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Lipton’s reduction theory provides an intuitive and simple way for deducing the non-interference properties of concurrent programs, but it is difficult to directly apply the technique to verify linearizability of sophisticated fine-grained concurrent data structures. In this paper, we propose three reduction-based proof methods that can handle such data structures. The key idea behind our reduction methods is that an irreducible operation can be viewed as an atomic operation at a higher level of abstraction. This allows us to focus on the reduction properties of an operation related to its abstract semantics. We have successfully applied the methods to verify 11 concurrent data structures including the most challenging ones: the Herlihy and Wing queue, the HSY elimination-based stack, and the time-stamped queue, and the lazy list. Our methods inherit intuition and simplicity of Lipton’s reduction, and concurrent data structures designers can easily and quickly learn to use the methods.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Linearizability is a widely accepted consistency condition for concurrent data structures. A concurrent data structure is linearizable if any concurrent execution of its methods is equivalent to a legal sequential execution according to the sequential specification of the data structure. To achieve high performance, concurrent data structures often employ sophisticated fine-grained synchronization techniques. This makes it more difficult to verify linearizability of concurrent data structures.

Lipton’s reduction [1] is an intuitive and simple way to deduce the non-interference properties of concurrent programs. Previous reduction-based techniques [2, 3, 4, 5] are very good at verifying linearizability of coarse-grained concurrent data structures, but are difficult to handle the sophisticated fine-grained ones, such as the Herlihy and Wing (HW) queue [6] and the time-stamped (TS) queue [7], the HSY elimination-based (HSY) stack [8]. In this paper, we propose three reduction-based proof methods: single path abstraction-based reduction, double paths abstraction-based reduction and relaxed reduction, which can handle such data structures.

The main observation behind single path abstraction-based reduction is that semantically irrelevant actions can be removed from a method for reduction according to the abstract semantics of the method. We successfully apply the method to 8 concurrent data structures including the MS lock-free queue [9], the lazy list [10], the pair snapshot [11].

The main idea of double paths abstraction-based reduction is to put together the two methods interfering with each other for reduction. We successfully apply the method to the HSY elimination-based stack. We conjecture that the reduction method can be applied to check the elimination optimization of other concurrent stacks.

The main idea of relaxed reduction is to explore the reduction properties under restrictive interleaving, which can help establish linearizability. We successfully apply the method to the HW queue, the TS queue, the baskets queue [12].

Our methods do not rely on program logics, do not need to rewrite algorithms and identify linearization points. The main overhead of our methods is to identify commuting types (i.e., left-mover, right-mover) of atomic actions. Our methods are simple, easy-to-use and expressive, can be applied to various sophisticated algorithms.

The structure of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we recall the definition of linearizability, and prove that the linearizability relation is transitive. In Section 3, we recall the definition of Lipton’s reduction. In
Section 4, we present the single path abstraction-based reduction, and use it to verify the MS lock-free queue and a simplified version of the lazy list. In Section 5, we present the double paths abstraction-based reduction, and use it to verify the HSY stack. In Section 6, we present the relaxed reduction method, and use it to verify the HW queue. Finally we discuss related work and conclude in Section 7.

2. LINEARIZABILITY

2.1. History and Linearizability Relation

In the concurrent setting, a concurrent object \( Z \) provides a set of methods, which can be called concurrently by threads. For simplicity, we assume each method of concurrent objects takes one argument and returns a value.

Let \( M \) be a set of method names, \( T \) be a set of thread identifiers. We refer to a method call as an operation. Let \( O \) be a set of operation identifiers which are used to identify every method call. An action is one of the following forms:

\[
\text{Action} ::= (t, \text{inv}(m, v), o) | (t, a, o) | (t, \text{ret}(v), o)
\]

Here, \( t \in T \), \( o \in O \), \( m \in M \). \((t, \text{inv}(m, v), o)\) represents an invocation event of a method \( m \) with an argument value \( v \) which is performed by a thread \( t \) and is identified by an operation identifier \( o \). \((t, a, o)\) represents an atomic statement (or region) \( a \) of an operation \( o \) which is performed by a thread \( t \). \((t, \text{ret}(v), o)\) represents a response event of an operation \( o \) with a return value \( v \). We sometimes omit the first and third fields of actions when they are irrelevant to discussions.

A shared state of \( Z \) (a state of \( Z \), for short) records the values of the \( Z \)’s shared variables (or references). A local state of an operation records the values of the operation’s local variables. Let \( u = \{l_1, \ldots, l_n\} \) be a set of local states where \( l_i \) is a local state of the operation \( i \), for each \( 1 \leq i \leq n \). Let \( \phi \) be an empty set: \( u = \phi \) before all operations begin to execute. A valid state \( \sigma \) is of the form \((z, u)\), where \( z \in Z\text{State} \) is a state of \( Z \), \( u \) is a set of local states.

An execution of \( Z \) consists of a collection of threads, each sequentially invoking the methods of \( Z \). The semantics of an execution is given by a transition relation. A transition is a triple of the form \( \sigma \xrightarrow{a} \sigma' \), where \( \sigma \) and \( \sigma' \) are states and \( a \) is an action. The transition characterizes the effect that the pre-state \( \sigma \) is transformed into the post-state \( \sigma' \) by the action \( a \).

A terminating execution \( \pi \) of \( Z \) is a sequence of transitions of the form \((z_0, \phi) \xrightarrow{e_1} (z_1, u_1) \xrightarrow{e_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{e_n} (z_n, u_n)\) where \((z_0, \phi)\) is an initial state, \((z_n, u_n)\) is a final state. \((e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_n)\) is called the trace of the execution \( \pi \).

A history of \( Z \) is a sequence of invocation and response events of \( Z \). The history of an execution \( \pi \), denoted by \( H(\pi) \), is the sequence comprised of the invocation and response events generated by the execution. A history of an object is feasible if the history can be generated by an execution of the object starting from a well-formed state. We will consider only feasible histories.

An invocation event \( e_1 \) matches a response event \( e_2 \) if they are associated with the same operation. A history is sequential if every invocation event, except possibly the last, is immediately followed by its matching response event. A history is complete if every invocation event has a matching response event. An invocation event is pending in a history if there is no matching response event to it.

For an incomplete history \( h \), a completion of \( h \), is a complete history gained by adding some matching response events to the end of \( h \) and removing some pending invocation events within \( h \). Let \( \text{Compl}(h) \) be the set of all completions of the history \( h \).

Let \(<_o \) denote the happened-before order on operations; for two operations \( o \) and \( o' \) in a history, \( o <_o o' \) if the response event of \( o \) precedes the invocation event of \( o' \).

For a history \( h \), let \( h(i) \) denote the the \( i \)th element of \( h \), \( |h| \) denote the length of \( h \), \( h[t] \) denote the maximal subsequence of \( h \) consisting of the events performed by the thread \( t \). The linearizability relation is a binary relation (denoted by \( \sqsubseteq \)) on histories, defined as follows:

DEFINITION 2.1 (Linearizability Relation [13]). \( H \sqsubseteq H' \iff \)

1. \( \forall t. H[t] = H'[t] \);
2. there exists a bijection \( \nu : \{1, \ldots, |H|\} \rightarrow \{1, \ldots, |H'|\} \) such that \( \forall i. H(i) = H'(\nu(i)) \) and if \( i \neq j \), \( H(i) \) is a response event, \( H(j) \) is an invocation event, then \( \nu(i) < \nu(j) \).

The second condition above requires that \( H' \) preserves the happened-before orders of the operations in \( H \) (i.e., for two operations \( op_1 \) and \( op_2 \), if in \( H \), \( op_1 \prec_o op_2 \), then in \( H' \), \( op_1 \prec_o op_2 \)).

Formally, a sequential history \( h_s \) is called a linearization of a history \( h_1 \) if there exists \( h_c \in \text{Compl}(h_1) \) such that \( h_c \sqsubseteq h_s \).

The following proposition shows that the linearizability relation is transitive and is used in the several proofs. The proof for the proposition appears in Appendix A.

PROPOSITION 2.1. \( H_1 \sqsubseteq H_2 \land H_2 \sqsubseteq H_3 \Rightarrow H_1 \sqsubseteq H_3 \)

2.2. Linearizable Objects

DEFINITION 2.2 (Abstract Data Type). An ADT \( A \) is a tuple \((A\text{State}, \sigma, \text{Aop}, \text{Input}, \text{Output})\), where \( A\text{State} \) is a set of states; \( \sigma \in A\text{State} \) is the initial state; \( \text{Aop} \) is a set of methods; \( \text{Input} \) is a set of input values; \( \text{Output} \) is a set of output values; each method \( op \in \text{Aop} \) is a mapping \( op : A\text{State} \times \text{Input} \rightarrow A\text{State} \times \text{Output} \).

A sequential and complete history: \( \text{inv}(op_1, i_1), \text{ret}(o_1), \text{inv}(op_2, i_2), \text{ret}(o_2), \ldots, \text{inv}(op_n, i_n), \text{ret}(o_n) \) of an ADT \( A \) is legal if there exists \( \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n \) such
that \( op_i(\sigma_{(i-1)}, i) = (\sigma_i, o_i) \), for each \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), where \( op(\sigma, in) = (\sigma', ret) \) denotes that the result of applying the function \( op \) to an input \( in \) and a state \( \sigma \) is the state \( \sigma' \) and the return value \( ret \).

**Definition 2.3 (Linearizability [6]).** A history of a concurrent object \( Z \) is linearizable w.r.t. an ADT \( A \) if there exists a legal sequential history \( h' \) of \( A \), such that \( h' \) is a linearization of \( h \).

A concurrent object \( Z \) is linearizable w.r.t. an ADT \( A \) if every history of \( Z \) is linearizable w.r.t. \( A \).

### 3. LIPTON’S REDUCTION

#### 3.1. LIPTON’S REDUCTION

The approach of reduction was first proposed by Lipton [1] to simplify reasoning about concurrent programs and further developed by Lamport and Cohen [14], Back [15]. Lipton’s reduction is based on the notion of commuting actions.

**Definition 3.1 (Commuting actions [14]).** An action, \( a \), right commutes with action \( b \), and \( b \) left commutes with \( a \), iff \( \forall \sigma, s, \sigma' \in \mathbb{S} \), \( \sigma \xrightarrow{a} s \xrightarrow{b} \sigma' \implies \exists t \in \mathbb{S} \), \( \sigma \xrightarrow{b} t \xrightarrow{a} \sigma' \).

Following [1], actions are classified according to their commutativity. Given a concurrent system, an action \( a \) is a right-mover/left-mover if, for any action \( b \) of a different thread, whenever \( a \) is followed/preceded by \( b \), then \( a \) right-left commutes with \( b \). An action is a both-mover if it is both a left-mover and a right-mover. An action is a non-mover if it is neither a left-mover nor a right-mover. Some standard commutative properties [1, 5, 16] are as follows:

**Commutativity 1.** An action is a local action if it only accesses (reads or writes) local variables. Local actions are both-movers.

**Commutativity 2.** An action that writes a shared variable (or a field of a shared object) is a right-mover/left-mover if the action is not followed/preceded by any action of other threads which accesses the variable (or the field of the shared object).

**Commutativity 3.** An action that reads a shared variable (or a field of a shared object) is a right-mover/left-mover if it is not followed/preceded by any action of other threads which writes the variable (or the field of the shared object).

**Commutativity 4.** An acquiring lock action is a right-mover. A releasing lock action is a left-mover.

**Commutativity 5.** We assume that every algorithm using the \( \text{cas} \) (i.e., compare-and-swap) atomic instruction provides a solution such as the ABA counter [17], to avoid the ABA problem [18]. The typical pattern for using \( \text{cas} \) is: \( \ldots, \text{exp} := \ast p, \ldots, \text{cas}(\ast p, \text{exp}, \text{new}_v) \). A thread first reads the value \( \text{exp} \) from \( \ast p \), and then uses \( \text{cas} \) to atomically change \( \ast p \) from \( \text{exp} \) to \( \text{new}_v \) if no other threads have changed \( \ast p \) to another value in the meantime; otherwise, it does nothing. In terms of the above assumption, if \( \text{cas} \) succeeds, \( \ast p \) is not modified by other threads between \( \text{cas} \) and its matching read. Thus, if \( \text{cas} \) succeeds, its matching read action is a right-mover (by Commutativity 3).

A path is a sequence of actions which are performed by the same thread. A path is reducible if it satisfies the pattern of statements \( R^*A^1L^* \), where \( R^* \) represents 0 or more right-movers, \( L^* \) represents 0 or more left-movers, and \( A^1 \) represents 0 or 1 non-mover.

Any interleaved execution of the program where a reducible path is executed, can be transformed into an execution where the reducible path is executed sequentially by commuting actions. Thus a reducible path can be viewed as an atomic region. For example, consider a reducible path \( (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) \) where \( a_1 \) is a right-mover, \( a_2 \) is a non-mover, \( a_3 \) and \( a_4 \) are left-movers. Figure 1(A) shows a concurrent execution of the reducible path interleaved with the actions \( e_1, e_2, e_3 \) of other threads. The actions of the reducible path can be executed contiguously by commuting adjacent actions of other threads, as shown in Figure 1(C).

![Figure 1. A Reducible Path](image)

### 4. SINGLE PATH ABSTRACTION-BASED REDUCTION AND EXAMPLES

In this section, we present single path abstraction-based reduction, and apply the method to verify the MS lock-free queue [9] and a simplified version of the lazy list [10]. In Appendix D, we verify 6 other algorithms including the lazy list using the method.

#### 4.1. Single path abstraction-based reduction

Given a concurrent object \( Z \) and an ADT \( A \), the abstraction function \( AF \) is used to map the well-formed states of \( Z \) to the states of \( A \), the renaming function \( RF \) is used to map the method names of \( Z \) to the method names of \( A \). The inverse of the function \( RF \) is denoted by \( RF^{-1} \).

For a path \( U \) of a method \( op \) in \( Z \), let \( (\sigma_z, in)U(\sigma'_z, ret) \) denote a sequential execution of the path starting from a state \( \sigma_z \) of \( Z \) with an actual parameter \( in \) (i.e., the initial local state of the execution is that the formal parameter of the method is mapped to \( in \)), terminating in a state \( \sigma'_z \) of \( Z \) with a return value \( ret \).

A path \( U \) of a method \( op \) in \( Z \) satisfies the semantics of an ADT \( A \) under an abstraction function \( AF \),
if for any well-formed \( \sigma_z, in, (\sigma_z, in)U(\sigma'_z, ret) \implies RF(op)(AF(\sigma_z), in) = (AF(\sigma'_z), ret) \). An action \( a \) of a method in \( Z \) is irrelevant to the states of an ADT \( A \) under an abstraction function \( AF \) if for any shared state \( \sigma_z \), any local state \( l \) of the method, \( (\sigma_z, l) \xrightarrow{a} (\sigma'_z, l') \implies AF(\sigma_z) = AF(\sigma'_z) \).

Let \( (x, y, \ldots) \) denote a sequence where \( x \) is the first element, and \( X \cdot Y \) denote the concatenation of sequences \( X \) and \( Y \). \( U' \) is a subsequence of the sequence \( U \) if \( U' \) can be derived from \( U \) by deleting some elements without changing the order of the remaining elements. For a subsequence \( U' \) of \( U \), let \( U -- U' \) denote the subsequence of \( U \) which can be derived from \( U \) by deleting the elements of \( U' \). \( U'' \) is a segment of the sequence \( U \) if \( U'' \) is a subsequence of \( U \) consisting of the adjacent elements of \( U \).

**Definition 4.1** (Single Path Abstraction-based Reduction). A path \( U \) of a method in concurrent object \( Z \) is abstractly reducible w.r.t. an ADT \( A \) under an abstraction function \( AF \) if there exists a segment \( U' \) of \( U \) such that

1. \( U' \) is reducible and satisfies the semantics of \( A \) under the abstraction function \( AF \),
2. the actions in \( U -- U' \) are irrelevant to the states of \( A \) under the abstraction function \( AF \) and do not modify the formal parameter of the method.

A segment of a path that complies with the above requirement is called a basic path of the path.

**Theorem 4.1** (Soundness). If every path of every method of \( Z \) is abstractly reducible w.r.t. an ADT \( A \) under an abstraction function \( AF \), then every complete history of \( Z \) is linearizable w.r.t. \( A \).

The proof for the theorem is given in Appendix B. Henzinger et al. [19] show that a purely-blocking data structure is linearizable iff its every complete history is linearizable. The notion of purely-blocking is a very weak liveness property, and most of concurrent data structures satisfy the liveness property. In this paper, we only consider complete histories.

### 4.2. The MS lock-free queue

Figure 2 shows the pseudo code for the lock-free queue algorithm of Michael and Scott [9]. The queue algorithm uses a singly-linked list with Head and Tail pointers. The Head pointer always points to the first node of the list, The Tail pointer always points to the last or second to last node. The first node of the list acts as a dummy node to simplify certain list operations. The queue is meant to be empty when the list contains only one node. If the queue is not empty, the **Dequeue** method advances the Head pointer and returns the value of the new first node of the list; otherwise it returns *empty*. The **Enqueue** method first appends a new node at the tail of the list, and then makes the Tail pointer point to the new node. A thread cannot finish the **Enqueue** method in one atomic step, thus other threads will try to help the thread to advance the Tail pointer before performing their own actions when they observe that the Tail pointer lags behind the end of the list.

Figure 2. The MS Lock-Free Queue

The specification of the abstract queue is defined as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Enqueue} & : (seq, x) \mapsto (seq^-(x), \varepsilon) \\
\text{Dequeue} & : seq \mapsto \begin{cases} 
(seq', y), & \text{if } seq = (y)^{-}\text{seq'}; \\
(seq, \text{EMPTY}), & \text{if } seq = \text{empty}.
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

Here, \( \varepsilon \) denotes that a method does not return values. The list is well-formed if there are no loops or cycles in it. The abstraction function \( AF \) maps the well-formed list \( Q \) pointed to by \( \text{Head} \) to the value sequence of the list, and is formally defined as follows:

\[
AF(Q) = \begin{cases} 
(), & \text{if } Q.\text{Head}.next = \text{null}; \\
(Q.\text{Head}.next.value)^{-}AF(Q'), & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

Here \( Q'.\text{Head} = Q.\text{Head}.next \). Note that Tail is irrelevant to the states of the abstract queue, thus updating Tail will not affect the abstract state.

An iteration of a while loop is called a failed iteration if the loop will restart after the iteration; otherwise, it is called a successful iteration. The failed iterations of a pure loop can be removed from the program path in terms of the notion of pure loop [5]. We indicate that a boolean expression is true/false by appending \(+/−\), and a case instruction succeeds/fails by appending \(+/−\).

We now show that the **Enqueue** method is abstractly reducible. The proof for the **Dequeue** method is similar to the one for the **Dequeue** method in the DGLM queue (in Appendix D.4). The iterations of the while loop in the **Enqueue** method are divided into three types:

- **Failed iteration, not changing the shared state**
  \[
P_1 = (t := \text{Tail}, t := \text{t.next}, t = \text{Tail}^{-})
  
P_2 = (t := \text{Tail}, t := \text{t.next}, t = \text{Tail}^{+}, t = \text{null}^{−}, \text{cas}(&\text{Tail}, t, t^{-}))
  
P_3 = (t := \text{Tail}, t := \text{t.next}, t = \text{Tail}^{+}, t = \text{null}^{+}, \text{cas}(&\text{t.next}, t, t^{-}))
  \]
- **Failed iteration, advancing the Tail pointer**
  \[
P_4 = (t := \text{Tail}, t := \text{t.next}, t = \text{Tail}^{+}, t = \text{null}^{−}, \text{cas}(&\text{Tail}, t, t^{+}))
  \]
The execution paths of the while loop can be described by the regular expression:
\[(P_1|P_2|P_3|P_4)^*P_5\]
The pre-loop path is \(P_0 = (\text{new}-a := \text{cons}(v,\text{null}))\). The post-loop path is \(P_6 = (\text{cas}(\&\text{Tail}, t, \text{new}-\text{n}))\) or \(P_7 = (\text{cas}(\&\text{Tail}, t, \text{new}-\text{n}))^{-}\). The execution paths of the \(\text{Enqueue}\) method can be described by the following regular expression:
\[\text{Enq} = P_0^\infty (P_1|P_2|P_3|P_4)^*P_5^ \infty (P_6|P_7)\]

\(P_1\), \(P_2\) and \(P_3\) are the failed iterations which do not change the shared state. The failed iterations can be removed from the path in terms of the notion of pure loops in [5].

Following this transformation, we get the following path expression:

\[\text{Enq}' = (P_4)^*P_0^\infty P_5^\infty (P_6|P_7)\]

\(P_4\) is used to create a new node, and the actions in \(P_4\) do not access the new node. Thus, \(P_4\) right commutes with every action of other threads and each of the actions in \(P_4\). Following this transformation, we get the following path expression:

\[\text{Enq}'' = (P_4)^*P_0^\infty P_5^\infty (P_6|P_7)\]

\(P_7\) does not change the program state. The actions in \(P_4\) and \(P_6\) successfully update \(\text{Tail}\), but they do not affect the abstract state of the queue. Thus, we extract a segment \(BP = P_0^\infty P_3\) from \(\text{Enq}''\) as a basic path.

Now we prove that the path \(BP\) is reducible. \(P_0\) and \(tn = \text{null}^+\) are local actions, thus both are movers (by Commutativity 1). Since \(\text{cas}(\&(t.next), tn, n)^+\) succeeds, \(tn := t\).next is a right-mover (by Commutativity 5). Since \(t := \text{Tail}\), \(t\).next = \(tn = \text{null}\) and \(t\).next is not modified by another thread between \(tn := t\).next and \(\text{cas}(\&(t\).next, \text{tn}, n)^+\), we obtain the fact: \(\text{Tail}.\text{next} = \text{null}\) between \(tn := \text{t.next}\) and \(\text{cas}(\&(t\).next, \text{tn}, n)^+\). In terms of the fact, \(\text{Tail}\) is not modified between \(t := \text{Tail}\) and \(\text{cas}(\&(t\).next, \text{tn}, n)^+\), then, by Commutativity 3, \(t := \text{Tail}\) and \(t = \text{Tail}^+\) are right-movers, \(\text{cas}(\&(t\).next, \text{tn}, n)^+\) is a non-mover. \(BP\) satisfies the pattern of statements \(R^*A\) and is reducible.

It is easy to prove that the sequential execution of \(BP\) satisfies the semantics of the abstract \(\text{Enqueue}\) method by using the standard method for proving correctness of data representation [20].

### 4.3. A simplified version of the lazy list

To simplify the presentation, we verify a simplified version of the lazy list algorithm [10], which is based on the concurrent set algorithm of O’Hearn et al. [21], and preserves the main difficulty of the linearizability proof of the lazy list. In Appendix D.5, we also verify the lazy list.

#### The code for the algorithm is given in Figure 3. The algorithm is a concurrent set implementation which uses a sorted singly-linked list with two sentinel nodes at the two ends of the list, containing the values \(-\infty\) and \(+\infty\) respectively. Each node has three fields: a data field, \(val\), a next field, \(nt\) a mark field, \(mk\).

The specification of the abstract set is defined by:

- \(\text{add}(S, e) = \begin{cases} (S \cup \{e\}, \text{true}) & \text{if } e \notin S \\ (S, \text{false}) & \text{if } e \in S \end{cases} \)
- \(\text{remove}(S, e) = \begin{cases} (S \setminus \{e\}, \text{true}) & \text{if } e \in S \\ (S, \text{false}) & \text{if } e \notin S \end{cases} \)
- \(\text{contain}(S, e) = \begin{cases} (S, \text{true}) & \text{if } e \in S \\ (S, \text{false}) & \text{if } e \notin S \end{cases} \)

The abstraction function maps the concrete list pointed to by \(\text{Head}\) to the set consisting of the values of the data fields of the nodes in the list except the two sentinel nodes.

The concurrent set defines three operations: \(\text{add}\), \(\text{remove}\) and \(\text{contain}\). The internal method \(\text{locate}(e)\) traverses the list nodes and returns a pair of nodes (pre, cur).

The \(\text{add/remove}\) method first calls the locate method (at \(A_2/R_2\)) to get two candidate nodes (pre, cur). Then the \(\text{add/remove}\) operation tests the validation condition at \(A_{3A}/R_{3A}\). If the validation condition is false (in this case, \(p\) or \(c\) is removed, or \(p\.\text{nt} \neq c\)), the \(\text{add/remove}\) operation restarts. Otherwise, the remainder of the atomic region is executed as follows:

- The \(\text{add}\) method returns \(\text{false}\) if \(c\.\text{val} = e\); otherwise, it inserts a new node with the value \(e\) between \(p\) and \(c\), and returns \(\text{true}\).
- The \(\text{remove}\) method returns \(\text{false}\) if \(c\.\text{val} \neq e\); otherwise, it first logically removes the node \(c\) by setting its mark field, then physically removes the node.
The contain(e) method is completely wait-free (i.e., any invocation of the method is guaranteed to terminate in a finite number of steps). The method traverses the list nodes without using any synchronization, and returns true if it can find a node with the value e, and false otherwise. Proving the linearizability of the contain method is challenging because its linearization points may depend on future interleaving.

**Lemma 4.1.** At any concurrent terminating execution of the add and remove methods, the paths of the methods are reducible.

Let \( A_3^+ / A_3^- \) denote the execution path of the atomic region \( A_3 \) where the boolean expression at \( A_3 \) is true/false. The execution paths of the two methods can be described by the following two regular expressions, respectively.

\[
\text{Add} = (A_2, A_3^-)^* (A_2, A_3^+, A_4)
\]

\[
\text{Rem} = (R_2, R_3^-)^* (R_2, R_3^+, R_4)
\]

\((A_2, A_3^-)^* (R_2, R_3^+, R_4)\) are the failed iterations which do not change the shared state. By deleting them (in terms of the notion of pure loop), we get the following two path expressions:

\[
\text{Add}' = (A_2, A_3^+, A_4)
\]

\[
\text{Rem}' = (R_2, R_3^+, R_4)
\]

We now show that \( \text{Add}' \) is reducible. At \( A_3 \) of the atomic region \( A_3^+ \), the nodes \( p \) and \( c \) are reachable from \( \text{Head} \) and \( p, nt = c \), thus the return value \((p, c)\) of the locate method in \( A_2 \) does not change when \( A_2 \) moves to the left of \( A_3^- \) by commuting actions. \( A_1 \) is a local action, thus is a both-mover. \( A_2 \) can move to the left of \( A_3^+ \) and \( A_4 \) can move to the right of \( A_3^+ \), thus, \( \text{Add}' \) is reducible. Similarly, we can show that \( \text{Rem}' \) is reducible.

**Lemma 4.2.** After every iteration of the while loop in the contain method, the node cur is reachable from \( \text{Head} \) at some time point between the starting of the loop and the ending of this iteration.

**Proof.** We prove the loop invariant by induction on the number of loop iterations.

Base case: Before the loop starts, cur = head, so the loop invariant holds.

Inductive case: Assume the loop invariant holds for the \( k^{th} \) iteration of loop. After the \( (k + 1)^{th} \) iteration, cur = cur'.nt, where cur' represents the value of cur after the \( k^{th} \) iteration. Consider two cases.

**Case 1:** cur' is reachable while the statement cur = cur'.nt is executed. Obviously, cur is also reachable at the time point.

**Case 2:** cur' is not reachable while the statement is executed. Since cur' is reachable at some time point (in terms of the assumption), cur' is removed from the list in the execution of the loop. Since the next field of a removed node is never changed, the next field of cur' is cur before cur' is removed. Thus cur is reachable before cur' is removed from the list.

**Lemma 4.3.** After the last iteration of the loop in the contain method, there exists a time point (called the method’s reachability point) between the starting of the loop and the ending of the loop such that at the time point, cur is reachable, and cur.val >= e and cur'.val < e, where cur = cur'.nt.

**Proof.** In terms of the above loop invariant (Lemma 4.2) and the termination condition of the loop (i.e., cur.val >= e).

**Lemma 4.4.** For any concurrent terminating execution \( \pi \) of the concurrent set, \( H(\pi) \) is linearizable w.r.t. the abstract set.

We prove the lemma by showing that (1) the concurrent execution \( \pi \) can be transformed into a sequential execution \( \pi' \) such that \( H(\pi) \subseteq H(\pi') \), and (2) \( H(\pi') \) is a legal sequential history of the abstract set. The latter can be verified by proving that the sequential execution of every method in the algorithm satisfies the semantics of the abstract set. Here, we focus on the former.

**Proof.** A sequential execution \( \pi' \) can be obtained from \( \pi \) by the following steps:

1. For every contain operation in \( \pi \), insert its reachability point into \( \pi' \).

2. Delete the transitions of all failed iterations of the add and remove operations and all contain operations (i.e., deleting their actions, corresponding post states, and the local states of the contain operations in the state configurations). The contain operations are read-only operations, therefore, deleting them does not affect the execution of the add and remove operations.

3. The actions \( A_2, A_4, R_2, R_4 \) in the add and remove operations do not change reachability of the nodes in the list and each of them (both right and left) commutes with every reachability point (i.e., after commuting, at each reachability point, its corresponding cur is still reachable). Thus, in terms of Lemma 4.1, \( A_2 \) can move to the left of \( A_3^+ \) and \( A_4 \) can move to the right of \( A_3^+ \); similarly, \( R_2 \) can move to the left of \( R_3^+ \) and \( R_4 \) can move to the right of \( R_3^+ \). Following the above transformation, each of the remove and add operations is executed sequentially and is not interleaved with the reachability points. After completing the step, we call the new execution \( \beta \).

4. For every contain operation in \( \pi \), insert a sequential execution of the contain operation into the execution \( \beta \) at its corresponding reachability point. After completing the last step, we call the new execution \( \pi' \). In terms of Lemma 4.3, the return value of every contain operation in \( \pi' \) is the same as the one of its corresponding contain operation in \( \pi \).

After the above transforming, \( \pi' \) is a sequential execution, does not change the arguments and return values of the operations in \( \pi \) and preserves the happened-before orders of the operations in \( \pi \). Thus \( H(\pi) \subseteq H(\pi') \).
5. DOUBLE PATHS ABSTRACTION-BASED REDUCTION AND EXAMPLES

5.1. Double paths abstraction-based reduction

Some concurrent stacks such as the HSY stack, the time-stamped (TS) stack, use elimination [8] as an essential optimization. The elimination optimization is based on the fact that if a push operation followed by a pop operation is performed on a stack, the stack state keeps unchanged. In order to increase the degree of parallelism of stack algorithms, the elimination optimization allows a push operation to exchange its value with a pop operation without accessing the shared stack. This makes one of the two operations irredicible because of interference from the other operation. The main idea of double paths abstraction-based reduction is to put together the two operations interfering with each other for reduction.

DEFINITION 5.1 (Double Paths Abstraction-based Reduction). For two operations $M_1$ and $M_2$ in a concurrent execution $\pi$ of $Z$, let $U_1$ and $U_2$ be the execution paths of $M_1$ and $M_2$, respectively. Let $D$ be the subsequence of $\pi$ consisting of the actions of $U_1$ and $U_2$. Let $(\sigma_z, in_1, in_2)D(\sigma', ret_1, ret_2)$ denote a sequential execution of the path D starting from an initial state $\sigma_z$ with two actual parameters: $in_1$ of $M_1$ and $in_2$ of $M_2$, terminating in a state $\sigma'$ with two return values: $ret_1$ of $M_1$ and $ret_2$ of $M_2$. $U_1$ and $U_2$ are abstractly reducible w.r.t. an ADT $A$ under an abstraction function $AF$ if

1. the actions of $D$ can be executed contingently by commuting actions, and
2. for any well-formed state $\sigma_z$, any actual parameter $in_1$ of $M_1$, any actual parameter $in_2$ of $M_2$, $(\sigma_z, in_1, in_2)D(\sigma', ret_1, ret_2)$ implies that there exists a state $\sigma_a$ of $A$ such that $RF(M_1)(AF(\sigma_z), in_1) = (\sigma_a, ret_1)$, and $RF(M_2)(\sigma_a, in_2) = (AF(\sigma'), ret_2)$ (or $RF(M_2)(AF(\sigma_z), in_2) = (\sigma_a, ret_2)$, and $RF(M_1)(\sigma_a, in_1) = (AF(\sigma'), ret_1)$).

The first condition above requires that the path $D$ is reducible. The second condition requires that the path $D$ satisfies the semantics of a sequential execution of two abstract operations. It is easy to show that Theorem 4.1 still holds in the extended definition of abstractly reducible path.

5.2. The HSY stack

Figure 4 shows the pseudo code for the HSY stack algorithm [8]. In the stack, the global variable $S$ is a top pointer of a singly-linked list; the global array $loc$ has one slot for each thread, where a thread descriptor (i.e., an instance of Tinfo) is stored. Each thread descriptor contains the thread id $id$, the type of the operation (push or pop) $op$, and the argument (input or output) $value$. Because there is one-to-one correspondence between thread descriptors and operations, we use the terms thread descriptor and operation interchangeably. The method TryStackOp tries to update $S$ by cas instructions to finish the push or pop operation, similar to the Treiber stack [22]. Due to space constraints, the code of TryStackOp is not shown in Figure 4.

A thread descriptor of a push/pop operation is created at $U_1/O_1$, then the push/pop operation calls the method StackOp. In StackOp($p$), a push/pop operation $p$ first attempts to update $S$ by calling the method TryStackOp. The operation $p$ returns if this attempt succeeds. Otherwise, it tries to eliminate itself with another operation in the manner described below.

The operation $p$ first writes its descriptor in the $loc$ array (at $L_5$) to allow other threads to eliminate it. Then the operation $p$ randomly selects an operation $q$ (at $L_6$ and $L_7$) which $p$ attempts to eliminate itself with. If $p$ and $q$ satisfy the conditions described at $L_8$ and $L_9$, $p$ tries to eliminate itself with $q$ by calling the method TryColl (at $L_{10}$). If TryColl succeeds, the operation $p$ returns. Otherwise, it restarts StackOp (at $L_{12}$). If the cas($\&loc[p.id], p, null$) instruction at $L_{10}$ or $L_{17}$ fails, then $p$ was eliminated by some other operation. In this case, $p$ finishes the collision by calling the method FinishColl at $L_{13}$ or $L_{18}$.

The specification of the abstract stack is defined as follows:

- $push(seq, x) = ((x)^{-}\text{seq, }\varepsilon)$
- $pop(seq) = \begin{cases} (seq, y) & \text{if } seq = (y)^{-}\text{seq} \\ (seq, EMPTY) & \text{if } seq = \text{empty} \end{cases}$

The abstraction function maps the concrete list pointed to by $S$ to the value sequence of the list.
Let $L_3^+/L_3^-$ denote the execution path of the method $TryStackOp$ where the method returns true/false. Let $L_{10}^+/L_{10}^-$ denote the execution path of the method $TryColll$ where the method returns true/false. Let $P_0 = (L_3^-, L_5, L_6, L_7)$. The iterations of the whole loop of $StackOp$ are divided into four types:

- Failed iteration, not changing the shared state
  $$P_1 = P_0^\circ (L_8^-, L_7^-)$$
- Successful iteration, a common operation
  $$P_2 = P_0^\circ (L_8^+, L_8^-, L_{10}^-)$$
- Successful iteration, a passive operation
  $$P_3 = (L_3^-, L_4)$$
- Successful iteration, an active operation
  $$P_4 = P_0^\circ (L_8^+, L_8^-, L_{15}^-)$$

The execution paths of the $push$ and $pop$ methods can be described by the following two regular expressions, respectively:

- $PUSH = (U_1) \cap (P_1P_2)^*(P_3P_4P_5P_6)$
- $POP = (O_1) \cap (P_1P_2)^*(P_3P_4P_5P_6)^*(O_3)$

$(P_1P_2)^*$ are the failed iterations which do not change the shared state. By deleting (in terms of the notion of pure loop), we get the following two path expressions:

- $PUSH' = (U_1) \cap (P_3P_4P_5P_6)$
- $POP' = (O_1) \cap (P_3P_4P_5P_6)^*(O_3)$

**Lemma 5.1.** The paths of any common operation are abstractly reducible.

**Proof.** The paths of the common $push$ and $pop$ operations are $(U_1) \cap P_3$ and $(O_1) \cap P_3^*(O_3)$, respectively. Similar to the proof for the Treiber stack in Appendix D.1, we can prove that the two paths are abstractly reducible using single path abstraction-based reduction.

In the following, we prove that the paths of any colliding operation are abstractly reducible using double paths abstraction-based reduction.

**Proposition 5.1.** An active $pop/push$ operation collides with exactly one passive $push/push$ operation.

**Proof.** The proposition is a restatement of Lemma 5.9 from [8].

**Proposition 5.2.** At any execution, if an operation $p$ successfully modifies $loc[p.id]$ using the action $cas(&loc[p.id],p,null)^+$ (at $L_3$), then in the execution, no other threads modify $loc[p.id]$.\end{proof}

**Proof.** If other threads have modified $loc[p.id]$ before $cas(&loc[p.id],p,null)^+$, then the value of $loc[p.id]$ is not $p$ at $cas(&loc[p.id],p,null)^+$. Thus, before $cas(&loc[p.id],p,null)^+$, no other threads modify $loc[p.id]$. Other threads can modify $loc[p.id]$ only when $loc[p.id] = p$. Thus, after $cas(&loc[p.id],p,null)^+$, no other threads can modify $loc[p.id]$.

**Proposition 5.3.** At any execution, if an operation $p$ successfully modifies $loc[q.id]$ using the action $cas(&loc[q.id],q,p)^+$ (at $T_2$) or $cas(&loc[q.id],q,null)^+$ (at $T_4$), then in the execution, no other threads modify $loc[q.id]$ except $q$ itself.

**Proof.** The proof for the proposition is similar to the above one.

**Lemma 5.2.** An active $pop/push$ operation and its corresponding passive $push/pop$ operation are abstractly reducible.

**Proof.** The path expression of the active $push/pop$ operation is: $(U_1)^*P_0/(O_1)^*P_0^\circ (O_3)$. The path expression of the passive $push/pop$ operation is: $(U_1)^\circ (P_4P_5)/(O_1)^\circ P_4P_5^\circ (O_3)$. We now prove that an active $push$ operation and its corresponding passive $pop$ operation are abstractly reducible—the arguments for other cases are similar. The paths of the active $push$ operation and its corresponding passive $pop$ operation can be described by the following two regular expressions, respectively:

- $Apush = (U_1, L_3^-, L_5, L_6, L_7, L_8^+, L_9^+, T_1, T_2^+)$$Ppop = (O_1, L_3^-, L_5, L_6, L_7, L_8^+, L_9^+, T_1, F_2, F_3, O_3)$

In $Apush$, $L_3^-$ fails to modify the top pointer $S$ and does not change the shared state. The local variables modified by $L_3^-$ are not used after it. Thus, $L_3^-$ is a side-effect free block, deleting it does not affect the executions of other operations and the rest of $Apush$. By deleting $L_3^-$, we can get the path:

- $Apush' = (U_1, L_5, L_6, L_7, L_8^+, L_9^+, T_1, T_2^+)$

In $Apush'$, $U_1$, $L_6$ and $T_1$ are local actions, thus are both-movers (by Commutativity 1). By Proposition 5.2 and Commutativity 2, $L_5, L_8^+$ are both-movers. Since at $T_2^+$, $loc[q.id] = q$, $loc[q.id]$ is not modified between $L_7$ and $T_2^+$. Then, by Commutativity 3, $L_7, L_8^+$ are right-movers. The left actions of $T_2^+$ are either right-movers or both-movers, thus $Apush'$ is reducible.

The effect of the segment $(L_6, L_7, L_8^+)$ in $Ppop$ is that the passive $pop$ operation selects an operation which it tries to eliminate itself with. In fact the passive $pop$ operation itself is eliminated by the active $push$ operation. Similar to $L_3^-$, the segment $(L_6, L_7, L_8^+)$ is a side-effect free block. By deleting the segment, we can get the path:

- $Ppop' = (O_1, L_5, L_1^+, F_1, F_2, F_3, O_3)$

In $Ppop'$, $O_3$ is a local action, thus is a both-mover (by Commutativity 1). Since at $L_1^+$, $loc[p.id] \neq p$, $loc[p.id]$ is modified by other threads between $L_5$ and $L_1^+$. Thus, $T_2^+$ of $Apush'$ is executed between $L_5$ and $L_1^+$. By Proposition 5.3, $O_1$, $L_5$ can move to the left of $T_2^+$, $L_1^+$, $F_1$, $F_2$ and $F_3$ can move to the right of $T_2^+$ by commuting actions.
For any execution $\pi$ generating $Apush$ and $Ppop$, let $D$ be the subsequence of $\pi$ consisting of the actions of $Apush'$ and $Ppop'$. In $D$, the left actions of $T_2^+$ are right-movers, and the right actions of $T_2^+$ are left-movers. Thus, the path $D$ can be executed sequentially by commuting actions. For any sequential execution of $D$, the return value of the pop operation is the argument of the push operation, and the execution does not change the shared state. Obviously, the execution satisfies the semantics of the sequential execution of an abstract push and pop operations.

6. RELAXED REDUCTION AND EXAMPLES

For some concurrent queue algorithms such as the HW queue [6], the TS queue [7], the baskets queue [12], the linearization points of their $Enqueue$ methods are not fixed, and depend on future $Dequeue$ methods. Thus, it is difficult to verify these algorithms using linearization-points-based approaches. In this section, we define novel conditions (stated in Theorem 6.1) sufficient to ensure linearizability of concurrent queues, which can be proved by using reduction under restrictive interleaving. We obtain a simple linearizability proof of the HW queue by using this method. In Appendix D.7, we also apply the method to the TS queue. We believe that new reduction method will be applicable to concurrent stacks by extending Theorem 6.1 to such data structures.

6.1. Conditions for linearizability of concurrent queues

For a history $H$ of a queue, let $Enq(H)$ denote the set of all $Enqueue$ operations in $H$, $Deq(H)$ denote the set of all $Dequeue$ operations in $H$. The conditions stated in the following theorem characterize the “FIFO" property of a concurrent queue. The detailed proof for the theorem is included in Appendix C.

**THEOREM 6.1.** A complete history $H$ of a concurrent queue is linearizable w.r.t the standard abstract queue (whose specification is given in Section 4.2) if there exists a linearization $Deq_1, Deq_2, \ldots, Deq_n$ of all $Dequeue$ operations in $H$ (i.e., $Deq(H) = \{Deq_1, Deq_2, \ldots, Deq_n\} \land Deq_x \not\xrightarrow{L} Deq_y$ if $x < y$), such that

1. $Deq_1$ returns a value inserted by an $Enqueue$ operation $Enq_x \in Enq(H)$ such that $\forall Enq_x \in Enq(H), Enq_x \not\xrightarrow{L} Enq_1 \land Deq_1 \not\xrightarrow{L} Enq_1$;
2. for each $2 \leq i \leq n$, the $i^{th}$ $Dequeue$ operation $Deq_i$ returns a value inserted by an $Enqueue$ operation $Enq_x \in Enq(H) - \{Enq_1\}$, ..., $\{Enq_{i-1}\}$ such that $\forall Enq_x \in Enq(H) - \{Enq_1\} - \{Enq_2\} - \{Enq_{i-1}\}, Enq_x \not\xrightarrow{L} Enq_i \land Deq_i \not\xrightarrow{L} Enq_i$.

The HW queue, the TS queue and the baskets queue have the following feature: the $Dequeue$ method has only a global write action which is a linearization point of the method. Our linearization proofs for these queues make use of the linearization points to construct the linearizations of the $Dequeue$ methods.

6.2. The HW queue

Figure 5 shows the pseudo code for the HW queue. To describe the path of the $Dequeue$ method using regular expression, the for loop of the $Dequeue$ method in the initial version [6] is rewritten with an unconditional while loop (i.e., while(true)). The queue is represented as an infinite size array, $items$, and an integer variable, $back$, holding the smallest index in the unused part of the array. The index of the array starts with 1, and the variable $back$ is initialized to 1. The algorithm assumes each element of the array is initialized to a special value null.

```
class Queue{
    int back:=1;
    int[] items;
    void Enqueue(int v);
    int Dequeue();
}

class HWQueue{
    void Enqueue(int v){
        L0 t=items[1];
        L1 items[1]:=v;
        L2 t:=null;
        L3 items[1]=t;
        L4 t:=back++;
    }
    int Dequeue()
    {
        T0 while(true){
            T1 range:=back-1;
            T2 i:=1;
            while(true){
                T3 if(i<range){
                    T4 temp:=swap(items[i],null)
                    T5 if(temp!=null){
                        T6 return temp;
                        T7 i++;
                    }
                }
            }
        }
    }
}
```

**Figure 5.** The HW Queue

The execution paths of the $Enqueue$ and $Dequeue$ methods can be described by the following two regular expressions respectively:

$$Enq = (L_0, L_1)$$

$$Deq = (\{(T_1, T_2)^{l} (T_3^{l+}, T_4, T_5^{l-}, T_7)\})$$

$$(T_1, T_2)^{l} (T_3^{l+}, T_4, T_5^{l-}, T_7)$$

$$(T_1, T_2)^{l} (T_3^{l+}, T_4, T_5^{l-}, T_7)^{l}$$

$$(T_1, T_2)^{l} (T_3^{l+}, T_4, T_5^{l-}, T_7)^{l}$$

$$(T_1, T_2)^{l}$$

$$(T_3^{l+}, T_4, T_5^{l-}, T_7)^{l}$$

$$(T_3^{l+}, T_4, T_5^{l-}, T_7)^{l}$$

In the path $Deq'$, $T_4$ is called a read action if the swap action of $T_4$ returns a null value. Otherwise, it is called a write action. The last $T_4$ of the path $Deq'$ is only a global write action of the path which is the linearization point of the $Dequeue$ method.

The following two propositions state two reduction properties of the HW queue under restrictive interleaving and are used in the proof of Lemma 6.1.

**PROPOSITION 6.1.** If at any execution, the actions in the path $Enq$ are only interleaved with the actions of the $Enqueue$ methods of other threads, then the path can be executed sequentially by commuting actions.

Proof: Under the restrictive interleaving, the non-mover action of the path $Enq$ is $L_0, L_1$ left commutes with every action of the $Enqueue$ methods of other threads.
Proposition 6.2. If at any execution, the actions in the path $\text{Deq}'$ are only interleaved with $L_1$ actions of the $\text{Enqueue}$ methods, then the path can be executed sequentially by commuting actions.

We prove the proposition by showing that all the $L_1$ actions which are interleaved with the actions in the path $\text{Deq}'$ can move to both ends of the path by commuting actions.

Proof. An $L_1$ action (both right and left) commutes any other $L_1$ action, and any action in $\text{Deq}'$ except $T_4$. For an $L_1$ action, at most one of the $T_4$ actions in $\text{Deq}'$ accesses the slot of the array $\text{items}$ where the $L_1$ action stores a value, thus there are three interleaving cases for an $L_1$ action interleaved with the actions in $\text{Deq}'$.

Case 1: All $T_4$ actions in $\text{Deq}'$ do not access the slot of the array $\text{items}$ where the $L_1$ action stores a value. In this case, the $L_1$ action left (or right) commutes with every action in $\text{Deq}'$. Thus $L_1$ can move to the left (or right) end of $\text{Deq}'$.

Case 2: A $T_4$ action in $\text{Deq}'$ accesses the slot of the array $\text{items}$ where the $L_1$ action stores a value before the $L_1$ action is executed. In this case, the $L_1$ action right commutes with every action of $\text{Deq}'$ behind it. Thus $L_1$ can move to the right end of $\text{Deq}'$.

Case 3: A $T_4$ action accesses the slot of the array $\text{items}$ where the $L_1$ action stores a value after the $L_1$ action is executed. In this case, the $L_1$ action left commutes with every action of $\text{Deq}'$ in front of it. Thus $L_1$ can move to the left end of $\text{Deq}'$.

Lemma 6.1. Every complete history of the HW queue is linearizable w.r.t. the standard abstract queue.

Proof. For any terminating execution $\pi$, let $\pi'$ be the execution gained from $\pi$ by deleting the failed iterations of the $\text{Dequeue}$ operations. We construct a linear order $\text{Deq}_1,\text{Deq}_2,\ldots,\text{Deq}_n$ on the $\text{Dequeue}$ operations in terms of their global write actions. We show that each of them satisfies the corresponding conditions of Theorem 6.1. Now we verify the first $\text{Dequeue}$ operation $\text{Deq}_1$. We extract an execution segment of $\pi'$, which begins at the pre-state of the first action of $\pi'$ and extends to the post-state of the write action of $\text{Deq}_1$. We transform the segment by the following steps:

1. Delete the transitions of other $\text{Dequeue}$ operations (i.e., deleting the actions of the $\text{Dequeue}$ operations and their corresponding post-states, the local states of the $\text{Dequeue}$ operations in the state configurations). Note that the deleted actions do not change the shared state. Thus, after the above transformation, the segment is a feasible execution.

2. Delete the transitions of all $\text{Enqueue}$ operations which start to execute after the first action $\text{range} := \text{back} - 1$ of $\text{Deq}_1$ (i.e., (1) delete the actions of the $\text{Enqueue}$ operations and their corresponding post-states, the local states of the $\text{Enqueue}$ operations in the state configurations; (2) in the post-states of the actions after $\text{range} := \text{back} - 1$, the slots of the array where the deleted $\text{Enqueue}$ operations have stored values are changed to null, $\text{back}$ is changed to its value in the post-state of $\text{range} := \text{back} - 1$). $\text{Deq}_1$ does not access the slots of the array $\text{items}$ where the deleted $\text{Enqueue}$ operations store values. The above transformation does not change the slots where the $\text{Enqueue}$ operations which start to execute before the first action of $\text{Deq}_1$ store values. Thus, after the above transformation, the segment is a feasible execution.

3. After completing Step 2, $\text{Deq}_1$ is only interleaved with the $L_1$ actions. By Proposition 6.2, we transform the segment into the one where $\text{Deq}_1$ is executed sequentially.

4. After completing Step 3, the execution segment before $\text{Deq}_1$ (i.e., from the pre-state of the first action to the pre-state of the first action of $\text{Deq}_1$) only contains the transitions of the $\text{Enqueue}$ methods. By Proposition 6.1, we transform the segment into a sequential execution (i.e., every $\text{Enqueue}$ operation is executed sequentially, some of them may not have finished).

After the above transforming, each of the $\text{Enqueue}$ operations in the execution segment before $\text{Deq}_1$ is executed sequentially, and $\text{Deq}_1$ is executed sequentially. Obviously, in the sequential execution, $\text{Deq}_1$ removes the value inserted by the $\text{Enqueue}$ operation which is the first one to complete its execution. For ease of reference, we call the $\text{Enqueue}$ operation $\text{Enq}_1$. All these transformations do not violate the happened-before orders of operations in $\pi$ (i.e., for two operations $\text{op}_1$ and $\text{op}_2$, if $\text{op}_1 \prec_{\pi} \text{op}_2$ in $\pi$ and $\text{op}_1, \text{op}_2$ are in the new sequence, then in the sequence, $\text{op}_1 \prec_{\pi} \text{op}_2$). Thus $\text{Enq}_1$ is a minimal $\text{Enqueue}$ operation under the happened-before order in $\pi$.

For the second $\text{Dequeue}$ operation $\text{Deq}_2$, we first extract an execution segment from the pre-state of the first action of $\pi'$ to the post-state of the write action of $\text{Deq}_2$. Then, we delete the actions of $\text{Deq}_1$, the $L_1$ action of $\text{Enq}_1$, and their post-states. The transformation does not affect the executions of other operations. Note that $\text{Enq}_1$ has not finished in the segment. Similar to the proof for $\text{Deq}_1$, we can show that $\text{Deq}_2$ satisfies the corresponding conditions of Theorem 6.1. The rest of $\text{Dequeue}$ operations are proved similar to $\text{Deq}_2$.

7. RELATED WORK AND CONCLUSION

There has been a great deal of work on linearizability verification. However, as Khyzha et al. argue [23], it remains the case that all but the simplest algorithms are difficult to verify. The purpose of this paper is that even complex algorithms can be relatively easy to prove. We propose three reduction-based methods for verifying linearizability which inherit intuition and simplicity of Lipton’s reduction. In our discussion on related work, we will concentrate on other reduction-
based techniques. To the best of our knowledge, the reduction-based techniques discussed below are not applied to the HW queue, the TS queue, the HSY stack, the lazy list.

Several previous works [2, 3, 4, 5, 24] have presented reduction-based techniques for atomicity verification. The notion of atomicity can help establish linearizability. The techniques suffice to verify the atomicity of the concurrent data structures with coarse-grained synchronization, but are often inadequate for the data structures with more subtle fine-grained synchronization.

Flanagan et al. [4, 24] propose the notion of purity and instability to enable wider application of reduction. They show that (1) actions in the normally terminating execution of a pure code block can be removed for reduction by purity-based abstraction, and (2) every action accessing unstable variables (i.e., such as performance counters) can be transformed into a both-mover by instability-based abstraction. Our proof methods are based on data abstraction which is more general and allows removing semantically irrelevant actions from a method for reduction.

Wang and Stoller [5, 25] propose the notion of pure loop, which generalizes the definition of purity in [4]. For a pure loop, its failed iterations can be removed from the program path for reduction. Automation of the technique is also conjectured.

Elmas et al. [26, 27] developed a technique for proving linearizability via a combination of reduction and abstraction. Linearizability is proved by rewriting every fine-grained method of a concurrent object into an atomic method (as a specification of the fine-grained method) by incrementally applying the rules of program transformation. The technique does not need to locate linearization points.

Groves [16] proposes a technique based on reduction and simulation for verifying linearizability. The technique can transform an irreducible path into a reducible path by simulate transformation. For example, to verify the MS lock-free queue, the simulate transformation changes an unsuccessfully advancing Tail action of a path to a successfully advancing Tail action. Instead, our methods only consider a semantically relevant actions of a path, thus the unsuccessfully advancing Tail action can directly be abstracted away.

**Conclusion** We propose three abstraction-based reduction methods for verifying linearizability. The methods are intuitive, easy to use, suitable for automation and they can be applied to various subtle and sophisticated algorithms. We have successfully applied the methods to 11 concurrent data structures including the most challenging ones: the HW queue, the HSY stack, and the TS queue, the lazy list.
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