

Primrose: Selecting Container Data Types by their Properties

XUEYING QIN, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom

LIAM O’CONNOR, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom

MICHEL STEUWER, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom

Container data types are ubiquitous in computer programming, enabling developers to efficiently store and process collections of data with an easy-to-use programming interface. Many programming languages offer a variety of container implementations in their standard libraries based on data structures offering different capabilities and performance characteristics. Choosing the *best* container for an application is not always straightforward, as performance characteristics can change drastically in different scenarios, and as real-world performance is not always correlated to theoretical complexity.

In this paper, we present Primrose, a language-agnostic tool for selecting the best performing valid container implementation from a set of container data types that satisfy the given *properties*. *Semantic properties* allow application developers to specify the expected behaviour of a container as a type refinement, e.g., if the container should only contain unique values (such as a set) or should satisfy the LIFO property of a stack. Semantic properties nicely complement *syntactic properties* (i.e., traits, interfaces, or type classes), allowing developers to specify a container’s programming interface *and* behaviour without committing to a concrete implementation. Primrose automatically selects the set of valid container implementations for which the *library specifications*, written by the developers of container libraries, satisfies the specified properties. Finally, Primrose ranks the valid library implementations based on their runtime performance.

We present our prototype implementation of Primrose that preprocesses annotated Rust code, selecting the best performing container implementation. Primrose is language-agnostic and is easy to integrate in other programming languages that support container data types and traits, interfaces, or type classes. Our implementation encodes properties and library specifications into verification conditions in Rosette, an interface for SMT solvers, which determines the set of valid container implementations.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Container Data Types, Properties, Data Abstraction, Performance

1 INTRODUCTION

Container data types, such as sets, lists, and trees, represent collections of data that are commonly used in computer programs [Cormen et al. 2009]. They are ubiquitous in everyday programming, and virtually all programming languages provide a variety of different container implementations in their standard libraries. Much work has been done in the past decades to design better abstractions, improve performance and verify correctness for container data types.

However, a crucial problem for application developers using containers still exists: when choosing a container data type, application developers are forced to select a concrete implementation that comes with certain theoretical complexity and practical performance tradeoffs. For example, let us consider a situation where an application developer would like to represent a mathematical set of elements, i.e., where each element should occur at most once in the set. In C++, they have to choose between `std::set`, usually implemented as red-black trees [Bayer 1972], and `std::unordered_set`, implemented as a hash table. The hash table implementation has been added to the C++ standard in 2011 as a new class, as the C++ standard has strict complexity requirements that prevent the ordinary `std::set` to be implemented with the (often faster) hash-based implementation. There are a vast number of blog posts [Ankerl 2019; Edouard 2020; Orr 2019; Wicht 2012] and online discussions [Cechner 2014] on the performance characteristics of various C++ container types, showing the interest of the community and the need for external guidance that the language itself does not provide.

In other languages, the situation is similar. Rust provides two container implementations, `HashSet` and `BTreeSet`, expecting application developers to make an explicit choice between them. Scala’s complex collection library features abstract interfaces, such as the `Set` trait, allowing to abstract over multiple concrete implementations, such as `HashSet` and `TreeSet`. But when creating an object of type `Set` a fixed default implementation is selected (`HashSet`) independent of whether this implementation choice is the best for the application with its particular usage pattern.

These examples demonstrate a general problem: Application developers are forced to *overspecify*, by having to select a concrete container implementation, where we generally would like application developers to be shielded from low-level implementation details. Application developers should primarily care about the *abstract behaviour* of the containers in their application, and not how this is achieved in the concrete implementation. The compiler, or a dedicated tool, should choose the best valid container implementation automatically.

In this paper, we propose such an automated tool: Primrose. Primrose allows application developers to specify the expected behaviour and programming interface of containers as *properties*. *Semantic properties* specify the expected behaviour of the container and are written as logical predicates used as refinements of the container type. *Syntactic properties* specify the programming interface that must be supported by the container and are expressed as traits (a.k.a., interfaces or type classes) of the underlying programming language. Primrose automatically selects the set of valid container implementations for which the *library specifications*, written by the library developers as pre- and post-conditions of the container operations, satisfy the specified syntactic and semantic properties using an SMT solver. Finally, Primrose ranks the valid library implementations based on their runtime performance.

In this work, we apply techniques from verification and formal methods, including refinement types, formal library specifications, and SMT solvers, in an innovative way to raise the level of abstraction for application developers, freeing them from the burden of choosing container implementations, and to improve the performance of applications.

To summarize, this paper makes the following contributions:

- We present Primrose, a language-agnostic tool for selecting valid container data type implementations based on *properties* used to describe their behaviour and programming interface, and ranking them based on their performance.
- We show a new application of refinement types not—as previous work did—for verification purposes, but to raise the level of abstraction for application developers and to improve the runtime performance of applications with container data types.
- We present formal specifications of four commonly used container implementations from the Rust standard library (`Vec`, `LinkedList`, `HashSet`, `BTreeSet`), which could be used in the future also to verify the correctness of their Rust implementations, and two custom container implementations (`SortedVec`, `LazySortedVec`).

We motivate the need for an automated tool for selecting container data type implementations in Section 2. We give an overview of the design of Primrose in Section 3, before we focus on the specification of properties in Section 4, and the library specifications in Section 5. Sections 6 and 7 describe the selection and ranking process of Primrose, before we discuss our prototype implementation in Section 8 that preprocesses annotated Rust code, selecting the best performing container implementation. We finish the paper with a discussion of related work in Section 9 before we conclude in Section 10.

```

1 type Set<I> = HashSet<I>;
2 // type Set<I> = BTreeSet<I>;
3 // type Set<I> = UniqueVect<I>;
4 // type Set<I> = FancySetImpl<I>;
5 // type Set<I> = HashMultiSet<I>; ???
6
7 let mut uniqueElements = Set::new();
8 for val in input.iter() {
9     uniqueElements.insert(val);
10 }

```

(a) In Rust, application developers are forced to choose a concrete container implementation with potentially surprising performance implications.

```

1 property unique {
2     c -> for-all-elems c (\a ->
3         (unique-count? a c)) };
4 type UniqueCon<I> = {
5     c <: ContainerT | unique c };
6
7 let mut uniqueElements = UniqueCon::new();
8 for val in input.iter() {
9     uniqueElements.insert(val);
10 }

```

(b) Using Primrose, application developers specify the *properties* describing the expected behaviour of the container and Primrose automatically selects the best valid implementation.

Fig. 1. Selecting the unique elements of an input sequence by inserting the elements into a *set*.

2 MOTIVATION

We start with a motivating example. Suppose we want to write a function as part of a larger application that finds and returns the elements of a larger collection, without duplicates. We might, for example, use the result of this function to count the number of unique elements or process the elements further, now with the guarantee that each element in the returned collection is unique.

An easy way to implement this is to return a container data type that only permits unique elements. Intuitively, we might think of a *set*, but as already pointed out in the introduction, there is a choice to be made by the application developer: Which concrete container implementation of the abstract idea of a mathematical set should we use?

Figure 1a shows a Rust code snippet computing a container `uniqueElements` that contains the unique elements of the original `input` sequence. The application developer must choose a concrete container implementation, such as `HashSet` in line 1 which uses a hash table as the implementation. Other valid choices would be Rust’s `BTreeSet` (line 2), which is implemented using a binary search tree, a custom `UniqueVect` (line 3) container, which uses a vector as its implementation but ensures that no duplicates are represented in the container, or other `FancySet` implementations (line 4). Application developers have to be careful to select a container implementation that has the expected behaviour, for example, the `HashMultiSet` (line 5) implementation would not be a valid choice as it implements a multi set allowing duplicates.

Of course, many techniques exist to abstract over multiple concrete implementations of a general concept. In object-oriented languages, *abstract classes* enable hiding multiple possible implementations behind a common interface. Similar features exist in many other languages under different names, such as, *traits* (e.g., in Rust and Scala), *protocols* (e.g., in Swift), *interfaces* (e.g., in Java), and *type classes* (e.g., in Haskell). All of these techniques allow developers to use multiple concrete implementations, such as `HashSet` and `BTreeSet`, using a single abstract type, which we might call `Set`. Abstract types list the operations that must be supported by each concrete implementation, and the types of these operations. But, these types are deliberately *abstract*, meaning that we *cannot* instantiate them directly: When creating such a type, the application developer must commit to a particular concrete implementation, which requires the application developer to look underneath layers of abstraction to make an informed decision. Thus, these abstraction techniques are not powerful enough to free the programmer from consideration of such low level details. They are




Fig. 2. Performance comparison of three container data type implementations used to select the unique elements of an input sequence in Figure 1a. The custom `UniqueVec` implementation, which ensures lazily on access that the elements are unique, is the fastest implementation, outperforming the `HashSet` and `BTreeSet` implementations from the Rust standard library.

also not powerful enough to express *semantic* requirements: The application developer cannot use these features to specify the expected *behaviour*, i.e., the semantics, of the concrete implementations, but merely provide a common *syntax* enabling the use of multiple implementations. Even though we might call an abstract container type `Set`, we cannot express the requirement that each concrete implementation actually contains no duplicate elements. Similarly, when implementing an abstract `Stack` container, we cannot state that the last-in-first-out property is respected by the `Stack` operations `push` and `pop`.

Figure 1b shows the same problem of selecting unique elements from a sequence, but expressed using Primrose. Application developers describe the expected behaviour—in this case, that all elements of the container must be unique—as a *semantic property* in lines 1–3. This semantic property is expressed as a logical predicate that is used to *refine* the container data type in lines 4 and 5. Refinement types have long been used before as a technique to verify correctness—also of container types, for example by Vazou et al. [2013]. Here, we use refinement types in a new way, allowing programmers to express the expected behaviour of a container, and freeing them from having to make a (potentially difficult) implementation choice. The remaining code remains unchanged, we just need to use the refined type in line 7. The Primrose preprocessor processes the code from Figure 1b, selects the best valid container implementation from a library of container implementations, and, finally, generates a program equivalent to Figure 1a with the best container implementation inserted automatically.

But which is the *best* container implementation? Figure 2 shows a performance comparison for three different implementation choices. Perhaps surprisingly, our custom `UniqueVec` implementation outperforms the Rust built-in `HashSet` and `BTreeSet` implementations. The `UniqueVec` uses a vector and ensures lazily on access that the stored elements are unique, by sorting the vector and removing duplicates. As seen in this example, choosing the best performing container implementation for a particular application is not always straightforward, particularly as theoretical complexity of operations can sometimes be misleading in the presence of practical effects such as cache-friendliness.

Using Primrose, application developers do not have to worry about choosing an incorrect container implementation or an implementation with subpar performance. Next, we are going to discuss an overview of the Primrose tool.




Fig. 3. The workflow of the Primrose selection tool: *Property specification* (top left), written and used by the application developer, are used to check which *library specifications* (top right), written by library developers, satisfy them. The valid implementations (marked with a green check marks), are then ranked by their performance (bottom).

3 OVERVIEW

Figure 3 gives an overview of the design of Primrose. Using Primrose, the application developer writes code in terms of an abstract type, and a *property specification* describing the syntactic and semantic properties they expect this type to satisfy. The syntactic properties take the form of traits and the semantic properties take the form of type refinements. To write a program, the application developer only needs to specify what properties must be satisfied by the required container, and does not have to commit to a particular implementation. In Figure 3, the application developer specifies that they require a container (the syntactic property `ContainerT`) where all elements are unique (the semantic property `unique`). We discuss properties in detail in Section 4.

Given this code as input, Primrose will, acting as a preprocessor, generate copies of the input code where the abstract type is instantiated into a valid concrete implementation that satisfies the expected properties. It determines which implementations are valid by consulting *library specifications*, which are provided by library developers. These specifications abstract over concrete container implementations and provide a compact summary of their externally observable semantics. For each container implementation, the library specification contains the pre-conditions and post-conditions of each operation in terms of an abstract list model. We discuss these specifications in more detail in Section 5.

In our example in Figure 3, the library specification of the `Vec<T>` type indicates that it is not a suitable choice for `UniqueCon<T>`, as it does not satisfy the required semantic property `unique`. We use a satisfiability modulo theories (SMT) solver to accomplish this selection process, specifically using the solver-aided programming language Rosette [Torlak and Bodik 2013; Torlak and Bodik 2014] interacting with Z3 solver. We discuss the selection process in Section 6.

Note that in order to make Figure 3 concise, we only show a simplified version of the generated programs with selected implementations that does not reflect how traits constrain available operations for interacting with the container type. In our implementation, we make sure that only those container operations that the application developer specifies with syntactic properties can be accessed in the generated program. We provide discussion about code generation in Section 7.

After all valid container implementations are selected, Primrose measures and ranks them according to their performance, and then selects the one providing the best performance for the program. We discuss the ranking in Section 7.

Currently, we choose Rust as the target language to implement our idea. Application developers write the property specifications as a part of their Rust programs and Primrose generates Rust code after processing specifications. However, Primrose could easily be ported to other languages, so long as the language contains features equivalent to a Rust trait, such as an abstract class, an interface, a protocol or a type class. We discuss the portability of Primrose in Section 8.

4 PROPERTY SPECIFICATIONS

As introduced in Section 3, the application developer specifies the desired behaviours of their required container type with a *property specification*. This specification consists of *semantic properties*, which refine the container type by a predicate, and *syntactic properties*, which in Rust take the form of traits specifying the operations that must be supported by the container and their types.

The property specification of the type `UniqueCon` from the example in Figure 3 is shown below:

```
1 property unique { \c -> (for-all-elems c (\a -> (unique-count? a c))) }
2 type UniqueCon<T> = {c <: (ContainerT) | (unique c)}
```

Listing 1. Example property specification

We first provide the definition of the semantic property `unique`. As mentioned, semantic properties are expressed as *predicates*, that is, a function from a container to a boolean. In the specification language of Primrose, such predicates have type $Con\langle\tau\rangle \rightarrow Bool$, where $Con\langle\tau\rangle$ is a placeholder container type used in writing property specifications that is resolved into a concrete container type by the selection process. The combinator `for-all-elems` is part of a library of combinators built in to Primrose to enable the application developer to write predicates that concern individual elements of a container. The function `unique-count?` is a predicate that holds iff the given element occurs in the container exactly once. These combinators and predicate functions are explained in detail in Section 4.2.

With the defined semantic property `unique`, we can then declare the container type `UniqueCon<T>`. The first part of the declaration specifies the syntactic property that must be satisfied by the container type, in the form of the trait `ContainerT`. Specifically, `c <: (ContainerT)` says that the type of the container `c`, in this case `UniqueCon`, must implement the trait `ContainerT`, which specifies a set of basic container operations (see Listing 2). The second part of the declaration *refines* our container type by the predicate `unique`, stating that our `unique` property must be invariant across all operations on the container. Properties may also be composed together. For multiple syntactic properties, we simply specify them as a list of traits that the container type implements, in the form `c <: (T1, T2)`. For multiple semantic properties, we can use conjunction, i.e. `((p1 c) and (p2 c))`.

Figure 4 shows the syntax of property specifications in Primrose. Formally, the specification language for semantic properties is a variant of the polymorphic λ -calculus [Girard 1986; Reynolds 1974], with restrictions on the use of polymorphism to enable implicit type inference [Hindley 1969; Milner 1978]. This type system guarantees termination, making specifications easier to analyse and straightforward to translate into SMT verification conditions.

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Literals | $l := true \mid false$ |
| Terms | $t := l \mid x \mid \lambda x. t \mid t t$ |
| Predicate | $p := \lambda x. t$ |
| Refinement | $r := p x \mid r \wedge r$ |
| Container Type Declarations | $c := \{v <: B \mid r\}$ |
| Simple Types | $\sigma := Bool \mid T \mid Con\langle\sigma\rangle$ |
| Types | $\tau := \sigma \mid \tau \rightarrow \tau \mid \forall T : \kappa <: B. \tau$ |
| Bounds | $B := trait_name \mid B, B$ |
| Kinds | $\kappa := type \mid \kappa_1 \Rightarrow \kappa_2$ |

Fig. 4. The syntax of the property specifications

4.1 Syntactic Properties as Traits

As previously mentioned, we encode syntactic properties as Rust traits, specifying the operations needed by the application developer to interact with a container. Traits are defined in Rust and lifted into our property specification language. For instance, the trait `ContainerT` introduced in Listing 1 is implemented as:

```

1 pub trait ContainerT<T> {
2   fn len(&self) -> usize;
3   fn contains(&self, x: &T) -> bool;
4   fn is_empty(&self) -> bool;
5   fn insert(&mut self, elt: T);
6   fn clear(&mut self);
7   fn remove(&mut self, elt: T) -> Option<T>;
8 }

```

Listing 2. The trait `ContainerT` specifying basic container operations

By writing `c <: ContainerT` in Listing 1, the application developer indicates that they expect the container type selected by Primrose to include implementations for all operations in the trait `ContainerT`. Thus, after executing Primrose, the declared container type `UniqueCon<T>` will be resolved into a concrete container type that implements the trait `ContainerT`.

As mentioned, we can also declare a container type that satisfies multiple syntactic properties. For instance, suppose that in addition to `ContainerT`, we would like our container to also satisfy the syntactic property `RandomAccess` shown below:

```

1 pub trait RandomAccess<T> {
2   fn first(&self) -> Option<T>;
3   fn last(&self) -> Option<T>;
4   fn nth(&self, n: usize) -> Option<T>;
5 }

```

Listing 3. The trait `RandomAccess` specifying operations to access elements in a container

Note that, with just `ContainerT`, there is no way for the program to observe the *ordering* of elements in the container, but with `RandomAccess` there is, as we can now select elements based on their position. By composing our new syntactic property `RandomAccess` with `ContainerT` we can now specify a container of unique elements where the order can be observed:

```
1 type UniqueRandomAccessCon<T> = {c <: (ContainerT, RandomAccess) | (unique c)}
```

Listing 4. Container type declaration of a unique container with multiple syntactic properties

Semantic properties, such as `unique` above, must be invariant across all operations from all syntactic properties required of the container. We discuss in Section 8.2 the portability of Primrose and how easily it could be adapted for other languages that implement equivalent features to Rust’s traits, such as traits in Scala and interfaces in Java.

4.2 Semantic Properties as Predicates

As mentioned, semantic properties are predicates that are used to construct refinements for container types; each declared container type in the form $\{v <: B \mid r\}$ is a *refinement type*, i.e. a type circumscribed by a logical predicate [Freeman and Pfenning 1991]. Refinement types are also present in programming languages like Liquid Haskell and F*, where they are used to facilitate verification of program correctness. For instance, in Liquid Haskell, we may define a refinement type `UniqueList` representing a list of unique elements as:

```
1 {-@ measure unique @-}
2 unique :: (Ord a) => [a] -> Bool
3 unique [] = True
4 unique (x:xs) = unique xs && not (S.member x (elts xs))
5
6 {-@ type UniqueList a = {v:[a] | unique v} @-}
```

Listing 5. Unique List in Liquid Haskell

While our syntax for type refinements strongly resembles Liquid Haskell, our refinement types are slightly different, and serve a different purpose. Firstly, Liquid Haskell’s refinements are attached to a *concrete type*, in this case a list (written `[a]`), whereas our refinements are attached to an abstract container type, which is then resolved by Primrose into a concrete implementation. Secondly, Liquid Haskell uses type refinements for the purpose of *correctness*: If a list is declared to have type `UniqueList`, the Liquid Haskell verifier will check that it satisfies the predicate `unique`. For example, it will report an error at compile time if given a list that contains duplicates:

```
1 {-@ notUniqueList :: UniqueList Int @-}
2 notUniqueList :: [Int]
3 notUniqueList = [3, 1, 2, 3]
```

Listing 6. An Invalid Unique List

Our work instead uses type refinements to specify the semantic requirements of the application developer to guide selection of valid concrete data type implementations. Once all valid implementations have been found, Primrose simply selects the implementation providing the best performance for the application developer. In short, rather than to aid verification, we use refinement types to help application developers optimise their programs. We give more details on the selection process in Section 6.

Combinators. As we have seen in our examples, Primrose provides a set of combinators and predicate functions to facilitate writing of property specifications. These combinators and predicate functions are defined in Rosette and then imported into our property specification language. In the semantic property `unique` shown in Listing 1, the combinator `for-all-elems` is used to specify that the predicate `unique-count?` must hold for all elements inside the container. The type of the combinator `for-all-elems` is $Con\langle\tau\rangle \rightarrow (\tau \rightarrow Bool) \rightarrow Bool$, meaning this combinator takes in two

arguments, the first of which is a container and the second of which is a predicate on the elements of that container, and eventually returns a boolean value.

For the purposes of checking, we represent containers $Con\langle\tau\rangle$ abstractly in Rosette as lists. We discuss this list abstraction and justify it in Section 5. This means that we can implement our `for-all-elems` combinator straightforwardly with a list fold:

```
1 (define (for-all-elems c fn)
2   (foldl elem-and #t (map (lambda (a) (fn a)) c)))
```

Listing 7. Combinator `for-all-elems` in Rosette

We also provide some combinators for applying *relations* between elements in a container. For instance, `for-all-consecutive-pairs`:

$$\text{for-all-consecutive-pairs} : Con\langle\tau\rangle \rightarrow (\tau \rightarrow \tau \rightarrow Bool) \rightarrow Bool \quad (1)$$

Unlike `for-all-elems`, this combinator is given a binary relation between elements, and checks that this relation holds between any two consecutive elements in our container.

With this combinator, we can define properties like `ascending` and `descending`, which specify a particular ordering of elements in the container:

```
1 property ascending { \c -> (for-all-consecutive-pairs c leq?) }
2 property descending { \c -> (for-all-consecutive-pairs c geq?) }
```

Listing 8. Semantic properties `ascending` and `descending`

Beside the set of predefined combinators, application developers may also provide customised combinators by encoding them in Rosette and importing them into our property specification language.

Predicate functions. In addition to the quantifier combinators above, we also supply predicate functions which are used to specify properties of individual elements of a container. For instance, in the properties `unique`, `ascending` and `descending` shown in Listings 1 and 8, we have the predicate functions `unique-count?`, `leq?` and `geq?`. Just as with combinators, we have predefined a set of predicate functions in our property specification language, and application developers can further provide additional functions by encoding them in Rosette and importing them.

Composition of semantic properties. As mentioned in Figure 4, we can compose semantic properties in a container type declaration with conjunction. For instance, to declare a container type with elements arranged in *strictly* ascending order, i.e., both `unique` and `ascending` properties must hold, we may write the following:

```
1 type StrictlyAscendingCon<T> = {c <: (ContainerT) | ((unique c) and (ascending c))}
```

Listing 9. Container type declaration of a strictly ascending container

This conjunction is straightforwardly translated into conjunction in Rosette.

4.3 The Interaction between Semantic and Syntactic Properties

All of the semantic properties we have seen so far have been invariants across all operations, but some semantic properties depend on specific operations given by syntactic properties. For instance, suppose we would like to specify a stack container type providing operations `push` and `pop` with the expected last-in-first-out (LIFO) property. Firstly, on top of the trait `ContainerT` specifying basic container operations, we define a trait specifying operations `push` and `pop`, namely `StackT`:

```

1 pub trait StackT<T> {
2   fn push(&mut self, elt: T);
3   fn pop(&mut self) -> Option<T>;
4 }

```

Listing 10. The trait `StackT` specifying operations `push` and `pop`

Secondly, we define the semantic property `lifo` for containers that implement this `StackT` trait:

```

1 property lifo { \c <: StackT -> (forall \x. pop (push c x) == x) }

```

Listing 11. The semantic property `LIFO`

Unlike previously, this semantic property includes a requirement that the given container implement the trait `StackT`, which enables us to refer to the operations `pop` and `push` inside the semantic property. Note that in this definition, `forall` is a combinator with type:

$$\text{forall} : (\forall x.x \rightarrow \text{Bool}) \rightarrow \text{Bool} \quad (2)$$

This combinator is implemented with the `forall` procedure defined in Rosette’s library, which serves as a construct for creating universally quantified formulae.

Armed with the trait `StackT` and the semantic property `lifo`, we can combine all these elements and declare our stack type as follows:

```

1 type StackCon<T> = {c <: (ContainerT, StackT) | (lifo c)}

```

Listing 12. The container type with stack operations that satisfies the semantic property `LIFO`

We have discussed how application developers use semantic and syntactic properties to specify a container’s programming interface and behaviour without committing to a concrete implementation. Next, we are going to discuss how library developers encode specifications of container implementations. Primrose selects among these library specifications the ones that satisfy the properties required by application developers.

5 LIBRARY SPECIFICATIONS

It is not feasible to select container implementations directly from the Rust standard library by analysing their implementations and checking if they satisfy the application developer’s property specification, as this would essentially entail complete verification of all of Rust’s container implementations. Rust is a Turing-complete, general purpose programming language with a complex semantics, and its container libraries are typically highly optimised, making extensive use of unsafe code, and are therefore difficult to analyse. While efforts are underway to formalise semantics of Rust [Jung et al. 2017], such verification is firmly outside the scope of Primrose. Instead, we use *library specifications* which abstract over the Rust implementations, providing a clear definition of intended semantics of each operation, without respect to performance or implementation details. This allows us to select container implementations by checking their library specifications in Rosette against the properties specified by the application developer, rather than by analysing Rust implementations. Moreover, using specifications which are abstracted from implementations makes Primrose easy to repurpose for programming languages other than Rust, as the same specifications would apply, with minimal or no modification, to container libraries written in any other language. In addition, because these library specifications form a functional correctness specification for each operation, these same specifications could in future be used as a basis for full verification of Rust libraries.

5.1 The Basic Design of Library Specifications

Library specifications of concrete container implementations are developed based on Hoare logic [Hoare 1969]. For each concrete container implementation, we provide a set of *Hoare triples*, one for each operation. A Hoare triple takes the form:

$$\{\phi\} \text{ op } \{\psi\} \quad (3)$$

This triple states that if the *precondition* ϕ holds and the operation op is executed, then the *postcondition* ψ will hold. These conditions are predicates on the state of the program. In our case, the state contains the container itself, as well as any other inputs and outputs of the operation op .

As mentioned in Section 3, we model the container itself as a list in our property specifications. This means that our library specification for each concrete implementation is also given in terms of lists. These lists are just models to convey the intended semantics, and do not proscribe anything about the implementation — the concrete implementation is free to represent data in any structure it chooses. For example, a set data type may be implemented by a binary search tree, but will still be specified in Primrose with a list. The lists are just a simple abstraction, easy to analyse in Rosette, with which all the container operations can be specified.

It is important that these library specifications are *sound*, in the sense that they fully capture all possible executions of the concrete implementation. Otherwise, the library specification would not be an accurate representation of the implementation’s semantics, and Primrose could select a data type that does not satisfy the required semantic properties. More formally, a proof of functional correctness using these specifications would take the form of a data refinement [de Roever and Engelhardt 1998], where each value of the concrete container type is related to our list model by an *abstraction function* α , and our specification on lists is shown to contain all possible behaviours of the concrete implementation using a *forward simulation*:




Fig. 5. Forward simulation

Here, we write $\text{op}(C)$ to denote the concrete implementation of our operation op , represented as a relation from inputs to outputs. The abstract operation $\text{op}(A)$ is the maximal relation satisfying the Hoare triple given in our library specification, and α is a suitable abstraction function flattening our concrete container data structure into a list.

If such a forward simulation is shown for all of our container operations, we know that each possible execution involving the concrete container has a corresponding execution involving an abstract list, and thus the specification accurately captures the semantics of our implementation.

For instance, a binary search tree T can be abstracted to a sorted list L by an abstraction function *inorder* that does an in-order traversal. For each operation interacting with T , there exists a corresponding operation at the abstract level defined using L . Take the operation $\text{insert}(T, x)$, which inserts an element x into a binary search tree T . We can abstract such an operation to $\text{insert}(L, x)$ which inserts x at the right location in a sorted list. The diagram in Figure 6 shows the relation between $\text{insert}(T, x)$ and $\text{insert}(L, x)$.

In this work, we have specified four concrete container implementations in Rust’s collections library (`Vec`, `LinkedList`, `HashSet`, `BTreeSet`) as well as two custom container implementations (`SortedVec`,




Fig. 6. The forward simulation condition for insert on a binary search tree

LazySortedVec) by abstracting them into a list model. As we discuss in Section 5.5, library specifications abstract over some implementation details, and, therefore, Vec and LinkedList as well as SortedVec and LazySortedVec share the same specification. While, as mentioned, we do not prove the forward simulation conditions required for full functional correctness verification, we do provide definitions of a suitable abstraction function for forward simulation to justify the correctness of our specifications. These library specifications are encoded in Rosette, and are used by the SMT solver for selecting implementations that satisfy property specifications.

5.2 The Library Specification of A LinkedList

The LinkedList in Rust’s collection library is a doubly-linked list. Defining an abstraction function to convert such a data structure into a list in Rosette’s logic is straightforward: Simply remove previous and next pointers and collect values of all nodes.

Firstly, let us specify the insertion operation, `LinkedList::insert`, which has the type signature:

```
1 fn insert(&mut self, elt: T) {...}
```

Listing 13. The signature of `LinkedList::insert`

Since variables in Rosette are immutable, in the corresponding abstract insertion operation on lists, we alter the type signature to instead return a new list rather than alter it in-place¹:

```
1 abs-insert: List<T> -> T -> List<T>
```

Listing 14. The signature of the abstract operation corresponding to `LinkedList::insert`

We can then provide the specification of `LinkedList::insert` with respect to its corresponding abstract operation, the maximal relation satisfying the Hoare triple:

$$\{xs_0. \text{true}\} \text{abs-insert} \{xs_0 \ x \ xs. \ xs = \text{model-insert} \ xs_0 \ x\} \quad (4)$$

In this Hoare triple, xs_0 refers to the initial value of the container, xs refers to the resultant container, and x is the element we insert. The function `model-insert` is a model operation defined in Rosette on lists:

```
1 (define (model-insert xs x) (append xs (list x)))
```

Listing 15. The model insertion operation

The postcondition states that we expect applying the insert operation to a container to produce the same results as our `model-insert` function. In our library specifications, defining such *model operations* in Rosette is a common technique to simplify the writing of postconditions.

Similarly, we can also provide the specification for the operation `LinkedList::contains`, with signature:

```
1 fn contains(&self, x: &T) -> bool {...}
```

Listing 16. The signature of `LinkedList::contains`

¹Rosette is untyped, but this is morally the type signature.

In our corresponding abstract operation, in addition to the boolean value indicating whether the given element x is present or not, the input container is also returned, as we would like to express the input container is not mutable, its value remains unchanged after this operation. Also, since the underlying value with type τ is given by an immutable reference $\&\tau$, in the abstract operation we treat the immutable reference $\&\tau$ as simply τ . The signature of the abstract operation is shown below:

```
1 abs-contains: List<T> -> T -> (List<T>, bool)
```

Listing 17. The signature of the abstract operation corresponding to `LinkedList::contains`

The Hoare triple that serves as the specification of `LinkedList::contains` is:

$$\{xs_0. \text{true}\} \text{abs-contains} \{xs_0 \ x \ xs \ r. (xs, r) = \text{model-contains} \ xs_0 \ x\} \quad (5)$$

Note that in this specification, the model operation `model-contains` defined in Listing 18 has the same type signature as the abstract operation shown in Listing 17. It also returns a pair of values: the output list, which is always equal to the input list, and a boolean value indicating if the element is present in the list.

```
1 (define (model-contains xs x)
2   (cond
3     [(list? (member x xs)) (cons xs #t)]
4     [else (cons xs #f)]))
```

Listing 18. The model operation for checking an element's containment

Because `model-contains` returns the list unchanged, this specifies that the operation should not change the list.

The library specification of the list removal operation is slightly more complicated, we use $\tau?$ to denote that a type may be `null` to express Rust's `Option<T>` type, which is the return type of `LinkedList::remove`. The type signature of `LinkedList::remove` is shown below:

```
1 fn remove(&mut self, x: T) -> Option<T> {...}
```

Listing 19. The type signature of `LinkedList::remove`

This is an operation that removes the first occurrence of an element from the given linked list and returns it. If the linked list does not contain the element, the value `None` will be returned and the linked list will remain unchanged. The signature of the corresponding abstract operation is:

```
1 abs-remove: List<T> -> T -> (List<T>, T?)
```

Listing 20. The signature of the abstract operation corresponding to `LinkedList::remove`

The model removal operation has the same signature shown in Listing 20. We return `null` in Rosette for the `None` case:

```
1 (define (model-remove xs x)
2   (cond
3     [(list? (member x xs)) (cons (remove x xs) x)]
4     [else (cons xs null)]))
```

Listing 21. The model removal operation

Again, we return a pair of values, where the first value is the resulting list and the second value is the element being removed.

The library specification of `LinkedList::remove` is then:

$$\{xs_0. \text{true}\} \text{abs-remove} \{xs_0 \ x \ xs \ r. (xs, r) = \text{model-remove} \ xs_0 \ x\} \quad (6)$$

To provide a complete specification of `LinkedList`, the library developer must ensure that each operation of the `LinkedList` is specified by a trait, and for each operation in each trait the `LinkedList` implements, specifications similar to the above are provided.

5.3 The Library Specification of A `BTreeSet`

In the library specification of the `LinkedList` above, it is intuitive to use a logic list as a model, as they are both lists. However, even for non-linear structures such as trees, we can still use logic lists as a model. For example, the `BTreeSet` in Rust’s collections library is a set implemented using a b-tree. All its elements are unique and arranged in ascending order. Thus, our list model of the b-tree is simply a sorted list in ascending order, where uniqueness of elements is preserved. The abstraction function α that connects the `BTreeSet` to our list model is simply an in-order traversal.

Our first example is again the specification of the insertion operation with signature:

```
1 pub fn insert(&mut self, value: T) {...}
```

Listing 22. The signature of `BTreeSet::insert`

The corresponding abstract operation on our model lists has a signature that resembles the abstraction of `LinkedList::insert`:

```
1 abs-insert: List<T> -> T -> List<T>
```

Listing 23. The signature of the abstract operation corresponding to `BTreeSet::insert`

The specification of `abs-insert` for `BTreeSet`, however, differs from that of `LinkedList`, as we must maintain ordering and uniqueness of elements:

$$\{x_{s_0}. x_{s_0} = \text{remove-duplicates} (\text{sort } x_{s_0} <)\} \text{abs-insert } \{x_{s_0} \ x \ x_s. x_s = \text{model-insert } x_{s_0} \ x\} \quad (7)$$

Similar to the specification for `LinkedList::insert`, x is the element to be inserted, and x_{s_0} and x_s are lists modelling the container (via the in-order traversal function α) before and after the `abs-insert` operation respectively. We place an assertion $x_{s_0} = \text{remove-duplicates} (\text{sort } x_{s_0} <)$ in the precondition requiring that the model x_{s_0} is a sorted list of unique elements. While this precondition should always be satisfied by an in-order traversal of a valid b-tree, we do not want our abstraction to constrain the implementation’s behaviour if the data invariants of the b-tree are violated — given a malformed b-tree, the implementation should be free to return any result. Because the semantics of `abs-insert` are the maximal relation satisfying this specification, this abstract operation contains all possible behaviours of the concrete implementation if this precondition is violated.

The `model-insert` here is insertion defined on a sorted list of unique elements:

```
1 (define (model-insert xs x) (remove-duplicates (sort (append xs (list x)) <)))
```

Listing 24. The unique and sorted list’s model insertion operation

Note that because our specifications do not need to be efficient, we can naïvely implement this function simply by appending the new element to the list, then sorting and removing duplicates from it.

We can also provide specifications for abstract operations that observe the ordering of elements in a `BTreeSet`, such as those operations from the `RandomAccess` trait, since there is an one-to-one correspondence between each element’s position in a `BTreeSet` and its position in the model list abstracted from the `BTreeSet`. For instance, we provide the specification of the operation `BTreeSet::first`, which is the operation obtaining the first (and also the minimal) element of a `BTreeSet` with signature:

```
1 fn first(&self) -> Option<T> {...}
```

Listing 25. The signature of `BTreeSet::first`

We again provide the signature of its corresponding abstract operation defined on our list model:

```
1 abs-first: List<T> -> (List<T>, T?)
```

Listing 26. The signature of the abstract operation corresponding to `BTreeSet::first`

As with the `contains` function on linked lists in Listing 17, this type includes a returned list, as Primrose does not consider the immutability of `&self` in the Rust type signature above. Instead, we include the requirement that the container is unchanged in our specification of `abs-first`:

$$\{xs_0. xs_0 = \text{remove-duplicates} (\text{sort } xs_0 <)\} \text{abs-first} \{xs_0 \text{ } xs \text{ } x. (xs, x) = \text{model-first } xs_0\} \quad (8)$$

Here, `model-first` is defined as a function that returns the first element of the list, is present, along with the list itself:

```
1 (define (model-first xs)
2   (cond
3     [(null? xs) (cons xs null)]
4     [else (cons xs (first xs))]))
```

Listing 27. The model operation obtaining the first element of a list

As before, our precondition includes the assumption that the model xs_0 abstracted from the `BTreeSet` contains unique elements that are sorted in ascending order.

5.4 The Library Specification of A HashSet

A b-tree implementation of a set, such as that specified in Section 5.3, maintains its elements in a fixed ascending order. The ordering of our abstract list model simply reflects the ordering of the elements in the b-tree. However, some container implementations do not have a fixed ordering of elements. For instance, the `HashSet` in Rust’s collection library is a set implementation using a hash algorithm which is randomly seeded. Despite the implementation storing elements in an unspecified order, we may still safely use a sorted, ascending list of unique elements as our abstract model of a `HashSet`: Our abstraction function α merely collects all elements from the `HashSet` into a list and then sorts them into ascending order.

Since the ordering of elements in our list is now different from the ordering of elements in the `HashSet`, the application developer may specify properties relating to the ordering of elements, such as `ascending`, that are not satisfied by the implementation, but are trivially satisfied by the abstraction function. This would lead to `HashSet` being considered a valid choice for an `ascending` container. However, Primrose prevents this problem by the checking of syntactic properties. The `HashSet` type does not implement any trait with operations that allow the internal ordering of its elements to be observed. Therefore, in any application for which the ordering of elements is important, the `HashSet` is never a valid choice. The process of selecting valid implementations according to traits will be discussed in detail in Section 6.1.

For the operations that are defined on both the `HashSet` and the `BTreeSet`, such as `insert`, `remove` and `contains`, the specifications of both implementations are identical—after all, the only externally observable difference between the two implementations is performance—but the specification for `HashSet` lacks any operations that observe the internal ordering of its elements, such as `first` or `last`.

5.5 Abstracting Over Implementation Details with Library Specifications

As we have seen and because the basic container operations of both `HashSet` and `BTreeSet` have the same externally observable behaviour, we can use the same specifications for both implementations. There are many such cases where specifications can be re-used: For instance, we provide two implementations of an ascending vector: `SortedVec` and `LazySortedVec`. `SortedVec` maintains the ascending order of elements inside the vector on insertion (*eager*) and `LazySortedVec` instead sorts elements whenever the vector is accessed (*lazy*). Since both implementations share the same externally observable behaviour, we use the same model for both eager and lazy implementations: a list with elements sorted in ascending order. Also, their operations are specified with the same set of model operations. For the eager implementation, our abstraction function α simply collects all its elements into a list. For the lazy implementation, in addition to collecting all elements into a list, the abstraction function α also sorts elements into ascending order.

These examples demonstrate that our library specifications form a concise model that abstracts over any implementation details that would complicate the process of selecting valid implementations. We further conjecture that these specifications and abstraction functions would have a valid forward simulation to any correct implementation, but due to lack of verification framework in Rust, this conjecture cannot yet be confirmed. Thus, it remains the responsibility of the library developer to provide valid library specifications that accurately describe the behaviour of their implementation.

We have seen how container implementations are specified by library developers as pre- and post-conditions, and how properties are specified by application developers as type refinements. Next, we are going to discuss how Primrose selects among all library specifications the valid implementations that satisfy the desired properties.

6 SELECTING VALID IMPLEMENTATIONS

Before ranking container implementations by performance and picking the best one for the given program, Primrose must first identify all container implementations that comply with the property specifications provided by the application developer. This selection process is comprised of two steps: Firstly, Primrose selects all container implementations that satisfy the required *syntactic* properties, and secondly, from the container implementations selected in the first step, it selects the ones whose library specifications match the required *semantic* properties. The first step is accomplished simply by gathering all types that implement the required Rust traits. For the second step, we check semantic properties against library specifications using the SMT solver in the backend of Rosette.

6.1 Selecting Container Implementations Satisfying Syntactic Properties

The first step of selecting valid implementations is to select concrete container implementations from the library that satisfy the required syntactic properties in a property specification. This step is straightforward. Primrose simply picks concrete container implementations in the library that implement the traits required by the property specifications.

For instance, suppose that in a property specification, an application developer requires a container type implementing traits `ContainerT` (Listing 2) and `RandomAccessT` (Listing 3), the elements of which are sorted in ascending order:

```
1 property ascending { \c -> (for-all-consecutive-pairs c leq?) }
2 type AscendingRandomAccessCon<T> = {c <: (ContainerT, RandomAccessT) | (ascending c)}
```

Listing 28. Property specification of an ascending container with traits `ContainerT` and `RandomAccessT`

In Rust’s collections library, we have concrete container implementations `Vec`, `LinkedList`, `BTreeSet` and `HashSet`, where `Vec`, `LinkedList` and `BTreeSet` implement both required traits while `HashSet` does not implement the trait `RandomAccessT`. Clearly, `HashSet` does not satisfy all required syntactic properties. Therefore, `HashSet` is ruled out as a possible implementations for `AscendingRandomAccessCon<T>`. The implementation for `AscendingRandomAccessCon<T>` is then selected from the remaining `Vec`, `LinkedList` and `BTreeSet` types by checking if the library specifications satisfy the required semantic property, `ascending`.

6.2 Selecting Container Implementations Satisfying Semantic Properties

After all container implementations with required syntactic properties have been gathered, Primrose then selects from these candidates that satisfy the required semantic properties. As discussed in Section 5, our library specifications abstract over the concrete container implementations, describing their externally observable semantics in a compact and tractable format. Primrose selects those candidates which satisfy the required semantic properties by encoding the property specifications as verification conditions against the candidate’s library specification in Rosette, to be discharged by an SMT solver.

In order to generate the required verification conditions, Primrose must first translate the required semantic properties, given in the specification language of Primrose, into definitions in Rosette that can be used by the solver. The container type `Con<T>` is resolved into the model type used in our library specifications, i.e., a logic list. For instance, the generated code according to the property `ascending` from Listing 28 is:

```
1 (define ascending (lambda (c) (for-all-consecutive-pairs c leq?)))
```

Listing 29. Generated code for the property `ascending`

With these Rosette definitions, Primrose can now generate our verification conditions. As an example, suppose we are considering `BTreeSet` as a candidate for our `AscendingRandomAccessCon<T>` type, and thus must generate verification conditions for the semantic property `ascending`. We must check that the semantic property `ascending` is an invariant held across each operation defined for `BTreeSet`. For instance, for the `BTreeSet`’s insertion operation, specified by (7) of Section 5.3, we check that the property `ascending` is preserved by any execution that satisfies its precondition and its postcondition:

$$\forall x_{s_0} x_s x. \frac{x_{s_0} = \text{remove-duplicates}(\text{sort } x_{s_0} <) \quad x_s = \text{model-insert } x_{s_0} x}{\text{ascending } x_{s_0} \Rightarrow \text{ascending } x_s}$$

(where: $\exists x_{s_0}. \text{ascending } x_{s_0} \wedge x_{s_0} = \text{remove-duplicates}(\text{sort } x_{s_0} <)$)

Fig. 7. The rule for checking the operation `BTreeSet::insert` against `ascending`

Recall that `xs0` and `xs` are model lists abstracted from the `BTreeSet`, specifically, `xs0` is the model for the input `BTreeSet`, and `xs` is model for the resulting `BTreeSet` of the operation `BTreeSet::insert`. The function `model-insert` is the model operation that specifies the behaviour of `BTreeSet::insert`’s corresponding abstract operation. Given the rule shown in Figure 7, the solver will attempt to find a counterexample: i.e., for all input models `xs0` that satisfy the semantic property `ascending`, the solver tries to find a resulting model of the operation that does not satisfy the property. If there is no such counterexample found, the solver will conclude that the operation `BTreeSet::insert` satisfies the property `ascending`.

$$\forall x_{s_0} x_s \vec{u} \vec{v}. \frac{\phi(x_{s_0}, \vec{u}) \quad \psi(x_s, \vec{v})}{P(x_{s_0}) \Rightarrow P(x_s)} \quad (\text{where: } \exists x_{s_0} \vec{u}. P(x_{s_0}) \wedge \phi(x_{s_0}, \vec{u}))$$

Fig. 8. The rule for checking an operation against a property

This search for a counterexample is parameterised by a *model size*, which denotes the maximum size of the input list x_{s_0} considered by the solver. This parameter is configurable by the application developer using Primrose, and its impact on the search time is discussed further in Section 8.1.

This rule also contains a side condition stating that there should be no contradiction between the required semantic property and the precondition of the operation. This side condition is important for ensuring that the solver does not search for a counterexample in an empty search space containing no models. Without the side condition, this rule is unsound. For example, suppose that the application developer specifies a semantic property requiring the container to have at least two elements that are sorted in strictly descending order. Clearly, the precondition of `BTreeSet::insert` would contradict this formula, as it implies elements are sorted in strictly ascending order. However, if we were to check its library specification of its operations against this semantic property without taking care of this side condition, the solver will conclude that `BTreeSet` is a valid choice for this property, since it cannot find a counterexample that violates this rule: The contradiction in the assumptions makes it vacuously true. The absence of counterexamples is not because the property is preserved by the operation, but rather because the property could never hold in the first place. Such a contradiction provides the solver an empty search space to find a counterexample, and thus none is found. Thus, our side condition requires that there exists at least one model that satisfies both the precondition of the operation and the required semantic property.

In general, the library specification of each operation takes the form:

$$\{\phi(x_{s_0}, \vec{u})\} \text{ op } \{\psi(x_s, \vec{v})\} \quad (9)$$

As before, x_{s_0} is the (abstract list model of the) input container and x_s is the result of the operation `op`. The sets of variables \vec{u} and \vec{v} denote any additional variables involved in the specification, such as additional inputs or outputs to the operation. The general form of the verification condition Primrose generates for the SMT solver, to check if an operation `op` satisfies a property P , is given in Figure 8.

For our `BTreeSet` example, Primrose checks these verification conditions for each operation of the traits `ContainerT` and `RandomAccessT`—the traits implemented by `BTreeSet`. Because the property `ascending` is satisfied by all operations, Primrose will conclude that the `BTreeSet` is a valid implementation choice for the required container type `AscendingRandomAccessCon<T>`.

The same checks are also run for our other two candidates that satisfy the required syntactic properties, specifically `Vec` and `LinkedList`, but they do not satisfy the required semantic property `ascending`. Thus, Primrose will conclude that amongst the three concrete implementations that satisfy the required syntactic properties, only the `BTreeSet` implementation satisfies the semantic property `ascending`, and hence it is the only valid implementation for the container type `AscendingRandomAccessCon<T>`.

6.3 Handling Interactions Between Semantic and Syntactic Properties

Recall our property specification of a stack container `StackCon<T>` from Section 4.3. Here, the operations `push` and `pop` specified in the trait `StackT` (Listing 10) are made available to the semantic property `lifo` (Listing 11). In this section, we discuss how Primrose selects library implementations for such cases.

Firstly, Primrose generates the definition of semantic property `lifo` in Rosette, where the operations `push` and `pop` are now replaced with their model operations:

```
1 (define lifo (lambda (c) (forall (list x) (equal? (cdr (model-pop (model-push c x))) x))))
```

Listing 30. The model insertion operation

Note that since `model-pop` returns a pair $(\text{List}\langle T \rangle, T?)$ and the definition of `lifo` only involves the element being popped, we use `cdr` to get the element, which is the second element in the returned pair. The specific model operations `model-pop` and `model-push` are supplied to this definition for each candidate type considered by Primrose. Recall that our library specifications state that these model operations exactly specify the behaviour of the list abstraction of every library operation, which means that these model operations can be used here to express assertions about the interaction between operations such as `push` and `pop`. Such assertions will, by virtue of forward simulation, also apply to the concrete implementations of the data type.

To illustrate the selection process, suppose a library developer provides two implementations that implement `push` and `pop`. The first one is a last-in-first-out implementation, where the library specification of `push` and `pop` is:

$$\{xs_0. \text{true}\} \text{abs-push}_1 \{xs_0 \ x \ xs. \ xs = \text{model-push } xs_0 \ x\} \quad (10)$$

$$\{xs_0. \text{true}\} \text{abs-pop}_1 \{xs_0 \ xs \ x. (xs, x) = \text{model-pop } xs_0\} \quad (11)$$

And the model operations are defined as:

```
1 (define (model-push xs x) (append xs (list x)))
2 (define (model-pop xs)
3   (cond
4     [(null? xs) (cons xs null)]
5     [else (cons (take xs (- (length xs) 1)) (last xs))]))
```

Listing 31. The model push and pop for a last-in-first-out implementation

With these two model operations, the solver can verify that this library specification satisfies the semantic property `lifo`.

By contrast, suppose the second implementation provided by the library developer is a first-in-first-out implementation. The library specification of `push` and `pop` appears similar:

$$\{xs_0. \text{true}\} \text{abs-push}_2 \{xs_0 \ x \ xs. \ xs = \text{model-push } xs_0 \ x\} \quad (12)$$

$$\{xs_0. \text{true}\} \text{abs-pop}_2 \{xs_0 \ xs \ x. (xs, x) = \text{model-pop } xs_0\} \quad (13)$$

But, the model operations have different semantics:

```
1 (define (model-push xs x) (append (list x) xs))
2 (define (model-pop xs)
3   (cond
4     [(null? xs) (cons xs null)]
5     [else (cons (take xs (- (length xs) 1)) (last xs))]))
```

Listing 32. The model push and pop for a first-in-first-out implementation

With these two model operations, the solver will conclude that this library specification does not satisfy the semantic property `lifo`, and Primrose does not consider this implementation as a valid choice for the container `StackCon<T>`.

7 CODE GENERATION AND RANKING IMPLEMENTATIONS BY PERFORMANCE

Once Primrose has selected the valid container implementations, it will generate a Rust program for each valid candidate by resolving the property specification into the selected container implementation. Although in Figure 3, we show a simplified version of generated programs where property specifications are directly replaced with concrete implementations, in practice Primrose carefully does not perform this replacement directly, as this would expose all operations defined on a concrete implementation including those that are not required by syntactic properties. Instead, Primrose generates Rust’s trait objects, encapsulating the concrete implementation and exposing only those operations in Rust traits which are specified as syntactic properties.

To rank the generated Rust code for each valid implementation, the current Primrose prototype executes all candidates, measures their runtime on some test input data, and ranks the candidates based on their runtime performance. This naïve technique is only a proof-of-concept prototype, and we anticipate adopting more sophisticated ranking techniques in the future.

Shacham et al. [2009], Jung et al. [2011], Xu [2013], and more recently, Costa and Andrzejak [2018] have proposed various dynamic techniques for assisting the selection of containers. Shacham et al. [2009] proposes a technique recording traces of executions that are then used to predict the best container with a machine learning model. Jung et al. [2011], Xu [2013], and Costa and Andrzejak [2018] even propose techniques that dynamically select the best implementation at runtime. All of this work is complementary to Primrose, and a more sophisticated ranking method could be incorporated easily in our overall design. Our existing prototype of Primrose focuses on enabling application developers to specify the desired behaviour as properties and selecting valid implementations satisfying those properties.

8 DISCUSSION

We shall now discuss various aspects of our prototype implementation of Primrose, including the practicality of using an SMT solver for selecting valid container implementations, the portability of Primrose to other programming languages, and the completeness of library specifications.

8.1 Efficiency of the SMT Solver

Our SMT-based selection process is parameterised by the *model size*, which defines the search space in which the solver attempts to find a counterexample. For our list models, this model size is the length of the input list to the abstract operation, $|xs_0|$. For instance, if our model size parameter is set to five, Primrose will instruct the solver to search for a counterexample amongst all lists from size zero to five. If a counterexample is found, the solver will conclude that the library specification does not satisfy the required semantic property; otherwise, the solver will report satisfaction. Naturally, the larger model size we set, the longer it takes for the solver to report satisfaction.

To optimise the selection time spent by the solver, the application developer must choose an appropriate model size, ideally the minimal size required by the solver to find any counterexamples to the semantic properties they have specified. A model size of two is already enough for the solver to find counterexamples to the semantic property `unique` for the library specifications of `Vec` and `LinkedList`. Two elements are also enough to distinguish elements in `ascending order` from elements in `descending order`.

In practice, we suggest a model of size five to be used in the process of selecting valid implementations, as this size is large enough to admit counterexamples to most conceivable semantic properties that the application developer may write, without slowing down the selection process to be impractical. For a library of six implementations, where each implementation contains nine operations, the solver only takes 11.44s for Primrose to check all of them against one semantic

property with a model size of five. The selection time doubles when another semantic property is added. We believe that these times allow a practical use of Primrose in many scenarios.

8.2 Portability of Primrose

Although currently we choose Rust as our target language to implement the proof-of-concept prototype of Primrose, it is possible to adapt Primrose to other languages with low effort, since property specifications, library specifications, and the process of selecting implementations are all language agnostic and not attached to Rust’s type system or language features.

Adapting property specifications into other languages only requires such languages to have a construct similar to Rust’s traits, such as traits in Scala and interfaces in Java, allowing us to model syntactic properties. It would be straightforward to add new backends to Primrose to generate code in these languages.

Our library specifications are, by design, an abstraction over implementation details, describing the intended semantics of container operations without respect to their implementation. This means we can easily adapt these specifications to container libraries from other languages, so long as we can justify such abstractions by defining suitable abstraction functions.

In the process of selecting valid implementations, there is little that is language-specific. Selecting implementations that satisfy the required syntactic properties can be easily adapted into languages with a construct similar to traits, and selecting implementations that satisfy the required semantic properties concerns only library specifications and property specifications, neither of which are tied to the semantics of any particular language. Thus, we anticipate that Primrose could, with minimal effort, be adapted to produce code in any language with sufficient support for data abstraction, such as Java, Scala, Swift, or C++.

8.3 Completeness of Library Specifications

In Section 5, we justified the soundness of our library specifications by defining suitable abstraction functions from the concrete implementation to our list model. Soundness of these specifications is crucial to ensure that Primrose does not select implementations that do not satisfy the required semantic properties, but *completeness* of these specifications is also important. Without completeness, it would be possible that Primrose could rule out perfectly valid implementations because it could not prove that the required semantic properties are preserved for an incompletely-specified operation.

Our model-based approach for writing library specifications, where each operation is specified by a deterministic model operation, easily ensures completeness. Because forward simulation ensures that every execution of the concrete implementation has a corresponding execution in the abstract operation, and our abstract operation is deterministic, that means that the correspondence between concrete executions and abstract executions is one-to-one. Thus, in addition to *soundness*, which states that each property established for an abstract operation applies also (via the inverse of the abstraction function α^{-1}) to an implementation, we have *completeness*, which states that each property established for a concrete implementation applies (via the abstraction function α) to the abstract operation. Thus, we ensure that all valid implementations and only the valid implementations are selected by Primrose.

There are many other approaches we could have taken for modelling library specifications. For instance, the axiomatic approach used in algebraic specifications for abstract data types [Wirsing 1990], which specifies the behaviour of operations by using a set of equational axioms that relate various operations. However, it is difficult to ensure the completeness of algebraic specifications, as it is difficult to ensure all behaviours of all operations are captured by a set of equations. Our model-based library specifications have the advantage of obvious completeness.

9 RELATED WORK

Refinement types. Refinement types, first introduced for the programming language ML [Freeman and Pfenning 1991], are types enriched with logical predicates from a restricted SMT-decidable logic. They improve compile-time error detection by incorporating rich logical constraints into the type system and automatically checking them. Refinement types have been more recently implemented in programming languages such as Haskell [Vazou et al. 2013, 2014] and F* [Swamy et al. 2016], supporting very rich specifications suitable for verifying the correctness of programs. While the syntax of Liquid Haskell inspires our design of the syntax of property specifications, we use refinement types not for verification, but for data abstraction, allowing application developers to specify the semantic requirements that are used to select valid implementations.

Abstract data types and algebraic specifications. An abstract data type is defined, from the perspective of users, as a class of objects that is characterised by the operations in their interface, rather than the details of their implementation [Liskov and Zilles 1974]. This data abstraction allows a separation of concerns, freeing application developers from having to consider the internal implementation details of a data type, instead allowing them to consider only the externally observable semantics of each operation. Our work advances this area of data abstraction, by raising the level of abstraction so that abstraction is maintained even when creating an instance of the data type, and the semantic requirements of an abstract data type can be formally specified.

Existing work in algebraic specifications [Gutttag 1976; Wirsing 1990] provide a formal definition of abstract data types where the semantics of operations are specified with a set of equational axioms. By contrast, our library specifications are not algebraic but model-based. As mentioned in Section 8.3, this allows us to easily ensure completeness of library specifications.

Model-based formal methods. There exist many formal modelling tools that facilitate model-based specification of abstract data types and software systems more generally, for example Z [Spivey 1989], VDM [Jones 1990], and most recently Alloy [Jackson 2006]. While these tools allow for application developers to formally analyse and explore the software design space, including formal reasoning about abstract data types, they work purely on the level of models and do not typically connect to actual code, as Primrose does.

Performance-oriented selection techniques. Many design space exploration techniques, particularly machine learning techniques, have been applied in compilers [Fursin et al. 2011] to selected performance optimization techniques [Cavazos et al. 2007] using various characteristics as features that are then used to rank the performance of multiple implementations [Siegmund et al. 2012]. Many dynamic selection techniques have been developed for assisting the selection of performant containers [Costa and Andrzejak 2018; Jung et al. 2011; Shacham et al. 2009; Xu 2013]. None of these techniques, however, use refinement types or semantic properties, and they have no general scheme to allow application developers to specify desired behaviour. These techniques purely focus on selecting between multiple, pre-known, valid container implementations. Such techniques could be incorporated into Primrose’s ranking process, and are highly complementary with our work.

10 CONCLUSION

This paper applies techniques from verification and formal methods in a new way to raise the level of abstraction for application developers, by freeing them from the burden of choosing concrete container implementations. Instead, application developers specify the expected behaviour of a container data type using semantic properties—a powerful novel abstraction technique. Semantic properties nicely complement syntactic properties (i.e., traits), allowing the specification of a programming interface and behaviour of a container without committing to a concrete implementation.

To select the best valid container implementations, this paper presents Primrose, a language-agnostic tool that automatically selects container implementations by checking that their library specifications satisfy the desired properties. The library specifications are written by the container library developers as pre- and post-conditions of the container’s operations, and we present formal specifications of four commonly-used container data types from the Rust standard library. To improve applications performance, Primrose ranks the selected valid container implementations based on their runtime performance.

We further discuss that: 1) our prototype implementation of Primrose is *practical*, selecting valid container implementations in seconds; 2) Primrose’s design is *language-agnostic*, enabling an easy adoption of Primrose for other languages beyond our Rust prototype; and 3) the model-based library specifications used in Primrose are guaranteed to be *complete specifications*.

In the future, we intend to significantly improve the ranking method used by Primrose, by using more sophisticated techniques, including machine-learning-based solutions and techniques that incorporate multiple non-functional metrics, such as runtime performance and memory consumption. It would also be interesting to integrate Primrose with a dynamic technique that changes the container implementation at runtime based on runtime performance measurements.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my special thanks to FromSoftware. Their game Elden Ring provided me remarkable mental supports through the development of the prototype of Primrose. Also, I would like to express my gratitude to HAL Laboratory, their game Kirby and the Forgotten Land provided me aesthetic inspirations for designing the interface of Primrose and served as my great accompany when I was writing this paper.

REFERENCES

- Martin Ankerl. 2019. Hashmaps Benchmarks – Finding the Fastest; Memory Efficient Hashmap. <https://martin.ankerl.com/2019/04/01/hashmap-benchmarks-01-overview/>
- Rudolf Bayer. 1972. Symmetric Binary B-Trees: Data Structure and Maintenance Algorithms. *Acta Informatica* 1 (1972), 290–306. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00289509>
- John Cavazos, Grigori Fursin, Felix Agakov, Edwin Bonilla, Michael F. P. O’Boyle, and Olivier Temam. 2007. Rapidly Selecting Good Compiler Optimizations Using Performance Counters. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO ’07)*. IEEE Computer Society, USA, 185–197. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CGO.2007.32>
- Paul Cechner. 2014. vector vs map performance confusion. <https://stackoverflow.com/questions/24542936/vector-vs-map-performance-confusion>
- Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. 2009. *Introduction to Algorithms, 3rd Edition*. MIT Press. <http://mitpress.mit.edu/books/introduction-algorithms>
- Diego Costa and Artur Andrzejak. 2018. CollectionSwitch: A Framework for Efficient and Dynamic Collection Selection. In *Proceedings of the 2018 International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (Vienna, Austria) (CGO 2018)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 16–26. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3168825>
- Willem-Paul de Roever and Kai Engelhardt. 1998. *Properties of Simulation*. Cambridge University Press, 73–89. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511663079.005>
- Edouard. 2020. Using C++ containers efficiently. <https://blog.quasar.ai/using-c-containers-efficiently>
- Tim Freeman and Frank Pfenning. 1991. Refinement Types for ML. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 1991 Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (Toronto, Ontario, Canada) (PLDI ’91)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 268–277. <https://doi.org/10.1145/113445.113468>
- Grigori Fursin, Yuriy Kashnikov, Abdul Wahid Memon, Zbigniew Chamski, Olivier Temam, Mircea Namolaru, Elad Yom-Tov, Bilha Mendelson, Ayal Zaks, Eric Courtois, et al. 2011. Milepost gcc: Machine learning enabled self-tuning compiler. *International journal of parallel programming* 39, 3 (2011), 296–327.
- Jean-Yves Girard. 1986. The System F of Variable Types, Fifteen Years Later. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 45, 2 (1986), 159–192. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(86\)90044-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(86)90044-7)

- John Guttag. 1976. Abstract Data Types and the Development of Data Structures. In *Proceedings of the 1976 Conference on Data: Abstraction, Definition and Structure* (Salt Lake City, Utah, USA). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 72. <https://doi.org/10.1145/800237.807124>
- Roger Hindley. 1969. The principal type-scheme of an object in combinatory logic. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 146 (1969), 29–60.
- C. A. R. Hoare. 1969. An Axiomatic Basis for Computer Programming. *Commun. ACM* 12, 10 (oct 1969), 576–580. <https://doi.org/10.1145/363235.363259>
- Daniel Jackson. 2006. *Software Abstractions: Logic, Language and Analysis*. MIT Press.
- Cliff B. Jones. 1990. *Systematic Software Development Using VDM (2nd Ed.)*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., USA.
- Changhee Jung, Silviu Rus, Brian P. Railing, Nathan Clark, and Santosh Pande. 2011. Brainy: Effective Selection of Data Structures. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation* (San Jose, California, USA) (*PLDI '11*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 86–97. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1993498.1993509>
- Ralf Jung, Jacques-Henri Jourdan, Robbert Krebbers, and Derek Dreyer. 2017. RustBelt: Securing the Foundations of the Rust Programming Language. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 2, POPL, Article 66 (dec 2017), 34 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3158154>
- Barbara Liskov and Stephen Zilles. 1974. Programming with Abstract Data Types. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Very High Level Languages* (Santa Monica, California, USA). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 50–59. <https://doi.org/10.1145/800233.807045>
- Robin Milner. 1978. A theory of type polymorphism in programming. *J. Comput. System Sci.* 17, 3 (1978), 348–375. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000\(78\)90014-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000(78)90014-4)
- Douglas A. H. Orr. 2019. Finding unique items - hash vs sort? <https://douglasorr.github.io/2019-09-hash-vs-sort/article.html>
- John C. Reynolds. 1974. Towards a theory of type structure. In *Programming Symposium, Proceedings Colloque sur la Programmation, Paris, France, April 9-11, 1974 (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 19)*, Bernard J. Robinet (Ed.). Springer, 408–423. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-06859-7_148
- Ohad Shacham, Martin Vechev, and Eran Yahav. 2009. Chameleon: Adaptive Selection of Collections. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation* (Dublin, Ireland) (*PLDI '09*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 408–418. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1542476.1542522>
- Norbert Siegmund, Sergiy S. Kolesnikov, Christian Kästner, Sven Apel, Don S. Batory, Marko Rosenmüller, and Gunter Saake. 2012. Predicting performance via automated feature-interaction detection. In *34th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2012, June 2-9, 2012, Zurich, Switzerland*, Martin Glinz, Gail C. Murphy, and Mauro Pezzè (Eds.). IEEE Computer Society, 167–177. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE.2012.6227196>
- J. M. Spivey. 1989. *The Z Notation: A Reference Manual*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., USA.
- Nikhil Swamy, Cătălin Hrițcu, Chantal Keller, Aseem Rastogi, Antoine Delignat-Lavaud, Simon Forest, Karthikeyan Bhargavan, Cédric Fournet, Pierre-Yves Strub, Markulf Kohlweiss, Jean-Karim Zinzindohoue, and Santiago Zanella-Béguelin. 2016. Dependent Types and Multi-Monadic Effects in F*. In *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages* (St. Petersburg, FL, USA) (*POPL '16*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 256–270. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2837614.2837655>
- Emina Torlak and Rastislav Bodík. 2013. Growing solver-aided languages with rosette. In *ACM Symposium on New Ideas in Programming and Reflections on Software, Onward! 2013, part of SPLASH '13, Indianapolis, IN, USA, October 26-31, 2013*, Antony L. Hosking, Patrick Th. Eugster, and Robert Hirschfeld (Eds.). ACM, 135–152. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2509578.2509586>
- Emina Torlak and Rastislav Bodík. 2014. A Lightweight Symbolic Virtual Machine for Solver-Aided Host Languages. In *Proceedings of the 35th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation* (Edinburgh, United Kingdom) (*PLDI '14*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 530–541. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2594291.2594340>
- Niki Vazou, Patrick Maxim Rondon, and Ranjit Jhala. 2013. Abstract Refinement Types. In *Programming Languages and Systems - 22nd European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2013, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2013, Rome, Italy, March 16-24, 2013. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 7792)*, Matthias Felleisen and Philippa Gardner (Eds.). Springer, 209–228. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-37036-6_13
- Niki Vazou, Eric L. Seidel, Ranjit Jhala, Dimitrios Vytiniotis, and Simon Peyton-Jones. 2014. Refinement Types for Haskell. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming* (Gothenburg, Sweden) (*ICFP '14*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 269–282. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2628136.2628161>
- Baptiste Wicht. 2012. C++ benchmark – std::vector VS std::list VS std::deque. <https://baptiste-wicht.com/posts/2012/12/cpp-benchmark-vector-list-deque.html>

- Martin Wirsing. 1990. Algebraic Specification. In *Formal Models and Semantics*, Jan Van Leeuwen (Ed.). Elsevier, Amsterdam, 675–788. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-88074-1.50018-4>
- Guoqing Xu. 2013. CoCo: Sound and Adaptive Replacement of Java Collections. In *ECOOP 2013 - Object-Oriented Programming - 27th European Conference, Montpellier, France, July 1-5, 2013. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 7920)*, Giuseppe Castagna (Ed.). Springer, 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39038-8_1