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Abstract
Distributed storage systems and databases are widely used by various types of applications. Transactional access to these storage systems is an important abstraction allowing application programmers to consider blocks of actions (i.e., transactions) as executing atomically. For performance reasons, the consistency models implemented by modern databases are weaker than the standard serializability model, which corresponds to the atomicity abstraction of transactions executing over a sequentially consistent memory. Causal consistency for instance is one such model that is widely used in practice.

In this paper, we investigate application-specific relationships between several variations of causal consistency and we address the issue of verifying automatically if a given transactional program is robust against causal consistency, i.e., all its behaviors when executed over an arbitrary causally consistent database are serializable. We show that programs without write-write races have the same set of behaviors under all these variations, and we show that checking robustness is polynomial time reducible to a state reachability problem in transactional programs over a sequentially consistent shared memory. A surprising corollary of the latter result is that causal consistency variations which admit incomparable sets of behaviors admit comparable sets of robust programs. This reduction also opens the door to leveraging existing methods and tools for the verification of concurrent programs (assuming sequential consistency) for reasoning about programs running over causally consistent databases. Furthermore, it allows to establish that the problem of checking robustness is decidable when the programs executed at different sites are finite-state.
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1 Introduction

Distribution and replication are widely adopted in order to implement storage systems and databases offering performant and available services. The implementations of these systems must ensure consistency guarantees allowing to reason about their behaviors in an abstract and simple way. Ideally, programmers of applications using such systems would like to have strong consistency guarantees, i.e., all updates occurring anywhere in the system are seen immediately and executed in the same order by all sites. Moreover, application programmers also need an abstract mechanism such as transactions, ensuring that blocks of actions (writes and reads) of a site can be considered as executing atomically without interferences from actions of other sites. For transactional programs, the consistency model offering strong consistency is serializability [36], i.e., every computation of a program is equivalent to another one where transactions are executed serially one after another without interference. In the non-transactional case this model corresponds to sequential consistency (SC) [30]. However, while serializability and SC are easier to apprehend by application programmers, their enforcement (by storage systems implementors) requires the use of global synchronization between all sites, which is hard to achieve while ensuring availability and acceptable performances [23, 24]. For this reason, modern storage systems ensure weaker consistency guarantees. In this paper, we are interested in studying causal consistency [29].

Causal consistency is a fundamental consistency model implemented in several production databases, e.g., AntidoteDB, CockroachDB, and MongoDB, and extensively studied in the literature [7, 22, 32, 33, 35]. Basically, when defined at the level of actions, it guarantees
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that every two causally related actions, say $a_1$ is causally before (i.e., it has an influence on) $a_2$, are executed in that same order, i.e., $a_1$ before $a_2$, by all sites. The sets of updates visible to different sites may differ and read actions may return values that cannot be obtained in SC executions. The definition of causal consistency can be lifted to the level of transactions, assuming that transactions are visible to a site in their entirety (i.e., all their updates are visible at the same time), and they are executed by a site in isolation without interference from other transactions. In comparison to serializability, causal consistency allows that conflicting transactions, i.e., which read or write to a common location, be executed in different orders by different sites as long as they are not causally related. Actually, we consider three variations of causal consistency introduced in the literature, weak causal consistency ($CC$), causal memory ($CM$), and causal convergence ($CCv$).

The weakest variation of causal consistency, namely $CC$, allows speculative executions and roll-backs of transactions which are not causally related (concurrent). For instance, the computation in Fig. 1a is only feasible under $CC$: the site on the right applies $t_2$ after $t_1$ before executing $t_3$ and roll-backs $t_2$ before executing $t_4$. $CCv$ and $CM$ offer more guarantees. $CCv$ enforces a total arbitration order between all transactions which defines the order in which delivered concurrent transactions are executed by every site. This guarantees that all sites reach the same state when all transactions are delivered. $CM$ ensures that all values read by a site can be explained by an interleaving of transactions consistent with the causal order, enforcing thus PRAM consistency on top of $CC$. Contrary to $CCv$, $CM$ allows that two sites diverge on the ordering of concurrent transactions, but both models do not allow roll-backs of concurrent transactions. Thus, $CCv$ and $CM$ are incomparable in terms of computations they admit. The computation in Fig. 1b is not admitted by $CM$ because there is no interleaving of those transactions that explains the values read by the site on the right: reading 0 from $z$ implies that the transactions on the left must be applied after $t_3$ while reading 1 from $y$ implies that both $t_1$ and $t_2$ are applied before $t_4$ which contradicts reading 2 from $x$. However, this computation is possible under $CCv$ because $t_1$ can be delivered to the right after executing $t_3$ but arbitrated before $t_3$, which implies that the write to $x$ in $t_1$ will be lost. The $CM$ computation in Fig. 1b is not possible under $CCv$ because there is no arbitration order that could explain both reads from $x$.

As a first contribution of our paper, we show that the three causal consistency semantics coincide for transactional programs containing no write-write races, i.e., concurrent transactions writing on a common variable. We also show that if a transactional program has a write-write race under one of these semantics, then it must have a write-write race under any of the other two semantics. This property is rather counter-intuitive since $CC$ is strictly weaker than both $CCv$ and $CM$, and $CCv$ and $CM$ are incomparable (in terms of admitted behaviors). Notice that each of the computations in Figures 1b, 1c, and 1d contains a write-write race which explains why none of these computations is possible under all three semantics.

Then, we investigate the problem of checking robustness of application programs against causal consistency relaxations: Given a program $P$ and a causal consistency variation $X$, we say that $P$ is robust against $X$ if the set of computations of $P$ when running under
X is the same as its set of computations when running under serializability. This means that it is possible to reason about the behaviors of P assuming the simpler serializability model and no additional synchronization is required when P runs under X such that it maintains all the properties satisfied under serializability. Checking robustness is not trivial, it can be seen as a form of checking program equivalence. However, the equivalence to check is between two versions of the same program, obtained using two different semantics, one more permissive than the other one. The goal is to check that this permissiveness has actually no effect on the particular program under consideration. The difficulty in checking robustness is to apprehend the extra behaviors due to the reorderings introduced by the relaxed consistency model w.r.t. serializability. This requires a-priori reasoning about complex order constraints between operations in arbitrarily long computations, which may need maintaining unbounded ordered structures, and make the problem of checking robustness hard or even undecidable.

We show that verifying robustness of transactional programs against causal consistency can be reduced in polynomial time to the reachability problem in concurrent programs over SC. This allows to reason about distributed applications running on causally consistent storage systems using the existing verification technology and it implies that the robustness problem is decidable for finite-state programs; the problem is PSPACE-complete when the number of sites is fixed, and EXPSPACE-complete otherwise. This is the first result on the decidability and complexity of verifying robustness against causal consistency. In fact, the problem of verifying robustness has been considered in the literature for several consistency models of distributed systems, including causal consistency [11, 15, 16, 19, 34]. These works provide (over- or under-)approximate analyses for checking robustness, but none of them provides precise (sound and complete) algorithmic verification methods for solving this problem, nor addresses its decidability and complexity.

The approach we adopt for tackling this verification problem is based on a precise characterization of the set of robustness violations, i.e., executions that are causally consistent but not serializable. For both CCv and CM, we show that it is sufficient to search for a special type of robustness violations, that can be simulated by serial (SC) computations of an instrumentation of the original program. These computations maintain the information needed to recognize the pattern of a violation that would have occurred in the original program under a causally consistent semantics (executing the same set of operations). A surprising consequence of these results is that a program is robust against CM iff it is robust against CC, and robustness against CM implies robustness against CCv. This shows that the causal consistency variations we investigate can be incomparable in terms of the admitted behaviors, but comparable in terms of the robust applications they support.

The complete formalizations and proofs are given in the Appendix.

2 Causal Consistency

Program syntax. We consider a simple programming language where a program is parallel composition of processes distinguished using a set of identifiers \( P \). Each process is a sequence of transactions and each transaction is a sequence of labeled instructions. Each transaction starts with a begin instruction and finishes with an end instruction. Each other instruction is either an assignment to a process-local register from a set \( R \) or to a shared variable from a set \( V \), or an assume statement. The assignments use values from a data domain \( D \). An assignment to a register \( \langle reg \rangle := \langle var \rangle \) is called a read of \( \langle var \rangle \) and an assignment to a shared variable \( \langle var \rangle := \langle reg-expr \rangle \) is called a write to \( \langle var \rangle \) (\( \langle reg-expr \rangle \) is an expression over registers). The statement assume \( \langle bexpr \rangle \) blocks the process if the Boolean expression
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\(\text{begin}\) over registers is false. Each instruction is followed by a \texttt{goto} statement which defines the evolution of the program counter. Multiple instructions can be associated with the same label which allows us to write non-deterministic programs and multiple \texttt{goto} statements can direct the control to the same label which allows us to mimic imperative constructs like loops and conditionals. We assume that the control cannot pass from one transaction to another without going as expected through \texttt{begin} and \texttt{end} instructions.

**Causal memory (CM) semantics.** Informally, the semantics of a program under causal memory is defined as follows. The shared variables are replicated across each process, each process maintaining its own local valuation of these variables. During the execution of a transaction in a process, the shared-variable writes are stored in a \textit{transaction log} which is visible only to the process executing the transaction and which is broadcasted to all the other processes at the end of the transaction.\(^1\) To read a shared variable \(x\), a process \(p\) first accesses its transaction log and takes the last written value on \(x\), if any, and then its own valuation of the shared variables, if \(x\) was not written during the current transaction. Transaction logs are delivered to every process in an order consistent with the \textit{causal delivery} relation between transactions, i.e., the transitive closure of the union of the \textit{program order} (the order in which transactions are executed by a process), and the \textit{delivered-before} relation (a transaction \(t_1\) is delivered-before a transaction \(t_2\) iff the log of \(t_2\) has been delivered at the process executing \(t_1\) before \(t_1\) starts). By an abuse of terminology, we call this property \textit{causal delivery}. Once a transaction log is delivered, it is immediately applied on the shared-variable valuation of the receiving process. Also, no transaction log can be delivered to a process \(p\) while \(p\) is executing another transaction, we call this property \textit{transaction isolation}.

**Causal convergence (CCv) semantics.** Compared to causal memory, causal convergence ensures eventual consistency of process-local copies of the shared variables. Each transaction log is associated with a timestamp and a process applies a write on some variable \(x\) from a transaction log only if it has a timestamp larger than the timestamps of all the transaction logs it has already applied and that wrote the same variable \(x\). For simplicity, we assume that the transaction identifiers play the role of timestamps, which are totally ordered according to some relation \(<\). CCv satisfies both \textit{causal delivery} and \textit{transaction isolation} as well.

**Weak causal consistency (CC) semantics.** Compared to the previous semantics, CC allows that reads of the same process observe concurrent writes as executing in different orders. Each process maintains a \textit{set} of values for each shared variable, and a read returns any one of these values non-deterministically. Transaction logs are associated with \textit{vector clocks} \(^2\) which represent the causal delivery relation, i.e., a transaction \(t_1\) is before \(t_2\) in causal-delivery iff the vector clock of \(t_1\) is smaller than the vector clock of \(t_2\). We assume that transactions identifiers play the role of vector clocks, which are partially ordered according to some relation \(<\). When applying a transaction log on the shared-variable valuation of the receiving process, we only keep the values that were written by \textit{concurrent} transactions (not related by causal delivery). CC satisfies both \textit{causal delivery} and \textit{transaction isolation}.

**Program execution.** The semantics of a program \(\mathcal{P}\) under a causal consistency semantics \(X \in \{\text{CCv, CM, CC}\}\) is defined using a labeled transition system \([\mathcal{P}]_X\) where the set \(\mathcal{E}_v\) of transition labels, called \textit{events}, is defined by:

\[
\mathcal{E}_v = \{ \text{begin}(p, t), \text{ld}(p, t, x, v), \text{isu}(p, t, x, v), \text{del}(p, t), \text{end}(p, t) : p \in \mathcal{P}, t \in T, x \in V, v \in \mathbb{D} \}
\]

where \texttt{begin} and \texttt{end} label transitions corresponding to the start, resp., the end of a transac-

---

\(^1\) For simplicity, we assume that every transaction commits. The effects of aborted transactions shouldn’t be visible to any process.
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to the variable by a process.

Fig. 2b shows an execution under $CCv$ from $CM$, respectively. This is possible only if $t$ executed by a process because the timestamp $t$ of the last transaction that wrote $x$ at $p_2$, namely $t_3$, a behavior that is not possible under $CM$. The two processes converge and store the same shared variable copy at the end of the execution. Fig. 2c shows an execution under $CC$, which is not possible under $CCv$ and $CM$ because $t_3$ and $t_4$ read 2 and 1 from $x$, respectively. Since the transactions $t_1$ and $t_2$ are concurrent, $p_2$ stores both values 2 and 1 written by these transactions. A read of $x$ can return any of these two values.

**Execution summary.** Let $\rho$ be an execution under $X \in \{CCv, CM, CC\}$, a sequence $\tau$ of events $isu(p, t)$ and $del(p, t)$ with $p \in P$ and $t \in T$ is called a summary of $\rho$ if it is obtained from $\rho$ by substituting every sub-sequence of transitions in $\rho$ delimited by a $begin$ and an $end$ transition, with a single “macro-event” $isu(p, t)$. For example, $isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot isu(p_2, t_3) \cdot del(p_1, t_3) \cdot del(p_2, t_1) \cdot isu(p_2, t_4) \cdot isu(p_1, t_2)$ is a summary of the execution in Fig. 2a.

We say that a transaction $t$ in $\rho$ performs an external read of a variable $x$ if $p$ contains an event $ld(p, t, x, v)$ which is not preceded by a write on $x$ of $t$, i.e., an event $isu(p, t, x, v)$. Under $CM$ and $CC$, a transaction $t$ writes a variable $x$ if $p$ contains an event $isu(p, t, x, v)$, for some $v$. In Fig. 2a both $t_2$ and $t_4$ perform external reads and $t_2$ writes to $y$. A transaction $t$ executed by a process $p$ writes $x$ at process $p' \neq p$ if $t$ writes $x$ and $p$ contains an event $del(p', t)$ (e.g., in Fig. 2a $t_1$ writes $x$ at $p_2$). Under $CCv$, we say that a transaction $t$ executed by a process $p$ writes $x$ at process $p' \neq p$ if $t$ writes $x$ and $p$ contains an event $del(p', t)$ which is not preceded by an event $del(p', t')$ (or $isu(p', t')$) with $t < t'$ and $t'$ writing $x$ (if it would be preceded by such an event then the write to $x$ of $t$ will be discarded). For example, in Fig. 2a $t_1$ does not write $x$ at $p_2$.

### 3 Write-Write Race Freedom

We say that an execution $\rho$ has a write-write race on a shared variable $x$ if there exist two concurrent transactions $t_1$ and $t_2$ that were issued in $\rho$ and each transaction contains a write to the variable $x$. We call $\rho$ write-write race free if there is no variable $x$ such that $\rho$ has a
write-write race on \( x \). Also, we say a program \( P \) is \textit{write-write race free} under a consistency semantics \( X \in \{ \text{CCv}, \text{CM}, \text{CC} \} \) iff for every \( \rho \in \mathbb{E}_X(P) \), \( \rho \) is write-write race free.

We show that if a given program has a write-write race under one of the three causal consistency semantics then it must have a write-write race under the remaining two. The intuition behind this is that the three semantics coincide for programs without write-write races. Indeed, without concurrent transactions that write to the same variable, every process local valuation of a shared variable will be a singleton set under \( \text{CC} \) and no process will ever discard a write when applying an incoming transaction log under \( \text{CCv} \).

\textbf{Theorem 1.} Given a program \( \mathcal{P} \) and two consistency semantics \( X, Y \in \{ \text{CCv}, \text{CM}, \text{CC} \} \), \( \mathcal{P} \) has a write-write race under \( X \) iff \( \mathcal{P} \) has a write-write race under \( Y \).

The following result shows that indeed, the three causal consistency semantics coincide for programs which are write-write race free under any one of these three semantics.

\textbf{Theorem 2.} Let \( \mathcal{P} \) be a program. Then, \( \mathbb{E}_\text{CC}(\mathcal{P}) = \mathbb{E}_\text{CCv}(\mathcal{P}) = \mathbb{E}_\text{CM}(\mathcal{P}) \) iff \( \mathcal{P} \) has no write-write race under \( \text{CM} \), \( \text{CCv} \), or \( \text{CC} \).

4 Programs Robustness

4.1 Program Traces

We define an abstraction of executions satisfying transaction isolation, called trace. Intuitively, a trace forgets the order in which shared-variables are accessed inside a transaction and the order between transactions accessing different variables. The trace of an execution \( \rho \) is obtained by adding several standard relations between events in its summary which record the data-flow, e.g. which transaction wrote the value read by another transaction.

The trace of an execution \( \rho \) is a tuple \( \text{tr}(\rho) = (\tau, \text{PO}, \text{WR}, \text{WW}, \text{RW}, \text{STO}) \) where \( \tau \) is the summary of \( \rho \), \( \text{PO} \) is the program order, which relates any two issue events \( \text{isu}(p, t) \) and \( \text{isu}(p, t') \) that occur in this order in \( \tau \), \( \text{WR} \) is the write-read relation (also called read-from), which relates events of two transactions \( t \) and \( t' \) such that \( t \) writes a value that \( t' \) reads, \( \text{WW} \) is the write-write order (also called store-order), which relates events of two transactions that write to the same variable, and \( \text{RW} \) is the read-write relation (also called conflict), which relates events of two transactions \( t \) and \( t' \) such that \( t \) reads a value overwritten by \( t' \), and \( \text{STO} \) is the same-transaction relation, which relates events of the same transaction.

Formally, \( \text{WR} \) relates any two events \( ev_1 \in \{ \text{isu}(p, t), \text{del}(p, t) \} \) and \( ev_2 = \text{isu}(p, t') \) that occur in this order in \( \tau \) such that \( t' \) performs an external read of \( x \), and \( ev_1 \) is the last event in \( \tau \) before \( ev_2 \) such that \( t \) writes \( x \) if \( ev_1 = \text{isu}(p, t) \), and \( t \) writes \( x \) at \( p \) if \( ev_1 \) is the \( \text{del}(p, t) \) \( \) (we may use \( \text{WR}(x) \) to emphasize the variable \( x \)). Also, \( \text{WW} \) relates any two events \( ev_1 \in \{ \text{isu}(p, t_1), \text{del}(p, t_1) \} \) and \( ev_2 \in \{ \text{isu}(p, t_2), \text{del}(p, t_2) \} \), that occur in this order in \( \tau \) provided that \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) both write the same variable \( x \), and if \( \rho \) is an execution under causal convergence, then (1) if \( ev_1 = \text{del}(p, t_i) \), for some \( i \in \{1, 2\} \), then \( t_i \) writes \( x \) at \( p \), and (2) if \( ev_1 \in \{ \text{isu}(p, t_1), \text{del}(p, t_1) \} \) and \( ev_2 = \text{del}(p, t_2) \), then \( t_1 < t_2 \) \( \) (we may use \( \text{WW}(x) \) to emphasize the variable \( x \)). We also define \( \text{RW}(x) = \text{WR}^{-1}(x) \); \( \text{WW}(x) \) \( \) (we use \( ; \) to denote the standard composition of relations) \( \) and \( \text{RW} = \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{V}} \text{RW}(x) \). If a transaction \( t \) reads the initial value of \( x \) then \( \text{RW}(x) \) relates \( \text{isu}(p, t) \) to \( \text{isu}(p', t') \) of any other transaction \( t' \) which writes \( x \) (i.e., \( \text{isu}(p, t), \text{isu}(p', t') \in \text{RW}(x) \)). Finally, \( \text{STO} \) relates any event \( \text{isu}(p, t) \) with the set of events \( \text{del}(p', t) \), where \( p \neq p' \).

Then, we define the \textit{happens-before} relation \( \text{HB} \) as the transitive closure of the union of all the relations in the trace, i.e., \( \text{HB} = (\text{PO} \cup \text{WR} \cup \text{WW} \cup \text{RW} \cup \text{STO})^+ \). Since we reason about only one trace at a time, we may say that a trace is simply a summary \( \tau \), keeping the
Theorem 3

We consider the problem of checking whether the causally-consistent semantics of a program is such that every event $e \in \{isu, del\}$ is “atomic”. In Fig. 3, $\tau$ is denoted by $\tau = (\rho, t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$ where $t_1$ happens-before many events $t_2$ and $t_3$ also happen before $t_4$. The following result characterizes serializable traces.

The semantics of a program under serializability [36] can be defined using a transition system with the standard interpretation of read or write statements. Each transaction executes in isolation. Alternatively, the serializability semantics can be defined as a restriction of $[PO \cup WR \cup STO]^+$ of the union of the program order, write-read relation, and the same-transaction relation, i.e., $\text{CO} = (\text{PO} \cup \text{WR} \cup \text{STO})^+$. For readability, we write $ev_1 \rightarrow_{HB} ev_2$ instead of $(ev_1, ev_2) \in \text{HB}$.

4.2 Program Semantics Under Serializability

The semantics of a program under serializability [36] can be defined using a transition system where the configurations keep a single shared-variable valuation (accessed by all processes) with the standard interpretation of read or write statements. Each transaction executes in isolation. Alternatively, the serializability semantics can be defined as a restriction of $[PO \cup WR \cup STO]^+$ of the union of the program order, write-read relation, and the same-transaction relation, i.e., $\text{CO} = (\text{PO} \cup \text{WR} \cup \text{STO})^+$.

Since multiple executions may have the same trace, it is possible that an execution $\rho$ produced by a variation of causal consistency has a serializable trace $tr(\rho)$ even though $end(p, t)$ actions may not be immediately followed by $del(p', t)$ actions. However, $\rho$ would be equivalent, up to reordering of “independent” (or commutative) transitions, to a serializable execution. The happens-before relation between events is extended to transactions as follows: a transaction $t_1$ happens-before another transaction $t_2$ if the trace $tr$ contains an event of transaction $t_1$ which happens-before an event of $t_2$. The happens-before relation between transactions is denoted by $\text{HB}$ and called transactional happens-before (an example is given on the right of Fig. 3). The following result characterizes serializable traces.

Theorem 3 ([36, 40]). A trace $tr$ is serializable iff $\text{HB}$ is acyclic.

4.3 Robustness Problem

We consider the problem of checking whether the causally-consistent semantics of a program produces the same set of traces as the serializability semantics.

Definition 4. A program $P$ is called robust against a semantics $X \in \{\text{CCv}, \text{CM}, \text{CC}\}$ iff $\text{Tr}_X(P) \subseteq \text{Tr}_{\text{SER}}(P)$.

Since $\text{Tr}_{\text{SER}}(P) \subseteq \text{Tr}_X(P)$, the problem of checking robustness of a program $P$ against a semantics $X$ boils down to checking whether there exists a trace $tr \in \text{Tr}_X(P) \setminus \text{Tr}_{\text{SER}}(P)$. We call $tr$ a robustness violation (or violation, for short). By Theorem 3, $\text{HB}$ of $tr$ is cyclic.
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We discuss several examples of programs which are (non-) robust against both CM and CCv or only one of them. Fig. 4a and Fig. 4b show examples of programs that are not robust against both CM and CCv, which have also been discussed in the literature on weak memory models, e.g. [6]. The execution of Lost Update under both CM and CCv allows that the two reads of x in transactions t1 and t2 return 0 although this cannot happen under serializability. Also, executing Store Buffering under both CM and CCv allows that the reads of x and y return 0 although this would not be possible under serializability. These values are possible because the first transaction in each of the processes may not be delivered to the other process.

Assuming for the moment that each instruction in Fig. 4c and Fig. 4d forms a different transaction, the values we give in comments show that the program in Fig. 4c, resp., Fig. 4d, is not robust against CCv, resp., CM. The values in Fig. 4e are possible assuming that the timestamp of the transaction \([x = 1]\) is smaller than the timestamp of \([x = 2]\) (which means that if the former is delivered after the second process executes \([x = 2]\), then it will be discarded). Moreover, enlarging the transactions as shown in Fig. 4c, the program becomes robust against CCv. The values in Fig. 4d are possible under CM because different processes do not need to agree on the order in which to apply transactions, each process applying the transaction received from the other process last. However, under CCv this behavior is not possible, the program being actually robust against CCv. As in the previous case, enlarging the transactions as shown in the figure leads to a robust program against CM.

We end the discussion with several examples of programs that are robust against both CM and CCv. These are simplified models of real applications reported in [27]. The program in Fig. 4e can be understood as the parallel execution of two processes that either create a new user of some service, represented abstractly as a write on a variable x or check its credentials, represented as a read of x (the non-deterministic choice abstracts some code that checks whether the user exists). Clearly this program is robust against both CM and CCv since each process does a single access to the shared variable. Although we considered simple transactions that access a single shared-variable this would hold even for “bigger” transactions that access an arbitrary number of variables. The program in Fig. 4f can be thought of as a process creating a new user of some service and reading some additional data in parallel to a process that updates that data only if the user exists. It is rather easy to see that it is also robust against both CM and CCv.
5 Robustness Against Causal Consistency

We consider now the issue of checking robustness against a variation of causal consistency, considering first the case of \( CCv \) and \( CM \). The result concerning \( CC \) is derived from the one concerning \( CM \). We show next that a robustness violation should contain at least an issue and a store event of the same transaction that are separated by another event that occurs after the issue and before the store and which is related to both via the happens-before relation. Otherwise, since any two events which are not related by happens-before could be swapped in order to derive an execution with the same trace, every store event could be swapped until it immediately follows the corresponding issue and the execution would be serializable.

- **Lemma 5.** Given a robustness violation \( \tau \), there exists a transaction \( t \) such that \( \tau = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma \) and an event \( a \in \beta \) such that \((isu(p, t), a) \in HB \) and \((a, del(p_0, t)) \in HB \).

The transaction \( t \) in the trace \( \tau \) above is called a delayed transaction. The happens-before constraints imply that \( t \) belongs to an \( HB \) cycle.

Next, we show that a program which is not robust against \( CCv \) or \( CM \) admits violations of particular shapes, which enables reducing robustness checking to a reachability problem in a program running under serializability (presented in Section 6).

5.1 Robustness Violations under Causal Convergence

Roughly, our characterization of \( CCv \) robustness violations states that the first delayed transaction (which must exist by Lemma 5) is followed by a possibly-empty sequence of delayed transactions that form a “causality chain”, i.e., every new delayed transaction is causally ordered after the previous delayed transaction. Moreover, the issue event of the last delayed transaction happens-before the issue event of another transaction that reads a variable updated by the first delayed transaction. The theorem above allows an event \( ev \) to the issue) between issue and store events of the same transaction is minimal. Minimality of particular shapes, which enables reducing robustness checking to a reachability problem in a program running under serializability (presented in Section 6).

- **Theorem 6.** A program \( P \) is not robust against \( CCv \) iff \( Tr(P)_{CCv} \) contains a trace of type \( \tau_{CCv1} = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta \cdot (isu(p_0, t_0) \cdot del(p_0, t)) \cdot \gamma \) or \( \tau_{CCv2} = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma \) that satisfies the properties given in Fig. 6.

Above, \( \tau_{CCv1} \) contains a single delayed transaction while \( \tau_{CCv2} \) may contain arbitrarily many delayed transactions. The issue event of the last delayed transactions, i.e., \( isu(p, t) \) in \( \tau_{CCv1} \) and \( isu(p_1, t_1) \) in \( \tau_{CCv2} \), happens before \( (p_0, t_0) \) and some event in \( \beta_2 \), respectively, which read a variable updated by the first delayed transaction. The theorem above allows \( \beta_1 = \epsilon \), \( \beta_2 = \epsilon \), \( \beta = \epsilon \), \( \gamma = \epsilon \), \( p = p_0 \), \( t = t_1 \), and \( t_1 \) to be a read-only transaction. If \( t_1 \) is a read-only transaction then \( isu(p_1, t') \) has the same effect as \((p_1, t_1)\) since \( t_1 \) does not contain writes.

Fig. 6a and Fig. 6b show two violations under \( CCv \).

The violation patterns in Theorem 6 characterize minimal robustness violations where the measure defined as the sum of the distances (number of events that are causally related to the issue) between issue and store events of the same transaction is minimal. Minimality enforces the constraints stated above. For example, in the context of \( \tau_{CCv2} \), the delayed transactions in \( \beta_1 \) cannot create a cycle in the transactional happens-before (otherwise,
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Figure 5: Robustness violation patterns. We use $\alpha \to R \forall \beta$ to denote $\forall b \in \beta. (a, b) \in R$. We use $\beta|_{\neg x}$ to say that all delayed transactions in $\beta_1$ do not access $x$. For violations $\tau_{CCv}$ and $\tau_{CM}$, $t$ is the only delayed transaction. For $\tau_{CCv}$ and $\tau_{CM}$, all delayed transactions are in $\beta|_{\neg x}$ and they form a causality chain that starts at $isu(p_1, t_1)$ and ends at $isu(p_1, t_1)$.

(a) Violation of LU program in Fig. 1a  
(b) Violation of SB program in Fig. 1b  
(c) Violation of LU program in Fig. 1a

Figure 6: (a) A $\tau_{CCv}$ violation where $\beta_2 = \epsilon$, $\gamma = \epsilon$, and $t$ and $t_0$ correspond to $t_1$ and $t_2$. (b) A $\tau_{CM}$ (resp., $\tau_{CM}$) violation where $t$ and $t_1$ correspond to $t_1$ and $t_2$. $t_1$ is a read-only transaction. Also, $\beta_1 = \epsilon$, $\beta_2 = (p_2, t_3) \cdot (p_2, t_4)$, $\gamma = \epsilon$, such that $(isu(p_1, t_1), (p_2, t_3)) \in RW(y)$ and $(p_2, t_4), del(p_2, t_1)) \in RW(x)$. (c) A $\tau_{CM}$ violation with $\beta_2 = \gamma = \epsilon$, and $t$ and $t_0$ correspond to $t_1$ and $t_2$. In all traces, we show only the relations that are part of the happens-before cycle.

$\alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma'$ would be a violation with a smaller measure, which contradicts minimality). Also, if it were to have a delayed transaction $t_2$ in $\beta_2$ (resp., $\beta$ for $\tau_{CCv}$), then it is possible to remove some transaction (all its issue and store events) from the original trace and obtain a new violation with a smaller measure. For instance, in the case of $\beta_2$, if $t \neq t_1$, then we can safely remove the last delayed transaction (i.e., $t_1$), that is causally dependent on the first delayed transaction, since all events in $\beta_2 \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$ neither read from the writes of $t_1$ nor are issued by the same process as $t_1$. The resulting trace is still a robustness violation (because of the $HB\setminus CO$ cycle involving $t_2$) but with a smaller measure. Note that all processes that delayed transactions, stop executing new transactions in $\beta_2$ (resp., $\beta$) because of the relation $HB \setminus CO$, shown in Fig. 5 between the delayed transaction $t_1$ (resp., $t$) and events in $\beta_2$ (resp., $\beta$). This precise characterization of minimal violations is essential for deriving an optimal reduction of robustness checking to SC reachability (presented in Section 6).

5.2 Robustness Violations under Causal Memory

The characterization of robustness violations under $CM$ is at some level similar to that of robustness violations under $CCv$. However, some instance of the violation pattern under $CCv$ is not possible under $CM$ and $CM$ admits some class of violations that is not possible under $CCv$. This reflects the fact that these consistency models are incomparable in general. The following theorem gives the precise characterization. Roughly, a program is not robust if it
admits a violation which can either be because of two concurrent transactions that write to
the same variable (a write-write race) or because of a restriction of the pattern admitted
by CCv where the last delayed transaction must be related only by RW in a happens-before
path with future transactions. The first pattern is not admitted by CCv because the writes
to each variable are executed according to the timestamp order.

Theorem 7. A program $P$ is not robust against CM iff $Tr(P)_{CM}$ contains a trace of type
$\tau_{CM} = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta \cdot (p_0, t_0) \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$ or $\tau_{CM} = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$
that satisfies the properties given in Fig. 5.

The CM violation in Fig. 5 (pattern $\tau_{CM}$) is a violation under CCv as well which corresponds
to the pattern $\tau_{CCv}$. The detection of the violation pattern $\tau_{CM}$ (e.g., Fig. 5) implies the
existence of a write-write race under CM. Conversely, if a program has a trace which contains
a write-write race under CM, then this trace must be a robustness violation since the two
transactions, that caused the write-write race, form a cycle in the store order hence a cycle
in the transactional happens-before order. Thus, the program is not robust against CM.
Therefore, a program which is robust against CM is also write-write race free under CM. Since
without write-write races, the CM and the CCv semantics coincide, we get the following.

Lemma 8. If a program $P$ is robust against CM, then $P$ is robust against CCv.

5.3 Robustness Violations under Weak Causal Consistency

If a program is robust against CM, then it must not contain a write-write race under CM (note
that this is not true for CCv). Therefore, by Theorem 2, a program which is robust against
CM has the same set of traces under both CM and CC, which implies that it is also robust
against CC. Conversely, since CC is weaker than CM (i.e., $Tr_{CM}(P) \subseteq Tr_{CC}(P)$ for any $P$), if a
program is robust against CC then it is robust against CM. Thus, we obtain the following.

Theorem 9. A program $P$ is robust against CC iff it is robust against CM.

6 Reduction to SC Reachability

We show here the reduction of robustness checking to a reachability problem in a program
executing under the serializability semantics. Essentially, given a program $P$ and a semantics
$X \in \{CCv, CM, CC\}$, we define an instrumentation of $P$ such that $P$ is not robust against
$X$ iff the instrumentation reaches an error state under the serializability semantics. The
instrumentation uses auxiliary variables in order to simulate the robustness violations (in
particular, the delayed transactions) satisfying the patterns given in Fig. 5. We will focus
our presentation on the second violation pattern of CCv (which is similar to the second
violation pattern of CM): $\tau_{CCv} = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$. For lack of
space, we describe the instrumentation only informally. The precise definition is given in the
Appendix.

The process $p$ that delayed the first transaction $t$ is called the Attacker. The other
processes delaying transactions in $\beta_1 \cdot isu(p_1, t_1)$ are called Visibility Helpers. Recall that all
the delayed transactions must be causally after $isu(p, t)$ and causally before $isu(p_1, t_1)$. The
processes that execute transactions in $\beta_2$ and contribute to the happens-before path between
isu($p_1, t_1$) and del($p_0, t$) are called Happens-Before Helpers. A happens-before helper cannot
be the attacker or a visibility helper since this would contradict the causal delivery guarantee
provided by causal consistency (a transaction of a happens-before helper is not delayed, so

---

2 Given two concurrent transactions $t_1$ and $t_2$ that write on a common variable $x$, $isu(p_1, t_1)$ is in store
order before del($p_1, t_2$) and $isu(p_2, t_2)$ before del($p_2, t_1$).
visible immediately to all processes, and it cannot follow a delayed transaction). $\gamma$ contains the stores of the delayed transactions from $isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot isu(p_1, t_1)$. It is important to notice that we may have $t = t_1$. In this case, $\beta_1 = \epsilon$ and the only delayed transaction is $t$. Also, all delayed transactions in $\beta_1$ including $t_1$ may be issued on the same process as $t$. In all these cases, the set of Visibility Helpers is empty.

The instrumentation uses two copies of the set of shared variables in the original program. We use primed variables $x'$ to denote the second copy. When a process becomes the attacker or a visibility helper, it will write only to the second copy that is visible only to these processes (and remains invisible to the other processes including the happens-before helpers). The writes made by the other processes including the happens-before helpers are made visible to all processes, i.e., they are applied on both copies of the shared variables.

To establish the causality chains of delayed transactions performed by the attacker and the visibility helpers, we look whether a transaction can extend the causality chain started by the first delayed transaction from the attacker. In order for a transaction to “join” the causality chain, it has to satisfy one of the following conditions:

- the transaction is issued by a process that has already another transaction in the causality chain. Thus, we ensure the continuity of the causality chain through program order.
- the transaction is reading from a variable that was updated by a previous transaction in the causality chain. Hence, we ensure the continuity of the causality chain through the write-read relation.

We introduce a flag for each shared variable to mark the fact that it was updated by a previous transaction in the causality chain. These flags are used by the instrumentation to establish whether a transaction “joins” a causality chain. Enforcing a happens-before path starting in the last delayed transaction, using transactions of the happens-before helpers, can be done in the similar way. Compared to causality chains, there are two more cases in which a transaction can extend a happens-before path:

- the transaction writes to a shared variable that was read by a previous transaction in the happens-before path. Hence, we ensure the continuity of the happens-before path through the read-write relation.
- the transaction writes to a shared variable that was updated by a previous transaction in the happens-before path. Hence, we ensure the continuity of the happens-before path through write-write order.

Therefore, we extend the shared variables flags used for causality chains in order to record if a variable was read or written by a previous transaction (in this case, a previous transaction in the happens-before path). Overall, the instrumentation uses a flag $x.event$ or $x'.event$ for each (copy of a) shared variable, that stores the type of the last access (read or write) to the variable. Initially, these flags and other flags used by the instrumentation as explained below are initialized to null ($\bot$).

In general, whether a process is an attacker, visibility helper, or happens-before helper is not enforced syntactically by the instrumentation, and can vary from execution to execution. The role of a process in an execution is set non-deterministically during the execution using some additional process-local flags. Thus, during an execution, each process chooses to set to true at most one of the flags $p.a$, $p.vh$, and $p.hbh$, implying that the process becomes an attacker, visibility helper, or happens-before helper, respectively. At most one process can be an attacker, i.e., set $p.a$ to true. Before a process becomes an attacker or visibility helper it passes though a stage where it executes transactions in the usual way without delaying them.

A process non-deterministically can choose to delay a transaction at which point it
sets a global flag \( a_{\alpha} \) to true. During the delayed transaction it chooses randomly a write instruction to a shared variable \( y \) and stores the name of this variable in the global variable \( a_{\alpha} \). The values written during delayed transactions are stored in the primed variables and are visible only to the attacker and the visibility helpers. Each time the attacker writes to a variable \( z' \) (the copy of \( z \) from the original program) during a delayed transaction, it sets the flag \( z'.event \) to \( st \) which will allow other processes that read the same variable to join the set of visibility helpers and start delaying their transactions. Once the attacker delays a transaction, it starts reading only from the primed variables (i.e., \( z' \)).

When \( a_{\alpha} \) is set to true by the attacker, other processes continue the execution of their original instructions but, whenever they store a value they write it to both the shared variable \( z \) and the primed variable \( z' \) so it is visible to all processes. When a process chooses non deterministically to join the visibility helpers, it delays all writes (i.e., writes only to primed variables) and reads only from the primed variables.

In order for the attacker or a process in the visibility helpers to start the happens-before path, it has to either read or write a shared variable \( x \) that was not accessed by a delayed transaction (i.e., \( x'.event = \bot \)). In this case we set the global flag \( HB \) to true to mark the start of the happens-before path and the end of the causality chain and set the flag \( x.event \) to \( ld \). When the flag \( HB \) is set to true the attacker and the visibility helpers stop executing new transactions. The remaining processes, which are not the attacker or a visibility helper, can now become a happens-before helper.

Once the flag \( HB \) is set to true, some process chooses non-deterministically to join the set of happens-before helpers, i.e., continue the happens-before path created by the existing happens-before helpers, the attacker, or visibility helper. The happens-before helpers continue executing their instructions, until one of them reads from the variable \( y \) whose name was stored in \( a_{\alpha} \). This establishes a happens-before path between the last delayed transaction and a “fictitious” store event corresponding to the first delayed transaction that could be executed just after this read of \( y \). The execution doesn’t have to contain this store event explicitly since it is always enabled. Therefore, at the end of every transaction, the instrumentation checks whether the transaction reads \( y \). If this is the case, then the execution stops and goes to an error state to indicate that this is a robustness violation.

As we have already mentioned, the role of a process in an execution is chosen non-deterministically at runtime. Therefore, the final instrumentation of a given program \( P \), denoted by \([P]\), is obtained by replacing each labeled instruction \( \langle\text{linst}\rangle \) with the concatenation of the instrumentations corresponding to the attacker, the visibility helpers, and the happens-before helpers, i.e., \([\langle\text{linst}\rangle]\) := \([\langle\text{linst}\rangle]_A\) \([\langle\text{linst}\rangle]_{VH}\) \([\langle\text{linst}\rangle]_{HBH}\).

The following theorem states the correctness of the instrumentation.

\(\triangleright\) \textbf{Theorem 10.} A program \( P \) is not robust against \( CC^v \) iff \([P]\) reaches the error state.

A similar instrumentation can be defined for the other variations of causal consistency, i.e., causal memory (CM) and weak causal consistency (CC).

The following result states the complexity of checking robustness for finite-state programs against one of the three variations of causal consistency considered in this work (we use causal consistency as a generic name to refer to all of them). It is a direct consequence of Theorem 10 and of previous results concerning the reachability problem in concurrent programs running over SC, with a fixed \([26]\) or parametric number of processes \([39]\).

---

\(^3\) That is, programs where the number of variables and the data domain are bounded.
Corollary 11. Checking robustness of finite-state programs against causal consistency is PSPACE-complete when the number of processes is fixed and EXPSPACE-complete, otherwise.

7 Related Work

Causal consistency is one of the oldest consistency models for distributed systems [29]. Formal definitions of several variants of causal consistency, suitable for different types of applications, have been introduced recently [13, 17, 18, 37]. The definitions in this paper are inspired from these works and coincide with those given in [13]. In that paper, the authors address the decidability and the complexity of verifying that an implementation of a storage system is causally consistent (i.e., all its computations, for every client, are causally consistent).

While our paper focuses on trace-based robustness, state-based robustness requires that a program is robust if the set of all its reachable states under the weak semantics is the same as its set of reachable states under the strong semantics. While state-robustness is the necessary and sufficient concept for preserving state-invariants, its verification, which amounts in computing the set of reachable states under the weak semantics, is in general a hard problem. The decidability and the complexity of this problem has been investigated in the context of relaxed memory models such as TSO and Power, and it has been shown that it is either decidable but highly complex (non-primitive recursive), or undecidable [8, 9]. As far as we know, the decidability and complexity of this problem has not been investigated for causal consistency. Automatic procedures for approximate reachability/invariant checking have been proposed using either abstractions or bounded analyses, e.g., [1, 5, 10, 20]. Proof methods have also been developed for verifying invariants in the context of weakly consistent models such as [4, 25, 28, 35]. These methods, however, do not provide decision procedures.

Decidability and complexity of trace-based robustness has been investigated for the TSO and Power memory models [12, 14, 21]. The work we present in this paper borrows the idea of using minimal violation characterizations for building an instrumentation allowing to obtain a reduction of the robustness checking problem to the reachability checking problem over SC. However, applying this approach to the case of causal consistency is not straightforward and requires different proof techniques. Dealing with causal consistency is far more tricky and difficult than dealing with TSO, and requires coming up with radically different arguments and proofs, for (1) characterizing in a finite manner the set of violations, (2) showing that this characterization is sound and complete, and (3) using effectively this characterization in the definition of the reduction to the reachability problem.

As far as we know, our work is the first one that establishes results on the decidability and complexity issues of the robustness problem in the context of causal consistency, and taking into account transactions. The existing work on the verification of robustness for distributed systems consider essentially trace-based concepts of robustness and provide either over- or under-approximate analyses for checking it. In [11, 13, 16, 19], static analysis techniques are proposed based on computing an abstraction of the set of computations that is used in searching for robustness violations. These approaches may return false alarms due to the abstractions they consider. In particular, [11] shows that a trace under causal convergence is not admitted by the serializability semantics iff it contains a (transactional) happens-before cycle with a RW dependency, and another RW or WW dependency. This characterization alone is not sufficient to prove our result concerning robustness checking. Our result relies on a characterization of more refined robustness violations and relies on different proof arguments. In [34] a sound (but not complete) bounded analysis for detecting robustness
violation is proposed. Our approach is technically different, is precise, and provides a decision procedure for checking robustness when the program is finite-state.

8 Conclusion

We have studied three variations of transactional causal consistency, showing that they are equivalent for programs without write-write races and devising a sound and complete, linear-time, reduction of the robustness problem to SC reachability. These results can be extended to hybrid consistency models where some of the transactions in a program can be declared serializable. These models include synchronization primitives similar to lock acquire/release which allow to enforce a serialization order between some transactions. Such mechanisms can be used as a “repair” mechanism in order to make programs robust.
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Figure 7 Program syntax. \( a^n \) indicates zero or more occurrences of \( a \). \( \langle \text{pid} \rangle \), \( \langle \text{reg} \rangle \), \( \langle \text{label} \rangle \), \( \langle \text{var} \rangle \) represent a process identifier, a register, a label, and a shared variable, respectively. \( \langle \text{reg-expr} \rangle \) is an expression over registers while \( \langle \text{bexpr} \rangle \) is a Boolean expression over registers.

A Causal Consistency

A.1 Program syntax

Our simple programming language syntax is given in Fig. 7

A.2 Program Semantics Under Causal Memory

Formally, a program configuration is a triple \( \text{gs} = (\text{ls}, \text{msgs}) \) where \( \text{ls} : \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{S} \) associates a local state in \( \mathbb{S} \) to each process in \( \mathbb{P} \), and \( \text{msgs} \) is a set of messages in transit. A local state is a tuple \( \langle \text{pc}, \text{store}, \text{rval}, \text{log} \rangle \) where \( \text{pc} \in \text{Lab} \) is the program counter, i.e., the label of the next instruction to be executed, \( \text{store} : \mathbb{V} \to \mathbb{D} \) is the local valuation of the shared variables, \( \text{rval} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{D} \) is the valuation of the local registers, and \( \text{log} \in (\mathbb{V} \times \mathbb{D})^* \) is the transaction log, i.e., a list of variable-value pairs. For a local state \( s \), we use \( s\cdot \text{pc} \) to denote the program counter component of \( s \), and similarly for all the other components of \( s \). A message \( m = (t, \text{log}) \) is a transaction identifier \( t \) from a set \( \mathbb{T} \) together with a transaction log \( \text{log} \in (\mathbb{V} \times \mathbb{D})^* \). We let \( \mathbb{M} \) denote the set of messages.

Then, the semantics of a program \( \mathbb{P} \) under causal memory is defined using a labeled transition system (LTS) \([P]_\mathbb{C} = (\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{E}v, \text{gs}_0, \rightarrow)\) where \( \mathbb{C} \) is the set of program configurations, \( \mathbb{E}v \) is a set of transition labels called events, \( \text{gs}_0 \) is the initial configuration, and \( \rightarrow \subseteq \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{E}v \times \mathbb{C} \) is the transition relation. As it will be explained later in this section, the executions of \( \mathbb{P} \) under causal memory are a subset of those generated by \([P]_\mathbb{C}\). The set of events is defined by:

\[
\mathbb{E}v = \{ \text{begin}(p, t), \text{ld}(p, t, x, v), \text{isu}(p, t, x, v), \text{del}(p, t), \text{end}(p, t) : p \in \mathbb{P}, t \in \mathbb{T}, x \in \mathbb{V}, v \in \mathbb{D} \}
\]

where \( \text{begin} \) and \( \text{end} \) label transitions corresponding to the start, resp., the end of a transaction, \( \text{isu} \) and \( \text{ld} \) label transitions corresponding to writing, resp., reading, a shared variable during some transaction, and \( \text{del} \) labels transitions corresponding to applying a transition log received from another process on the local state. An event \( \text{isu} \) is called an issue while an event \( \text{del} \) is called a store.

The transition relation \( \rightarrow \) is partially defined in Fig. 8 (we will present additional constraints later in this section). The events labeling a transition are written on top of \( \rightarrow \). A begin transition will just reset the transaction log while an end transition will apply the writes stored in the transaction log on the shared-variable valuation store and add the transaction log together with the transaction identifier to the set \( \text{msgs} \) of messages in transit. An ld transition will read the value of a shared-variable looking first at the transaction log \( \text{log} \) and then, at the shared-variable valuation store, while an isu transition will add a new write to the transaction log. Finally, a del transition represents the delivery of a transaction log from another process which is applied immediately on the shared-variable valuation store.

We say that an execution \( p \) satisfies transaction isolation if no transaction log is delivered to a process \( p \) while \( p \) is executing a transaction, i.e., if an event \( \text{ev} = \text{del}(p, t) \) occurs in \( p \) before an event \( \text{ev}' = \text{end}(p, t') \) with \( t' \neq t \), then \( p \) contains an event \( \text{ev}'' = \text{begin}(p, t') \)
Figure 8 The set of transition rules defining the causal memory semantics. We assume that all the events which come from the same transaction use a unique transaction identifier. For a function \( f \), we use \( f[a \mapsto b] \) to denote a function \( g \) such that \( g(c) = f(c) \) for all \( c \neq a \) and \( g(a) = b \). The function \( \text{inst} \) returns the set of instructions labeled by some given label while \( \text{next} \) gives the next instruction to execute. We use \( \cdot \) to denote sequence concatenation. The function \( \text{eval}(\text{ls}(p), x) \) returns the value of \( x \) in the local state \( \text{ls}(p) \): (1) if \( \text{ls}(p).\log \) contains a pair \((x, v)\), for some \( v \), then \( \text{eval}(\text{ls}(p), x) \) returns the value of the last such pair in \( \text{ls}(p).\log \), and (2) \( \text{eval}(\text{ls}(p), x) \) returns \( \text{ls}(p).\text{store}(x) \), otherwise. Also, \( \text{last}(\log, x) \) returns the value \( v \) in the last pair \((x, v)\) in \( \log \), and \( \bot \), if such a pair doesn’t exist.

between \( ev \) and \( ev' \). For an execution \( \rho \) satisfying transaction isolation, we assume w.l.o.g. that transactions executed by different processes don’t interleave, i.e., if an event \( ev \) associated to a transaction \( t \) (an event of the process executing \( t \) or the delivery of the transaction log of \( t \)) occurs in \( \rho \) before \( ev' = \text{end}(p', t') \), then \( \rho \) contains an event \( ev'' = \text{begin}(p', t') \) between \( ev \) and \( ev' \). Also, we say that an execution \( \rho \) satisfies causal delivery if the following hold:

- for any event \( \text{begin}(p, t) \), \( \rho \) does not contain the event \( \text{del}(p, t) \), and for any process \( p' \neq p \), \( \rho \) contains at most one event \( \text{del}(p', t) \),
- for any events \( ev_1 \in \{ \text{del}(p, t_1), \text{end}(p, t_1) \} \), \( ev_2 = \text{begin}(p, t_2) \), and \( ev'_2 = \text{del}(p', t_2) \) with \( p \neq p' \), if \( ev_1 \) occurs in \( \rho \) before \( ev_2 \), then there exists \( ev'_1 \in \{ \text{del}(p', t'_1), \text{end}(p', t'_1) \} \) such that \( ev'_1 \) occurs before \( ev'_2 \) in \( \rho \).

An execution \( \rho \) satisfies causal memory if it satisfies transaction isolation and causal delivery. The set of executions of \( \mathcal{P} \) under causal memory, denoted by \( \mathcal{E}_{\text{cm}}(\mathcal{P}) \), is the set of executions of \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{cm}} \) satisfying causal memory.

Let \( \rho \) be an execution under causal memory, a sequence \( \tau \) of events isu\((p, t)\) and del\((p, t)\) with \( p \in \mathcal{P} \) and \( t \in \mathcal{T} \) is called a summary of \( \rho \) if it is obtained from the projection of \( \rho \) on isu and del events by substituting every sub-sequence of transitions in \( \rho \) delimited by a begin and an end transition, with a single “macro-event” isu\((p, t)\).

A.3 Program Semantics Under Causal Convergence

In causal convergence, we assume that the transaction identifiers play the role of timestamps, and assume some total order relation \(<\) on these identifiers. Formally, we define a variation of the LTS \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{cm}} \), denoted by \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{ccv}} \), where essentially, the transition identifiers play the role of timestamps and are ordered by a total order \(<\), each process-local state contains an additional component \( \text{tstamp} \) storing the largest timestamp the process has seen for each
variable, and a write on a variable \( x \) from a transaction log is applied on the local valuation store only if it has a timestamp larger than \( t \). Also, a \( \text{begin}(p, t) \) transition will choose a transaction identifier \( t \) greater than those in the image of the \( \text{tstamp} \) component of \( p \)'s local state. The transition rules of \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{CCV}} \) that change w.r.t. those of \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{CM}} \) are given in Fig. 8.

The set of executions of \( \mathcal{P} \) under causal convergence, denoted by \( \text{Ex}_{\text{CCV}}(\mathcal{P}) \), is the set of executions of \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{CCV}} \) satisfying transaction isolation, causal delivery, and the fact that every process \( p \) generates monotonically increasing transaction identifiers. The execution in Fig. 8 is not possible under causal convergence since \( t4 \) and \( t2 \) read 2 and 1, respectively, from \( x \) which is possible only if \( t1 \) and \( t3 \) write \( x \) at \( p2 \) and \( p1 \), respectively which contradicts the definition of \( \text{del} \) transition given in Fig. 9 where we cannot have both \( t1 < t3 \) and \( t3 < t1 \) at the same time.

### A.4 Program Semantics Under Weak Causal Consistency

In \( \text{CC} \) semantics, the local valuation of the shared variables \( \text{store} : \mathbb{V} \rightarrow (\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T})^* \) is a map that accepts a shared variable and returns a set of pairs. The pairs are composed of values that were stored concurrently and identifiers of the associated transactions that wrote those values. When applying a transaction log on the local valuation store, we keep the values that are in local valuation store and were written by transactions that are concurrent with the transaction under consideration. When a process does an external read, it gets a random value from one of the pairs that are stored at the specified location. Under \( \text{CC} \) semantics, we use an additional component in each process local state denoted by \( \text{storecp} \in \mathbb{V} \rightarrow (\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{T}) \) that maps each shared variable to a single pair. When a transaction begins, the \( \text{storecp} \) is copied from the \( \text{store} \) where for every shared variable \( x \in \mathbb{V} \), the set \( \text{store}(x) \) is projected to a random element \( (u, t) \in \text{store}(x) \) such that the binary relation \( uw \subset (\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}) \), where for each \( (u', t') \in \text{store}(x) \), \( (t', t) \in uw \), is a partial order. In this way, \( \text{storecp} \) ensures that reads from the same transaction are consistent with each other. In Fig. 10, we provide the transition rules of \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{CC}} \) that change w.r.t. those of \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{CCV}} \) and \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{CM}} \).

The set of executions of \( \mathcal{P} \) under weak causal consistency model, denoted by \( \text{Ex}_{\text{CC}}(\mathcal{P}) \), is the set of executions of \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{CC}} \) satisfying transaction isolation and causal delivery. We denote by \( \text{Tr}(\mathcal{P})_{\text{CC}} \) the set of traces of executions of a program \( \mathcal{P} \) under weak causal consistency.
Figure 10 Transition rules for defining weak causal consistency semantics: \( \Pi(\text{store}) \) returns an image of \( \text{store} \) where each set \( \text{store}(x) \) is mapped to a single pair \((v, t')\) such that \((v, t') \in \text{store}(x)\) and there exists a partial order \(ww\) where for every \((u_1, t_1) \in \text{store}(x)\) we have \((t_1, t') \in ww\). \( eval1(\text{ls}(p), x) = (v, t') \quad \text{real} = \text{ls}(p).\text{rval}[r \mapsto v] \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{begin} \in \text{inst}(\text{ls}(p)\text{.pc}) \\
\text{img}(\text{ls}(p)\text{.tsnap}) < t \\
\text{s} = \text{ls}(p)[\log \mapsto \epsilon, \text{store}\text{pc} \mapsto \Pi(\text{store})\text{.pc} \mapsto \text{next}(\text{pc})]
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{array}{c}
(\text{ls}, \text{msgs}) \xrightarrow{\text{ls}(p)\text{.pc} \mapsto \epsilon} (\text{ls}[p \mapsto \text{s}], \text{msgs})
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
r := x \in \text{inst}(\text{ls}(p)\text{.pc}) \\
\text{eval1}(\text{ls}(p), x) = (v, t') \\
\text{real} = \text{ls}(p).\text{rval}[r \mapsto v]
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{array}{c}
(\text{ls}, \text{msgs}) \xrightarrow{\forall (p, t, x) \in \Pi(\text{pc})} (\text{ls}[p \mapsto \text{s}], \text{msgs})
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{end} \in \text{inst}(\text{ls}(p)\text{.pc}) \\
\text{store} = \text{ls}(p).\text{store}[x \mapsto \text{eval2}(\text{ls}(p), x, t) : x \in \mathbb{V}]
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{array}{c}
(\text{ls}, \text{msgs}) \xrightarrow{\text{ls}(p)\text{.pc} \mapsto \epsilon} (\text{ls}[p \mapsto \text{s}], \text{msgs} \cup \{(t, \text{ls}(p)\text{.log})\})
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{array}{c}
(\text{t}, \text{log}) \in \text{msgs} \\
\text{store} = \text{ls}(p).\text{store}[x \mapsto \text{eval3}(\text{ls}(p), x, t, \text{last}(\text{log}, x)) : x \in \mathbb{V}]
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{array}{c}
(\text{ls}, \text{msgs}) \xrightarrow{\text{ls}(p)\text{.pc} \mapsto \epsilon} (\text{ls}[p \mapsto \text{s}], \text{msgs})
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

B Relations to Axiomatic Definitions

In this section, we show that our operational semantics are equivalent to the existing axiomatic definitions for the three causal consistency models.

We use the axiomatic definitions for the causal consistency models to help in determining whether an execution of a program is allowed or not over the given causal consistency models. Also, whether all histories which are acceptable by the axiomatic definitions can be extracted from executions under the corresponding causal consistency semantics. In \cite{13}, the three causal consistency models were formalized as sets of axioms that program histories must satisfy. We will be using these definitions in this section. Given an execution’s trace of a program \(P\) over some consistency semantics \(X \in \{\text{CCv, CM, CC}\}\), \(\tau \in \text{Tr}_X(\mathcal{P})\), we formally define, a history of \(\tau\) as a poset \(h\tau = (\mathcal{T}, \text{PO}, \ell)\) where \(\mathcal{T}\) is the set of transactions identifiers that were issued in \(\tau\), \(\text{PO}\) is the program order between transactions such that \((t_1, t_2) \in \text{PO}\) iff there exists \(p_1 \in \mathcal{P}\) such that \((\text{isu}(p_1, t_1), \text{isu}(p_1, t_2)) \in \text{PO}\), and for every \(t \in \mathcal{T}\), \(\ell(t) = \{\text{isu}(p, t), \text{del}(p', t, p, p') \in \mathcal{P} p' \neq p\}\). Similarly, we define \(\text{WR}\) such that \((t_1, t_2) \in \text{WR}\) iff there exists \(p_1 \in \mathcal{P}\) such that \((\text{isu}(p_1, t_1), \text{isu}(p_1, t_2)) \in \text{WR}\) or \((\text{del}(p_1, t_1), \text{isu}(p_1, t_2)) \in \text{WR}\). We provide in Table \ref{table:axioms} the axioms from \cite{13} that should be satisfied by every history \(h\) for the three causal consistency criteria CM, CCv, and CC.

where \(\text{CO}\) is the causal order, \(\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T}\) is strict partial order named causal order. The axiom \text{AxCausal} states that the causal order must contain the program order and the read-from order. Notice that an instance of the underlying causal order is the extension of the relation CO to transactions. The second axiom of CC, \text{AxCausalValue} states that for every transaction \(t \in \mathcal{T}\), the causal history of \(t\) (\text{CausalPast}(t)), the set of all transactions which are visible to \(t\) can be sequentialized with accordance to the causality order \text{CO} in order to obtain a valid sequence under read/write memory specification \cite{13}. In CC, a process does not need to be consistent with the past reads from transactions that happened before \(t\), thus the axiom \text{AxCausalValue} uses
the causal history of $t$ where only the return values of the read events in the transaction $t$ are kept. This is denoted by $\text{CausalHist}(t)\{t\}$. If $\text{CausalHist}(t)\{t\}$ can be sequentiaлизed to a sequence $\rho_t$ that is permissible under read/write memory specification, we denote it by $\text{CausalHist}(t)\{t\} \leq \rho_t$. For $\text{CM}$ consistency model, we replace the axiom $\text{AxCausalValue}$ by the axiom $\text{AxCausalSeq}$ which is stronger. The axiom $\text{AxCausalSeq}$ requires each process to be consistent with respect to its past reads (i.e., the reads by all transactions in $\text{POPast}(t)$). It is denoted by $\text{CausalHist}(t)\{\text{POPast}(t)\}$. For $\text{CCv}$ consistency model we require the existence of a total order relation $\text{ARB} \in T \times T$ between all transactions in the history, called the arbitration order which must contain the causal order $\text{CO}_t$ (axiom $\text{AxArb}$). Furthermore, in $\text{CCv}$ we replace the axiom $\text{AxCausalValue}$ by the axiom $\text{AxCausalArb}$ which is stronger.

The axiom $\text{AxCausalArb}$ requires that the causal history of $t$ must be sequentiaлизed with accordance to the arbitration order $\text{ARB}$ instead of the causal order $\text{CO}_t$.

### B.1 From Operational Models to Axiomatic Definitions

In the following theorem we demonstrate that histories which are extracted from execution traces under the semantics $\text{CM}$, $\text{CCv}$, and $\text{CC}$ defined in Sections A.2, A.3, and A.4 respectively, satisfy the axiomatic definitions given in Table 1.

**Theorem 12.** Let $\tau \in \text{Tr}(P)_{\text{CC}}$ then $h_\tau = (T, \text{PO}_t, \ell)$ is $\text{CC}$.

Let $\tau \in \text{Tr}(P)_{\text{CM}}$ then $h_\tau = (T, \text{PO}_t, \ell)$ is $\text{CM}$.

Let $\tau \in \text{Tr}(P)_{\text{CCv}}$ then $h_\tau = (T, \text{PO}_t, \ell)$ is $\text{CCv}$.

In the proof, we consider the partial order relation defined as $\text{CO}_t = (\text{PO}_t \cup \text{WR}_t)^+$ to be the causal order. We get the following lemma about $\text{CO}_t$.

**Lemma 13.** $\text{CO}$ satisfies the axiom $\text{AxCausal}$.

**Lemma 14** (Weak Causal Consistency). Let $\tau \in \text{Tr}(P)_{\text{CC}}$ be an execution trace under $\text{CC}$ semantics then $h_\tau$ is $\text{CC}$.

**Proof.** We already know that $h_\tau$ satisfies the axiom $\text{AxCausal}$, hence, we just need to show that $h_\tau$ satisfies the axiom $\text{AxCausalValue}$. 

| $h$ is $\text{CC}$ | $\exists \text{CO}_t$, a partial order, s.t. $\text{AxCausal} \land \text{AxCausalValue}$ |
| $h$ is $\text{CM}$ | $\exists \text{CO}_t$, a partial order, s.t. $\text{AxCausal} \land \text{AxCausalSeq}$ |
| $h$ is $\text{CCv}$ | $\exists \text{CO}_t, \text{ARB}$, a partial and a total orders, s.t. $\text{AxCausal} \land \text{AxArb} \land \text{AxCausalArb}$ |

| $\text{AxCausal}$ | $\text{PO}_t \subseteq \text{CO}_t \wedge \text{WR}_t \subseteq \text{CO}_t$ |
| $\text{AxArb}$ | $\text{CO}_t \subseteq \text{ARB}$ |
| $\text{AxCausalValue}$ | $\forall t \in T. \text{CausalHist}(t)\{t\} \leq \rho_t$ |
| $\text{AxCausalSeq}$ | $\forall t \in T. \text{CausalHist}(t)\{\text{POPast}(t)\} \leq \rho_t$ |
| $\text{AxCausalArb}$ | $\forall t \in T. \text{CausalArb}(t)\{t\} \leq \rho_t$ |

**Table 1** Axioms definitions of causal consistency.
Lemma 15 (Causal Memory). Let $\tau \in \text{Tr}(P)_\text{CM}$ be an execution trace under CM semantics then $h_\tau$ is CM.

Proof. Similar to the previous lemma, we already know that $h_\tau$ satisfies the axiom $\text{AxCausal}$, hence, we just need to prove that $h_\tau$ satisfies the axiom $\text{AxCausalSeq}$.

We have to show that we can construct a sequence from $\text{CausalHist}(t)$ that is consistent with the return values of all events from the process $p$ that issued $t$.

We prove this property by induction on the number of transactions in $\text{POPast}(t)$. The basic case where $\text{POPast}(t)$ contains single transaction holds because the operational model of CM satisfies the axiom $\text{AxCausalValue}$ proven in the previous case.

For the inductive step, we assume we were able to construct a valid sequence from $\text{CausalHist}(t_n)$ which is consistent with $\text{POPast}(t_n)$, we prove by induction on the number of instructions within the transaction $t_{n+1}$ that we can construct a valid sequence from $\text{CausalHist}(t_{n+1})$ which is consistent with $\text{POPast}(t_{n+1})$.

For the case where transaction $t_{n+1}$ contains single instruction, let $a$ be the underlying instruction. If $a$ is a write then we can build a sequence of transactions in $\text{CausalHist}(t_{n+1})$ from appending $t_{n+1}$ at the end of the valid sequence $\text{CausalHist}(t_n)$ which is consistent
with \( \text{POPast}(t_n) \). The obtained \( \text{CausalHist}(t_{n+1}) \) is consistent with \( \text{POPast}(t_{n+1}) \). If \( t \) is a read that reads the initial value then \( \text{CausalHist}(t_n) \) does not contain a write that accesses the same location. In this case we can build a sequence of transactions in \( \text{CausalHist}(t_{n+1}) \) obtained by appending \( t_{n+1} \) at the end of \( \text{CausalHist}(t_n) \). If \( a \) is a read that reads its value from a write in \( O = \text{CausalHist}(t_{n+1}) \setminus \text{CausalHist}(t_n) \) then we can build a sequence of transactions in \( \text{CausalHist}(t_{n+1}) \) obtained by appending \( t_{n+1} \) and \( O \) at the end of \( \text{CausalHist}(t_n) \).

If \( a \) is a read that obtains its value from a write in \( \text{CausalHist}(t_n) \) then the transaction that contains the write must be maximal in the store order otherwise in the CM operational model \( a \) cannot read from this transaction. Thus, we obtain a valid \( \text{CausalHist}(t_{n+1}) \) by appending \( t_{n+1} \) at the end of the valid sequence \( \text{CausalHist}(t_n) \).

For the case where transaction \( t_{n+1} \) contains \( n + 1 \) instructions, let \( t_{n+1} = t'_{n+1} \cup \{a_{n+1}\} \) such \( t'_{n+1} \) contains \( n \) instructions. If \( a_{n+1} \) is a write, a read that reads the initial value, or a read that obtains its value from a write in \( t'_{n+1} \), then the causal past of \( t_{n+1} \) is the same as the causal past of \( t'_{n+1} \). Otherwise, if \( a_{n+1} \) performs an external read then we apply the same procedure as in the previous case.

Before showing that all histories which are extracted from execution traces under \( \text{CCv} \) satisfy the axiomatic definitions, we start by defining the total order relation \( \text{ARB} \) under \( \text{CCv} \) semantics. The formal definition of store order for each process is the following.

**Definition 16.** Given a process \( p \in \mathbb{P} \), we define the local store order \( \text{WW}_p \) between transactions such that \( (t_1, t_2) \in \text{WW}_p \) iff \( (\text{isu}(p, t_1), \text{isu}(p, t_2)) \in \text{WW} \) or \( (\text{del}(p, t_1), \text{isu}(p, t_2)) \in \text{WW} \) or \( (\text{isu}(p, t_1), \text{del}(p, t_2)) \in \text{WW} \) or \( (\text{del}(p, t_1), \text{del}(p, t_2)) \in \text{WW} \).

**Lemma 17.** Given two processes \( p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{P} \) then under \( \text{CCv} \) if \( (t_1, t_2) \in \text{WW}_{p_1} \), then \( (t_2, t_1) \notin \text{WW}_{p_2} \).

**Proof.** If both \( (t_1, t_2) \in \text{WW}_{p_1} \) and \( (t_2, t_1) \in \text{WW}_{p_2} \), hold then from Fig. 2 we have \( t_2 > t_1 \) and \( t_1 > t_2 \) hold which is not possible.

Next, we give the formal definition of the total store order under the \( \text{CCv} \) semantics.

**Definition 18.** \( (t_1, t_2) \in \text{WW}_t \) iff \( \exists p \in \mathbb{P} \) where \( (t_1, t_2) \in \text{WW}_p \).

Assuming that the timestamp of a given transaction is calculated based on causally visible transactions, we get that if \( (t_1, t_2) \in \text{CO}_t \), then \( t_2 > t_1 \). Therefore, if \( (t_1, t_2) \in \text{CO}_t \), then \( t_2 > t_1 \). Thus, \( \text{CO}_t \cup \text{WW}_t \) is acyclic.

**Definition 19.** We define the arbitration order \( \text{ARB} \) as any strict total order which contains \( \text{CO}_t \cup \text{WW}_t \). Which is possible since \( \text{CO}_t \cup \text{WW}_t \) is acyclic.

**Lemma 20 (Causal Convergence).** Given an execution \( \alpha \in \text{Exp}_{\text{CM}}(\mathcal{P}) \) such that \( \alpha \) is possible under \( \text{CCv} \) model then \( h_{\text{tr}(\alpha)} \) is \( \text{CCv} \).

**Proof.** We have already proved that \( h_{\text{tr}(\alpha)} \) satisfies the axioms \( \text{AxIsolation} \) and \( \text{AxCausal} \), hence, we just need to prove that \( h_{\text{tr}(\alpha)} \) satisfies the axioms \( \text{AxArbAnd} \) and \( \text{AxCausalArb} \). From the definition of \( \text{ARB} \), we can conclude that \( \text{AxArbIs} \) satisfied. Since the operational model of \( \text{CCv} \) satisfies the axiom \( \text{AxCausalValue} \), thus we can construct a valid sequence from \( \text{CausalHist}(t) \) that is consistent with return values of instructions in the transaction of \( t \) originated from process \( p \). From the definition of the relation \( \text{WW}_p \), \( \text{CausalHist}(t) \) must be consistent with the order \( \text{WW}_p \). Thus, \( \text{CausalHist}(t) \) is consistent with the order \( \text{WW}_t \subseteq \text{ARB} \). Therefore, we can construct a valid sequence from \( \text{CausalHist}(t) \) that is consistent with return values of instructions in \( t \) and with the total order relation \( \text{ARB} \).
B.2 From Axiomatic Definitions to Operational Models

Next, we show that given CC, CM, and CCv histories which satisfy the axioms given in Table 1 we can obtain executions under the operational models as defined in Sections A.2, A.3, and A.4 from which we produce these histories.

**Theorem 21.** Let \( h = (T, PO_t, \ell) \) be a history which satisfies CC then we can obtain an execution trace under CC which produces the history \( h \).

Let \( h = (T, PO_t, \ell) \) be a history which satisfies CM then we can obtain an execution trace under CM which produces the history \( h \).

Let \( h = (T, PO_t, \ell) \) be a history which satisfies CCv then we can obtain an execution trace under CCv which produces the history \( h \).

**Proof.** Given \( h = (T, PO_t, \ell) \) to be a history which satisfies CC. Then, \( h \) holds the axioms AxCausal and AxCausalValue. Based on the axiom AxCausal, we can safely assume that the causal order CO\(_t\) is consistent with the causal delivery guaranteed in CC semantics. In the remaining of the proof, we say a transaction \( t \) is visible to another transaction \( t' \) if \((t, t') \in \text{CO}_t\). It remains to show that the returns of every read instruction in \( h \) is obtainable in an execution under CC semantics. If the read is internal (i.e., the read obtain its value from a write within the same transaction) then it can indeed be explained through the operational model of CC since eval\(_1\) fetches first the transaction log when executing a read instruction. If the read is external then either it reads the initial value or a value that was written by another transaction. If the read obtains the initial value, thus implies there is no visible transaction that updates the underlying shared variable which the read accesses because the valuation of \( \Pi(\text{store}) \) at the underlying shared variable will not return any pair. Otherwise, the read should obtain its value from one the visible transactions that update the underlying shared variable which the read accesses. The randomness in the operation model involved in the value returned by a read that accesses a shared variable that contains multiple values written by concurrent transactions explain why two consecutive transactions that read from the same variable and share the same set of visible transactions can return different values. Also, notice that at the start of every transaction we obtain an image of the memory local valuation store through \( \Pi(\text{store}) \) which is single value memory. This guarantees that all reads from the same transaction are consistent with each other. Thus, the obtained execution from the history \( h \) is valid under CC model. Therefore, we can obtain an execution trace \( \tau \) under CC semantics where \( h = h_\tau \).

Second, we assume that \( h \) satisfies CCv. Then, \( h \) satisfies CC which implies that we can obtain an execution trace \( \tau \) under CC semantics such that \( h_\tau \) corresponds to \( h \). Since, \( h \) is constrained by an arbitration then it is not permissible that reads from two consecutive transactions that share the same set of visible transactions to read different values of the same shared variable without one of the two updating the content of the shared variable. Therefore, the arbitration order can be seen as timestamp order based on which the writes are applied to the local memory. Then, it is possible to reproduce the execution trace \( \tau \) under CCv semantics as well.

Third, suppose that \( h \) satisfies CM. Then, similar to before \( h \) satisfies CC and it is not permissible to reorder the contents of the memory without violating the axiom AxCausalSeq. Also, since no writes are discarded by the events del then CM semantics guarantees that all reads of the same process are consistent with each other that is holding for every history \( h \) that satisfies CM. Thus, it is possible to produce an execution trace \( \tau \) under CM semantics such that \( h = h_\tau \).
C. Proofs For Section 3 (Write-Write Race Freedom)

C.1 Write-Write Race Definition

Given a program $P$, let $\tau \in \text{Tr}_X(P)$ be a trace of the execution of $P$ under a consistency semantics $X \in \{\text{CCv}, \text{CM}, \text{CC}\}$.

Suppose we have two transactions $t_1$ and $t_2$ that were issued in $\tau$ such that $t_1$ and $t_2$ are originated from two independent processes $p_1$ and $p_2$, respectively. Formally, if $(\text{isu}(p_1, t_1), \text{isu}(p_2, t_2)) \notin \text{CO}$ and $(\text{isu}(p_2, t_2), \text{isu}(p_1, t_1)) \notin \text{CO}$ then we call the two transactions concurrent.

We say a trace $\tau$ has a write-write race on a shared variable $x$ if there exist two transactions $t_1, t_2$ that were issued in $\tau$ that are concurrent and each transaction contains a write to the shared variable $x$. We call $\tau$ a write-write race free if there is no shared variable $x$ such that $\tau$ has a write-write race on $x$. Also, we say a program $P$ has no write-write race under a consistency semantics $X \in \{\text{CCv}, \text{CM}, \text{CC}\}$ iff for every $\tau \in \text{Tr}_X(P)$, $\tau$ is a write-write race free.

C.2 Causal Consistency Semantics

- **Theorem 22.** Let $P$ be a parallel program. Then, $\text{Tr}_{\text{CC}}(P) = \text{Tr}_{\text{CCv}}(P) = \text{Tr}_{\text{CM}}(P)$ iff $P$ has no write-write race under $\text{CC}$.

  The proof of this theorem is the combination of the two Lemmas 25 and 26.

- **Lemma 23.** Let $\tau$ be an execution trace which has no write-write race under $\text{CC}$. Then $\tau \in \text{Tr}_{\text{CC}}(P)$ implies $\tau \in \text{Tr}_{\text{CM}}(P)$.

  **Proof.** Let $\tau \in \text{Tr}_{\text{CC}}$ be an execution trace under $\text{CC}$ model. Then, $\tau$ satisfies transactions isolation and causal delivery. It is important to notice that if $\tau$ has no write-write race, therefore, the contents of $\text{store}$ at a given shared variable will always have single value at a time. Which implies that $\text{store}$ can be considered as single value memory which does not discard writes. Thus, we obtain a semantics that is the same as the one for $\text{CM}$ model.

- **Lemma 24.** Let $\tau$ be an execution trace which has no write-write race under $\text{CC}$. Then, $\tau \in \text{Tr}_{\text{CC}}$ implies $\tau \in \text{Tr}_{\text{CCv}}$.

  **Proof.** Similar to the previous lemma, $\tau$ satisfies transactions isolation and causal delivery and the contents of $\text{store}$ at a given shared variable will always have single value at a time. Now, we want to ensure that $\tau$ ensure a total arbitration between transactions that store to the same variable which is ensured by $\text{CCv}$ semantics.

  Suppose we have two transactions $t_1$ and $t_2$ that are issued in $\tau$ that contain writes to the same shared variable. Thus, $(\text{isu}(p_1, t_1), \text{isu}(p_2, t_2)) \in \text{CO}$ or $(\text{isu}(p_2, t_2), \text{isu}(p_1, t_1)) \in \text{CO}$. Because the two cases are similar, it is enough to consider one of them. Consider for example the case $(\text{isu}(p_2, t_1), \text{isu}(p_2, t_2)) \in \text{CO}$, thus the timestamp of $t_2$ must be bigger than the timestamp of $t_1$. Also, since causal delivery is guaranteed then $\forall p'$. $(\text{del}(p', t_1), \text{del}(p', t_2)) \in \text{CO}$ which implies $\forall p'$. $(\text{del}(p', t_1), \text{del}(p', t_2)) \in \text{WW}_{p'}$, thus, all writes in both transactions $t_1$ and $t_2$ will be stored in the local memory of $p'$ in an ordered fashion, ensuring a store order between the two transactions that is consistent on all processes.

- **Lemma 25.** Consider a program $P$ which has no write-write race under $\text{CC}$ (which implies no write-write race under $\text{CCv}$ and $\text{CM}$ see Theorem 3). Then, we must have $\text{Tr}_{\text{CC}}(P) = \text{Tr}_{\text{CCv}}(P) = \text{Tr}_{\text{CM}}(P)$.
We have that

To prove the above theorem, it is sufficient to prove the two axioms: directions from the set of executions of \( P \) to \( P' \) and from 1 to 2 and from 1 to 3. Because the directions from 2 to 1 and from 3 to 1 hold since \( CC \) is weaker than both \( CCv \) and \( CM \). For the direction from 1 to 2: suppose we have an execution trace \( \tau \) that is concurrent (i.e., \((isu(p_1, t_1),isu(p_2, t_2)) \notin CO \) or \((isu(p_2, t_2),isu(p_1, t_1)) \notin CO \)) and contain writes to the variable \( x \). Since the set of traces of \( CC \) and \( CM \) coincide then under \( CM \) semantics we can obtain \( \tau \) as well. Similar to the proof given for minimal violation trace, from \( \tau \) we can extract another execution trace \( \tau' \) under \( CM \) in the form \( \tau' = \alpha \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta \cdot (p_2, t_2) \cdot del(p_2, t_1) \cdot \gamma \) such that \((isu(p_1, t_1),del(p_1, t_2)) \in WW(x) \) and \((del(p_2, t_2),del(p_2, t_1)) \in WW(x) \) and \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) contains both the causal past of \((p_1, t_1)\) and the causal past of \((p_2, t_2)\). It is impossible to obtain \( \tau \) under \( CCv \) because of Lemma 26 it impossible to have \((del(p_2, t_2),del(p_2, t_1)) \in WW(x) \) if \((isu(p_1, t_1),del(p_1, t_2)) \in WW(x) \). Thus, a contradiction.

Lemma 26. Let \( P \) be a parallel program, if \( Tr_{CC}(P) = Tr_{CCv}(P) \) then \( P \) has no write-write race under \( CC \).

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that \( P \) has a write-write race under \( CC \). Then, there must exist an execution trace \( \tau \in Tr_{CC}(P) \) and a shared variable \( x \) such that we have two transactions \( t_1, t_2 \) that are issued in \( \tau \) that are concurrent (i.e., \((isu(p_1, t_1),isu(p_2, t_2)) \notin CO \) or \((isu(p_2, t_2),isu(p_1, t_1)) \notin CO \)) and contain writes to the variable \( x \). Since the set of traces of \( CC \) and \( CM \) coincide then under \( CM \) semantics we can obtain \( \tau \) as well. Similar to the proof given for minimal violation trace, from \( \tau \) we can extract another execution trace \( \tau' \) under \( CM \) in the form \( \tau' = \alpha \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta \cdot (p_2, t_2) \cdot del(p_2, t_1) \cdot \gamma \) such that \((isu(p_1, t_1),del(p_1, t_2)) \in WW(x) \) and \((del(p_2, t_2),del(p_2, t_1)) \in WW(x) \) and \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) contains both the causal past of \((p_1, t_1)\) and the causal past of \((p_2, t_2)\). It is impossible to obtain \( \tau \) under \( CCv \) because of Lemma 26 it impossible to have \((del(p_2, t_2),del(p_2, t_1)) \in WW(x) \) if \((isu(p_1, t_1),del(p_1, t_2)) \in WW(x) \). Thus, a contradiction.

Theorem 27. Given \( P \) a parallel program which has write-write races. Let \( P' \) be a write-write synchronized restriction of \( P \) where all write-write racy transactions are serialized. Then,

\[
Tr_{CC}(P') = Tr_{CCv}(P') = Tr_{CM}(P') = Tr_{CC}(P) \cap Tr_{CCv}(P) \cap Tr_{CC}(P)
\]

Proof. If \( P' \) is a write-write date race free then from the Lemma 26 we obtain: \( Tr_{CC}(P') = Tr_{CCv}(P') = Tr_{CM}(P') \) and \( Tr_{CC}(P) \cap Tr_{CM}(P) \cap Tr_{CCv}(P) \). On the other hand, we have that if \( P' \) is restriction of \( P \) then \( Tr_{CCv}(P') \subset Tr_{CCv}(P), Tr_{CC}(P') \subset Tr_{CC}(P), \) and \( Tr_{CM}(P') \subset Tr_{CM}(P) \) then because \( Tr_{CCv}(P') = Tr_{CM}(P') \) we obtain:

\[
Tr_{CC}(P') = Tr_{CCv}(P') = Tr_{CM}(P') \subset Tr_{CM}(P) \cap Tr_{CCv}(P) \cap Tr_{CC}(P)
\]

For the other direction of proof, suppose by contradiction that \( \exists \tau \in Tr_{CM}(P) \cap Tr_{CCv}(P) \cap Tr_{CC}(P) \) such that \( \tau \notin Tr_{CM}(P') \). Then, \( \tau \in Tr_{CM}(P) \cap Tr_{CCv}(P) \) which means \( \tau \) contains a write-write race. This means there exist two transactions \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) that were issued in \( \tau \) that are concurrent and contain writes to the same shared variable \( x \). Let \( p_1 \) and \( p_2 \) be the two processes that issued the transactions \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \), respectively. Thus, we assume that in \( \tau \) both transactions \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) were delivered to the processes \( p_2 \) and \( p_1 \), respectively. Therefore, under \( CM \) semantics we must have \((isu(p_1, t_1),del(p_1, t_2)) \in WW(x) \) and \((del(p_2, t_2),del(p_2, t_1)) \in WW(x) \) which is not possible under \( CCv \). Thus, \( \tau \notin Tr_{CM}(P) \cap Tr_{CCv}(P) \cap Tr_{CC}(P) \) which is contradictory to the hypothesis.

Next, we describe the proof of Theorem 28 stated as follow.

Theorem 28. Let \( P \) be a parallel program then the following three statements are equivalent:

1. The set of executions of \( P \) has no write-write race under \( CC \),
2. The set of executions of \( P \) has no write-write race under \( CCv \),
3. The set of executions of \( P \) has no write-write race under \( CM \).

Proof. To prove the above theorem, it is sufficient to prove the two axioms: directions from 1 to 2 and from 1 to 3. Because the directions from 2 to 1 and from 3 to 1 hold since \( CC \) is weaker than both \( CCv \) and \( CM \).
Lemma 29. Given a parallel program $P$, if $P$ is not robust under $CCv$ then $P$ is not robust under $CM$.

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that $P$ is robust under $CM$ but is not robust under $CCv$. Since $P$ is robust under $CM$ then it is not possible to obtain an execution trace of $P$ that has the shape of the first minimal violation pattern given in Theorem 7. Thus, $P$ has no write-write race under $CM$. Then, using Theorem 22 we obtain that $Tr_{CCv}(P) = Tr_{CM}(P)$. However, since $P$ is robust under $CM$ then $Tr_{SER}(P) = Tr_{CM}(P)$. Therefore, $Tr_{SER}(P) = Tr_{CCv}(P)$ which implies that $P$ is robust under $CCv$ which is contradicting the hypothesis.

D Proofs For Section 4 (Programs Robustness)

In this section, we give some auxiliary lemmas about the happens-before relation (between events). We also give the formal definition of minimal violations traces. First, we define the notation $ev_1 \rightarrow_{HB^1} ev_2$ (resp., $(ev_1, ev_2) \in HB^1$) to denote $(ev_1, ev_2) \in (PO \cup WW \cup WR \cup STO \cup RW)$.

To decide if two events in a trace are “independent” (or commutative) we use the information about the existence of a happens-before relation between the events. If two events are not related by happens-before then they can be swapped while preserving the same happens-before. Thus, we extend the happens-before relation to obtain the happens-before through relation as follows:

Definition 30. Let $\tau = \alpha \cdot a \cdot \beta \cdot b \cdot \gamma$ be a trace where $a$ and $b$ are events (or atomic macro events), and $\alpha$, $\beta$, and $\gamma$ are sequences of events (or atomic macro events) under a semantics $X \in \{CCv, CM\}$. We say that $a$ happens-before $b$ through $\beta$ if there is a non empty sub-sequence $c_1 \cdots c_n$ of $\beta$ that satisfies:

$$c_i \rightarrow_{HB^1;STO} c_{i+1} \quad \text{for all} \ i \in [0, n]$$

where $c_0 = a$, $c_{n+1} = b$ and $STO^?$ is the reflexive closure of STO.

Notice that we may have two events $ev_1$ and $ev_2$ which are adjacent and are $HB^1$-related but not $HB^1$-related in the case where $ev_2$ is a store of an issue event $ev_0$ which occurs before $ev_1$. In this case $ev_1$ can be $RW$-related to $ev_0$ (e.g., $ev_1$ reads the initial value of $x$ and $ev_0$ writes $x$) and since $ev_0$ is STO-related to $ev_2$, then $ev_1$ is $HB^1;STO$-related to $ev_2$. However, if $ev_2$ does not write $x$ (a plausible case under $CCv$) then $ev_1$ might not be $HB^1$-related to $ev_2$. 
D.1 Minimal Violations

Given a trace $\tau = \alpha \cdot b \cdot \beta \cdot c \cdot \omega$ containing two events $b = \text{isu}(p, t)$ and $c$, the distance between $b$ and $c$, denoted by $d_\tau(b, c)$, is the number of events in $\beta$ that are causally related to $b$, excluding events that correspond to the deliver of $t$, i.e., $d_\tau(b, c) = \{d \in \beta \mid \{b, d\} \in \text{CO} \land d \neq \text{del}(p', t) \text{ for every } p' \in P\}$.

The number of delays $\#(\tau)$ in a trace $\tau$ is the sum of all distances between issue and store events that originate from the same transaction:

$$\#(\tau) = \sum_{\text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \text{del}(p', t) \in \tau} d_\tau(\text{isu}(p, t), \text{del}(p', t))$$

**Definition 31** (Minimal violation). A robust violation $\tau$ is called minimal if it has the least number of delays among all robustness violations (for a given program $\mathcal{P}$ and semantics $X \in \{\text{CCv}, \text{CM}\}$).

A non-robust program may admit several minimal violations with different happens-before. For instance, in Fig. 11 we have two traces which do not have the same happens-before and both traces have the same number of delays which equals to 0, i.e., both traces are minimal violation traces. In the trace in Fig. 11a a single transaction is delayed and on the other hand in the trace in Fig. 11b two transactions are delayed that are not causally related. For example, for the violation trace $\tau_1$ in Fig. 11b we have that $\#(\tau_1) = d_{\tau_1}(\text{isu}(p2, t2), \text{del}(p3, t2)) = 0$ since ($\text{isu}(p2, t2), (p3, t3)) \not\in \text{CO}$. Also, for the violation trace $\tau_2$ in Fig. 11b we have that $\#(\tau_2) = d_{\tau_2}(\text{isu}(p1, t1), \text{del}(p3, t1)) + d_{\tau_2}(\text{isu}(p2, t2), \text{del}(p3, t2)) = 0 + 0 = 0$ since ($\text{isu}(p2, t2), (p3, t3)) \not\in \text{CO}$, ($\text{isu}(p1, t1), (p3, t3)) \not\in \text{CO}$, and ($\text{isu}(p1, t1), \text{isu}(p2, t2)) \not\in \text{CO}$.

![Example of two minimal violation traces which do not have the same happens-before relation (possible under both CCv and CM). Both traces have the same number of delays which is equal to 0. However, in (b) the minimal violation trace contains a single delayed transaction (t2), and in (c) the minimal violation trace contains two delayed transactions (t1 and t2).](image)

Next, we show that a robustness violation should contain at least an issue and a store event of the same transaction that are related via the happens-before through relation. Otherwise, we can build another trace with the same happens-before where events are reordered such that every issue $\text{isu}(p, t)$ is immediately followed by all corresponding stores $\text{del}(p', t)$ with $p' \neq p$. The latter is a serializable trace which contradicts the initial assumption.

**Lemma 32.** Given a violation $\tau$, there must exist a transaction $t$ such that $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$ and $\text{isu}(p, t)$ happens-before $\text{del}(p_0, t)$ through $\beta$.

The above lemma corresponds exactly to the Lemma 5 where the happens-before relations in Lemma 5 where rephrased using the happens-before through relation.
Similarly, given a violation of the from $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$, we call $t$ a delayed transaction in the trace $\tau$ when $\text{isu}(p, t)$ happens-before $\text{del}(p_0, t)$ through $\beta$.

Since the number of delays is defined using the causal order and the concept of delayed transaction using the happens-before through, the number of delays of a minimal violation may be zero, although it must contain at least one delayed transaction. For example, considering the case of Lost Update program given in Fig. 4a, its minimal violation execution trace given in Fig. 12 has a total number of delays which is zero. In the minimal violation trace, transaction $t_1$ was delayed after transaction $t_2$. However, since $(\text{isu}(p_1, t_1), (p_2, t_2)) \notin \text{CO}$ (i.e., the two transactions are not causally related) then $\#(\tau) = d_t(\text{isu}(p_1, t_1), \text{del}(p_2, t_1)) = 0$ where $\tau$ designates the minimal violation trace in Fig. 12.

Even though $\text{CO} \subset \text{HB}$ we may have a violation trace with the least number of events that occur between $\text{isu}(p_1, t_1)$ and $\text{del}(p_2, t_1)$ and are happens-before related to $\text{isu}(p_1, t_1)$ and the violation trace does not correspond to a minimal violation. For example, consider the modified Store Buffer program given in Fig. 13a. Its minimal violation trace has a number of delays which is equal to 1 since only two transactions were delayed (i.e., $t_1$ and $t_2$). In Fig. 13c we show another violation trace of the same program which has a number of delays which is equal to $\frac{(N + 2) \times (N + 3)}{2}$ since $N + 3$ transactions were delayed (all the delayed transactions are from the process $p_1$) that are causally related. However, the violation trace in Fig. 13c has less number of events, that occur between $\text{isu}(p_1, t_1)$ and $\text{del}(p_2, t_1)$, than the minimal violation trace given in Fig. 13b.

Before giving the proof of Lemma 32 we state an important property of RW under both
Lemma 33. Let \( \tau \in \text{Tr}_X(P) \) be a trace under a semantics \( X \in \{ \text{CCv}, \text{CM} \} \) and \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) two transaction from two different processes \( p_1 \) and \( p_2 \) that are issued in \( \tau \). If \((\text{isu}(p_1, t_1), \text{isu}(p_2, t_2)) \in \text{RW}(x)\), then either \( \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \) reads the initial value from \( x \) or there exists another transaction \( t_3 \) from process \( p_3 \) such that \((\text{isu}(p_1, t_1), \text{isu}(p_1, t_1)) \in \text{WR}(x)\) and \((\text{isu}(p_2, t_2), \text{isu}(p_3, t_3)) \in \text{WW}(x)\).

An important property of the happens-before through relation is the stability of the relation when adding new operations in the middle of a trace. The proof is similar to an analogous property of traces that consist of individual reads and writes (without transactions).

Lemma 34. Let \( \tau = \alpha \cdot a \cdot \beta \cdot b \cdot \gamma \) and \( \tau' = \alpha' \cdot a' \cdot \beta' \cdot b' \cdot \gamma' \) be two traces such that \( \tau \downarrow p = \tau' \downarrow p \) for every process \( p \). (where \( \tau \downarrow p \) denotes the projection of the sequence \( \tau \) on the set of events of process \( p \)). Then, if \( a \) happens-before \( b \) through \( \beta \) then \( a \) happens-before \( b \) through \( \beta' \).

Based on Lemma 34 we can show that any two events in an execution trace which are not related via the happens-before through relation can be reordered without affecting the happens-before or can be placed adjacent to each other.

Lemma 35. Let \( \tau \) be an execution trace of a program \( P \) under a semantics \( X \in \{ \text{CCv}, \text{CM} \} \), and \( a \) and \( b \) two events such that \( \tau = \alpha \cdot a \cdot \beta \cdot b \cdot \gamma \). Then, either (1) \( a \) happens-before \( b \) through \( \beta \) or there is another trace \( \tau' \) that has the same happens-before as \( \tau \) and (2) \( \tau' = \alpha' \cdot a' \cdot \beta' \cdot b' \cdot \gamma' \in \text{Tr}_X(P) \) if \( (a, b) \in \text{HB}^1; \text{STO}? \) or, otherwise, (3) \( \tau' = \alpha' \cdot a' \cdot b' \cdot \beta' \cdot \gamma' \in \text{Tr}_X(P) \).

Proof. Let \( \tau \) be a minimal violation trace of a program \( P \) under some semantics \( X \in \{ \text{CCv}, \text{CM} \} \), and \( a \) and \( b \) two events such that \( \tau = \alpha \cdot a \cdot \beta \cdot b \cdot \gamma \).

We prove \( \neg (1) \Rightarrow ((2) \text{ or } (3)) \) using induction on \( |\beta| \) which concludes the disjunction since \( \neg (2) \text{ or } (3) \Rightarrow (1) \) is the reverse:

**Base case:** \( |\beta| = 0 \). Then \( \tau_0 = \alpha \cdot a \cdot b \cdot \gamma \) where \( a \) and \( b \) are not \( \text{HB}^1; \text{STO}? \)-related.

**Induction step case:** We assume the lemma holds for \( |\beta| = n + 1 \). Consider \( \tau_{n+1} = \alpha \cdot a \cdot \beta \cdot b \cdot \gamma \) with \( |\beta| = n + 1 \). Consider \( c \) the last event in the sequence \( \beta = \beta_1 \cdot c \). If \( a \) does not happen before \( b \) through \( \beta \), then either \( a \) does not happen before \( c \) through \( \beta_1 \) and \( a \) and \( c \) are not \( \text{HB}^1; \text{STO}? \)-related or \( c \) and \( b \) are not \( \text{HB}^1; \text{STO}? \)-related.

First case: suppose \( a \) does not happen before \( c \) through \( \beta_1 \) and \( a \) and \( c \) are not \( \text{HB}^1; \text{STO}? \)-related. Using induction hypothesis over \( \tau_{n+1} \) with respect to \( a \) and \( c \) (because \( |\beta_1| \leq n \)) results in \( \tau'_n = \alpha \cdot \beta_1 \cdot c \cdot a \cdot \beta_{12} \cdot b \cdot \gamma \) similar to \( \tau_{n+1} \). Using the Lemma 34 we know that if \( a \) happen before \( b \) through \( \beta_{12} \) then \( a \) happens before \( b \) through \( \beta \) because \( \beta_{12} \) is a subset of

CCv and CM semantics.
Lemma 36. Let \( \tau \) be a minimal violation trace such that \( \text{isu}(p, t) \) happens-before \( \text{del}(p', t) \) through \( \beta \). Therefore, \( a \) does not happen before \( b \) through \( \beta_{12} \). Since \(|\beta_{12}| \leq |\beta_1| \leq n\), then we can apply the induction hypothesis as well to \( \tau'_{n+1} \) with respect to \( a \) and \( b \) which yields either \( \tau''_{n+1} = \alpha \cdot \beta_{11} \cdot \cdot \cdot \beta_{121} \cdot b \cdot a \cdot \beta_{122} \cdot \gamma \) which has the same happens-before as \( \tau'_{n+1} \), if \( a \) and \( b \) are not \( \text{HB}^1; \text{STO}^2 \)-related, or \( \tau''_{n+1} = \alpha \cdot \beta_{11} \cdot \cdot \cdot \beta_{121} \cdot a \cdot b \cdot \beta_{122} \cdot \gamma \) which has the same happens-before as \( \tau'_{n+1} \), otherwise.

Second case: suppose \( c \) and \( b \) are not \( \text{HB}^1; \text{STO}^2 \)-related. We apply the induction hypothesis to \( \tau_{n+1} \) with respect to \( c \) and \( b \), and we get \( \tau''_{n+1} = \alpha \cdot a \cdot b \cdot a \cdot c \cdot \beta \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot }
Lemma 38. Let \( \tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma \) be a minimal violation such that isu\((p, t)\) happens-before del\((p', t)\) through \( \beta \). Then, \( \tau' = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta \cdot (p', t') \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma \) such that isu\((p, t)\) happens-before del\((p', t)\) through \( \beta \cdot (p', t') \), and (isu\((p, t), (p', t')\)) \( \in \) HB, and ((\( p', t'\)), del\((p_0, t)\)) \( \in \) HB\(^1\); STO\(^?\), is also a minimal violation.

Proof. From Lemma\(^37\) we know that there must exist an event isu\((p', t')\) such that (isu\((p', t'), \text{del}(p_0, t)\)) \( \in \) HB. Suppose isu\((p', t')\) is the last issue event that occurs in \( \beta \) such that (isu\((p', t'), \text{del}(p_0, t)\)) \( \in \) HB. Therefore, we can safely remove every issue event and atomic event which occur after isu\((p', t')\) with all related stores (i.e., stores of the issue events) and we obtain \( \tau_0 = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p', t') \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma \) such that \( \beta_1 \subseteq \beta \) and \( \beta_2 \subseteq \beta \) and the number of delays of \( \tau_0 \) is less or equal to the one of \( \tau \). Since \( \beta_2 \) contains only store events, then we can safely combine isu\((p', t')\) with all its store events and obtain \( \tau_1 = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot (p', t') \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma \) which has the same number of delays as \( \tau_0 \). If (isu\((p, t), (p', t')\)) \( \notin \) HB then we can swap the two events and obtain \( \tau_2 = \alpha \cdot (p', t') \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \beta_3 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma_2 \) as minimal violation as well.

Then, applying Lemma\(^37\) over \( \tau_2 \) and redoing the above process recursively, we can construct a minimal violation trace \( \tau' = \alpha' \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1' \cdot (p', t') \cdot \beta_2' \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma' \) which has the same number of delays as \( \tau \) (otherwise, we get a contradiction) such that isu\((p, t)\) happens-before del\((p', t)\) through \( \beta_1' \cdot (p', t') \cdot \beta_2' \cdot (isu(p, t), (p', t')) \) \( \in \) HB, ((\( p', t'\)), del\((p_0, t)\)) \( \in \) HB, and \( \beta_2' \) contains only store events.

Since in \( \beta_2' \) we have only store events and ((\( p', t'\)), del\((p_0, t)\)) \( \in \) HB and there is no other issue events of transaction \( t'' \neq t \) such that ((\( p', t'\)), isu\((p'', t'')\)) \( \in \) HB and (isu\((p'', t'')\), del\((p_0, t)\)) \( \in \) HB. Then, (isu\((p, t), (p', t')\)) \( \notin \) CO. Therefore, del\((p', t)\) \( \in \) \( \beta_2' \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma' \).

Given \( \tau' = \alpha' \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1' \cdot (p', t') \cdot \beta_2' \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma' \), we will demonstrate that the store events in \( \beta_2' \) can either be moved to \( \beta_1' \) or \( \gamma' \). If (\( (p', t'), \text{del}(p_0, t)\)) \( \in \) HB\(^1\); STO\(^?\) then we can safely move the store events in \( \beta_2' \) to \( \gamma' \) also we get that ((\( p', t'\)), del\((p', t)\)) \( \in \) HB\(^1\); STO\(^?\) (since del\((p', t)\) \( \in \) \( \beta_2' \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma' \)). Otherwise, there must exist a transaction \( t'' \) such that ((\( p', t'\)), del\((p_0, t'')\)) \( \in \) HB\(^1\); STO\(^?\) and (del\((p_0, t'')\), del\((p_0, t)\)) \( \in \) WW\(^+\). However, since \( t \) is the first delayed transaction then \( t'' \) was issued in \( \beta_1' \). We assume that in \( \beta_1' \) we don’t have an (\( p_1, t_1 \)) (or isu\((p_1, t_1)\)) event such that ((\( p_1, t_1\)), del\((p_1, t)\)) \( \in \) HB\(^1\); STO\(^?\) (or (isu\((p_1, t_1)\), del\((p_1, t)\)) \( \in \) HB\(^1\); STO\(^?\)). Thus, if (isu\((p'', t'')\), (\( p', t'\))) \( \in \) HB then we get a new minimal violation from \( \tau' \) without delaying transaction \( t \) (because of the cycle formed by (isu\((p'', t'')\), (\( p', t'\))) \( \in \) HB and ((\( p', t'\)), del\((p_0, t'')\)) \( \in \) HB\(^1\); STO\(^?\)). Therefore, if \( t \) was delayed over the issue event of another transaction which causally depends on it, we get a contradiction. If \( t \) was not delayed over another transaction which causally depends on it, we can safely remove \( t \) and related stores, and obtain \( \tau'' = \alpha' \cdot \beta_1' \cdot \text{isu}(p'', t'') \cdot \beta_2' \cdot (p', t') \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t'') \cdot \gamma'' \) such that (isu\((p'', t'')\), (\( p', t'\))) \( \in \) HB and ((\( p', t'\)), del\((p_0, t'')\)) \( \in \) HB\(^1\); STO\(^?\) which has the same number of violation.

Thus, in both cases we get a minimal violation trace \( \tau' = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta \cdot (p', t') \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma \) such that isu\((p, t)\) happens-before del\((p', t)\) through \( \beta \cdot (p', t') \), and (isu\((p, t), (p', t')\)) \( \in \) HB, and ((\( p', t'\)), del\((p_0, t)\)) \( \in \) HB\(^1\); STO\(^?\).

\footnote{4 Otherwise, we take \( t_1 \) instead of \( t' \) and repeat the same reasoning.}
E Proofs For Section 5.1 (Minimal Violations under CCv)

The characterization of minimal violations under CCv is stated in the following theorem where we state explicitly the properties of Theorem 6 that were given in Fig. 6. We say that a sequence of issue events $ev_i \cdot ev_{i+1} \cdots ev_n$ forms a causality chain when $(ev_i, ev_{i+1}) \in CO$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Also, for simplicity, we use “macro-events” $(p, t)$ even in traces obtained under causal consistency (recall that this notation was introduced to simplify serializable traces), i.e., we assume that any sequence of events formed of an issue $isu(p, t)$ followed immediately by all the store events $del(p', t)$ is replaced by $(p, t)$. Then, all the relations that held between an event $ev$ and such a sequence and another event $ev'$, e.g., $(ev, ev') \in PO$, are defined to hold as between the corresponding macro-event $(p, t)$ and $ev'$, e.g., $(p, t), ev') \in PO$.

Theorem 39. A program $P$ is not robust under CCv iff there exists a minimal violation $\tau$ under CCv such that one of the following must hold:

1. $\tau = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot (p_0, t_0) \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$ where:
   (a) $isu(p, t)$ is the issue of the first and only delayed transaction in $\tau$ (Lemmas 41 and 42);
   (b) $(isu(p, t), (p_0, t_0)) \in WW(x)$ and $(isu(p, t), (p_0, t_0)) \in RW(x)$ (Lemma 42);
   (c) $\forall a \in \beta_2, (isu(p, t), a) \in HB \setminus CO$ and $(a, (p_0, t_0)) \in CO$ (Lemma 42);
   (d) $\gamma$ contains only stores of $t$ (Lemma 36).

2. $\tau = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$ where:
   (a) $isu(p, t)$ and $isu(p_1, t_1)$ are the issues of the first and last delayed transactions in $\tau$ (Lemmas 41 and 42);
   (b) the issues of all the delayed transactions are in $\beta_1$ and they are included in a causality chain that starts with $isu(p, t)$ and ends with $isu(p_1, t_1)$ (Lemma 42);
   (c) for any event $a \in \beta_2$, we have that $(isu(p, t), a) \in HB \setminus CO$ and $(a, del(p_0, t)) \in HB$ (Lemma 42);
   (d) $isu(p_1, t_1)$ happens before $del(p_0, t)$ through $\beta_2$ (Lemma 41);
   (e) there exist events $a$ and $b$ in $\beta_2$ such that $(isu(p_1, t_1), a) \in WW(x) \cup RW(x)$ and $(b, del(p_0, t)) \in RW(y)$ with $x \neq y$ (Lemma 42);
   (f) all delayed transactions in $isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_1$ don’t access the variable $x$ (Lemma 42);
   (g) $\gamma$ contains only stores of delayed transactions that were issued in $\beta_1$ (Lemma 36).

Note that the theorem above allows $\beta = \epsilon, \gamma = \epsilon$, $p = p_1, t = t_1$, and $t_1$ to be a read-only transaction. If $t_1$ is a read-only transaction then $isu(p_1, t_1)$ has the same effect as $\equiv (p_1, t_1)$ and $t_1$ does not contain actions that may or may not be visible. The delayed transactions in $\beta_1$ cannot create a cycle in the transactional happens-before (otherwise, $\alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma'$ would be a violation with a smaller number of delays than $\tau$, which contradicts minimality). Moreover, (c) implies that $\beta_2$ contains no stores of delayed transactions from $\beta$. If this were the case, then either these stores can be reordered after $del(p_0, t)$ or if this is not possible due to happens-before constraints, then necessarily there would exist an issue event which is after such a store in the happens-before order and thus causally after $isu(p, t)$.

We start with an important of property of the store order relation WW that is enforced by CCv semantics since the writes of different transactions are “visible” to different processes in the same order given by their timestamps.
Lemma 40. Let \( \tau \in \mathcal{T}_{CO}(\mathcal{P}) \) be a trace. If \( (isu(p_0, t_0), del(p_0, t_1)) \in WW(x) \) where \( del(p_0, t_1) \) is the store of \( t_1 \) issued by \( p_1 \), then \( (isu(p_1, t_1), del(p_1, t_0)) \not\in WW(x) \) and for every other process \( p \not\in \{p_0, p_1\} \) we have that \( (del(p, t_1), del(p, t_0)) \not\in WW(x) \).

Let \( \tau = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta \cdot del(p, t) \cdot \gamma \) be a trace such that \( (isu(p, t), isu(p_1, t_1)) \in CO \) and \( (isu(p_1, t_1), del(p_0, t)) \in HB \). Then, we say that \( isu(p_1, t_1) \) was overstepped by \( del(p_0, t) \).

The following lemma characterizes the relation between the last delayed transaction that was overstepped by the first delayed transaction and the store of the first delayed transaction. Also, it shows the nature of the first and last happens-before relations in the happens-before path between the issue of the last delayed transaction and the store of the first delayed transaction.

Lemma 41. Let \( \tau = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta \cdot del(p, t) \cdot \gamma \) be a minimal violation under \( COv \). Then, one of the following three cases must hold:

1. \( \sigma = \{c \in \beta \mid (isu(p, t), c) \in CO\} \) is empty and
   \[
   \tau = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta \cdot del(p, t) \cdot \gamma
   \]
   \[\text{where:}\]
   \( (a) \) \( (isu(p, t), (p_0, t_0)) \in WW(x) \) and \( ((p_0, t_0), isu(p, t)) \in RW(x) \);
   \( (b) \) \( \forall a \in \beta. (isu(p, t), a) \in HB \setminus CO \) and \( (a, (p_0, t_0)) \in CO \).

2. \( \sigma = \{c \in \beta \mid (isu(p, t), c) \in CO\} \) is empty and
   \[
   \tau = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta \cdot del(p, t) \cdot \gamma
   \]
   \[\text{where:}\]
   \( (a) \) \( isu(p, t) \) happens-before \( del(p_0, t) \) through \( \beta \);
   \( (b) \) \( \forall a \in \beta. (isu(p, t), a) \in HB \setminus CO \) and \( (a, del(p_0, t)) \in HB \);
   \( (c) \) there exist events \( a \) and \( b \) in \( \beta \) such that \( (isu(p, t), a) \in WW(x) \cup RW(x) \), \( (b, del(p_0, t)) \in RW(y) \), and \( x \neq y \).

3. \( \sigma = \{c \in \beta \mid (isu(p, t), c) \in CO\} \) is not empty and \( isu(p_1, t_1) \) is the last issue from \( \sigma \) in \( \tau \), then
   \[
   \tau = \alpha \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma
   \]
   \[\text{where:}\]
   \( (a) \) \( isu(p_1, t_1) \) happens-before \( del(p_0, t) \) through \( \beta_2 \);
   \( (b) \) for any event \( a \in \beta_2 \), we have that \( (isu(p, t), a) \in HB \setminus CO \) and \( (a, del(p_0, t)) \in HB \);
   \( (c) \) there exist events \( a \) and \( b \) in \( \beta_2 \) such that \( (isu(p_1, t_1), a) \in WW(x) \cup RW(x) \), \( (b, del(p_0, t)) \in RW(y) \), and \( x \neq y \).

Proof. It is important to note that \( ((p_0, t_0), isu(p, t)) \in RW(x) \) iff \( ((p_0, t_0), del(p, t)) \in RW(x) \cup STO \).

First, suppose that \( \sigma \) is empty. We know that from Lemma 32 there must exist \( b \in \beta \) such that \( (isu(p, t), b) \in HB^1; STO \) and \( (b, del(p_0, t)) \in HB \). Thus, let \( b \) be the first event of \( \beta \), i.e., \( \beta = b \cdot \beta_1 \). We know that \( \beta \) does not contain events that are related to \( isu(p, t) \) through \( CO \) (which includes \( PO \cup WR \) ), therefore, the only possibilities are \( (isu(p, t), b) \in WW; STO \) or \( (isu(p, t), b) \in RW; STO \). Note that if \( (isu(p, t), del(p_0, t)) \in RW \cup WW \) it does not imply \( (isu(p, t), del(p_0, t)) \in CO \) unless \( (isu(p, t), (p_0, t_0)) \in CO \).

It is impossible that \( b = del(p_0, t) \). If it were the case, then \( (b, del(p_0, t)) \in HB \) would imply the existence of another event \( isu(p, t_2) \) which occurs after \( b \) and before \( del(p_0, t) \). However, since \( (isu(p, t), isu(p, t_2)) \in CO \) we get a contradiction to the fact that \( \sigma \) is empty.

Also, from Lemma 35 there must exist \( c = (p_3, t_3) \) such that \( \beta_1 = \beta_2 \cdot c \) (\( c \) and \( b \) might be equal) where \( (c, del(p_0, t)) \in HB^1; STO \). Which, either implies \( (c, del(p_0, t)) \in HB^1; STO \) or \( (c, del(p_0, t)) \in HB^1 \). If \( (c, del(p_0, t)) \in HB^1; STO \) and \( (c, del(p_0, t)) \not\in HB^1 \).
Then, \((c, \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in (RW \cup WW); \text{STO}\) and \((c, \text{del}(p_0, t)) \not\in RW \cup WW\) which means that \text{del}(p_0, t) discarded some write which is possible only if \(c\) and \(t\) write to the same shared variable (see Lemma 40). We obtain that \((\text{isu}(p, t), c) \in WW\). Thus, assuming that for every \(a \in \beta\), \((\text{isu}(p, t), a) \notin \text{HB}\), we can safely remove \(a\) from \(\beta\) if \((a, c) \not\in \text{CO}\) and the obtained trace is a violation since \((\text{isu}(p, t), c) \in WW\) and \((c, \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in (RW \cup WW); \text{STO}\).

Otherwise, the only remaining cases are \(b = (p_4, t_4)\) such that \((\text{isu}(p, t), b) \in WW(x)\) or \((\text{isu}(p, t), b) \in RW(x)\) such that \((b, c) \in \text{HB}\) and \((c, \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in \text{HB}^1\) (and \(b\) and \(c\) are identical) which is possible only if \((c, \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in RW(y)\), for some \(y\). We assume \(c\) corresponds to the first transaction in \(\beta\) that reads from the shared variable \(y\) written by \(t\).

Now, we show by contradiction that \(x\) and \(y\) cannot be equal. Consider the case \((\text{isu}(p, t), b) \in RW(x)\) and \(b = (p_4, t_4)\) which implies \(b \neq \text{del}(p_0, t)\). However, \((\text{isu}(p, t), b) \in RW(x)\) implies that \(t_4\) writes to the variable \(x\), therefore, if \(x = y\) then \((\text{isu}(p, t), \text{del}(p, t_4)) \in WW(x)\) and \((\text{del}(p_0, t_4), \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in WW(x)\) (because \((c, \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in RW(y)\) which is not possible under \(\text{CCV}\) (Lemma 40). Thus, \(x \neq y\). The remaining cases are similar.

Second, assume that \(\sigma\) is not empty. If all the elements of \(\sigma\) are store events, we obtain the same characterization as in the first case. Since \(\tau\) does not contain an issue event that is causally related to \(\text{isu}(p, t)\) (because \(\sigma\) contains only stores) then all stores in \(\sigma\) are stores of \(t\) (it is the first delayed transaction in \(\tau\)). Given \(\text{del}(p_2, t) \in \sigma\), if \((\text{del}(p_2, t), \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in \text{HB}\) then there must exist \(c \in \beta\) such that \((\text{del}(p_2, t), c) \in (\text{PO} \cup WW \cup \text{WR} \cup \text{STO} \cup RW)\) and \((c, \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in \text{HB}\), and since \(\sigma\) contains stores of \(t\) then \((\text{del}(p_2, t), c) \in WW(x)\) and \(c = (p_3, t_3)\) which implies \((\text{isu}(p, t), c) \in WW(x)\). Thus, we can remove \(\text{del}(p_2, t)\) from \(\tau\) (because no event in \(\beta\) depends on \(\text{del}(p_2, t)\)) obtaining \(\tau'\) and we still have \((\text{isu}(p, t), c) \in WW(x)\) and \((c, \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in \text{HB}\) in \(\tau'\). Therefore, we obtain a new minimal violation trace \(\tau'\) with the same delay number and happens-before as \(\tau\) where in \(\tau'\), \(\sigma\) is empty. Thus, we obtain a minimal violation traces as in the first case.

Otherwise, let \(d = \text{isu}(p_1, t_1)\) be the last issue event in \(\sigma\), i.e., \(\beta = \beta_1 \cdot d \cdot \beta_2\) where all the events in \(\beta_2\) are either stores of transactions that are causally related to \(\text{isu}(p, t)\) (we can safely remove these stores or move them to be part of \(\gamma\)) or other events that are not causally related to \(\text{isu}(p, t)\). We also have that \(\text{isu}(p, t)\) is in causal order before \(d\).

In the current case, we cannot have \(c = (p_1, t_2) \in \beta_2\) such that \((c, \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in \text{HB}^1; \text{STO}\) and \((c, \text{del}(p_0, t)) \not\in \text{HB}^1\). Because if it were the case then we can obtain a new minimal violation by removing all events related to \(t_1\) and we have a cycle that is formed by \((\text{isu}(p, t), c) \in \text{HB}^1\) and \((c, \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in \text{HB}^1; \text{STO}\), which is a contradiction because the new minimal violation has less number of delays then the original one because \(t\) was not delayed after \(t'\).

We obtain that \(\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma\). Similar to before, we must have \(b, c \in \beta_2\) such that \((\text{isu}(p_1, t_1), b) \in WW(y)\) or \((\text{isu}(p_1, t_1), b) \in RW(y)\), and \((b, c) \in \text{HB}\), and \((c, \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in RW(x)\) (note that we may have \(b = c\)). We show that \(x \neq y\). Assume by contradiction that \(x = y\). Consider the case \((\text{isu}(p_1, t_1), b) \in RW(x)\) and \(b\) an event of a transaction \(t_2\) issued by a process \(p_2\). Since \((c, \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in RW(x)\), we have that \(t\) writes to \(x\). Therefore, we obtain \((\text{isu}(p, t), \text{del}(p_2, t_2)) \in WW(x)\) and \((\text{del}(p_0, t_2), \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in WW(x)\) which is not possible under \(\text{CCV}\) semantics (Lemma 40). Thus, \(x \neq y\). The other cases can be handled in a similar way.

In the rest of this section we focus on minimal violations that satisfy the third case in Lemma 40 (the proofs concerning the first two cases are similar and simpler). For a minimal violation \(\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma\), the transactions \(t\) and \(t_1\) are involved in a cycle in the transactional happens-before \(\text{HB}_t\). By an abuse of terminology, we say that \((\text{isu}(p, t), \text{isu}(p_1, t_1), \text{del}(p_0, t))\) is a happens-before cycle. The following lemma shows that we can always obtain a minimal violation trace where \(\beta_2\) contains no delayed
Lemma 42. Let \( \tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma \) be a minimal violation. Then, there exist \( \beta'_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma' \) a minimal violation, where \( \beta'_1 \) contains no delayed transactions (\( \tau' \) is obtained from \( \tau \), and \( \tau \) and \( \tau' \) can be equal).

Proof. We consider two cases in the proof: first case is when \( t_1 \) and \( t \) are two distinct transactions, in which we prove by contradiction that \( \beta_2 \) cannot contain a delayed transaction. The second case is when \( t_1 \) and \( t \) correspond to the same transaction, in which we extract new minimal violation trace where we remove the transaction \( t \) from the original minimal violation trace.

First case: Suppose by contradiction that \( \beta_2 \) contains a delayed transaction \( t_0 \) issued by a process \( q \neq p \). Then, \( \tau \) is of the form
\[
\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{isu}(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma
\]
We can notice that if we don’t have a happens-before relation between \( \text{isu}(q_1, t_0') \) and \( \text{del}(q_0, t_0) \) then we can reorder them and obtain new trace with less number of delays. Thus, \( \text{isu}(q_1, t_0') \) and \( \text{del}(q_0, t_0) \) are related by a happens-before through relation. We obtain a new happens-before cycle formed by \( (\text{isu}(q_0, t_0), \text{isu}(q_1, t_0'), \text{del}(q_0, t_0)) \), hence, we deduce that we can get a violation when the event \( \text{del}(q_0, t_0) \) is executed, thus we can remove all issued transactions from \( \beta_2 \) except stores of already issued transactions and we obtain:
\[
\tau' = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{isu}(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma
\]
which is a minimal violation because of the cycle formed by \( (\text{isu}(q_0, t_0), \text{isu}(q_1, t_0'), \text{del}(q_0, t_0)) \) and its number of delays is less or equal to the one of \( \tau \). We know that in \( \beta_2 \cdot \text{isu}(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma \) there are no issued transactions from the process \( p_1 \) or that see the transactions of \( p_1 \). Therefore, \( \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \) is the last issued transaction from \( p_1 \) and we don’t have any transaction in \( \tau' \) that depends on it. Thus, we can remove \( \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \) and we obtain a valid execution:
\[
\tau'' = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{isu}(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma'
\]
\( \tau'' \) is a violating execution’s trace because of the cycle formed by \( (\text{isu}(q_0, t_0), \text{isu}(q_1, t_0'), \text{del}(q_0, t_0)) \) and has less number of delays than \( \tau' \), a contradiction (\( \text{del}(p_0, t) \) did not bypass \( \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \) that was removed).

Second case: Suppose that \( \beta_2 \) contains a delayed transaction \( t_0 \) issued by a process \( q \neq p \). Then, \( \tau \) is of the form
\[
\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{isu}(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{isu}(q_1, t_0') \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma
\]
Similar to the justification in the previous case, we can safely remove \( \text{isu}(p, t) \) and its related stores in \( \text{del}(p_0, t) \gamma \). We obtain a new trace:
\[
\tau' = \alpha \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{isu}(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{isu}(q_1, t_0') \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \gamma'
\]
which has the same number of delays as \( \tau \) and \( \tau' \) contains a cycle formed by \( (\text{isu}(q, t_0), \text{isu}(q_1, t_0'), \text{del}(q_0, t_0)) \). We recursively repeat the same reasoning we did for \( \tau \) with \( \tau' \) until we obtain a contradiction or a minimal violation trace where \( \beta_2 \) (\( \beta_2 \)) does not contain a delayed transaction.
Note that the above proof steps hold in the case \(isu(q, t_0)\) and \(isu(q_1, t_0')\) are identical as well.

Next, we demonstrate that a minimal violation cannot have a transaction in \(\beta_1\) that was delayed after the first delayed transaction but it is not causally dependent on it. We prove this lemma by showing that if this were possible then we can remove a transaction that is causally dependent on one of the two delayed transactions and obtain a new violation with less number of delays, which contradicts the minimality assumption.

**Lemma 43.** Let \(\tau = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot C\) be a minimal violation. Then, \(isu(p, t)\) is causally related (i.e., in the relation CO) to all the issue events of delayed transactions in \(\beta\).

**Proof.** Assume by contradiction that \(\beta_1\) contains a delayed transaction \(t_0\) from another process \(q \neq p\) that is not causally related \(isu(p, t)\). Hence, \(\tau\) can be of one of the following forms:

(a) \(\tau = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_{11} \cdot isu(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_{12} \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_{21} \cdot isu(q_1, t_0') \cdot \beta_{22} \cdot del(q_0, t_0) \cdot C\)

(b) \(\tau = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_{11} \cdot isu(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_{12} \cdot isu(q_1, t_0') \cdot \beta_{13} \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_{21} \cdot del(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_{22} \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot C\)

(c) \(\tau = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_{11} \cdot isu(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_{12} \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_{21} \cdot del(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_{22} \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot C\)

Case a: we must have \((isu(q_1, t_0'), del(q_0, t_0))\) ∈ HB, otherwise, we can reorder the two events and obtain a new trace with less number of delays. Hence, \((isu(q, t_0), isu(q_1, t_0'), del(q_0, t_0))\) forms a happens-before cycle in \(\tau\). Since in \(\gamma_1: isu(q_1, t_0') < del(q_0, t_0)\) there is no an issued transaction that depends on \(isu(p_1, t_1)\), therefore, \(isu(p_1, t_1)\) is the last issued transaction by \(p_1\) and we can remove it and obtain a new valid trace:

\[\tau' = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_{11} \cdot isu(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_{12} \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \gamma_1 \cdot isu(q_1, t_0') \cdot \gamma_2 \cdot del(q_0, t_0) \cdot \gamma_3 \cdot del(p_0, t)\]

The trace \(\tau'\) is a violation because of the happens-before cycle \((isu(q, t_0), isu(q_1, t_0'), del(q_0, t_0))\) and has less number of delays than \(\tau\) since \(del(p_0, t)\) was not delayed after \(isu(p_1, t_1)\), a contradiction.

Case b: for the same reason as in the case a, we conclude that the tuple \((isu(q, t_0), isu(q_1, t_0'), del(q_0, t_0))\) forms a happens-before cycle in \(\tau\). Hence, after executing \(del(q_0, t_0)\) we get a violation, thus we can remove all issued transactions in \(\beta_{22}\) and keep only the stores of already issued transactions and we obtain:

\[\tau' = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_{11} \cdot isu(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_{12} \cdot isu(q_1, t_0') \cdot \gamma_1 \cdot isu(q_1, t_0') \cdot \gamma_2 \cdot del(q_0, t_0) \cdot \gamma_3 \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma'\]

\(\tau'\) is a violation because of the happens-before cycle \((isu(q, t_0), isu(q_1, t_0'), del(q_0, t_0))\) and has less or equal number of delays as \(\tau\). In \(\tau'\), we should have \((isu(p_1, t_1), del(p_0, t))\) ∈ HB, otherwise, we can reorder the two events and obtain a new trace with less number of delays.

Hence, \((isu(p, t), isu(p_1, t_1), del(p_0, t))\) forms a cycle in \(\tau'\). Similar to the previous case, since in \(\beta_{13} \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_{21} \cdot del(q_0, t_0) \cdot \gamma_4 \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma'\) there is no an event that depends on \(isu(q_1, t_0')\), therefore, \(isu(q_1, t_0')\) is the last issued transaction by \(q_1\) and we can safely remove it and its associated stores and obtain a new valid trace:

\[\tau'' = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_{11} \cdot isu(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_{12} \cdot \beta_{13} \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \gamma_1 \cdot \beta_{21} \cdot del(q_0, t_0) \cdot \gamma_2 \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma''\]

The trace \(\tau''\) is a violation because of the happens-before cycle \((isu(p, t), isu(p_1, t_1), del(p_0, t))\) and has less number of delays than \(\tau'\), since \(del(q_0, t_0)\) was not delayed after \(isu(q_1, t_0')\), a contradiction.

Case c. We know that if we don’t have a happens-before relation between \(isu(p_1, t_1)\) and \(del(q_0, t_0)\) then we can reorder the two events and obtain new trace with less number of
Lemma 44. \( \text{Let } \tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma \text{ be a minimal violation. Then, for every issue event ev in } \{c \in \beta_1 \mid (\text{isu}(p, t), c) \in \text{CO} \} \text{ of a delayed transaction, we have that } (ev, \text{isu}(p_1, t_1)) \in \text{CO}. \)

**Proof.** Assume by contradiction that \( \tau \) contains an issue \( \text{isu}(q, t_0) \) of a delayed transaction which is not causally before \( \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \). Then,

\[
\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma
\]

We know that \( \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma \) contains no issue of transaction that is causally after \( \text{isu}(q, t_0) \), which implies that \( t_0 \) is the last transaction issued by \( g \) in \( \tau \). Thus, we can safely remove \( \text{isu}(q, t_0) \) (and all related store events in \( \gamma \)) and obtain:

\[
\tau' = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma_1
\]
which is a violation because of the happens-before cycle formed by \((isu(p, t), isu(p_1, t_1), del(p_0, t))\) and it has less number of delays because \(t\) was not delayed after \(isu(q, t_0)\), a contradiction.

Next, we show that all delayed transactions in \(isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_1\) don’t access the shared variable \(x\) that starts the happens-before path in \(\beta_2\) (mentioned in the Lemma [11]). If this was not the case, then the last delayed transaction can be removed and still guarantee a happens-before path to \(del(p_0, t)\) (starting in the delayed transaction accessing the variable \(x\)), thus obtaining a trace with less number of delays, which contradicts the minimality assumption.

\(\blacktriangleright\) Lemma 45. Let \(\tau = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma\) be a minimal violation such that there exists an event \(a\) in \(\beta_2\) with \((isu(p_1, t_1), a) \in WW(x) \cup RW(x)\). Then, all the delayed transactions in \(isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_1\) don’t access the shared variable \(x\).

**Proof.** Suppose by contradiction that we have an issue \(isu(p_2, t_2)\) in \(isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_1\) which accesses the shared variable \(x\) with either a load or store instruction. Then, in both cases \((isu(p_2, t_2), a) \in WW(x) \cup RW(x)\) because \(\beta_2 \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma\) does not contain any transaction that causally depends on \(isu(p_1, t_1)\). Therefore, \(isu(p_1, t_1)\) is the last issued transaction by the process \(p_1\) and we can remove it and all related stores in \(\gamma\) to obtain:

\[\tau' = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_{11} \cdot isu(p_2, t_2) \cdot \beta_{12} \cdot \beta_2 \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma'\]

which is a violation because of the happens-before cycle formed by \((isu(p, t), isu(p_2, t_2), del(p_0, t))\). Furthermore, \(\tau'\) has less delays, a contradiction to minimality.

\(\blacktriangleright\) Lemma 46. Let \(\tau = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta \cdot (p_0, t_0) \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma\) be a minimal violation such that \(isu(p, t)\) happens-before \(del(p_0, t)\) through \(\beta \cdot (p_0, t_0)\), and \((isu(p, t), (p_0, t_0)) \in HB\), and \((p_0, t_0), del(p_0, t)) \in HB^1; STO. If \(((p_0, t_0), del(p_0, t)) \in HB^1; STO\) and \((p_0, t_0), del(p_0, t)) \not\in HB^1\) then \((isu(p, t), (p_0, t_0)) \in WW\).

**Proof.** \((p_0, t_0), del(p_0, t)) \in HB^1; STO implies that \(((p_0, t_0), isu(p, t)) \in HB^1\). Also, since \((p_0, t_0)\) occurs after \(isu(p, t)\) and \((isu(p, t), (p_0, t_0)) \in HB\) then \(((p_0, t_0), isu(p, t)) \not\in CO\), hence, \(((p_0, t_0), isu(p, t)) \in (WW \cup RW)\) and since in \(CC_v\) semantics the store order is based on timestamps, thus \(((p_0, t_0), isu(p, t)) \in RW\). This is possible only if there exist a transaction \(t_2\) such that \(((p_2, t_2), (p_0, t_0)) \in WR\) and \(((p_2, t_2), isu(p, t)) \in WW\) or \((p_0, t_0, t) \not\in EOF\) reads an initial value that \(isu(p, t)\) tries to overwrite. Also, since \(((p_0, t_0), del(p_0, t)) \not\in HB^1\) then \(((p_0, t_0), del(p_0, t)) \not\in RW\) which means that \(del(p_0, t)\) discarded some write to a variable \(x\) where \(((p_0, t_0), isu(p, t)) \in RW(x)\) and \(((p_0, t_0), del(p_0, t)) \not\in RW(x)\). Therefore, there must exist a transaction \(t_3\) which occurs after \(isu(p, t)\) and before \(del(p_0, t)\) which writes \(x\) at process \(p_0\). Since the \(t_0\) reads from the write of \(t_2\) or reads the initial value, thus, the transaction \(t_3\) refers to \(t_0\) where the write \(x\) occurs after the read from \(x\). Therefore, both \(t_0\) and \(t\) write to \(x\) which implies that \((isu(p, t), (p_0, t_0)) \in WW(x)\).

**F Proofs For Section 5.2 (Minimal Violations under CM)**

The following theorem gives the characterization of minimal violations under \(CM\) where we state explicitly the properties of Theorem [1], that were given in Fig. [14]. Roughly, a program is not robust if it admits a minimal violation which can either be because of two “concurrent” transactions (which are not causally related) that write to the same variable or because of a restriction of the pattern admitted by \(CC_v\) where the last delayed transaction must be related only by \(RW\) in a happens-before path with future transactions. The first pattern is not admitted by \(CC_v\) because the writes to each variable are executed according to the timestamp order (\(CM\) doesn’t hold the \(CC_v\) property stated in Lemma [10]).
Theorem 47. A program $\mathcal{P}$ is not robust under CM iff there exists a minimal violation $\tau$ under CM such that one of the following must hold:

1. $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot (p_0, t_0) \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$, where:
   
   (a) $\text{isu}(p, t)$ is the issue of the first and only delayed transaction in $\tau$ (Lemma 48);
   
   (b) $((p_0, t_0), \text{isu}(p, t)) \in \text{WW}(x)$ and $((p_0, t_0), \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in \text{WW}(x)$ (Lemma 48);
   
   (c) $\forall a \in \beta_2$, $((\text{isu}(p, t), a) \in \text{HB} \setminus \text{CO}$ and $(a, (p_0, t')) \in \text{CO}$ (Lemma 48);
   
   (d) $\gamma$ contains only stores of $t$ (Lemma 37).

2. $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$, where
   
   (a) $\text{isu}(p, t)$ and $\text{isu}(p_1, t_1)$ are the issues of the first and last delayed transactions in $\tau$ (Lemmas 48 and 49);
   
   (b) the issues of all the delayed transactions are in $\beta_1$ and they are included in a causality chain that starts with $\text{isu}(p, t)$ and ends with $\text{isu}(p_1, t_1)$ (Lemma 48);
   
   (c) for any event $a \in \beta_2$, we have that $((\text{isu}(p, t), a) \in \text{HB} \setminus \text{CO}$ and $(a, \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in \text{HB}$ (Lemma 48);
   
   (d) $\text{isu}(p_1, t_1)$ happens before $\text{del}(p_0, t)$ through $\beta_2$ (Lemma 48);
   
   (e) there exist events $a$ and $b$ in $\beta_2$ such that $((\text{isu}(p_1, t_1), a) \in \text{RW}(x)$ and $\text{del}(p_0, t) \in \text{RW}(y)$ with $x \neq y$ (Lemma 48);
   
   (f) all delayed transactions in $\text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1$ don’t access the variable $x$;
   
   (g) $\gamma$ contains only stores of delayed transactions that were issued in $\beta_1$ (Lemma 37).

In this section, we give the lemmas that constitute the properties of minimal violations traces under causal memory semantics, and which need different arguments than those used for causal convergence (see Section 4).

In the first case of Lemma 41 under $\text{CCv}$ model, we have that $((p_0, t_0), \text{isu}(p, t)) \in \text{WW}(x)$ and $((p_0, t_0), \text{isu}(p, t)) \in \text{WW}(x)$. Which under $\text{CM}$ model implies that $((p_0, t_0), \text{isu}(p, t)) \in \text{WW}(x)$ and $((p_0, t_0), \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in \text{WW}(x)$ since $\text{del}$ events in $\text{CM}$ semantics do not discard writes. Therefore, we obtain the case of write-write race.

The next lemma describes the different varieties of minimal violations and characterizes the relation between the last delayed transaction that was overstepped by the first delayed transaction and the store of the first delayed transaction.

Lemma 48. Let $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$ be a minimal violation under CM. Then, one of the following three cases must hold:

1. there exist $(p_0, t_0) \in \beta$ where $(\text{isu}(p, t), (p_0, t_0)) \notin \text{CO}$, $(\text{isu}(p, t), (p_0, t_0)) \in \text{WW}$, and $((p_0, t_0), \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in \text{HB}$. Therefore,
   
   $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot (p_0, t_0) \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t)$ where:
   
   (a) $\beta_2 \subseteq \beta$ and $\forall a \in \beta_2$, $(\text{isu}(p, t), a) \in \text{HB}$ and $(a, (p_0, t_0)) \in \text{CO}$.
   
2. if $\sigma = \{c \in \beta \mid ((\text{isu}(p, t), c) \in \text{CO} \}$ is empty, then
   
   $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t)$ where:
   
   (a) $\beta_2 \subseteq \beta$ and $\text{isu}(p, t)$ happens before $\text{del}(p_0, t)$ through $\beta_2$;
   
   (b) there exist events $a$ and $b$ in $\beta_2$ such that $(\text{isu}(p, t), a) \in \text{RW}(x)$, $(b, \text{del}(p_0, t)) \in \text{RW}(y)$, and $x \neq y$.
   
3. if $\sigma = \{c \in \beta \mid ((\text{isu}(p, t), c) \in \text{CO} \}$ is not empty and $\text{isu}(p_1, t_1)$ is the last issue event from $\sigma$ in $\tau$, then
   
   $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$ where:
(a) $\beta_1 \subset \beta$, $\beta_2 \subset \beta$, and $\text{isu}(p_1,t_1)$ happens before $\text{del}(p_0,t)$ through $\beta_2$; (b) there exist events $a$ and $b$ in $\beta_2$ such that $(\text{isu}(p_1,t_1), a) \in \text{RW}(x)$, $(b, \text{del}(p_0,t)) \in \text{RW}(y)$, and $x \neq y$.

**Proof.** First, assume that $\beta$ contains a transaction $(p_0,t_0)$ that is concurrent with $(p,t)$, i.e., $(\text{isu}(p,t), (p_0,t_0)) \not\in \text{CO}$, and which writes to a common shared variable with $(p,t)$. Therefore, we obtain that $(\text{isu}(p,t), (p_0,t_0)) \in \text{WW}$. Also, we must get $((p_0,t_0), \text{del}(p_0,t)) \in \text{WW}$ as well. Then, we get a happens-before cycle formed by $(\text{isu}(p,t), (p_0,t_0), \text{del}(p_0,t))$ where $p$ and $p_0$ are two different processes executing two concurrent transactions. Thus, we can build a violation $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p,t) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot (p_0,t_0) \cdot \text{del}(p_0,t)$ by executing all transactions of $p$ that are before $t$ and their causal past, and all transactions of $p_0$ and their causal past, then executing $t$ and $t_0$, and removing all events from $\beta$ which occur after $\text{isu}(p,t)$ and are not part of the causal past of $(p_0,t_0)$ resulting in $\beta_2$.

Second, assume that $\beta$ contains no transaction like above, and that the set of events $\sigma = \{ c \in \beta \mid (\text{isu}(p,t), c) \in \text{CO} \}$ is empty. We know that from Lemma 32 there must exist $b \in \beta$ such that $(\text{isu}(p,t), b) \in \text{HB}$ and $(b, \text{del}(p_0,t)) \in \text{HB}$. Hence, let $b$ be the first event of $\beta$, i.e., $\beta = b \cdot \beta_1$. We know that $\beta$ does not contain actions that are causally related to $\text{isu}(p,t)$ (which includes $\text{PO} \cup \text{WR}$), therefore, the only possibilities are $(\text{isu}(p,t), b) \in \text{WW}$ or $(\text{isu}(p,t), b) \in \text{RW}$. However, if $(\text{isu}(p,t), b) \in \text{WW}$ we get the previous case, which is a contradiction to the hypothesis of the current case. Also, we have that $b \neq \text{del}(p_2,t_2)$, for any $t_2$, using a similar argument as in Lemma 33. The only remaining case is $b = (p_2,t_2)$ and $(\text{isu}(p,t), b) \in \text{RW}(x)$, which implies $b \neq \text{del}(p_0,t)$. Then, there exists $c \in \beta$ such that $(c, \text{del}(p_0,t)) \in \text{RW}(y)$, for some $y$. We assume $c$ is the first transaction in $\beta$ that has a load that reads from any shared variable $y$ that $t$ writes to. However, $(\text{isu}(p,t), b) \in \text{RW}(x)$ implies that $b$ writes to $x$, therefore, if $x = y$ then $(\text{isu}(p,t), (p_2,t_2)) \in \text{WW}(x)$, hence, we obtain the first case, a contradiction to the hypothesis. Thus, $x \neq y$.

Third, assume that $\beta$ contains no transaction like in first case, and that the set of events $\sigma = \{ c \in \beta \mid (\text{isu}(p,t), c) \in \text{CO} \}$ is not empty and $t_3$ from the first case does not exist. If all the elements of $\sigma$ are stores we obtain the same characterization as the previous case.

Since $\tau$ does not contain an issue of transaction that is causally related to $\text{isu}(p,t)$ (because $\sigma$ contains only stores) then all stores in $\sigma$ are stores of $t$ (it is the first delayed transaction in $\tau$). Given $\text{del}(p_2,t) \in \sigma$, if $(\text{del}(p_2,t), \text{del}(p_0,t)) \in \text{HB}$ then there must exist $c \in \beta$ such that $(\text{del}(p_2,t), c) \in (\text{PO} \cup \text{WW} \cup \text{WR} \cup \text{STO} \cup \text{RW})$ and $(c, \text{del}(p_0,t)) \in \text{HB}$, and since $\sigma$ contains stores of $t$ then $(\text{del}(p_2,t), c) \in \text{WW}(x)$ and $c = (p_3,t_3)$ which implies $(\text{isu}(p,t), c) \in \text{WW}(x)$. Thus, we can remove $\text{del}(p_2,t)$ from $\tau$ (because no event in $\beta$ depends on $\text{del}(p_2,t)$) obtaining $\tau'$ and we still have $(\text{isu}(p,t), c) \in \text{WW}(x)$ and $(c, \text{del}(p_0,t)) \in \text{HB}$ in $\tau'$. Therefore, we obtain a new minimal violation trace $\tau'$ with the same delay number and happens-before as $\tau$ where in $\tau'$, $\sigma$ is empty. Thus, we obtain a minimal violation trace as in the second case.

Otherwise, let $d = \text{isu}(p_1,t_1)$ be the last non-store event in $\{ c \in \beta \mid ((p,t),c) \in \text{CO} \}$, i.e., $\beta = \beta_1 \cdot d \cdot \beta_2$ which means that all events in $\beta_2$ are either stores of transactions that are causally related to $t$ or other transactions that are not causally related to $t$. Thus, $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p,t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1,t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0,t) \cdot \gamma$. Then, $(\text{isu}(p_1,t_1), \text{del}(p_0,t)) \in \text{HB}$ or we can swap the two events and we get a new trace with less number of delays (a contradiction to minimality). Hence, we must have $b, c \in \beta_2$ such that $(\text{isu}(p_1,t_1), b) \in \text{WW}(y)$ or $(\text{isu}(p_1,t_1), b) \in \text{RW}(y)$ and $(b, c) \in \text{HB}$ and $(c, \text{del}(p_0,t)) \in \text{RW}(x)$. It is not possible that $(\text{isu}(p_1,t_1), b) \in \text{WW}(y)$ because if it were the case then we can remove all elements from $\beta_2$ except $b = (p_2,t_2)$ and its causal past, $\beta_2 = \beta_2 \cdot (p_2,t_2)$, and add the store $\text{del}(p_0,t_1)$ (and its causal past of stores, $\gamma$) to $\tau$ and we obtain:

$$\tau' = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p,t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1,t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot (p_2,t_2) \cdot \text{del}(p_0,t) \cdot \gamma \cdot \text{del}(p_0,t_1)$$
Lemma 49. We will prove either we obtain a contradiction or we can extract a new minimal violation trace $\tau'$ after isu($p_1, t'$), thus, we obtain:

$$\tau'' = \alpha \cdot (p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot (p_2, t_2) \cdot \gamma' \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t_1)$$

$\tau''$ contains the same happens-before cycle as $\tau'$ and its number of delays is less than $\tau'$, a contradiction.

We show that $x \neq y$. Consider the case, (isu($p_1, t_1$), $b$) $\in$ RW($x$) and $b = (p_2, t_2)$. If $x = y$, we obtain that (isu($p, t$), (p_2, t_2)) $\in$ WW($x$) and ((p_2, t_2), del($p_0, t_1$)) $\in$ WW($x$). Thus, $b$ satisfies the conditions of the first case of the lemma which we assumed are not satisfied in our current case, a contradiction. Therefore, $x \neq y$.

Next, we show that for a given minimal violation trace, we can obtain another minimal violation where there are no delayed transactions in $\beta_2$. The proof of this lemma has many similarities with the proof of Lemma 42.

Lemma 49. Let $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$ be a minimal violation. Then, there are no delayed transactions in $\beta_2$. Then, there exist $\tau' = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1' \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2' \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma'$ a minimal violation, where $\beta_2'$ contains no delayed transactions ($\tau'$ is obtained from $\tau$, and $\tau$ and $\tau'$ can be equal).

Proof. We will prove either we obtain a contradiction or we can extract a new minimal violation trace with one less delayed transaction and recursively we continue this reasoning until we get a contradiction or obtain a new minimal violation trace where $\beta_2$ does not contain a delayed transaction.

Suppose that $\beta_2$ contains a delayed transaction $t_0$ issued by a process $q \neq p$. Then, $\tau$ is of one of the following forms:

(a) $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{isu}(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_2' \cdot \text{del}(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_2' \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$

(b) $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{isu}(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_2' \cdot (q_1, t_0') \cdot \text{del}(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_2' \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$

(c) $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{isu}(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_2' \cdot (q_1, t_0') \cdot \text{del}(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_2' \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$

(d) $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{isu}(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_2' \cdot \text{del}(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_2' \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$

The proof of the case (a) is similar to that of Lemma 42. Concerning the case (b), we know that after executing the event $\text{del}(q_0, t_0)$, we have obtained a violation because of the happens-before cycle formed by $(\text{isu}(q, t_0), (q_1, t_0'), \text{del}(q_0, t_0))$. Also, since $\beta_2 \cdot \text{isu}(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_2' \cdot (q_1, t_0') \cdot \text{del}(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_2' \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$ contains no issue event that is causally related to $\text{isu}(p_1, t_1)$, and $\text{isu}(p_1, t_1)$ is the last transaction issued by $p_1$ in $\tau$. Therefore, we can remove $\text{isu}(p_1, t_1)$ and all related stores events from $\tau$ and obtain:

$$\tau' = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{isu}(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_2' \cdot (q_1, t_0') \cdot \text{del}(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_2' \cdot \gamma'$$

which is a violation because of the happens-before cycle formed by $(\text{isu}(q, t_0), (q_1, t_0'), \text{del}(q_0, t_0))$ and has less number of delays than $\tau$ because $\text{del}(p_0, t)$ was not delayed after $\text{isu}(p_1, t_1)$, a contradiction. Cases (c) and (d) can be proven in the same way as shown in the previous case and in the proof of Lemma 42.

Lemma 50. Let $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$ be a minimal violation. Then, $\text{isu}(p, t)$ is causally before (i.e., in the relation $\text{CO}$) all the issue events of delayed transactions in $\beta_1$.

Proof. Assume by contradiction that $\beta_1$ contains a delayed transaction $t_0$ from another process $q \neq p$ that is not causally after $\text{isu}(p, t)$. Hence, $\tau$ can be of one of the following forms:
(a) \( \tau = \alpha \cdot \isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_{11} \cdot \isu(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_{12} \cdot \isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_{21} \cdot \isu(q_1, t'_0) \cdot \beta_{22} \cdot \del(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_{23} \cdot \del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma \)

(b) \( \tau = \alpha \cdot \isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_{11} \cdot \isu(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_{12} \cdot \isu(q_1, t'_0) \cdot \beta_{13} \cdot \isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_{21} \cdot \del(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_{22} \cdot \del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma \)

(c) \( \tau = \alpha \cdot \isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_{11} \cdot \isu(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_{12} \cdot \isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_{21} \cdot \del(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_{22} \cdot \del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma \)

(d) \( \tau = \alpha \cdot \isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_{11} \cdot \isu(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_{12} \cdot \isu(q_1, t'_0) \cdot \del(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_{13} \cdot \isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_{2} \cdot \del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma \)

Cases (a), (b), and (c) have the same proof as the cases (a), (b), and (c) in the proof of Lemma 44 respectively.

We consider now case (d), notice that in \( \tau \) after executing \( \del(q_0, t_0) \) we get a happens-before cycle formed by (\( \isu(q, t_0), (q_1, t'_0), \del(q_0, t_0) \)). Therefore, we can remove all issued transactions and their associated stores events from \( \beta_{13} \cdot \isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_{2} \cdot \del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma \) excepts the stores of already issued transactions and we obtain:

\[ \tau' = \alpha \cdot \isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_{1} \cdot \isu(q, t_0) \cdot \beta_{12} \cdot (q_1, t'_0) \cdot \del(q_0, t_0) \cdot \beta_{13} \cdot \beta_{2} \cdot \del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma' \]

\( \tau' \) is a violation because of the happens-before cycle \((\isu(q, t_0), (q_1, t'_0), \del(q_0, t_0))\) and has less number of delays than \( \tau \) since \( \del(p_0, t) \) was not delayed after \( \isu(p_1, t_1) \) which was removed, a contradiction.

The rest of the properties in Theorem 47 can be proved as in Lemma 44 and Lemma 45.

\section*{G The Complete Instrumentation}

In this section, we present the instrumentation for all the instructions for the attacker, visibility helper, and happens-before helper.

\subsection*{G.1 Instrumentation of the Attacker}

We provide in Fig. 14 the instrumentation of the instructions of the attacker. Such a process passes through an initial phase where it executes transactions that are visible immediately to all the other processes (i.e., they are not delayed), and then non-deterministically it can choose to delay a transaction. When the attacker randomly chooses the first transaction to start delaying of transactions, it sets the flag \( a_{\text{ata}} \) to true in the instruction begin (line 3). Then, it sets the flag \( p.a \) to 1 to indicate that the current process is the attacker. During the first delayed transaction, the attacker chooses randomly a write instruction to a shared variable \( x \) and stores the name of this variable in the flag \( a_{\text{ata}} \) (line 5). The values written during delayed transactions are stored in the primed variables and are visible only to the attacker and the visibility helpers. For example, given a variable \( y \), all the writes to \( y \) from the original program are transformed into writes to the primed version \( y' \) (line 6).

Each time the attacker writes to a variable \( y' \) (the copy of \( y \) from the original program) during a delayed transaction, it sets the flag \( y'.event \) to \( \text{st} \) (line 7) which will allow other processes that read the same variable to join the set of visibility helpers and start delaying their transactions. Once the attacker delays a transaction, it will read only from the primed variables (i.e., \( y' \)). If the attacker wants to start the happens-before path, it has to execute a transaction that either reads or writes to a shared variable \( x' \) that was not accessed by a delayed transaction (i.e., \( x'.event = \bot \)). In this case we set the variable \( \text{HB} \) to true (lines 11 and 12) to mark the start of the happens before path and the end of the visibility chains, and set the flag \( x.event \) to \( \text{ld} \) (lines 12 and 10). When the flag \( \text{HB} \) is set to true the attacker stops executing new transactions. We can notice that when the \( \text{HB} \) is set to true, we can no longer execute new transactions from the attacker (all conditions in lines 11 and 12 become false).
Then, it continues the execution of its original instructions but, whenever it stores a value
original code instructions (lines (11) and (19)) until the flag
of visibility helpers. Such a process passes through an initial phase where it executes the
processes. Non deterministically it chooses a first transaction to delay, at which point it
joins the set of visibility helpers. It sets the flag
not keep its pledge (i.e.,
begin
a process chooses a first transaction to delay (during the
end
// Write before attacker starts delaying
transactions
l1: assume a_ha = \perp \land p.a \neq \perp \land a_ha = \perp ; goto l2;
// transactions
l1: begin; goto l2;
// Read before attacker starts delaying
l1: r := x; goto l2;
// Read in delayed transactions
l1: assume a_ha \neq \perp \land p.a \neq \perp ; goto l2;
// Special write in first delayed transaction
l1: assume a_ha = \perp \land a_ha \neq \perp \land p.a \neq \perp ; goto l3;
// Special read in last delayed transaction
l1: assume (x'.event = \perp \land a_ha \neq \perp \\
\land p.a \neq \perp ) ; goto l4;
l4: r := x'; goto l5;
l5: HB := true; goto l6;
l6: x.event := id; goto l7;
\end for

\begin{figure}[ht]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{c c c c}
\hline
[1]: begin; goto l2; & \[1]: x := e; goto l2; & \[1]: \begin{align*}
& \text{begin; goto l2;} \\
& \text{assume HB = } \perp \land (p.a \neq \perp \land a_ha = \perp ); \text{ goto } l1; \\
& \text{assume } a_ha = \perp ; \text{ goto } l3;
\end{align*}
\end{tabular}
\caption{Instrumentation of the Attacker. We use ‘x’ to denote the name of the shared variable $x$.}
\end{figure}

\subsection{G.2 Instrumentation of the Visibility Helpers}

Fig. \ref{fig:instrumentation} lists the instrumentation of the instructions of a process that belongs to the set of visibility helpers. Such a process passes through an initial phase where it executes the
original code instructions (lines (11) and (19)) until the flag $a_{vis}$ is set to true by the attacker. Then, it continues the execution of its original instructions but, whenever it stores a value it writes it to both the shared variable $x$ and the primed variable $x'$ so it is visible to all processes. Non deterministically it chooses a first transaction to delay, at which point it
joins the set of visibility helpers. It sets the flag $p.vh$ to false signaling its desire to join the visibility helpers and randomly chooses a transaction (the begin of this transaction is shown in line (18)) through which the process will join the set of visibility helpers. The process directly starts delaying its writes, i.e., writing to primed variables, and reading only from delayed writes, i.e., from primed variables, and behaving the same as the attacker. When a process choses a first transaction to delay (during the begin instruction) it has made a pledge that during this transaction it will read from a variable that was updated by a another delayed transaction from either the attacker or some other visibility helper. This is to ensure that this transaction extends the visibility chain. Hence, the local process flag $p.vh$ will be set to true when the process meets its pledge (line (21)). If the process does not keep its pledge (i.e., $p.vh$ is equal to false) at the end of the transaction (i.e., during the end instruction) we block the execution. Thus, when executing the end instruction of the underlying transaction we check whether the flag $p.vh$ is null, if so we block the execution (line (16)).
When a process joins the visibility helpers, it delays all writes and reads only from the primed variables (lines (12) and (20)). Similar to the attacker, a process in the visibility helpers delays a write to a shared variable $y$ by writing to $y'$; it sets the flag $y'.event$ to $st$ (line (13)). In order for a process in the visibility helpers to start the happens-before path, it has to either read or write a shared variable $x$ that was not accessed by a delayed transaction (i.e., $x'.event = \bot$). In this case we set the flag $HB$ to true (lines (14) and (22)) to mark the start of the happens-before path and the end of the visibility chains and set the flag $x.event$ to $ld$ (lines (15) and (23)). When the flag $HB$ is set to true, all processes in the set of visibility helpers stop issuing new transactions because all conditions for executing the begin instruction become false.

Notice that in the underlying procedure for selecting a process to join the set of visibility helpers, it suffices that the first transaction executed by the process to be causally dependent on some transaction $t$ which was executed by the existing visibility helpers or the attacker. The transaction $t$ does not need to be the last transaction executed by the existing visibility helpers or the attacker. Therefore, the instrumentation allows executions that contain several “concurrent” causality chains that start from the first delayed transaction (of the attacker), however, at least one of these chains must end with the last delayed transaction in the execution. This is a slight deviation from the characterization of minimal violations in Theorem 6 and Theorem 7 where all the delayed transactions must be causally related to the last delayed transaction, which however has no impact on the correctness of the instrumentation (stated in Theorem 10). The delayed transactions that are not causally related to the last delayed transaction could be safely removed from the execution in order to get a minimal violation.

**G.3 Instrumentation of the Happens-Before Helpers**

The remaining processes, which are not the attacker or a visibility helper, can become a happens-before helper. Fig. 16 lists the instrumentation of the instructions of a happens-before helper.

In a first phase, each process executes the original code until the flag $a.tr$ is set to true by the attacker. This flag signals the “creation” of the secondary copy of the shared-variables, which can be observed only by the attacker and the visibility helpers. At this point, the process enters a phase where it continues executing its original instructions, however, when it stores a value it writes it in both the shared variable $x$ and the primed variable $x'$ (lines (28) and (29)). The latter is needed in order to make the written values visible to the attacker and the visibility helpers. Even though it writes to primed variables as well, it only reads from the original shared variables (line (23)).

Once the flag $HB$ is set to true, the process (which cannot be the Attacker, i.e., the flag $p.a$ is null, or a visibility helper, i.e., the flag $p.vh$ is null) chooses non-deterministically a first transaction (the begin of this transaction is shown in line (24)) through which it wants to join the set of happens-before helpers, i.e., continue the happens-before path created by the existing happens-before helpers. Similar to visibility helpers, when a process choses a transaction, it makes a pledge (while executing the begin instruction) that during this transaction it will either read a variable updated by a delayed transaction or another happens-before helper, or write to a variable that was accessed (read or written) by another happens-before helper. When the pledge is met, the process sets the flag $p.hbh$ to true (lines (26) and (31)). The execution is blocked if a process does not keep its pledge (i.e., the flag $p.hbh$ is null) at the end of the transaction (line (35)). We use a flag $x.event$ for each variable $x$ to record the type (read $ld$ or write $st$) of the last access made by a happens-before helper.
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\[ l_1: \text{x := e; goto } l_2; \]  
\[ \text{vh = } \]  
// Write before attacker starts  
// delaying transactions  
\[ l_1: \text{assume } a_{\text{Atx}} = \bot \text{; goto } l_{x1}; \]  
\[ l_{x1}: \text{x := e; goto } l_2; \]  
\[ \]  
// Write before joining visibility helpers  
\[ l_1: \text{assume } a_{\text{Atx}} \not= \bot \land p.vh = p.a = \bot \text{; goto } l_{e2}; \]  
\[ l_{e2}: x' := e; \text{goto } l_{x3}; \]  
\[ l_{x3}: \text{x := e; goto } l_2; \]  
\[ \]  
// Write after joining visibility helpers  
\[ l_1: \text{assume } a_{\text{Atx}} \not= \bot \land p.vh \not= \bot \text{; goto } l_{e4}; \]  
\[ l_{e4}: x' := e; \text{goto } l_{x5}; \]  
\[ l_{x5}: x'.event := st; \text{goto } l_2; \]  
\[ \]  
// Special write in last delayed transaction  
\[ l_1: \text{assume (x'.event = } \bot \land a_{\text{Atx}} \not= \bot \land p.vh \not= \bot) \text{; goto } l_{x6}; \]  
\[ l_{x6}: \text{HB := true; goto } l_{x7}; \]  
\[ l_{x7}: x.event := ld; \text{goto } l_{x8}; \]  
\[ l_{x8}: x' := e; \text{goto } l_2; \]  
\[ \]  
\[ l_1: \text{end; goto } l_2; \text{vh = } \]  
// End before joining visibility helpers  
\[ l_1: \text{assume } a_{\text{Atx}} = \bot \lor (a_{\text{Atx}} \not= \bot \land p.vh = \bot) \text{; goto } l_{x1}; \]  
\[ l_{x1}: \text{end; goto } l_2; \]  
\[ \]  
// End after joining visibility helpers  
\[ l_1: \text{assume } a_{\text{Atx}} \not= \bot \land p.vh = true \text{; goto } l_{e2}; \]  
\[ l_{e2}: \text{end; goto } l_2; \]  
\[ \]  
// Failed attempt to join visibility helpers  
\[ l_1: \text{assume } a_{\text{Atx}} \not= \bot \land p.vh = false \text{; assume false; } \]  
\[ \]  
\[ l_1: \text{begin; goto } l_2; \text{vh = } \]  
// Begin before becoming visibility helpers  
\[ l_1: \text{assume } HB = true \land (a_{\text{Atx}} = \bot \lor p.vh = \bot) \text{; goto } l_{x1}; \]  
\[ l_{x1}: \text{begin; goto } l_2; \]  
\[ \]  
// Begin of first delayed transaction to join  
// visibility helpers  
\[ l_1: \text{assume } HB = \bot \land a_{\text{Atx}} \not= \bot \land p.vh = p.a = \bot \text{; goto } l_{e2}; \]  
\[ l_{e2}: \text{begin; goto } l_{x3}; \]  
\[ l_{x3}: p.vh := false; \text{goto } l_{i4}; \]  
\[ \]  
// Copying visibility flags before the first transaction  
// starts executing and modifying the flags  
\[ l_{i4}: \text{Foreach } x' \in V, x'.event' := x'.event \text{; goto } l_2; \]  
\[ \]  
// Begin after joining visibility helpers  
\[ l_1: \text{assume } HB = \bot \land a_{\text{Atx}} \not= \bot \land p.vh = true \text{; goto } l_{x5}; \]  
\[ l_{x5}: \text{begin; goto } l_2; \]  
\[ \]  
\[ l_1: r := x; \text{goto } l_2; \text{vh = } \]  
// Read before joining visibility helpers  
\[ l_1: \text{assume } a_{\text{Atx}} = \bot \lor (p.vh = p.a = \bot) \text{; goto } l_{x1}; \]  
\[ l_{x1}: r := x; \text{goto } l_2; \]  
\[ \]  
// Read after joining visibility helpers  
\[ l_1: \text{assume } a_{\text{Atx}} \not= \bot \land p.vh \not= \bot \text{; goto } l_{e2}; \]  
\[ l_{e2}: r := x'; \text{goto } l_{x3}; \]  
\[ l_{x3}: \text{assume } x'.event' = st \lor p.vh = false \text{; goto } l_{i4}; \]  
\[ l_{i4}: p.vh := true \text{; goto } l_{x2}; \]  
\[ \]  
// Special read in last delayed transaction  
\[ l_1: \text{assume (x'.event = } \bot \land a_{\text{Atx}} \not= \bot \land p.vh \not= \bot) \text{; goto } l_{x6}; \]  
\[ l_{x6}: \text{HB := true; goto } l_{x7}; \]  
\[ l_{x7}: x.event := ld; \text{goto } l_{x8}; \]  
\[ l_{x8}: r := x' \text{; goto } l_2; \]  

Figure 15: Instrumentation of the Visibility Helpers.

(lines 27 and 30). Moreover, once HB is set to true (i.e., there are no more delayed transactions), the process can write and read only the original shared variables, since the primed versions are no longer in use.

The happens-before helpers continue executing their instructions, until one of them reads from the shared variable x whose name was stored in aAtx. This establishes a happens-before path between the last delayed transaction and a “fictitious” store event corresponding to the first delayed transaction that could be executed just after this read of x. The execution doesn’t have to contain this store event explicitly since it is always enabled. Therefore, at the end of every transaction, the instrumentation checks whether the transaction read x. If it is the case, then the execution stops and goes to an error state to indicate that this is a robustness violation. The happens-before helpers processes continue executing their instructions, until one of them executes a load that reads from (or a write to) the shared variable x that was stored in aAtx which implies the existence of a happens-before cycle. Thus, when executing the instruction end at the end of every transaction, we have a conditional check to detect if we have a load or a write accessing the variable x (lines 32, 34, and 35). When the check detects that the variable x was accessed, the execution goes to the error state (line 34) to indicate that the execution has produced a violating trace and we
denote the reached state of the instrumented program’s execution, the error state.

### G.4 Instrumentation For the First Patterns in Theorems 6 and 7

The instrumentation given above is for finding minimal violation of the shape: $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot \text{isu}(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$ which corresponds to the pattern $\tau_{\text{CCV1}}$ in Theorem 6 and the pattern $\tau_{\text{CM}}$ in Theorem 7.

The first case in Theorem 6 is of the shape: $\tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta \cdot (p_0, t_0) \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma$ where $t$ writes to a variable ‘$x$’ and $t_0$ writes and reads from the same variable and $t$ is the only delayed transaction in $\tau$. Also, in $\beta$ there must be no write to the variable ‘$x$’ and the read in $t_0$ must occur before the write. To find this minimal violation, we reuse the above instrumentation for the second case in Theorem 6 where the attacker delays a single transaction and stops and there are no visibility helpers. In the attacker instrumentation, the two cases for the special writes in first and last delayed transactions in Fig. 14 will coincide. 

In Fig. 17 we show the instrumentation of the attacker that changes $w.r.t.$ those given in Fig. 14. In Fig. 18 we show the instrumentation of the happens-before helpers that changes $w.r.t.$ those given in Fig. 16. Note that $t_0$ does read and write accesses to the variable ‘$x$’. Thus, we use two process-local flags $p.tr$ and $p.tw$ which determine if a process did execute a transaction that does a read and a write accesses to the variable ‘$x$’. The flags
Figure 17 Modified Instrumentation of the Attacker.

The first case in Theorem 7 is of the shape:

\[ \tau = \alpha \cdot \text{isu}(p, t) \cdot \beta \cdot (p_0, t_0) \cdot \text{del}(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma \]

where transactions of the form \( t \cdot \text{isu} \) designate transactions that write to the auxiliary variables which are considered to be the delayed transactions. The last transaction, \( (p_0, t_2) \) performed by a process \( p_0 \) that has a load accessing the variable \( x = a_{stA} \) and is part of the happens-before helpers. Because the conditional check can be performed only by a process \( p_{HBH1} \) that is one of the happens-before helpers and is executing.

**H Soundness and Completeness of the Instrumentation**

The aim of the instrumentation procedure is to reduce the problem of checking the existence of the violation patterns described in Section 5.1 to reachability under SC of an error state by the instrumented version of a program.

The instrumentation procedure is sound and complete iff an error state is reachable, then we can reconstruct a violation pattern, and every violation pattern ensures that the error state is reachable by the instrumented version of the program.

**Theorem 51 (Soundness and Completeness).** A program \( P \) is not robust iff the instrumented version of it, \( P' \), reaches an error state under SER.

**Proof. Soundness.** Suppose the instrumented program reaches an error state. Then, the execution’s trace of the instrumented program is of the form:

\[ \tau_e = \tau_1 \cdot (p, t) \cdot \tau_2 \cdot (p_1, t_1) \cdot \tau_3 \cdot (p_0, t_2) \]

where transactions of the form \( t \cdot \text{isu} \) designate transactions that write to the auxiliary variables which are considered to be the delayed transactions. The last transaction, \( (p_0, t_2) \) performed by a process \( p_0 \) that has a load accessing the variable \( x = a_{stA} \) and is part of the happens-before helpers. Because the conditional check can be performed only by a process \( p_{HBH1} \) that is one of the happens-before helpers and is executing.
Figure 18 Modified Instrumentation of Happens-Before Helpers Processes.
In order for \( p_{HB1} \), to join the set of happens-before helpers, it must have found that the valuation of the flag \( HB \) is not null which means there exists some process \( p \) that is either an attacker or one of the visibility helpers that sets the flag \( HB \) to true. If \( p \) is one of the visibility helpers then there must be an attacker processes that was the first process to start the delaying of transactions and setting the flag \( a_{\alpha_1} \) to true. Otherwise, \( p \) is the attacker itself.

In \( \tau_1 \), the attacker, visibility helpers, and happens-before helpers start executing the original instructions without setting any flags or delaying any transactions. Afterwards, the attacker issues its first delayed transaction \((p, t)^\gamma\) and it starts populating the primed variables \( x' \) and the visibility flags \( x'.event \). In \( \tau_2 \), the visibility helpers continue executing the original instructions with an additional check at every instruction whether the flags \( x'.event \) are set to \( st \). If so, they start delaying transactions. In \( \tau_2 \), the happens-before helpers continue the same execution as in \( \tau_1 \) waiting until the last delayed transaction to be issued \((p', t)^\gamma\), then the flag \( HB \) is set to true. Hence, the happens-before helpers start checking at every instruction whether the flags \( x.event \) are set to either \( st \) or \( ld \). If so, they start populating the flags \( x.event \) as well. When \( HB \) is set to true, the attacker and visibility helpers stop issuing new transactions. Therefore, all transaction in \( \tau_3 \) are from the happens-before helpers.

We now transform \( \tau_\ast \) into the following \( CCV \) (resp., \( CM \)) execution trace:

\[
\tau = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma
\]

Here, \( \alpha' \) is the subsequence of all \( \tau_1 \) events that are produced by instructions from \( P \) without the conditionals checking (i.e., the assume statements). \( \beta_1 \) is the subsequence of all events of \( \tau_2 \) produced by transactions from \( P \) that were executed by the attacker or visibility helpers or other processes which are not yet visibility or happens-before helpers.

The transactions which are executed by the attacker and visibility helpers represent the delayed transactions in \( \beta_1 \) with the removal of the conditionals checking and the flags setting. \( \beta_2 \) is the subsequence of all events of \( \tau_3 \cdot (p_0, t_2) \) produced by transactions from \( P \) which are executed only by the happens-before helpers except the conditionals checking and the flags setting. We add the store of transaction \( del(p_0, t) \) to describe the storing of the first transaction that was delayed by the attacker by a happens-before helper \( p_0 \) that executed the last transaction that accessed the variable \( x' = a_{\alpha_1} \). In \( \gamma \), we add the stores of the delayed transactions in \( \beta_1 \).

\( \tau \) is a possible execution’s trace of the program \( P \) because \( \tau_\ast \) is result of an execution of the instrumented version of \( P \) and we have removed from \( \tau \) all the effects of the instrumentation and replaced the stores to auxiliary variables by issues of stores without changing the dependency between all the events in the execution.

All transactions in \( \beta_2 \) are from the happens-before helpers, therefore, \( \forall \ a \in \beta_2 \cdot (t, a) \notin CO \). Transactions in \( \beta_2 \) form a happens-before path between \( isu(p_1, t_1) \) and \( del(p_0, t) \). Also, we have \( a, b = (p_0, t_2) \in \beta_2 \) such that \( (isu(p_1, t_1), a) \in RW(x) \cup WW(x) \) and \( (b, del(p_0, t)) \in RW(y) \). All the delayed transactions are from the attacker and visibility helpers and were issued in \( \beta_1 \), therefore, all delayed transactions are in \( \beta_1 \). Hence, \( \tau \) indeed holds all the properties of a minimal violation pattern defined in Theorems \( \Box \) and \( \checkmark \).

**Completeness.** Suppose we have a minimal violation trace pattern of a given program \( P \):

\[
\tau = \alpha \cdot isu(p, t) \cdot \beta_1 \cdot isu(p_1, t_1) \cdot \beta_2 \cdot del(p_0, t) \cdot \gamma
\]

such that \( \tau \) maintains all the properties given in Theorems \( \Box \) and \( \checkmark \). We demonstrate that there is a possible serializable execution based on \( \tau \) of the instrumented version of the program \( P \) that reaches the error state. Next, we show how to build the instrumented
At the start of the execution, α, the attacker, visibility helpers, and happens-before helpers execute the original instructions with just conditional checks. Afterwards, the attacker delays its first transaction (isu(p, t)) and starts delaying transactions and populating the flags. In isu(p, t), the attacker issues a store to the shared variable ‘x’ = ast and ∃ b ∈ β2 such that (b, del(p0, t)) ∈ RW(x). All delayed transactions in β1 forms a chain of causality that was started by isu(p, t). Thus, the executed transactions in the chain which are not from the attacker, are from processes which constitute the set of visibility helpers which are delaying their transactions after joining the set of visibility helpers which was permissible because of their causal dependency on the attacker. All writes that were executed in β1 by the processes that are delaying transactions (i.e., attacker and visibility helpers) are invisible to the remaining processes which includes the happens-before helpers.

When, the process p1 issues the last transaction, isu(p1, t1), it sets the content of the flag x.event to ld if (isu(p1, t1), a) ∈ RW(x) or to st if (isu(p1, t1), a) ∈ WW(x) and it sets the flag HB to true.

On the other hand, the processes which are executing their transactions without delaying them will attempt to join the happens-before helpers by checking if the flag HB is set to true. If so, they start the attempt of joining the happens-before helpers and when it succeed they joining the happens-before helpers and start executing their transactions which constitute β2. The first executed transaction by the happens-before helpers is a described above which signals the start of β2 and the happen before path. Thus, in β2, we have only transactions form the happens-before helpers (because the attacker and visibility helpers stop when the flag HB is set to true) such that they are related by the happen before path that started from isu(p1, t1) until it reaches del(p0, t) through β2. We know that there must exist b ∈ β2 such that (b, del(p0, t)) ∈ RW(‘x’ = ast). b is equivalent to the last executed transaction by the happens-before helpers that accesses the shared variable x. Thus, the underlying happens-before helper will set the content of the flag x.event to ld. Hence, when the underlying process executes the end instruction of this transaction, it will go to the error state (lines 32, 33, and 34) and in this case the instrumented version of the program P has reached the desired error state.

## Examples of Programs Instrumentation

In this section, we illustrate the instrumentations on the SB and LU programs which lead to the detection of the minimal violations given in Fig. 6b and Fig. 6a. In Fig. 19 and Fig. 20, we show the instrumentations of the two processes of SB program, where p1 is the Attacker and p2 is a Happens-Before Helper. Similarly, in Fig. 21 and Fig. 22, we show the instrumentations of the two processes of LU program, where p1 is the Attacker and p2 is a Happens-Before Helper.
Figure 19 Attacker instrumentation of the process pl of the SB program in Fig. 10. Highlighted are the choices taken during the execution that reaches the error state.
Figure 20 Happens-before helper instrumentation of the process p2 of the SB program in Fig. 1H. Highlighted are the choices taken during the execution that reaches the error state.
// Original Program
l1: begin; goto l2;
l2: r1 := x; goto l3;
l3: x := r1 + 1; goto l4;
l4: end; goto l5;

// Instrumented Program
[l1: r1 := x; goto l2]_A =
l1: assume a_{U_A} = \bot; goto l1;
l2: r1 := x; goto l2;
l3: assume a_{U_A} \neq \bot \land p1.a \neq \bot; goto l2;
l4: x' := x; goto l4;
l5: x'.event := id; goto l5;
l6: HB := true; goto l6;
l7: x.event := id; goto l7;
l8: end; goto l8;
[l1: begin; goto l2]_B =
l1: assume HB = \bot \land (p1.a \neq \bot \lor a_{U_A} = \bot); goto l1;
l2: begin; goto l2;
l3: assume HB = \bot \land a_{U_A} = \bot; goto l3;
l4: begin; goto l4;
l5: p1.a := 1; goto l5;
l6: foreach s @ V, z' := s; goto l6;
l7: assume a_{U_A} := true; goto l7;
l8: x := r1 + 1; goto l8;

Figure 21 Attacker instrumentation of the process p1 of the LU program in Fig. [13] Highlighted are the choices taken during the execution that reaches the error state.
4a. Highlighted are the choices taken during the execution that reaches the error state.

Figure 22 Happens-before helper instrumentation of the process p2 of the LU program in Fig. 4a
Highlighted are the choices taken during the execution that reaches the error state.