenario. If any of the conditions is violated, the algorithm restarts from Line 35. Then, the algorithm takes the lock on *curr = prev.next* and checks a condition *curr.next* equals to *next* in Line 41 (note that the second condition is satisfied by the lock on *prev* as *curr* is not marked as deleted). This condition ensures correctness: otherwise, the link *next* to *prev* will be incorrect. If it is not satisfied, the algorithm restarts from Line 35. Afterwards, the algorithm sets *curr.deleted* to *true* (Line 44) and unlinks *curr* (Line 45).

Correctness. We show that the VBL list accepts only correct schedules of the list-based set. In the next section, we show

that the VBL list accepts *every* correct schedule of the list-based set, thus establishing its concurrency-optimality.

Theorem III.1. *Every schedule of the VBL list is linearizable with respect to the set.*

Proof sketch. We depict the assignment of the linearization points to show how the partial ordering is constructed that is equivalent to the sequential history of the list-based set; however the full formal proof is delegated to the Appendix A. For every operation π , let ℓ_π denote its linearization point in an execution α and \tilde{H} , the corresponding history.

For every $\pi = \text{insert}(v)$ that returns *true* in \tilde{H} , ℓ_π is associated with the write event in Line 30 (rendering the node that stores *v* reachable from the *head*); otherwise ℓ_π is associated with the last read of a node’s *next* field performed by π in α .

For every $\pi = \text{remove}(v)$ that returns *true* in \tilde{H} , ℓ_π is associated with the write event in Line 44 (setting the *deleted* flag of a list’s node); otherwise ℓ_π is associated with the last read of a node’s *next* field performed by π in α .

For $\pi = \text{contains}(v)$ that returns *true*, ℓ_π is associated with the last read performed by π .

For $\pi = \text{contains}(v)$ that returns *false* in H , ℓ_π is assigned to one of the two events:

- If π reads $(X.val \neq v)$ in Line 13, where *X* is the last node read by π in α , ℓ_π is assigned to the read of the *next* field of the node accessed by π immediately before *X*.
- Alternatively, ℓ_π is defined as follows: let π_1 be the remove operation that performs the last write to *X.deleted* (Line 44) prior to the read of *X* by π . Then, ℓ_π is chosen to be the first event performed by π_1 immediately after the write to *X.deleted*, but prior to the read of *X* by π . Otherwise if no such event of π_1 exists, then ℓ_π is the read of *X* by π .

Given a sequential history \tilde{S} constructed by the above assignment of linearization points, we inductively construct the proof. Let \tilde{S}^k be the prefix of \tilde{S} consisting of the first *k* complete operations. We associate each \tilde{S}^k with a set q^k of objects that were successfully inserted and not subsequently successfully removed in \tilde{S}^k . We show by induction on *k* (via case by case analysis) that the sequence of state transitions in \tilde{S}^k is consistent with operations’ responses in \tilde{S}^k with respect to the *set* type. \square

The Appendix establishes the full proof of the above theorem while Theorem A.2 proves that VBL list is deadlock-free. Observe that the only nontrivial case to analyse for proving deadlock-freedom is the execution of the update operations. Suppose that an update operation π fails to return a matching response after taking infinitely many steps. However, this means that there exists a concurrent insert and remove that successfully acquires its locks and completes its operation, thus implying progress for at least one correct process.

Theorem III.2. *The VBL implementation accepts only correct list-based set schedules locally serializable (wrt LL).*

Algorithm 2. Value-aware trylock

1: Shared variables: 2: class Node: 3: V val, its value 4: Node next, its reference to the next node 5: bool deleted, a deleted mark 6: Lock lock	7: lockNextAt(Node node): 8: lock.lock() 9: if deleted or next \neq node then 10: lock.unlock() 11: return false 12: return true	13: lockNextAtValue(V v): 14: lock.lock() 15: if deleted or next.v \neq v then 16: lock.unlock() 17: return false 18: return true
--	---	--

Algorithm 3. VBL list

9: contains(v): 10: curr \leftarrow head 11: while curr.val \leq v do 12: curr \leftarrow curr.next 13: return curr.val = v	14: waitfreeTraversal(v, prev): 15: if prev.deleted then 16: prev \leftarrow head 17: curr \leftarrow prev.next 18: while curr.val \leq v do 19: prev \leftarrow curr 20: curr \leftarrow curr.next 21: return (prev, curr) 22: insert(v): 23: prev \leftarrow head 24: (prev, curr) \leftarrow waitfreeTraversal(v, prev) 25: if curr.val = v then return false 26: newNode.val \leftarrow v 27: newNode.next \leftarrow curr 28: if not prev.lockNextAt(curr) then 29: goto Line 24 30: prev.next \leftarrow newNode 31: prev.lock.unlock() 32: return true	33: remove(v): 34: prev \leftarrow head 35: (prev, curr) \leftarrow waitfreeTraversal(v, prev) 36: if curr.val \neq v then 37: return false 38: next \leftarrow curr.next 39: if not prev.lockNextAtValue(v) then goto Line 35 40: curr = prev.next 41: if not curr.lockNextAt(next) then 42: prev.unlock() 43: goto Line 35 44: curr.deleted \leftarrow true 45: prev.next \leftarrow curr.next 46: curr.lock.unlock() 47: prev.lock.unlock() 48: return true
--	---	---

Proof. To show our algorithm is locally serializable, we first remark that every operation traverses the list starting from the *head* node and reads the *next* field of a node to locate the subsequent node. Before adding a new node to the list (Lines 26 and 27), each insert operation initializes the node's *val* and *next* fields, so that at all times the *next* field of a node stores a pointer to an inserted node with a strictly higher value or to the *tail* node. Furthermore, the values stored in the list are integers, every operation invoked with parameter v eventually locates the node storing v or a higher value. Thus, every sequence of non-aborted events (i.e., without prior restart) of every operation π is finite. Hence, there exists a sequence of insert operations S_0 , such that $S_0 \cdot \sigma | \pi$ is a sequential schedule of LL . \square

Concurrency-optimality. We prove that the VBL accepts every correct interleaving of the sequential code. The goal is to show that any finite schedule rejected by our algorithm is not correct. Recall that a correct schedule σ is locally serializable and, when extended with all its update operations completed and $\text{contains}(v)$, for any $v \in \mathbb{Z}$, we obtain a linearizable schedule.

Note that given a correct schedule, we can define the contents of the list from the order of the schedule's write operations. For each node that has ever been created in this schedule, we derive the resulting state of its *next* field from the last write in the schedule. Since in a correct schedule each new node is first created and then linked to the list, we

can reconstruct the *state of the list* by iteratively traversing it, starting from the *head*.

Theorem III.3 (Optimality). *The VBL implementation accepts all correct schedules.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{\sigma}$ be a schedule rejected by VBL. Let σ be the longest prefix of $\tilde{\sigma}$ that was accepted by VBL. For every update operation π in σ , $\sigma | \pi$ is defined to be the subsequence $\sigma | \pi$ consisting of the reads, writes and node creation events from the last invocation of the function *waitfree-traversal* by π extended by the execution in which $\pi = \text{insert}$ (and resp. $\pi = \text{remove}$) executes contiguously without restarting in Line 28 (and resp. Line 39 and 41). For every $\pi = \text{contains}$ in σ , $\sigma | \pi$ is the subsequence $\sigma | \pi$ consisting of the reads and writes on a node's *val* and *next* fields.

We argue that any schedule *rejected* by our algorithm is not observably correct. More precisely, an operation restarts a fragment of its execution (in Lines 28, 41, 39) only if extending it with a read or a write on *next* or *val* field would result in a schedule that is not observably correct.

We consider two cases:

- We first observe that if a node is logically deleted (Line 44), then its next write renders the node unreachable from the *head* node. Thus, an update operation π partially restarts because of reading a logically deleted node (in function *lockNextAt*) only if it is concurrent with a *remove* operation which, when completed would physically

remove the node addressed by π at the end of its traversal. It is easy to see that regardless of what this operation π is (insert(v) or remove(v)), if we complete it in turn and then extend the resulting schedule with contains(v), the effect of π will not be seen and the schedule will not be linearizable.

- Similarly, let σ be the schedule up to the prefix where an update operation π partially restarts in Lines 41. The update operation restarts because it fails in grabbing a lock on one of the nodes it is about to modify, i.e., π is concurrent with another update operating on the same node. By completing both π and the concurrent update, we obtain an extension of the schedule in which one of the updates is “lost”, so that its extension with some contains(v) will not be linearizable.

□

IV. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

Experimental setup. In this section, we compare the performance of our solution to two state-of-the-art list-based set algorithms written in different languages (Java and C++) and on two multicore machines from different manufacturers:

- A 4-socket Intel Xeon Gold 6150 2.7 GHz server (Intel) with 18 cores per socket (yielding 72 cores in total), 512 Gb of RAM, running Debian 9.9. This machine has OpenJDK 11.0.3.
- A 4-socket AMD Opteron 6276 2.3 GHz server (AMD) with 16 cores per socket (yielding 64 cores in total), running Ubuntu 14.04. This machine has OpenJDK 1.8.0_222.

Concurrent list implementations. We compared our VBL algorithm (VBL) to the lock-based Lazy Linked List (Lazy) [2] and Harris-Michael’s non-blocking list (Harris-Michael) [4], [5] with its wait-free and RTTI optimization suggested by Heller et al. [2] using the Synchrobench benchmark suite [9]. To compare these algorithms on the same ground we primarily used Java as it is agnostic of the underlying set up. The evaluation of the C++ implementations of these algorithms is presented in Appendix B. The code of the implementations is part of Synchrobench at <https://github.com/gramoli/synchrobench>.

Experimental methodology. To evaluate the performance we considered the following parameters:

- **Workloads.** Each workload distribution is characterized by the percent $x\%$ of update operations. This means that the list will be requested to make $(100 - x)\%$ of contains calls, $x/2\%$ of insert calls and $x/2\%$ of remove calls. We considered three different workload distribution: 0%, 20%, and 100%. Percentages 0% and 100% were chosen as the extreme workloads, while 20% update ratio corresponds to the standard load on databases. Each operation contains, insert, and remove chooses its argument uniformly at random from the fixed key range.
- **List size.** On the workloads described above, the size of the list depends on the range from which the operations

take the arguments. Under the described workload the size of the list is approximately equal to the half of the key range. We consider four different key ranges: 50, 200, $2 \cdot 10^3$, and $2 \cdot 10^4$. To ensure consistent results we pre-populated the list: each element is present with probability $1/2$.

- **Degree of contention.** This depends on the number of cores in a machine. We take enough points to reason about the behavior of the curves.

Results. We run experiments for each workload 5 times for 5 seconds with a warm-up of 5 seconds. Figure 4 (and resp. Figure 5) contains the results of executions on Intel (and resp. AMD) machine. Our new list algorithm outperforms both Harris-Michael’s and the Lazy Linked List algorithms, and remains scalable except for the situation with very high contention, i.e., high update ratio with small range. We find this behavior normal at least in our case, since the processes contend to get the cache-lines in exclusive mode and this traffic becomes the dominant factor of performance in the execution.

Comparison against Harris-Michael. Harris-Michael’s algorithm in general scales well and performs well under high contention. Even though the three algorithms feature the wait-free contains, our original implementation of the Harris-Michael’s contains was slower than the other two. The reason is the extra indirection needed when reading the *next* pointer in the combined *pointer-plus-boolean* structure. To avoid reading an extra field when fetching the Java AtomicMarkableReference we implemented the run-time type identification (RTTI) variant with two subclasses that inherit from a parent node class and that represent the marked and unmarked states of the node as previously suggested [2]. This optimization requires, on the one hand, that a remove casts the subclass instance to the parent class to create a corresponding node in the marked state. It allows, on the other hand, the traversal to simply check the mark of each node by simply invoking instanceof on it to check the subclass the node instantiates. As we see, Harris-Michael’s algorithm has very efficient updates because it only uses CAS, however it spends much longer on list traversals.

Comparison against the Lazy Linked List. The Lazy Linked List has almost the same performance as our algorithm under low contention because both share the same wait-free list traversal with zero overhead (as the sequential code does) and for the updates, when there is no interference from concurrent operations, the difference between our pre-locking-validation and Heller et al.’s post-locking-validation becomes negligible. The difference raises however as the contention appears. The Lazy Linked List performance drops significantly due to its intense lock competition (as briefly explained in Section I). By contrast, there are several features in our implementation that reduce significantly the amount of contention on the locks. We observed a tremendous increase in execution time for the Lazy Linked List because of the contention on locks.




Fig. 4. Evaluation on Intel

V. DISCUSSION

List-based sets. Heller *et al.* [2] proposed the Lazy Linked List and mentioned the option of validating prior to locking, and using a single lock within an insert. One of the reasons why our implementation is faster than the Lazy Linked List is the use of a novel value-aware try-lock mechanism that allows

validating before acquiring the lock.

Harris [4] proposed a non-blocking linked list algorithm that splits the removal of a node into two atomic steps: a logical deletion that marks the node and a physical removal that unlinks the node from the list. Michael [5] proposed advanced memory reclamation algorithms for the algorithm of Harris. In our implementation, we rely on Java's garbage




Fig. 5. Evaluation on AMD

collector for memory reclamation [13]. We believe that our implementation could outperform Michael’s variant for the same reason it outperforms Harris’ one because it does not combine the logical deletion mark with the next pointer of

a node but separates metadata (logical deletion and versions) from the structural data (check [3] for variants of these list-based sets).

Fomitchev and Ruppert [14] proposed a lock-free linked

list where nodes have a backlink field that allows to backtrack in the list in case a conflict is detected instead of restarting from the beginning of the list. Its *contains* operation also helps remove marked nodes from the list. Gibson and Gramoli [15] proposed the *selfish linked list*, as a more efficient variant of this approach with the same amortized complexity, relying on wait-free *contains* operations. These algorithms are, however, not concurrency-optimal: schedule constructions similar to those outlined for the Harris-Michael and Lazy linked lists apply here.

Concurrency metrics. Sets of accepted schedules are commonly used as a metric of concurrency provided by a shared-memory implementation. For static database transactions, Kung and Papadimitriou [16] use the metric to capture the parallelism of a locking scheme. While acknowledging that the metric is theoretical, they insist that it may have “practical significance as well, if the schedulers in question have relatively small scheduling times as compared with waiting and execution times.” Herlihy [17] employed the metric from [16] to compare various optimistic and pessimistic synchronization techniques using commutativity [18] of operations constituting high-level transactions. A synchronization technique is implicitly considered in [17] as highly concurrent, namely “optimal”, if no other technique accepts more schedules. In contrast to [16], [17], we focus here on a *dynamic* model where the scheduler cannot use the prior knowledge of all the shared addresses to be accessed.

Optimal concurrency can also be seen as a variant of metrics like *permissiveness* [19] and *input acceptance* [20] defined for transactional memory. The concurrency framework considered in this paper though is independent of the synchronization technique and, thus, more general.

Concurrent interleavings of *sequential* code has been used as a base-line for evaluating performance of search data structures [21]. Defining *optimal concurrency* as the ability of accepting *all* correct interleavings has been originally proposed and used to compare concurrency properties of optimistic and pessimistic techniques in [22].

The case for concurrency-optimal data structures. Intuitively, the ability of an implementation to successfully process interleaving steps of concurrent threads is an appealing property that should be met by performance gains.

In this paper, we support this intuition by presenting a concurrency-optimal list-based set that outperforms (less concurrent) state-of-the-art algorithms. Does the claim also hold for other data structures? We believe that generalizations of linked lists, such as skip-lists or tree-based dictionaries, may allow for optimizations similar to the ones proposed in this paper. The recently proposed concurrency-optimal tree-based dictionary [23] justifies this belief. This work presents the opportunity to construct a rigorous methodology for deriving concurrency-optimal data structures that also perform well.

Also, there is an interesting intermingling between progress conditions, concurrency properties, and performance. For example, the Harris-Michael algorithm is superior with respect to

both the Lazy Linked List and VBL in terms of progress (lock-freedom is a strictly stronger progress condition than deadlock-freedom). However, as we observe, this superiority does not necessarily imply better performance. Improving concurrency seems to provide more performance benefits than boosting liveness. Relating concurrency and progress in concurrent data structures remains an interesting research direction.

REFERENCES

- [1] Sutter, H.: Choose concurrency-friendly data structures. Dr. Dobbs’s Journal (June 2008)
- [2] Heller, S., Herlihy, M., Luchangco, V., Moir, M., Scherer, W.N., Shavit, N.: A lazy concurrent list-based set algorithm. In: OPODIS. (2006) 3–16
- [3] Herlihy, M., Shavit, N.: The art of multiprocessor programming. Morgan Kaufmann (2012)
- [4] Harris, T.L.: A pragmatic implementation of non-blocking linked-lists. In: DISC. (2001) 300–314
- [5] Michael, M.M.: High performance dynamic lock-free hash tables and list-based sets. In: SPAA. (2002) 73–82
- [6] Guerraoui, R., Kapalka, M.: Principles of Transactional Memory, Synthesis Lectures on Distributed Computing Theory. Morgan and Claypool (2010)
- [7] Herlihy, M., Wing, J.M.: Linearizability: A correctness condition for concurrent objects. ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst. **12**(3) (1990) 463–492
- [8] Aksenov, V., Gramoli, V., Kuznetsov, P., Ravi, S., Shang, D.: Extracting maximum concurrency from list-based sets. Technical Report 1502.01633v2, arXiv (2020)
- [9] Gramoli, V.: More than you ever wanted to know about synchronization: Synchrobench, measuring the impact of the synchronization on concurrent algorithms. In: PPoPP. (2015) 1–10
- [10] Aguilera, M.K., Frølund, S., Hadzilacos, V., Horn, S.L., Toueg, S.: Abortable and query-abortable objects and their efficient implementation. In: PODC. (2007) 23–32
- [11] Lynch, N.A.: Distributed Algorithms. Morgan Kaufmann (1996)
- [12] Riegel, T., Fetzer, C., Felber, P.: Time-based transactional memory with scalable time bases. In: SPAA ’07, New York, NY, USA, ACM (2007) 221–228
- [13] Sun Microsystems: Memory Management in the Java HotSpot Virtual Machine. (April 2006) <http://www.oracle.com/technetwork/java/javase/memorymanagement-whitepaper-150215.pdf>.
- [14] Fomitchev, M., Ruppert, E.: Lock-free linked lists and skip lists. In: Proceedings of the Twenty-third Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing. PODC ’04 (2004) 50–59
- [15] Gibson, J., Gramoli, V.: Why non-blocking operations should be selfish. In: Proceedings of the 29th International Symposium on Distributed Computing. Volume 9363 of LNCS., Springer (Oct 2015) 200–214
- [16] Kung, H.T., Papadimitriou, C.H.: An optimality theory of concurrency control for databases. In: SIGMOD. (1979) 116–126
- [17] Herlihy, M.: Apologizing versus asking permission: optimistic concurrency control for abstract data types. ACM Trans. Database Syst. **15**(1) (1990) 96–124
- [18] Weihl, W.E.: Commutativity-based concurrency control for abstract data types. IEEE Trans. Comput. **37**(12) (1988) 1488–1505
- [19] Guerraoui, R., Henzinger, T.A., Singh, V.: Permissiveness in transactional memories. In: DISC. (2008) 305–319
- [20] Gramoli, V., Harmanci, D., Felber, P.: On the input acceptance of transactional memory. Parallel Processing Letters **20**(1) (2010) 31–50
- [21] David, T., Guerraoui, R., Trigonakis, V.: Asynchronized concurrency: The secret to scaling concurrent search data structures. In: ASPLOS. (2015) 631–644
- [22] Gramoli, V., Kuznetsov, P., Ravi, S.: In the search for optimal concurrency. In Suomela, J., ed.: SIROCCO. Volume 9988 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science. (2016) 143–158
- [23] Aksenov, V., Gramoli, V., Kuznetsov, P., Malova, A., Ravi, S.: A concurrency-optimal binary search tree. In: Euro-Par. (2017) 580–593

A. Proof of linearizability of VBL list

Theorem A.1. *Every schedule of VBL list is linearizable with respect to the set.*

Proof. Let α be a finite execution of VBL implementation and $<_\alpha$ denote the total-order on events in α . For the sake of the proof, we assume that α starts with an artificial sequential execution of an insert operation π_0 that inserts *tail* and sets *head.next* = *tail*. Let H be the high-level history exported by α . Since *linearizability* is a *safety* property [11], it is sufficient for us to prove that every *finite* high-level history H is linearizable.

Completions. We obtain a completion \tilde{H} of H as follows. The invocation of an incomplete contains operation is discarded. The invocation of an incomplete $\pi = \text{remove}$ operation that has not performed the write in Line 44 is discarded; otherwise, it is completed with response *true*. The invocation of an incomplete $\pi = \text{insert}$ operation that has not performed the write in Line 26 is discarded; otherwise, it is completed with response *true*.

Linearization points. We obtain a sequential high-level history \tilde{S} equivalent to \tilde{H} by associating a linearization point ℓ_π with each operation π as follows.

For every $\pi = \text{insert}(v)$ that returns *true* in \tilde{H} , ℓ_π is associated with the write event in Line 30 (rendering the node that stores v reachable from the *head*); otherwise ℓ_π is associated with the last read of a node's *next* field performed by π in α .

For every $\pi = \text{remove}(v)$ that returns *true* in \tilde{H} , ℓ_π is associated with the write event in Line 44 (setting the *deleted* flag of a list's node); otherwise ℓ_π is associated with the last read of a node's *next* field performed by π in α .

For $\pi = \text{contains}(v)$ that returns *true*, ℓ_π is associated with the last read performed by π .

For $\pi = \text{contains}(v)$ that returns *false* in H , ℓ_π is assigned to one of the two events:

- if π reads $(X.\text{val} \neq v)$ in Line 13, where X is the last node read by π in α , ℓ_π is assigned to the read of the *next* field of the node accessed by π immediately before X
- Alternatively, ℓ_π is defined as follows: let π_1 be the remove operation that performs the last write to $X.\text{deleted}$ (Line 44) prior to the read of X by π . Then, ℓ_π is chosen to be the first event performed by π_1 immediately after the write to $X.\text{deleted}$, but prior to the read of X by π . Otherwise if no such event of π_1 exists, then ℓ_π is the read of X by π .

Since linearization points are chosen within the intervals of operations performed in α , for any two operations π_i and π_j in \tilde{H} , if $\pi_i \rightarrow_{\tilde{H}} \pi_j$, then $\pi_i \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}} \pi_j$.

Let \tilde{S}^k be the prefix of \tilde{S} consisting of the first k complete operations. We associate each \tilde{S}^k with a set q^k of objects that were successfully inserted and not subsequently successfully

removed in \tilde{S}^k . We show by induction on k (via case by case analysis) that the sequence of state transitions in \tilde{S}^k is consistent with operations' responses in \tilde{S}^k with respect to the *set* type. The base case $k = 1$ is trivial: the *tail* node containing $+\infty$ is successfully inserted. Suppose that \tilde{S}^k is consistent with the *set* type and let π_1 with argument $v \in \mathbb{Z}$ and response r_{π_1} be the last operation of \tilde{S}^{k+1} . We want to show that $(q^k, \pi_1, q^{k+1}, r_{\pi_1})$ is consistent with the *set* type.

(1) Let $\pi_1 = \text{insert}(v)$ return *true* in \tilde{S}^{k+1} . We show below that each preceding $\pi_2 = \text{insert}(v)$ returning *true* is followed by $\text{remove}(v)$ returning *true*, such that $\pi_2 \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}^{k+1}} \text{remove}(v) \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}^{k+1}} \pi_1$. Suppose the opposite. Observe that π_1 performs its penultimate read on a node X that stores a value $v' < v$ and the last read is performed on a node that stores a value $v'' > v$. By construction of \tilde{S} , π_1 is linearized at the write on node X in Line 30. Observe that π_2 must also perform a write to the node X (otherwise it is easy to see that one of π_1 or π_2 would return *false*). By assumption, the write to X in shared-memory by π_2 in Line 30 precedes the corresponding write to X in shared-memory by π_1 . But π_1 can return *true* from the *lock* performed in Line 28 only after π_2 releases the lock on X_1 by performing the event in Line 31. Thus, π_1 could not have returned *true*—a contradiction.

Let $\pi_1 = \text{insert}(v)$ return *false* in \tilde{S}^{k+1} . We show that there exists a preceding $\pi_2 = \text{insert}(v)$ returning *true* that is not followed by $\pi_3 = \text{remove}(v)$ returning *true*, such that $\pi_2 \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}^{k+1}} \pi_3 \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}^{k+1}} \pi_1$. Suppose that such a π_2 does not exist. Thus, π_1 must perform its last read on a node X that stores value $v'' > v$, acquire the lock on X (Line ??) and return *true*—a contradiction to the assumption that π_1 returned *false*.

It is easy to verify that the conjunction of the above two claims proves that $\forall q \in Q; \forall v \in \mathbb{Z}, \tilde{S}^{k+1}$ satisfies $(q, \text{insert}(v), q \cup \{v\}, (v \notin q))$.

(2) If $\pi_1 = \text{remove}(v)$, similar arguments as applied to $\text{insert}(v)$ prove that $\forall q \in Q; \forall v \in \mathbb{Z}, \tilde{S}^{k+1}$ satisfies $(q, \text{remove}(v), q \setminus \{v\}, (v \in q))$.

(3) We now consider the case of $\text{contains}(v)$. Let $\pi_1 = \text{contains}(v)$ return *true* in \tilde{S}^{k+1} . We show that there exists $\pi_2 = \text{insert}(v)$ returning *true* that is not followed by any $\text{remove}(v)$ returning *true*, such that $\pi_2 \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}^{k+1}} \text{remove}(v) \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}^{k+1}} \pi_1$.

Recall that π_1 is linearized at the last read of a node, say X , performed by π when π reads the *deleted* field of X to be *false* (Line 13). By the VBL algorithm, there exists $\pi_2 = \text{insert}(v)$ such that $\pi_2 \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}^{k+1}} \pi_1$ (let π_2 be the latest such operation). Suppose that there exists a $\text{remove}(v)$ that returns *true*, such that $\pi_2 \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}^{k+1}} \text{remove}(v) \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}^{k+1}} \pi_1$. Thus, $\text{remove}(v)$ performs the write event in Line 44 prior to the read of $X.\text{deleted}$ by π_1 . But then π_1 must read $X.\text{deleted}$ to be *true* and return *false*—a contradiction.

Now, let $\pi_1 = \text{contains}(v)$ return *false* in \tilde{S}^{k+1} . Thus, (1) there exists a $\pi_2 = \text{remove}(v)$ returning *true* that is not followed by any $\text{insert}(v)$ returning *true*, such that $\pi_2 \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}^{k+1}}$

$\text{insert}(v) \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}_{k+1}} \pi_1$, or (2) there does not exist any $\text{insert}(v)$ returning *true* such that $\text{insert}(v) \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}_{k+1}} \pi_1$.

We consider two cases:

- Suppose that π_1 reads $(X.\text{value} \neq v)$, where X is the last node read by π_1 in α . Thus, ℓ_{π_1} is assigned to the read of the *next* field of the node, say X' accessed by π_1 immediately before X . Assume by contradiction that there exists $\pi_2 = \text{insert}(v)$ that returns *true* such that there does not exist any $\text{remove}(v)$ that returns *true*; $\pi_2 \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}_{k+1}} \text{remove}(v) \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}_{k+1}} \text{contains}(v)$. But then π_1 must read $(X.\text{value} = v)$ and return *true*—contradiction.
- Suppose that π_1 reads $(X.\text{value} = v)$ and $X.\text{deleted}$ is *true* in Line 13. Clearly, there exists a $\pi_2 = \text{remove}(v)$ that is concurrent to π_1 and returns *true* in \tilde{H} . By the assignment of linearization points, ℓ_{π_1} is assigned to the first event performed by π_2 immediately after the write to $X.\text{deleted}$, but prior to the read of $X.\text{deleted}$ by π_1 , where X is the last node read by π_1 .

We consider two cases:

- (1) Suppose that some such event of π_2 exists. We claim that there does not exist any $\pi_3 = \text{insert}(v)$ that returns *true* such that $\pi_2 \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}_{k+1}} \pi_3 \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}_{k+1}} \pi_1$. Any such π_2 must acquire the VBL lock on X' , the node read by π_1 immediately prior to X . Since π_1 reads $(X.\text{value} = v)$ and $X.\text{deleted}$ to be *true*, π_2 must also acquire the lock on X' . By our assumption, $\ell_{\pi_2} \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}_{k+1}} \ell_{\pi_3}$. Thus, π_3 acquires the VBL lock on X' only after π_2 releases it. But we linearize π_1 prior to ℓ_{π_3} —a contradiction to our assumption that $\ell_{\pi_3} <_{\alpha} \ell_{\pi_1}$.
- (2) Otherwise, if no such event of π_2 exists, ℓ_{π_1} is chosen as the read of $X.\text{deleted}$ by π_1 . Since π_2 does not release the value-aware lock on X' prior to the read of $X.\text{deleted}$ by π_1 , there does not exist any $\text{insert}(v)$ that returns *true* such that $\text{insert}(v) \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}_{k+1}} \pi_1$. Now, by the assignment of linearization points, $\pi_2 \rightarrow_{\tilde{S}_{k+1}} \pi_1$.

Thus, inductively, the sequence of state transitions in \tilde{S} satisfies the sequential specification of the *set* type. \square

Theorem A.2. *The VBL list provides deadlock-freedom.*

Proof. Suppose that an update operation π fails to return a matching response after taking infinitely many steps. Intuitively, π fails to do so because (1) it fails to acquire the lock on the *prev* node in Line 28 for insert, or (2) it is returned *false* from the call to `lockNextAtValue` for remove, or (3) it fails to acquire the lock on the *curr* node during Line 41 by remove.

In Case (1), there exists a concurrent remove operation that is executing the code in its critical section and must eventually return the response *true*. In Case (2), if π returns *false* from the call to `lockNextAtValue`, then some concurrent update operation has indeed succeeded to acquire the lock and enters its critical section if its an insert. Otherwise if this concurrent operation is a remove, we are in Case (3), i.e., remove does not return from the call to `curr.lockNextAt` in Line 41. Thus, some other update operation has acquired the lock on the *curr* node of this remove. Note that we can iteratively extend

this execution, but the last such correct process performing an update operation must eventually enter the critical section and return a matching response.

The schedule of α is defined as the sub-sequence of its events consisting of, for every operation, read operations of the last traversal (lines 15-21), node creation events (line 26), and writes to the next fields (lines 30 and 45). One can easily see that the sequence of these events follows, for each operation in α , the sequential specification of the linked list. Thus, the schedule is locally serializable.

Therefore, all schedules accepted by our algorithm are correct. \square

B. Evaluation in C++

In this section, we present the evaluation of the performance of our algorithm on Intel machine (see Section IV) with the code written in C++. We compiled the code with MinGW 6.3.0, -O2 flag, and linked it with TCMalloc allocator.

We compare our VBL algorithm with Lazy Linked List and original Harris-Michael algorithm with the only change: we do not support memory reclamation in any algorithm, i.e., the allocated nodes are never reclaimed. The code is available by the following link https://cutt.ly/icdcs2021_677.

We use the same workloads as in the Section IV. The results are shown at Figure 6.

Comparison against the Lazy Linked List. On workloads with high-contention, i.e., short list (range 50 and range 200), high update rate (20% and 100%), and high number of processes (19–72, out of one socket), VBL outperforms Lazy. On all other workloads VBL performs similarly to Lazy. Thus, we can state that the application of the notion of concurrency-optimality improves the performance of lock-based algorithms.

Comparison against Harris-Michael. It can be seen that on workloads with high-contention Harris-Michael significantly outperforms VBL and Lazy. This situation is the opposite to what happens with the algorithms written in Java. It happens because in C++ we can store the next pointer and the deleted flag inside one field and there is no necessity to follow two references in order to get the next pointer. On all other workloads Harris-Michael outperforms VBL and Lazy a little bit or even performs worse.

The only thing that we cannot unequivocally explain is why Harris-Michael unambiguously outperforms VBL and Lazy on contains-only workloads with high range when the contains operation in VBL and Lazy is implemented as a simple while loop. We relate this behaviour to the fact that the compiler could have done his job better on Harris-Michael and the function contains is aligned in the address-space more friendly to the operating system.




Fig. 6. Evaluation on Intel in C++