

Clustered Relational Thread-Modular Abstract Interpretation with Local Traces

Michael Schwarz¹, Simmo Saan², Helmut Seidl¹,
Julian Erhard¹, and Vesal Vojdani²

¹ Technische Universität München, Garching, Germany
{m.schwarz, helmut.seidl, julian.erhard}@tum.de

² University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia
{simmo.saan, vesal.vojdanii}@ut.ee

Abstract. We construct novel thread-modular analyses that track relational information for potentially overlapping clusters of global variables – given that they are protected by common mutexes. We provide a framework to systematically increase the precision of clustered relational analyses by splitting control locations based on abstractions of *local traces*. As one instance, we obtain an analysis of dynamic thread creation and joining. Interestingly, tracking *less relational* information for globals may result in higher precision. We consider the class of 2-decomposable domains that encompasses many weakly relational domains (e.g., *Octagons*). For these domains, we prove that maximal precision is attained already for clusters of globals of sizes at most 2.

Keywords: thread-modular relational abstract interpretation, collecting local trace semantics, clusters, dynamic thread creation, concurrency

1 Introduction

Tracking relationships between program variables is indispensable for proving properties of programs or verifying the absence of certain programming errors [14, 16, 33]. Inferring relational properties is particularly challenging for multi-threaded programs as all interferences by other threads that may happen in parallel, must be taken into account. In such an environment, only relational properties between globals protected by common mutexes are likely to persist throughout program execution. Generally, relations on clusters consisting of fewer variables are less brittle than those on larger clusters. Moreover, monolithic relational analyses employing, e.g., the polyhedral abstract domain are known to be notoriously expensive [36, 52]. Tracking *smaller* clusters may even be more precise than tracking larger clusters [19].

Example 1. Consider the following program. All accesses to globals g , h , and i are protected by the mutex a .

```

main:
  x = create(t1); y = create(t2);
  lock(a);
  g = ?; h = ?; i = ?;
  unlock(a); r = join(y); lock(a);
  z = ?; g = z; h = z; i = z;
  unlock(a); lock(a);
  // ASSERT(h==i); (1) ASSERT(g==h); (2)
  unlock(a);

t1:
  lock(a);
  x = h;
  i = x;
  unlock(a);
  return 1;

t2:
  lock(a);
  g = ?; h = ?;
  unlock(a);
  return 0;

```

In this program, the main thread creates two new threads, starting at t_1 and t_2 , respectively. Then it locks the mutex a to set all globals non-deterministically to some value and unlocks a again. After having joined the thread t_2 , it locks a again and sets all globals to the *same* unknown value and unlocks a again. Thread t_1 sets i to the value of h . Thread t_2 sets g and h to (potentially different) unknown values. Assume we are interested in equalities between globals. In order to succeed in showing assertion (1), it is necessary to detect that the main thread is unique and thus cannot read its past writes since these have been overwritten. Additionally, the analysis needs to certify that thread t_2 also is unique, has been joined before the assertion, and that its writes must also have been overwritten.

For an analysis to prove assertion (2), propagating a joint abstraction of the values of all globals protected by a does not suffice: At the unlock of a in t_1 , $g=h$ need not hold. If this monolithic relation is propagated to the last lock of a in main, (2) cannot be shown — despite t_1 modifying neither g nor h . \square

Here we show, that the loss of precision indicated in the example can be remedied by replacing the monolithic abstraction of all globals protected by a mutex with suitably chosen subclusters. In the example, we propose to instead consider the subclusters $\{g, h\}$ and $\{h, i\}$ separately. As t_1 does not write any values to the cluster $\{g, h\}$, the imprecise relation \top thus is not propagated to the main thread and assertion (2) can be shown.

To fine-tune the analysis, we rely on *weakly* relational domains. A variety of weakly relational domains have been proposed in the literature such as *Two Variables Per Inequality* [51], *Octagons* [36, 37], or simplifications thereof [33, 35]. The technical property of interest which all these domains have in common is that each abstract relation can be reconstructed from its projections onto subclusters of variables of size at most 2. We call such domains *2-decomposable*. Beyond the numerical 2-decomposable domains, also non-numerical 2-decomposable domains can be constructed such as a domain relating string names and function pointers.

Based on 2-decomposable domains, we design thread-modular relational analyses of globals which may attain additional precision by taking *local* knowledge of threads into account. Therefore, we do not rely on a *global* trace semantics, but on a *local* trace semantics which formalizes for each thread that part of the computational past it can observe [48]. Abstract values for program points describe the set of all reaching local traces. Likewise, values recorded for *observable* actions are abstractions of all local traces ending in the corresponding action. Such observable actions are, e.g., unlock operations for mutexes. The abstract

values are then refined by taking finite abstractions of local traces into account. To this end, we propose a generic framework that re-uses the components of any base analysis as black boxes. Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We provide a new relational analysis of globals as an abstraction of the collecting local trace semantics based on overlapping clusters of variables (Sections 3, 4, and 8).
- Our analysis deals with dynamically created and joined threads, whose thread *ids* may, e.g., be communicated to other threads via variables and which may synchronize via mutexes (Section 3).
- We provide a generic scheme to incorporate history-based arguments into the analysis by taking finite abstractions of local traces into account (Section 5).
- We give an analysis of dynamically created thread *ids* as an instance of our generic scheme. We apply this to exclude *self-influences* or reads from threads that cannot possibly run in parallel (Sections 6 and 7).
- We prove that some loss of precision of relational analyses can be avoided by tracking *all* subclusters of variables. For the class of 2-decomposable relational domains, we prove that tracking variable clusters of size greater than 2 can be abandoned without precision loss (Section 8).

The analyses in this paper have all been implemented, a report of a practical evaluation is included in Section 9, whereas Section 10 details related work.

2 Relational Domains

First, we define the notion of relational domain employed in the description of our analysis. Let \mathcal{Vars} be a set of variables, potentially of different types. We assume all configurations and assignments to be well-typed, i.e., the type of the (abstract) value matches the one specified for a variable. For each type τ of values, we assume a complete lattice $\mathcal{V}_\tau^\#$ of abstract values abstracting the respective concrete values from \mathcal{V}_τ . Let $\mathcal{V}^\#$ denote the collection of these lattices, and $\mathcal{Vars} \rightarrow_{\perp} \mathcal{V}^\#$ denote the set of all type-consistent assignments σ from variables to non- \perp abstract values, extended with a dedicated least element (also denoted by \perp), and equipped with the induced ordering. A *relational domain* \mathcal{R} then is a complete lattice which provides the following operations

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 \llbracket x \leftarrow e \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R} \text{ (assignment for expression } e) & \text{lift} : (\mathcal{Vars} \rightarrow_{\perp} \mathcal{V}^\#) \rightarrow \mathcal{R} \\
 r|_Y : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R} \text{ (restriction to } Y \subseteq \mathcal{Vars}) & \text{unlift} : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow (\mathcal{Vars} \rightarrow_{\perp} \mathcal{V}^\#) \\
 \llbracket ?e \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R} \text{ (guard for condition } e) &
 \end{array}$$

The operations to the left provide the abstract state transformers for the basic operation of programs (with non-deterministic assignments expressed as restrictions), while `lift` and `unlift` allow casting from abstract variable assignments to the relational domain as well as extracting single-variable information. We assume that `lift` $\perp = \perp$ and `unlift` $\perp = \perp$, and require that `unlift` \circ `lift` \sqsupseteq `id` where \sqsupseteq refers to the ordering of $(\mathcal{Vars} \rightarrow_{\perp} \mathcal{V}^\#)$. Moreover, we require that the *meet* operations \sqcap of $\mathcal{V}^\#$ and \mathcal{R} safely approximate the intersection of the concretizations

of the respective arguments. Restricting a relation r to a subset Y of variables amounts to *forgetting* all information about variables not in Y . Thus, we demand $r|_{\mathcal{V}ars} = r$, $r|_{\emptyset} = \top$, $r|_{Y_1} \supseteq r|_{Y_2}$ when $Y_1 \subseteq Y_2$, $(r|_{Y_1})|_{Y_2} = r|_{Y_1 \cap Y_2}$, and

$$\text{unlift}(r|_Y)x = \top \quad (x \notin Y) \quad \text{unlift}(r|_Y)x = (\text{unlift } r)x \quad (x \in Y) \quad (1)$$

Restriction thus is *idempotent*. For convenience, we also define a shorthand for assignment of abstract values³: $\llbracket x \leftarrow^\# v \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r = (r|_{\mathcal{V}ars \setminus \{x\}}) \sqcap (\text{lift}(\top \oplus \{x \mapsto v\}))$. In order to construct an abstract interpretation, we further require monotonic concretization functions $\gamma_{\mathcal{V}^\#} : \mathcal{V}^\# \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{V}}$ and $\gamma_{\mathcal{R}} : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{V}ars \rightarrow \mathcal{V}}$ satisfying the requirements presented in Fig. 1.

Example 2. As a value domain $\mathcal{V}_\tau^\#$, consider the flat lattice over the sets of values of appropriate type τ . A relational domain \mathcal{R}_1 is obtained by collecting satisfiable conjunctions of equalities between variables or variables and constants where the ordering is logical implication, extended with **False** as least element. The greatest element in this complete lattice is given by **True**. The operations **lift** and **unlift** for non- \perp arguments then can be defined as

$$\text{lift } \sigma = \bigwedge \{x = \sigma x \mid x \in \mathcal{V}ars, \sigma x \neq \top\} \quad \text{unlift } r x = \begin{cases} c & \text{if } r \implies (x = c) \\ \top & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The restriction of r to a subset Y of variables is given by the conjunction of all equalities implied by r which only contain variables from Y or constants. \square

In line of Example 2, relational domains for non-numerical values may also be constructed.

A variable clustering $\mathcal{S} \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{V}ars}$ is a set of subsets (*clusters*) of variables. For any cluster $Y \subseteq \mathcal{V}ars$, let $\mathcal{R}^Y = \{r \in \mathcal{R}, r|_Y = r\}$; this set collects all abstract values from \mathcal{R} containing information on variables in Y only. Given an arbitrary clustering $\mathcal{S} \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{V}ars}$, *any* relation $r \in \mathcal{R}$ can be approximated by a meet of relations from \mathcal{R}^Y ($Y \in \mathcal{S}$) since for every $r \in \mathcal{R}$, $r \sqsubseteq \prod \{r|_Y \mid Y \in \mathcal{S}\}$ holds.

Some relational domains, however, can be fully recovered from their restrictions to specific subsets of clusters. We consider for $k \geq 1$, the set \mathcal{S}_k of all non-empty subsets $Y \subseteq \mathcal{V}ars$ of cardinality at most k . We call a relational domain \mathcal{R} *k-decomposable* if each abstract value from \mathcal{R} can be precisely expressed

³ We use $\sigma \oplus \{x_i \mapsto v_i \mid i = 1, \dots, m\}$ to denote the variable assignment obtained from σ by replacing the values for x_i with v_i ($i = 1, \dots, m$).

$\forall a, b : a \sqsubseteq b \implies \gamma_{\mathcal{V}^\#} a \subseteq \gamma_{\mathcal{V}^\#} b \quad \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} \perp = \emptyset \quad \forall r, s : r \sqsubseteq s \implies \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} r \subseteq \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} s$ $\gamma_{\mathcal{R}} (\llbracket x \leftarrow e \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r) \supseteq \{\sigma \oplus \{x \mapsto \llbracket e \rrbracket \sigma\} \mid \sigma \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} r\}$ $\gamma_{\mathcal{R}} (r _Y) \supseteq \{\sigma \oplus \{x_1 \mapsto v_1, \dots, x_m \mapsto v_m\} \mid v_i \in \mathcal{V}, x_i \in \mathcal{V}ars \setminus Y, \sigma \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} r\}$ $\gamma_{\mathcal{R}} (\text{lift } \sigma^\#) \supseteq \{\sigma \mid \forall x : \sigma x \in \gamma_{\mathcal{V}^\#} (\sigma^\# x)\} \quad \gamma_{\mathcal{V}^\#} (\text{unlift } r)x \supseteq \{\sigma x \mid \sigma \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} r\}$
--

Fig. 1: Required properties for $\gamma_{\mathcal{V}^\#} : \mathcal{V}^\# \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{V}}$ and $\gamma_{\mathcal{R}} : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{V}ars \rightarrow \mathcal{V}}$.

as the meet of its restrictions to clusters of \mathcal{S}_k and when all least upper bounds can be recovered by computing with clusters of \mathcal{S}_k only; that is,

$$r = \sqcap \{r|_Q \mid Q \in \mathcal{S}_k\} \quad (\sqcup R)|_Q = \sqcup \{r|_Q \mid r \in R\} \quad (Q \in \mathcal{S}_k) \quad (2)$$

holds for each abstract relation $r \in \mathcal{R}$ and each set of abstract relations $R \subseteq \mathcal{R}$.

Example 3. The domain \mathcal{R}_1 from the previous example is 2-decomposable. This also holds for the *octagon* domain [36] and many other weakly relational numeric domains (pentagons [33], weighted hexagons [21], logahedra [28], TVPI [51], dDBM [46], and AVO [11]). The *affine equalities* or *affine inequalities* domains [16, 30], however, are not. The relational string domains recently proposed by Arceri et al. [6] in Sec. 5.1 through Sec. 5.3, are examples of non-numeric 2-decomposable domains.

3 A Local Trace Semantics

We build upon the semantic framework for *local traces*, introduced by Schwarz et al. [48]. A local trace records all past events that have affected the present configuration of a specific thread, referred to as the *ego* thread. In [48], the local trace semantics is proven equivalent to the global trace semantics which itself is equivalent to a global interleaving semantics. In particular, any analysis that is sound w.r.t. the local trace semantics also is w.r.t. the interleaving semantics.

While the framework of Schwarz et al. [48] allows for different formalizations of traces, thread synchronization happens only via locking/unlocking and thread creation. Generalizing their semantics, we identify certain actions as *observable* by other threads when executing corresponding *observing* actions (see Table 1). When the *ego* thread executes an *observing* action, a local trace ending in the corresponding *observable* action is incorporated. Here, we consider as observable/observing actions locking/unlocking mutexes and creating/joining threads.

Consider, e.g., the program in Fig. 2a and a corresponding local trace (Fig. 2b). This trace consists of one *swim lane* for each thread representing the sequence of steps it executed where each node in the graph represents a configuration attained by it. Additionally, the trace records the *create* and *join* orders as well as

Table 1: Observable and observing actions and which concurrency primitive they relate to. The primitives targeted by this paper are in bold font.

Observable Action	Observing Action	Programming Concept
<code>unlock(a)</code>	<code>lock(a)</code>	Mutex , Monitor, ...
<code>return x</code>	<code>x' = join(x'')</code>	Thread Returning / Joining
<code>g = x</code>	<code>x = g</code>	Writing/Reading a global variable
<code>signal(c)</code>	<code>wait(c)</code>	Condition Variables
<code>send(chan, v)</code>	<code>x = receive(chan)</code>	Channel-Based Concurrency, Sockets, ...
<code>set_value</code>	<code>get</code>	Futures / Promises




Fig. 2: An example program and a corresponding local trace.

for each mutex a , the *locking* order for a (\rightarrow_c , \rightarrow_j , and \rightarrow_a , respectively). These orders introduce extra relationships between thread configurations. The unique start node of each local trace is an initial configuration of the *main* thread.

We distinguish between the sets \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{G} of *local* and *global* variables. We assume that \mathcal{X} contains a special variable *self* within which the thread *id* of the current thread, drawn from the set \mathcal{I} , is maintained. A (local) *thread configuration* is a pair (u, σ) where u is a program point and the type-consistent map $\sigma : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ provides values for the local variables. The values of globals are *not* explicitly represented in a thread configuration, but can be recovered by consulting the (unique) last write to this global within the local trace. To model weak memory effects, weaker notions of last writes are conceivable. As in [48], we consider a set of actions \mathcal{Act} that consists of locking and unlocking a (non-reentrant) mutex from a set M , copying values of globals into locals and vice-versa, creating a new thread, as well as assignments with and branching on local variables. We extend \mathcal{Act} with actions for *returning* from and *joining* with threads. We assume that writes to and reads from globals are *atomic* (or more precisely, we assume copying values of *integral* type to be atomic). This is enforced for each global g by a dedicated mutex m_g acquired just before accessing g and released immediately after. For simplicity, we associate traces corresponding to a write of g to this dedicated mutex m_g , and thus do not need to consider writing and reading of globals as observable/observing actions. In examples, we omit explicitly locking and unlocking these mutexes. By convention, at program start all globals have value 0, while local variables may initially have any value.

Each thread is represented by a control-flow graph with edges $e \in \mathcal{E}$ of the form $e = (u, \text{act}, u')$ for some action $\text{act} \in \mathcal{Act}$ and program points u and u' where the start point of the *main* thread is u_0 . Let \mathcal{T} denote the set of all local traces of a given program. A formalism for local traces must, for each edge e of the control-flow graph, provide a transformation $\llbracket e \rrbracket : \mathcal{T}^k \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{T}}$ so that $\llbracket e \rrbracket(t_0, \dots, t_{k-1})$ extends the local trace t_0 , possibly incorporating other

local traces. For the operations $\text{lock}(a)$, $a \in \mathbf{M}$, or $x=\text{join}(x')$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, the arity of $\llbracket e \rrbracket$ is two, another local trace, namely, with last operation $\text{unlock}(a)$ or $\text{return } x''$, respectively, is incorporated. The remaining edge transformations have arity one. In all cases, the set of resulting local traces may be empty when the operation is not applicable to its argument(s). We write $\llbracket e \rrbracket(T_0, \dots, T_{k-1})$ for the set $\bigcup_{t_0 \in T_0, \dots, t_{k-1} \in T_{k-1}} \llbracket e \rrbracket(t_0, \dots, t_{k-1})$.

Given definitions of $\llbracket e \rrbracket$, the set \mathcal{T} can be inductively defined starting from a set init of *initial local traces* consisting of initial configurations of the *main* thread. To develop efficient thread-modular abstractions, we are interested in subsets $\mathcal{T}[u]$, $\mathcal{T}[a]$, $\mathcal{T}[i]$ of local traces ending at some program point u , ending with an *unlock* operation for mutexes a (or from init), or ending with a *return* statement of thread i , respectively. Schwarz et al. [48] showed that such subsets can be described as the least solution of a *side-effecting constraint system* [5]. There, each right-hand side may, besides its contribution to the unknown on the left, also provide contributions to other unknowns (the *side-effects*). This allows expressing analyses that accumulate flow-insensitive information about globals during a flow-sensitive analysis of local states with dynamic control flow [49]. Here, in the presence of dynamic thread creation, we use side-effects to express that an observable action, unlock or return, should *also* contribute to the sets $\mathcal{T}[a]$ or $\mathcal{T}[i]$, such that they can be incorporated at the corresponding observing action. The side-effecting formulation of our concrete semantics takes the form:

$$(\eta, \eta[u_0]) \sqsupseteq (\{[a] \mapsto \text{init} \mid a \in \mathbf{M}\}, \text{init}) \quad (\eta, \eta[u']) \sqsupseteq \llbracket u, \text{act} \rrbracket \eta \quad (u, \text{act}, u') \in \mathcal{E} \quad (3)$$

where the ordering \sqsupseteq is induced by the superset ordering and right-hand sides are defined in Fig. 3. A right-hand side takes an assignment η of the unknowns of the system and returns a pair (η', T) where T is the contribution to the unknown occurring on the left (as in ordinary constraint systems). The first component collects the side-effects as the assignment η' . If the right-hand sides are monotonic, Eq. (3) has a unique least solution.

We only detail the right-hand sides for the *creation* of threads as well as the new actions *join* and *return*; the rest remain the same as defined by Schwarz et al. [48]. For **thread creation**, they provide the action $x=\text{create}(u_1)$. Here, u_1 is the program point at which the created thread should start. We assume

$\llbracket u, \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket \eta = (\emptyset, \llbracket e \rrbracket(\eta[u], \eta[a]))$	$\llbracket u, x=\text{create}(u_1) \rrbracket \eta = \mathbf{let } T = \llbracket e \rrbracket(\eta[u]) \mathbf{in}$ $(\{[u_1] \mapsto \mathbf{new } u \ u_1 \ (\eta[u])\}, T)$
$\llbracket u, \text{unlock}(a) \rrbracket \eta =$ $\mathbf{let } T = \llbracket e \rrbracket(\eta[u]) \mathbf{in}$ $(\{[a] \mapsto T\}, T)$	$\llbracket u, x=\text{join}(x') \rrbracket \eta = \mathbf{let } T = \eta[u] \mathbf{in}$ $(\emptyset, \llbracket e \rrbracket(\eta[u], \bigcup\{\eta[t(x')] \mid t \in \eta[u]\}))$
$\llbracket u, x = g \rrbracket \eta = (\emptyset, \llbracket e \rrbracket(\eta[u]))$	$\llbracket u, \text{return } x \rrbracket \eta = \mathbf{let } T = \eta[u] \mathbf{in}$ $(\{[i] \mapsto \llbracket e \rrbracket(\{t \in T \mid t(\mathbf{self}) = i\}) \mid i \in \mathcal{I}\}, \llbracket e \rrbracket T)$
$\llbracket u, g = x \rrbracket \eta = (\emptyset, \llbracket e \rrbracket(\eta[u]))$	

Fig. 3: Right-hand sides for side-effecting formulation of concrete semantics; $t(y)$ extracts the value of local variable y from the terminal configuration of trace t .

that all locals from the creator are passed to the created thread, except for the variable `self`. The variables `self` in the created thread and x in the creating thread receive a fresh thread id . Here, `new u u1 t` computes the local trace at the start point u_1 from the local trace t of the creating thread. To handle **returning** and **joining** of threads we introduce the following two actions:

- `return x`; – terminating a thread and returning the value of the local variable x to a thread waiting for the given thread to terminate.
- `x=join(x')`; where x' is a local variable holding a thread id – blocks the ego thread, until the thread with the given thread id has terminated. As in *pthreads*, at most one thread may call join for a given thread id . The value provided to return by the joined thread is assigned to the local variable x .

For returning results and realization of join, we employ the unknown $[i]$ for the thread id i of the returning thread, as shown in Fig. 3.

4 Relational Analyses as Abstractions of Local Traces

Subsequently, we give relational analyses of the values of globals which we base on the local trace semantics. They are generic in the relational domain \mathcal{R} , with 2-decomposable domains being particularly well-suited, as the concept of *clusters* is central to the analyses. We focus on relations between globals that are jointly *write-protected* by some mutex. We assume we are given for each global g , a set $\mathcal{M}[g]$ of (write) *protecting* mutexes, i.e., mutexes that are *always* held when g is written. Let $\mathcal{G}[a] = \{g \in \mathcal{G} \mid a \in \mathcal{M}[g]\}$ denote the set of globals protected by a mutex a . Let $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{Q}_a \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{G}[a]}$ the set of clusters of these globals we associate with a . For technical reasons, we require at least one cluster per mutex a , which may be the empty cluster \emptyset , thus not associating any information with a .

Our basic idea is to store at the unknown $[a, Q]$ (for each mutex a and cluster $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a$) an abstraction of the relations *only* between globals in Q . By construction, all globals in Q are protected by a . Whenever it is locked, the relational information stored at all $[a, Q]$ is incorporated into the local state by the lattice operation *meet*, i.e., the local state now maintains relations between locals *as well as* globals which no other thread can access at this program point. Whenever a is unlocked, the new relation between globals in all corresponding clusters $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a$ is side-effected to the respective unknowns $[a, Q]$. Simultaneously, all information on globals no longer protected, is *forgotten* to obtain the new local state. In this way, the analysis is fully relational in the local state, while only keeping relations within clusters of globals jointly protected by some mutex.

For clarity of presentation, we perform *control-point splitting* on the set of held mutexes when reaching program points. Apart from this, the constraint system and right-hand sides for the analysis closely follow those of the concrete semantics (Section 3) — with the exception that unknowns now take values from \mathcal{R} and that unknowns $[a]$ are replaced with unknowns $[a, Q]$ for $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a$.

All right-hand sides are given in detail in Fig. 4. For the **start point** of the program and the empty lockset, the right-hand side `init#` returns the \top relation

$\begin{aligned} \text{init}^\# \eta = & \\ \text{let } r(Q) = \llbracket \{g \leftarrow 0 \mid g \in Q\} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# \top \text{ in} & \\ \text{let } \rho = \{[a, Q] \mapsto r(Q) \mid a \in M, Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a\} & \\ \text{in } (\rho, \llbracket \text{self} \leftarrow^\# i_0 \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# \top) & \\ \llbracket [u, S], x = \text{create}(u_1) \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \\ \text{let } r = \eta[u, S] \text{ in} & \\ \text{let } i = \nu^\# u u_1 r \text{ in} & \\ \text{let } r' = \left\{ \llbracket \text{self} \leftarrow^\# i \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r \right\} \Big _{\mathcal{X}} \text{ in} & \\ \text{let } \rho = \{[u_1, \emptyset] \mapsto r'\} \text{ in} & \\ (\rho, \llbracket x \leftarrow^\# i \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r) & \\ \llbracket [u, S], g = x \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \\ (\emptyset, \llbracket g \leftarrow x \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# (\eta[u, S])) & \\ \llbracket [u, S], x = g \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \\ (\emptyset, \llbracket x \leftarrow g \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# (\eta[u, S])) & \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} \llbracket [u, S], \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \\ (\emptyset, \eta[u, S] \sqcap \left(\prod_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a} \eta[a, Q] \right)) & \\ \llbracket [u, S], \text{unlock}(a) \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \\ \text{let } r = \eta[u, S] \text{ in} & \\ \text{let } \rho = \{[a, Q] \mapsto r _Q \mid Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a\} \text{ in} & \\ (\rho, r _{\mathcal{X} \cup \{g[a'] \mid a' \in (S \setminus a)\}}) & \\ \llbracket [u, S], \text{return } x \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \\ \text{let } r = \eta[u, S] \text{ in} & \\ \text{let } i^\# = \text{unlift } r \text{ self in} & \\ \left(\left\{ [i^\#] \mapsto \left(\llbracket \text{ret} \leftarrow x \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r \right) \Big _{\{\text{ret}\}} \right\}, r \right) & \\ \llbracket [u, S], x' = \text{join}(x) \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \\ \text{let } v = \bigsqcup_{\text{unlift } r \ x' \cap i' \neq \perp} \text{unlift } (\eta[i']) \text{ ret in} & \\ (\emptyset, \llbracket x' \leftarrow^\# v \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# (\eta[u, S])) & \end{aligned}$
--	---

Fig. 4: Right-hand sides for the basic analysis. All functions are strict in \perp (describing the empty set of local traces), we only display definitions for non- \perp abstract values here. $\llbracket \{g \leftarrow 0 \mid g \in Q\} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\#$ is shorthand for the abstract transformer corresponding to the assignment of 0 to all variables in Q one-by-one.

updated such that the variable **self** holds the abstract thread $id\ i_0$ of the *main* thread. Additionally, $\text{init}^\#$ produces a side-effect for each mutex a and cluster Q that initializes all globals from the cluster with the value 0.

For a **thread creating** edge starting in program point u with lockset S , the right-hand side $\llbracket [u, S], x = \text{create}(u_1) \rrbracket^\#$ first generates a new abstract thread id , which we assume can be computed using the function $\nu^\#$. The new id is assigned to the variable x in the local state of the current thread. Additionally, the start state r' for the newly created thread is constructed and side-effected to the thread's start point with empty lockset $[u_1, \emptyset]$. Since threads start with empty lockset, the state r' is obtained by removing all information about globals from the local state of the creator and assigning the new abstract thread id to the variable **self**.

When **locking** a mutex a , the states stored at unknowns $[a, Q]$ with $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a$ are combined with the local state by *meet*. This is sound because the value stored at any $[a, Q]$ only maintains relationships between variables write-protected by a , and these values soundly account for the program state at every $\text{unlock}(a)$ and at program start. When **unlocking** a , on the other hand, the local state restricted to the appropriate clusters $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a$ is side-effected to the respective unknowns $[a, Q]$, so that the changes made to variables in the cluster become visible to other threads. Also, the local state is restricted to the local variables and only those globals for which at least one protecting mutex is still held.

As special mutexes m_g immediately surrounding accesses to g are used to ensure atomicity, and information about g is associated with them, all **reads**

and **writes** refer to the local copy of g . **Guards** and **assignments** (which may only involve local variables) are defined analogously.

For a **return** edge, the abstract value to be returned is looked up in the local state and then side-effected to the abstract thread id of the current thread (as the value of the dedicated variable **ret**). For a **join** edge, the least upper bound of all *return* values of all possibly joined threads is assigned to the left-hand side of the *join* statement in the local state.

Example 4. Consider the program⁴ where $\mathcal{M}[g] = \{a, b, m_g\}$, $\mathcal{M}[h] = \{a, b, m_h\}$, $\mathcal{Q}_a = \{\{g, h\}\}$, $\mathcal{Q}_b = \{\{g, h\}\}$.

```

main:                                t1:                                t2:
x = create(t1); y = ?;               lock(b);                            lock(b);
lock(a); lock(b);                   unlock(b);                           lock(a);
g = y; h = y+9;                     lock(a);                             // ASSERT(g==h); (4)
unlock(b); lock(b);                 lock(b);                             unlock(a);
h = y;                              // ASSERT(g==h); (3)                unlock(b);
// ASSERT(g==y); (1)                y = ?; g = y; h = y;
// ASSERT(h==y); (2)                unlock(b);
unlock(b); unlock(a);               unlock(a);
x = create(t2);

```

Our analysis succeeds in proving all assertions here. Thread t_2 is of particular interest: When locking b only $g \leq h$ is known to hold, and locking the additional mutex a means that the better information $g = h$ becomes available. The analysis by Mukherjee et al. [42] on the other hand only succeeds in proving assertion (2) — even when all globals are put in the same region. It cannot establish (1) because all correlations between locals and globals are forgotten when the *mix* operation is applied at the second $\text{lock}(b)$ in the main thread. (3) cannot be established because, at $\text{lock}(b)$ in t_1 , the *mix* operation also incorporates the state after the first $\text{unlock}(b)$ in the main thread, where $g = h$ does not hold. Similarly, for (4). The same applies for assertion (3) and the analysis using *lock invariants* proposed by Miné [39]. This analysis also falls short of showing (1), as at the $\text{lock}(b)$ in the main thread, the lock invariant associated with b is joined into the local state. (4) is similarly out of reach. The same reasoning also applies to [39, 42, 48] after equipping the analyses with thread *ids*. \square

Theorem 1. *Any solution of the constraint system is sound w.r.t. the local trace semantics.*

Proof. The proof is by fixpoint induction, the details are given in Appendix B.

We remark that, instead of relying on $\mathcal{M}[g]$ being pre-computed, an analysis can also infer this information on the fly [56]. GOBLINT, e.g., is capable of dealing with the resulting non-monotonicity in the side-effects.

⁴ In all examples, g , h , and i are globals, whereas x , y , and z are locals, and the clusters at special mutexes m_g contain exactly the global g : $\mathcal{Q}_{m_g} = \{\{g\}\}$. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, the domain \mathcal{R}_1 from Example 2, enhanced with inequalities between variables is used.

The analysis described here however still has some deficiencies. All writes to a global are accumulated regardless of the writing thread. As a consequence, a thread does, e.g., not only read its latest local writes but also all earlier local writes, even if those are *definitely* overwritten. Excluding some threads' writes is an instance of a more general idea for excluding writes that cannot be last writes. Instead of discussing ad hoc ways to address this specific shortcoming, we propose a general mechanism to improve the precision of any thread-modular analysis in the next section, and later instantiate it to the issue highlighted here.

5 Refinement via Finite Abstractions of Local Traces

To improve precision of thread-modular analyses we take additional abstractions of local traces into account. Our approach is generic in that it builds on the right-hand sides of a base analysis and uses them as black boxes. We will later instantiate this framework to exclude writes based on thread *ids* from the analysis in Section 4. Other instantiations are conceivable as well. To make it widely applicable, the framework allows base analyses that already perform some splitting of unknowns at program points (e.g., locksets as seen in Section 4). We denote by $[\hat{u}]$ such (possibly) extended unknowns for a program point u .

A (base) analysis is defined by its right-hand sides, and a collection of different domains: (1) \mathcal{D}_S for abstract values stored at unknowns for program points; (2) \mathcal{D}_{act} for abstract values stored at observable actions act (e.g., in Section 4, \mathcal{D}_M for unlocks and \mathcal{D}_T for thread returns).

Let \mathcal{A} be some set of finite information that can be extracted from a local trace by a function $\alpha_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. We call $\alpha_{\mathcal{A}} t \in \mathcal{A}$ the *digest* of some local trace t . Let $\llbracket u, \text{act} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\#} : \mathcal{A}^k \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{A}}$ be the effect on the digest when performing a k -ary action $\text{act} \in \mathcal{Act}$ for a control flow edge originating at u . We require that for $e = (u, \text{act}, v) \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \forall A_0, \dots, A_{k-1} \in \mathcal{A} : & \quad \left| \llbracket u, \text{act} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\#}(A_0, \dots, A_{k-1}) \right| \leq 1 \\ \forall t_0, \dots, t_{k-1} \in \mathcal{T} : & \quad \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}(\llbracket e \rrbracket(t_0, \dots, t_{k-1})) \subseteq \llbracket u, \text{act} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\#}(\alpha_{\mathcal{A}} t_0, \dots, \alpha_{\mathcal{A}} t_{k-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\alpha_{\mathcal{A}}$ is lifted element-wise to sets. While the first restriction ensures determinism, the second intuitively ensures that $\llbracket u, \text{act} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\#}$ soundly abstracts $\llbracket e \rrbracket$.

For thread creation, we additionally require a helper function $\text{new}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\#} : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ that returns for a thread created at an edge originating from u and starting execution at program point u_1 the new digest. The same requirements are imposed for edges $(u, x=\text{create}(u_1), v) \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$\forall A_0 \in \mathcal{A} : |\text{new}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\#} u u_1 A_0| \leq 1 \quad \forall t_0 \in \mathcal{T} : \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}(\text{new } u u_1 t) \subseteq \text{new}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\#} u u_1 (\alpha_{\mathcal{A}} t_0) \quad (5)$$

Also, we define for the initial digest at the start of the program

$$\text{init}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\#} = \{\alpha_{\mathcal{A}} t \mid t \in \text{init}\} \quad (6)$$

Under these assumptions, we can perform *control-point splitting* according to \mathcal{A} . This means that unknowns $[\hat{u}]$ for program points u are replaced with new

$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket [\hat{u}, A_0], \mathbf{act}, A_1 \rrbracket^\# \eta = \\ & \mathbf{let} \eta' [x] = \mathbf{if} [x] = [\hat{u}] \mathbf{then} \\ & \quad \eta [\hat{u}, A_0] \\ & \quad \mathbf{else} \eta [x, A_1] \\ & \mathbf{in} \\ & \llbracket [\hat{u}], \mathbf{act} \rrbracket^\# \eta' \\ & \llbracket [\hat{u}, A_0], \mathbf{act}'' \rrbracket^\# \eta = \\ & \mathbf{let} \eta' [x] = \eta [x, A_0] \mathbf{in} \\ & \llbracket [\hat{u}], \mathbf{act}'' \rrbracket^\# \eta' \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket [\hat{u}, A_0], \mathbf{act}', A' \rrbracket^\# \eta = \\ & \mathbf{let} \eta' [x] = \eta [x, A_0] \mathbf{in} \\ & \mathbf{let} (\rho, v) = \llbracket [\hat{u}], \mathbf{act}' \rrbracket^\# \eta' \mathbf{in} \\ & \mathbf{let} \rho' = \{[x, A'] \mapsto v' \mid ([x] \mapsto v') \in \rho\} \mathbf{in} \\ & (\rho', v) \\ & \llbracket [\hat{u}, A_0], x=\mathbf{create}(u_1) \rrbracket^\# \eta = \\ & \mathbf{let} \eta' [x] = \eta [x, A_0] \mathbf{in} \\ & \mathbf{let} (\{[\hat{u}_1] \mapsto v'\}, v) = \llbracket [\hat{u}], x=\mathbf{create}(u_1) \rrbracket^\# \eta' \mathbf{in} \\ & (\{[\hat{u}_1, A'] \mapsto v' \mid A' \in \mathbf{new}_{\mathcal{A}}^\# u u_1 A_0\}, v) \end{aligned}$
--	---

Fig. 5: Right-hand sides for an observing action \mathbf{act} , an observable action \mathbf{act}' , a create action, and an action \mathbf{act}'' that is neither for the refined analyses, defined as wrappers around the right-hand sides of a base analysis.

unknowns $[\hat{u}, A]$, $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Analogously, unknowns for observable actions $[\mathbf{act}]$ are replaced with unknowns $[\mathbf{act}, A]$ for $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Consider a single constraint from an abstract constraint system of the last section, which soundly abstracts the collecting local trace semantics of a program.

$$(\eta, \eta [\hat{v}]) \sqsupseteq \llbracket [\hat{u}], \mathbf{act} \rrbracket^\# \eta$$

The corresponding constraints of the refined system with control-point splitting differ based on whether the action \mathbf{act} is observing, observable, or neither.

- When \mathbf{act} is *observing*, the new right-hand side additionally gets the digest A_1 associated with the local traces that are to be incorporated:

$$(\eta, \eta [\hat{v}, A']) \sqsupseteq \llbracket [\hat{u}, A_0], \mathbf{act}, A_1 \rrbracket^\# \eta \quad \text{for } A_0, A_1 \in \mathcal{A}, A' \in \llbracket u, \mathbf{act} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^\# (A_0, A_1)$$

- When \mathbf{act} is *observable*, the digest A' of the resulting local trace is passed to the new right-hand side, such that the side-effect can be redirected to the appropriate unknown:

$$(\eta, \eta [\hat{v}, A']) \sqsupseteq \llbracket [\hat{u}, A_0], \mathbf{act}, A' \rrbracket^\# \eta \quad \text{for } A_0 \in \mathcal{A}, A' \in \llbracket u, \mathbf{act} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^\# (A_0)$$

- When \mathbf{act} is *neither*, no additional digest is passed:

$$(\eta, \eta [\hat{v}, A']) \sqsupseteq \llbracket [\hat{u}, A_0], \mathbf{act} \rrbracket^\# \eta \quad \text{for } A_0 \in \mathcal{A}, A' \in \llbracket u, \mathbf{act} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^\# (A_0)$$

The new right-hand sides are defined in terms of the right-hand side of the base analysis which are used as black boxes (Fig. 5). They act as wrappers, mapping any unknown consulted or side-effected to by the original analysis to the appropriate unknown of the refined system. Thus, the refined analysis automatically benefits from the extra information the digests provide. It may, e.g., exploit that $\llbracket u, \mathbf{act} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^\# (A_0, A_1) = \emptyset$ meaning that, no local traces with digests A_0, A_1 can be combined into a valid local trace ending with action \mathbf{act} .

The complete definition of the refined constraint system instantiated to the actions considered in this paper and unknowns for program points enriched with locksets can be found in the additional material (Fig. 14 in Appendix C).

Enriching program points with locksets can in fact be seen as a first application of this framework. The right-hand sides are given in Fig. 6.

Example 5. As a further instance, consider tracking which mutexes have been locked at least once in the local trace. At $\text{lock}(a)$ traces in which a thread has performed a $\text{lock}(a)$ can not be combined with traces that contain no lock action for a . The corresponding right-hand sides are given in Fig. 7.

When refining the analysis from Section 4 accordingly (assuming that a protects g and h), it succeeds in proving the assert in this program as the initial values of 0 for g and h can be excluded.

```

main:                t1:                t2:
lock(a);             x = create(t2);    lock(a);
h = 9; g = 10;       lock(a);           // ASSERT(h<=g);
unlock(a);           h = 11; g = 12;    unlock(a);
x = create(t1);     unlock(a);
    
```

This could be naturally generalized to obtain instances counting how often some action (e.g., a write to a global g) occurred, stopping exact bookkeeping at some constant (1 in this example). \square

To prove soundness of local-trace-based refinement of our analysis from Section 4, we first construct a corresponding refined collecting local trace semantics. Then we verify that the refined analysis is sound w.r.t. this refined semantics – which, in turn, is proven sound w.r.t. the original collecting local trace semantics.

Theorem 2. *Assume that $\alpha_{\mathcal{A}}$, $\text{new}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp}$, and $\llbracket u, \text{act} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp}$ fulfill requirements (4), (5), and (6). Then any solution of the refined constraint system is sound relative to the collecting local trace semantics.*

Proof. A proof sketch instantiated with the actions considered in this work and unknowns at program points enriched with locksets is provided in Appendix D.

6 Analysis of Thread Ids and Uniqueness

$\text{init}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp} = \{\emptyset\}$	$\llbracket u, \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp} (S, S') = \{S \cup \{a\}\}$
$\text{new}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp} u u_1 S = \{\emptyset\}$	$\llbracket u, \text{unlock}(a) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp} S = \{S \setminus \{a\}\}$
$\llbracket u, a \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp} S = \{S\}$ (other non-observing)	$\llbracket u, a \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp} (S, S') = \{S\}$ (other observing)

Fig. 6: Right-hand sides for expressing locksets as a refinement.

We instantiate the scheme from the previous section to compute abstract thread *ids* and their uniqueness. That refinement of the base analysis enhances precision of the analysis by excluding reads, e.g., from threads that have not yet been started. For that, we identify threads by their thread creation history, i.e., by sequences of *create* edges. As these sequences may grow arbitrarily, we collect all creates occurring after the first repetition into a *set* to obtain finite abstractions.

Example 6. In the program from Fig. 8, the first thread created by *main* receives the abstract thread *id* $(\text{main} \cdot \langle u_1, t_1 \rangle, \emptyset)$. It creates a thread with abstract thread *id* $(\text{main} \cdot \langle u_1, t_1 \rangle \cdot \langle u_3, t_1 \rangle, \emptyset)$. At program point u_3 , the latter creates a thread starting at t_1 and receiving the abstract thread *id* $(\text{main} \cdot \langle u_1, t_1 \rangle, \{\langle u_3, t_1 \rangle\})$ – as do all threads subsequently created at this edge. \square

Create edges, however, may also be repeatedly encountered within the creating thread, in a loop. To deal with this, we track for each thread, the set C of possibly already encountered *create* edges. As soon as a *create* edge is encountered again, the created thread receives a non-unique thread *id*.

Example 7. The first time the main thread reaches program point u_2 in the program from Fig. 8, the created thread is assigned the *unique* abstract thread *id* $(\text{main} \cdot \langle u_2, t_1 \rangle, \emptyset)$. In subsequent loop iterations, the created threads are no longer kept separate, and thus receive the non-unique *id* $(\text{main}, \{\langle u_2, t_1 \rangle\})$. \square

Formally, let $\mathcal{N}_C, \mathcal{N}_S$ denote the subsets of program points with outgoing edge labeled $x=\text{create}(\dots)$, and of starting points of threads, respectively. Let $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_C \times \mathcal{N}_S$ denote sets of pairs relating thread creation nodes with the starting points of the created threads. The set \mathcal{I}^\sharp of abstract thread *ids* then consists of all pairs $(i, s) \in (\text{main} \cdot \mathcal{P}^*) \times 2^{\mathcal{P}}$ in which each pair $\langle u, f \rangle$ occurs at most once. Given the set \mathcal{I}^\sharp , we require that there is a concretization $\gamma : \mathcal{I}^\sharp \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{I}}$ and a function $\text{single} : \mathcal{I}^\sharp \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}}^\sharp$ with $\gamma i^\sharp \subseteq \gamma_{\mathcal{V}^\sharp}(\text{single } i^\sharp)$. The abstract thread *id* of the *main* thread is given by (main, \emptyset) . Therein, the elements in $(\text{main} \cdot \mathcal{P}^*) \times \{\emptyset\}$ represent the *unique* thread *ids* representing at most one concrete thread *id*, while the elements (i, s) , $s \neq \emptyset$, are *ambiguous*, i.e., may represent multiple concrete thread *ids*. Moreover, we maintain the understanding that the concretizations of distinct abstract thread *ids* from \mathcal{I}^\sharp all are disjoint.

As refining information \mathcal{A} we consider not only abstract thread *ids* – but additionally track sets of executed thread creations within the current thread. Accordingly, we set $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{I}^\sharp \times 2^{\mathcal{P}}$ and define the right-hand sides as seen in Fig. 9, where \bar{i} denotes the set of pairs occurring in the sequence i .

$\begin{aligned} \text{init}_{\mathcal{A}}^\sharp &= \{\emptyset\} \\ \text{new}_{\mathcal{A}}^\sharp u u_1 L = \{L\} \\ \llbracket u, a \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^\sharp S = \{L\} \text{ (other non-observing)} \end{aligned}$	$\llbracket u, \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^\sharp (L, L') = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } a \in L \wedge a \notin L' \\ \{L \cup L' \cup \{a\}\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
$\llbracket u, a \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^\sharp (L, L') = \{L \cup L'\} \text{ (other observing)}$	

Fig. 7: Right-hand sides for refining according to encountered lock operations.

Example 8. Consider again the program from Fig. 8 with right-hand sides from Fig. 9, and assume that the missing right-hand for join returns its first argument. The initial thread has the abstract thread $id\ i_0 = (\text{main}, \emptyset)$. At its start point, the digest thus is (i_0, \emptyset) . At the create edge originating at u_1 , a new thread with $id\ (\text{main} \cdot \langle u_1, t_1 \rangle, \emptyset)$ is created. The digest for this thread then is $((\text{main} \cdot \langle u_1, t_1 \rangle, \emptyset), \emptyset)$. For the main thread, the encountered create edge $\langle u_1, t_1 \rangle$ is added to the second component of the digest, making it $(i_0, \{\langle u_1, t_1 \rangle\})$.

When u_2 is reached with $(i_0, \{\langle u_1, t_1 \rangle\})$, a unique thread with $id\ (\text{main} \cdot \langle u_2, t_1 \rangle, \emptyset)$ is created. The new digest of the creating thread then is $(i_0, \{\langle u_1, t_1 \rangle, \langle u_2, t_1 \rangle\})$. In subsequent iterations of the loop, for which u_2 is reached with $(i_0, \{\langle u_1, t_1 \rangle, \langle u_2, t_1 \rangle\})$, a non-unique thread with $id\ (\text{main}, \{\langle u_2, t_1 \rangle\})$ is created.

When reaching u_3 with $id\ (\text{main}, \{\langle u_2, t_1 \rangle\})$, a thread with $id\ (\text{main}, \{\langle u_2, t_1 \rangle, \langle u_3, t_1 \rangle\})$ is created as the id of the creating thread was already not unique. When reaching it with the $id\ (\text{main} \cdot \langle u_1, t_1 \rangle, \emptyset)$, a new thread with $id\ (\text{main} \cdot \langle u_1, t_1 \rangle \cdot \langle u_3, t_1 \rangle, \emptyset)$ is created. When the newly created thread reaches this program point, the threads created there have the *non-unique* $id\ (\text{main} \cdot \langle u_1, t_1 \rangle, \{\langle u_3, t_1 \rangle\})$, as $\langle u_3, t_1 \rangle$ already appears in the id of the creating thread. \square

Abstract thread ids should provide us with functions

- $\text{unique} : \mathcal{I}^\# \rightarrow \mathbf{bool}$ tells whether a thread id is unique.
- $\text{lcu_anc} : \mathcal{I}^\# \rightarrow \mathcal{I}^\# \rightarrow \mathcal{I}^\#$ returns the last common *unique* ancestor of two threads.
- $\text{may_create} : \mathcal{I}^\# \rightarrow \mathcal{I}^\# \rightarrow \mathbf{bool}$ checks whether a thread *may* (transitively) create another.

For our domain $\mathcal{I}^\#$, these can be defined as $\text{unique}(i, s) = (s = \emptyset)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{lcu_anc}(i, s)(i', s') &= (\text{longest common prefix } i\ i', \emptyset) \\ \text{may_create}(i, s)(i', s') &= (\bar{i} \cup s) \subseteq (\bar{i}' \cup s') \end{aligned}$$

We use this extra information to enhance the definitions of $\llbracket u, \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^\#$ and $\llbracket u, x' = \text{join}(x) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^\#$ to take into account that the ego thread cannot acquire a mutex from another thread or join a thread that has definitely not yet been created. This is the case for a thread t'

- (1) that is directly created by the *unique* ego thread, but the ego thread has not yet reached the program point where t' is created;
- (2) whose thread id indicates that a thread that has not yet been created according to (1), is part of the creation history of t' .

```

main:                                     t1:
x = g; // PP u1                            g = 42; // PP u3
y = create(t1);                             y = create(t1);
for(i = 0; i < 5; i++) { // PP u2
    z = create(t1); }
    
```

Fig. 8: Program with multiple thread creations.

Accordingly, we introduce the predicate $\text{may_run}(i, C)(i', C')$ defined as

$$(\text{lcu_anc } i \ i' = i) \implies \exists \langle u, u' \rangle \in C : (i \circ \langle u, u' \rangle = i' \vee \text{may_create}(i \circ \langle u, u' \rangle) \ i')$$

which is false whenever thread i' is definitely not yet started. We then set

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket u, \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp}(i, C)(i', C') &= \llbracket u, x' = \text{join}(x) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp}(i, C)(i', C') \\ &= \begin{cases} \{(i, C)\} & \text{if } \text{may_run}(i, C)(i', C') \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

This analysis of thread *ids* and uniqueness can be considered as a *May-Happen-In-Parallel* (or, more precisely, *Must-Not-Happen-In-Parallel*) analysis. MHP information is useful in a variety of scenarios: a thread-modular analysis of *data races* or *deadlocks*, e.g., that does not consider thread *ids* and joining yet, can be refined by means of the given analysis of thread *ids* to exclude some data races or deadlocks that the original analysis can not. Subsequently, we outline how the analysis from Section 4 may benefit from MHP information.

7 Exploiting Thread *IDs* to Improve Relational Analyses

We subsequently exploit abstract thread *ids* and their uniqueness to limit the amount of reading performed by the analysis from Section 4.

- I1** from other threads that have not yet been created.
- I2** the ego thread's past writes, if its thread *id* is unique.
- I3** past writes from threads that have already been joined.

Improvements **I1** and **I3** have, e.g., been realized in a setting where thread *ids* and which thread is joined where can be read off from control-flow graphs [31]. Here, however, this information is computed *during* analysis. In our framework, **I1** is already achieved by refining the base analysis according to Section 6.

Example 9. Consider the program below where $\mathcal{M}[g] = \{a, b, m_g\}$, $\mathcal{M}[h] = \{a, b, m_h\}$, $\mathcal{M}[i] = \{m_i\}$ and assume $\mathcal{Q}_a = \{\{g, h\}\}$.

$\text{init}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp} = \{((\text{main}, \emptyset), \emptyset)\}$ $\llbracket u, x = \text{create}(u_1) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp}(i, C) = \{(i, C \cup \{\langle u, u_1 \rangle\})\}$ $\llbracket u, a \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp}(i, C) = \{(i, C)\}$ (for other actions a) $\text{new}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp} u \ u_1 \ ((d, s), C) =$ let $(d', s') = (d, s) \circ \langle u, u_1 \rangle$ in if $s' = \emptyset \wedge \langle u, u_1 \rangle \in C$ then $((d, \{\langle u, u_1 \rangle\}), \emptyset)$ else $((d', s'), \emptyset)$	$(d, s) \circ \langle u, u_1 \rangle =$ if $d = (d_0 \cdot \langle u, u_1 \rangle) \cdot d_1$ then $(d_0, s \cup \bar{d}_1 \cup \{\langle u, u_1 \rangle\})$ else if $s = \emptyset$ then $(d \cdot \langle u, u_1 \rangle, \emptyset)$ else $(d, s \cup \{\langle u, u_1 \rangle\})$
--	--

Fig. 9: Right-hand sides for thread *ids*.

```

main:                                     t1:
x = create(t1); lock(a);                 lock(a);
// ASSERT(g==h); (1)                     r = ?; g = r; h = r;
unlock(a);                               unlock(a);
y = create(t2); lock(a);
// ASSERT(g==h); (2)                     t2:
g = 42; h = 42;                           lock(a); v = g; unlock(a);
unlock(a); z = create(t3);
i = 3; i = 2; // ASSERT(i==2); (3)       t3:
i = 8;                                   lock(a); g = 19; unlock(a);
    
```

The analysis succeeds in proving assertion (1), as the thread (starting at) t_3 that breaks the invariant $g=h$ has definitely not been started yet at this program point. Without refinement, the analysis from Section 4 could not prove (1). However, this alone does not suffice to prove (2). At this program point, thread t_2 may already be started. At the $\text{lock}(a)$ in t_2 , thread t_3 may also be started; thus, the violation of the invariant $g=h$ by t_3 is incorporated into the local state of t_2 at the lock. At $\text{unlock}(a)$, despite t_2 *only reading* g , the imprecise abstract relation where $g=h$ does not hold, is side-effected to $[a, \{g, h\}, t_2]$ and is incorporated at the second $\text{lock}(a)$ of the main thread. The final shortcoming is that each thread reads all its own past (and future!) writes – even when it is known to be unique. This means that (3) cannot be proven. \square

To achieve **I2**, some effort is required as our analysis forgets values of globals when they become unprotected. This is in contrast, e.g., to [39, 42]. We thus restrict side-effecting to mutexes to cases where the ego thread has possibly written a protected global since acquiring it. This is in contrast to Section 4, where a side-effect is performed at every unlock, i.e., everything a thread reads is treated as if it was written by that thread.

Technically, we locally track a map $L : (\mathbb{M} \times \mathcal{Q}) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$, where $L(a, Q)$ maintains for a mutex a , an abstract relation between the globals in cluster $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a$. More specifically, the abstract relation on the globals from Q recorded in $L(a, Q)$ is the one that held when a was unlocked *join-locally* for the *first* time after the *last join-local* write to a global in $\mathcal{G}[a]$. If there is no such $\text{unlock}(a)$, the relation at program start is recorded. We call an operation in a local trace *join-local* to the ego thread, if it is (a) *thread-local*, i.e., performed by the ego thread, or (b) is executed by a thread that is (transitively) joined into the ego thread, or (c) is *join-local* to the parent thread at the node at which the ego thread is created. This notion will also be crucial for realizing **I3**. *Join-locality* is illustrated in Fig. 10, where the *join-local* part of a local trace is highlighted.

For *join-local* contributions, by construction, it suffices to consult $L a$ instead of unknowns $[a, Q, i]$. Such contributions are called *accounted for*. To check whether a contribution from a specific thread id is *accounted for*, we introduce the function $\text{acc} : (\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{D}_S) \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{bool}$ (see definition (7) below). Besides an abstract value from \mathcal{R} , the local state \mathcal{D}_S now contains two additional components:

- The map $L : (\mathbb{M} \times \mathcal{Q}) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ for which the join is given component-wise;

- The set $W : 2^{\mathcal{G}}$ (ordered by \subseteq) of globals that may have been written since one of its protecting mutexes has been locked, and not all protecting mutexes have been unlocked since.

Just like r , L and W are abstractions of the reaching local traces. \mathcal{D}_T is also enhanced with an L component, while \mathcal{D}_M remains unmodified. We sketch the right-hand sides here, definitions are given in Fig. 11. For **program start** init^\sharp , in contrast to the analysis from Section 4, there is no initial side-effect to the unknowns for mutexes. The initial values of globals are *join-local*, and thus accounted for in the L component also passed to any subsequently created thread.

The right-hand sides for **thread creation** and **return** differ from the analysis from Section 4 enhanced with thread *ids* only in the handling of additional data structures L and W . As the thread *ids* are tracked precisely in the \mathcal{A} component, this information is directly used when determining which unknown to side-effect to and unknowns $[(i, C)]$ replace unknowns $[i', (i, C)]$.

For a **join** edge, if the return value of the thread is not accounted for, it is assigned to the variable on the left-hand side and the L information from the ego thread and the joined thread is joined together. If, on the other hand, it is accounted for, then the thread has already been joined and cannot be joined here again. There is a separate constraint for each (i', C') , so that all threads that could be joined here are considered.

For **locking** of mutexes, upon lock, if (i', C') is not accounted for, its information on the globals protected by a is joined with the *join-local* information for a maintained in $L(a, Q)$, $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a$. This information about the globals protected by a is then incorporated into the local state by \sqcap . For **unlocking** of mutexes, if there may have been a write to a protected global since the mutex was locked (according to W), the *join-local* information is updated and the local state restricted to Q is side-effected to the appropriate unknown $[a, Q, (i, C)]$ for $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a$. Just like in Section 4, r is then restricted to only maintain relationships between locals and those globals for which at least one protecting mutex is still held. **Reading** from and **writing** to globals once more are purely local operations. To exclude self writes, we set

$$\text{acc}((i, C), _) (i', C') = \text{unique } i \wedge i = i' \quad (7)$$

The resulting analysis thus takes **I1** (via $[\dots]_{\mathcal{A}}^\sharp$ defined in Section 6), as well as **I2** (via acc) into account. In Example 9, it is now able to show all assertions.




Fig. 10: Illustration highlighting the *join-local* part of a local trace of the program from Fig. 2a, and which writes are thus accounted for by L .

$\begin{aligned} \text{init}_{(i,C)}^\# = & \quad \llbracket \{g \leftarrow 0 \mid g \in Q\} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# \top \text{ in} \\ \text{let } L(a, Q) = & \quad \llbracket \text{self} \leftarrow^\# i \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# \top \text{ in} \\ & (\emptyset, (\{(a, Q) \mapsto L(a, Q) \mid a \in \mathcal{M}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a\}, \emptyset, r)) \\ \llbracket [u, S, (i, C)], x' = \text{join}(x), (i', C') \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \quad \text{let } (L, W, r) = \eta[u, S, (i, C)] \text{ in} \\ \text{let } (L, W, r) = & \quad \eta[u, S, (i, C)] \text{ in} \\ \text{if } (\text{single } i' \sqcap ((\text{unlift } r) x) = \perp) \text{ then} & \quad \perp \text{ else if } \text{acc}((i, C), (L, W, r)) (i', C') \\ \perp \text{ else if } & \quad \text{acc}((i, C), (L, W, r)) (i', C') \\ \text{then } \perp \text{ else} & \quad \text{let } (L', v) = \eta[(i', C')] \text{ in} \\ \text{let } r' = & \quad \llbracket x' \leftarrow^\# (\text{unlift } v) \text{ret} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r \text{ in} \\ (\emptyset, (L \sqcup L', W, r')) & \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} \llbracket [u, S, (i, C)], x = \text{create}(u_1) \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \quad \text{let } (L, W, r) = \eta[u, S, (i, C)] \text{ in} \\ \text{let } (i', C') = & \quad \text{new}_{\mathcal{A}}^\# u u_1 (i, C) \text{ in} \\ \text{let } r' = & \quad (\llbracket \text{self} \leftarrow^\# (\text{single } i') \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r) \Big _{\mathcal{X}} \text{ in} \\ \text{let } \rho = & \quad \{[u_1, (\emptyset, (i', C'))] \mapsto (L, \emptyset, r')\} \text{ in} \\ (\rho, (L, W, \llbracket x \leftarrow^\# \text{single } i' \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r)) & \\ \llbracket [u, S, (i, C)], \text{return } x, (i, C) \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \quad \text{let } (L, W, r) = \eta[u, S, (i, C)] \text{ in} \\ \text{let } v = & \quad (\llbracket \text{ret} \leftarrow x \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r) \Big _{\{\text{ret}\}} \text{ in} \\ \text{let } \rho = & \quad \{(i, C) \mapsto (L, v)\} \text{ in} \\ (\rho, (L, W, r)) & \\ \llbracket [u, S, (i, C)], \text{lock}(a), (i', C') \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \quad \text{let } (L, W, r) = \eta[u, S, (i, C)] \text{ in} \\ \text{let } r' = & \quad \text{if } \text{acc}((i, C), (L, W, r)) (i', C') \\ \text{then } \perp \text{ else } & \quad \prod_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a} \eta[a, Q, (i', C')] \text{ in} \\ (\emptyset, (L, W, r \sqcap & \quad (\prod_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a} L(a, Q)) \sqcup r')) \\ \llbracket [u, S, (i, C)], g = x \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \quad \text{let } (L, W, r) = \eta[u, S, A] \text{ in} \\ \text{let } (L, W, r) = & \quad \eta[u, S, A] \text{ in} \\ (\emptyset, (L, W \cup \{g\}, & \quad \llbracket g \leftarrow x \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r)) \\ \llbracket [u, S, (i, C)], x = g \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \quad \text{let } (L, W, r) = \eta[u, S, A] \text{ in} \\ \text{let } (L, W, r) = & \quad \eta[u, S, A] \text{ in} \\ (\emptyset, (L, W, \llbracket x \leftarrow g \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r)) & \end{aligned}$
$\begin{aligned} \llbracket [u, S, (i, C)], \text{unlock}(a), (i, C) \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \quad \text{let } (L, W, r) = \eta[u, S, (i, C)] \text{ in} \\ \text{let } (L', \rho) = & \quad \text{if } \mathcal{G}[a] \cap W = \emptyset \text{ then } (L, \emptyset) \\ \text{else } (L \oplus \{ & \quad (a, Q) \mapsto r _Q \mid Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a\}, \\ & \quad \{[a, Q, (i, C)] \mapsto r _Q \mid Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a\}) \\ \text{in} & \\ \text{let } r' = & \quad r _{\mathcal{X} \cup \{g[a'] \mid a' \in (S \setminus a)\}} \text{ in} \\ \text{let } W' = & \quad \{W \mid g \in W, \mathcal{M}[g] \cap S \setminus \{a\} \neq \emptyset\} \\ \text{in } (\rho, (L', W', r')) & \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} \llbracket [u, S, (i, C)], x = \text{create}(u_1) \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \quad \text{let } (L, W, r) = \eta[u, S, (i, C)] \text{ in} \\ \text{let } (i', C') = & \quad \text{new}_{\mathcal{A}}^\# u u_1 (i, C) \text{ in} \\ \text{let } r' = & \quad (\llbracket \text{self} \leftarrow^\# (\text{single } i') \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r) \Big _{\mathcal{X}} \text{ in} \\ \text{let } \rho = & \quad \{[u_1, (\emptyset, (i', C'))] \mapsto (L, \emptyset, r')\} \text{ in} \\ (\rho, (L, W, \llbracket x \leftarrow^\# \text{single } i' \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r)) & \\ \llbracket [u, S, (i, C)], \text{return } x, (i, C) \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \quad \text{let } (L, W, r) = \eta[u, S, (i, C)] \text{ in} \\ \text{let } v = & \quad (\llbracket \text{ret} \leftarrow x \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r) \Big _{\{\text{ret}\}} \text{ in} \\ \text{let } \rho = & \quad \{(i, C) \mapsto (L, v)\} \text{ in} \\ (\rho, (L, W, r)) & \\ \llbracket [u, S, (i, C)], \text{lock}(a), (i', C') \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \quad \text{let } (L, W, r) = \eta[u, S, (i, C)] \text{ in} \\ \text{let } r' = & \quad \text{if } \text{acc}((i, C), (L, W, r)) (i', C') \\ \text{then } \perp \text{ else } & \quad \prod_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a} \eta[a, Q, (i', C')] \text{ in} \\ (\emptyset, (L, W, r \sqcap & \quad (\prod_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a} L(a, Q)) \sqcup r')) \\ \llbracket [u, S, (i, C)], g = x \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \quad \text{let } (L, W, r) = \eta[u, S, A] \text{ in} \\ \text{let } (L, W, r) = & \quad \eta[u, S, A] \text{ in} \\ (\emptyset, (L, W \cup \{g\}, & \quad \llbracket g \leftarrow x \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r)) \\ \llbracket [u, S, (i, C)], x = g \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \quad \text{let } (L, W, r) = \eta[u, S, A] \text{ in} \\ \text{let } (L, W, r) = & \quad \eta[u, S, A] \text{ in} \\ (\emptyset, (L, W, \llbracket x \leftarrow g \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r)) & \end{aligned}$

Fig. 11: Right-hand sides for the improved (**I1**, **I2**) analysis using thread *ids*.

Theorem 3. *This analysis is sound w.r.t. to the local trace semantics.*

Proof. The proof relies on the following observations:

- When $\mathcal{G}[a] \cap W = \emptyset$, no side-effect is required.
- Exclusions based on `acc` are sound, i.e., it only excludes *join-local* writes.

The detailed proof is a simplification of a correctness proof for the enhanced analysis from Appendix F, which we outline in Appendix G. \square

The analysis does not make use of components C at unknowns $[a, Q, (i, C)]$ and $[i, C]$. We detail in Appendix E how this information can be exploited to exclude a further class of writes – namely, those that are performed by an ancestor of the ego thread before the ego thread was created. Alternatively, an implementation may abandon control-point splitting according to C at mutexes and thread *ids*, replacing the unknowns $[a, Q, (i, C)]$, $[i, C]$ with $[a, Q, i]$ and $[i]$, respectively.

When turning to improvement **I3**, we observe that after joining a thread t with a *unique* thread id , t cannot perform further writes. As all writes of joined threads are *join-local* to the ego thread, it is not necessary to read from the

corresponding global unknowns. We therefore enhance the analysis to also track in the local state, the set J of thread *ids* for which join has definitely been called in the *join-local* part of the local trace and refine acc to take J into account:

$$\text{acc}((i, C), (J, L, W, r))(i', C') = \text{unique } i' \wedge (i = i' \vee i' \in J)$$

Details on this enhancement can be found in Appendix F.

8 Exploiting Clustered Relational Domains

Naively, one might assume that tracking relations among a larger set of globals is necessarily more precise than between smaller sets. Interestingly, this is no longer true for our analyses, e.g., in presence of thread *ids*. A similar effect where relating more globals can deteriorate precision has also been observed in the context of an analysis using a data-flow graph to model interferences [19].

Example 10. Consider again Example 1 in the introduction with $\mathcal{Q}_a = \{\{g, h, i\}\}$. For this program, the constraint system of the analysis has a unique least solution. It verifies that assertion (1) holds. It assures for $[a, \{g, h, i\}, t_1]$ that $h = i$ holds, while for the *main* thread and the program point before each assertion, $L(a, \{g, h, i\}) = \{g = h, h = i\}$ holds, while for $[a, \{g, h, i\}, \text{main}]$ and $[a, \{g, h, i\}, t_2]$ only \top is recorded, as is for any relation associated with m_g, m_h , or m_i . Assertion (2), however, will not succeed, as the side-effect from t_1 causes the older values from the first write in the main thread to be propagated to the assertions as well, implying that while $h = i$ is proven, $g = h$ is not. \square

Intuitively, the reason the analysis loses precision is that, at an unlock of mutex a , the current relationships between *all* clusters protected by a are side-effected. As soon as a single global is written to, the analysis behaves as if *all* protected globals had been written. A better result thus may be hoped for, if publishing is limited to those clusters for which at least one global has been written, such that more precise information may remain at others.

Accordingly, in the improved analysis, when **unlocking** a mutex a , side-effects are only produced to those clusters $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a$ containing at least one global that was written to since the last operation $\text{lock}(a)$. The definitions for locking and unlocking are given in Fig. 12.

For **locking** the mutex a , on the other hand, the abstract value to be incorporated into the local state is assembled from the contributions of different threads to the clusters. In order to allow that, the separate constraints for each admitted digest from Section 5 are combined into one constraint for the set $\mathbf{I} = \{(i', C') \mid (i, C) \in \llbracket \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\perp}((i, C), (i', C'))\}$ of *all* admitted digests. This is necessary as side-effects to unaffected clusters at $\text{unlock}(a)$ have been abandoned and thus the meet with the values for clusters of one thread at a time is unsound. For each cluster Q , the join-local information $L(a, Q)$ is joined with all contributions to Q by threads that are not yet *accounted* for, but admitted for Q by the digests. Here, the contributions of threads that do *not* write Q is \perp , and thus

$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket [u, S, (i, C)], \text{unlock}(a), (i, C) \rrbracket^\# \eta = \\ & \text{let } (L, W, r) = \eta [u, S, (i, C)] \text{ in} \\ & \text{let } \mathcal{Q}' = \{Q \mid Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a, Q \cap W \neq \emptyset\} \text{ in} \\ & \text{let } L' = L \oplus \{(a, Q) \mapsto r _Q \mid Q \in \mathcal{Q}'\} \text{ in} \\ & \text{let } \rho = \{(a, Q, (i, C)) \mapsto r _Q \mid Q \in \mathcal{Q}'\} \text{ in} \\ & \text{let } r' = r _{X \cup \{\mathcal{G}[a'] \mid a' \in (S \setminus a)\}} \text{ in} \\ & \text{let } W' = \{W \mid g \in W, \mathcal{M}[g] \cap S \setminus \{a\} \neq \emptyset\} \text{ in} \\ & (\rho, (L', W', r')) \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket [u, S, (i, C)], \text{lock}(a), \mathbf{I} \rrbracket^\# \eta = \\ & \text{let } (L, W, r) = \eta [u, S, (i, C)] \text{ in} \\ & \text{let } l = ((i, C), (L, W, r)) \text{ in} \\ & \text{let } J(Q) = \bigsqcup \{\eta [a, Q, (i', C')] \mid \\ & \quad (i', C') \in \mathbf{I}, \neg \text{acc } l(i', C')\} \text{ in} \\ & \text{let } r' = \prod_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a} (J(Q) \sqcup L(a, Q)) \\ & (\emptyset, (L, W, r \sqcap r')) \end{aligned}$
---	---

Fig. 12: Right-hand sides for unlocking and locking when limiting side-effecting to potentially written clusters.

do not affect the value for Q . Finally, the resulting value is used to improve the local state by the operation *meet*. The right-hand side for $\text{lock}(a)$ thus exploits the fine-grained, per-cluster MHP information provided by the digests and the predicate acc . By construction, we have:

Theorem 4. *Given domains \mathcal{R} and $\mathcal{V}^\#$ fulfilling the requirements from Fig. 1, any solution of the constraint system is sound w.r.t. the local trace semantics. Maximum precision is obtained with $\mathcal{Q}_a = 2^{\mathcal{G}[a]}$. \square*

For Example 1, with $\mathcal{Q}_a = 2^{\mathcal{G}[a]}$, both assertions are verified. Performing the analysis with all possible subclusters simultaneously can be rather expensive when sets $\mathcal{G}[a]$ are large. The choice of a most appropriate subclustering thus generally involves a trade-off between precision and runtime. The situation is different if the relational domain is k -decomposable:

Theorem 5. *Provided the relational domain is k -decomposable (Equations (2)), the clustered analysis using all subclusters of sizes at most k only, is equally precise as the clustered analysis using all subclusters $\mathcal{Q}_a = 2^{\mathcal{G}[a]}$ at mutexes a .*

Proof. Consider a solution η of the constraint system with $\mathcal{Q}_a = 2^{\mathcal{G}[a]}$. Then for unknowns $[a, Q, (i, C)]$ and $[a, Q', (i, C)]$ with $Q \subseteq Q'$ and $|Q| \leq k$, and values $r = \eta [a, Q, (i, C)]$, $r' = \eta [a, Q', (i, C)]$, we have that $r \sqsubseteq r'|_Q$ (whenever the smaller cluster receives a side-effect, so does the larger one). Thus, by k -decomposability, the additional larger clusters Q' , do not improve the *meet* over the clusters of size at most k for individual thread *ids* as well as the *meet* of their *joins* over all thread *ids*. The same also applies to the clustered information stored in L . \square

Example 11. Consider again Example 1. If the analysis is performed with clusters $\mathcal{Q}_a = \{\{h, i\}, \{g, h\}, \{g, i\}, \{g\}, \{i\}, \{h\}\}$ both assertions can be proven. \square

The one element clusters, on the other hand, cannot be abandoned – as indicated by the example from Appendix H in the additional material.

9 Experimental Evaluation

We implemented the analyses extending the context-sensitive static analyzer GOBLINT. It supports the dynamic creation of mutexes and provides the set of protecting mutexes for each global. The implementation tracks information about integral variables using either the *Interval* or the *Octagon* domains from APRON [29]. A comparison with other tools is difficult, for details see Appendix I:

- DUET [19] — The benchmark suite from the paper is only available as binary goto-programs which neither the current version of DUET nor any other tool considered here can consume. Since DUET does not support function calls and its inlining support is limited, it could only be run on *some* benchmarks.
- ASTRÉE [39] — A public version is available but not licensed for evaluation.
- WATTS [31] — Since we were unable to run the tool on any program, we compared with the numbers reported by the authors.
- NR-GOBLINT [48] — GOBLINT with the non-relational analyses from [48].

We considered four different settings for the analyses, namely, *Interval*: the analysis from Section 4 with Intervals only; *Octagon*: the analysis from Section 4 with Octagons; *TIDs*: the analysis from Section 7 with the enhancement Appendix F with Octagons; *Clusters*: *TIDs* using clusters of size at most 2 only. All benchmarks were run in a virtual machine on an AMD EPYC 7742 64-Core processor⁵ running Ubuntu 20.04. The results of our evaluation are summarized in Table 2.

Our benchmarks. To capture particular challenges for multi-threaded relational analysis, we collected a set of small benchmarks (including the examples from this paper) and added assertions. On these, we evaluated our analyzer, NR-GOBLINT, and DUET. Our analysis in the *Clusters* configuration is capable of verifying all the programs. The other tools could only prove a handful of relational assertions.

GOBLINT benchmarks [48]. These benchmarks do not contain assertions. To still relate the precision of our analyzer to the non-relational analyzer NR-GOBLINT and to DUET, we used our tool in the *Clusters* setting to automatically derive invariants at each locking operation. Perhaps surprisingly, NR-GOBLINT could verify 95% of the invariants despite being non-relational and not using thread *ids*.

WATTS benchmarks [31]. These benchmarks from various sources were instrumented with asserts and significantly changed by the authors. Our analyses are able to verify all but 7 out of over 1000 assertions. Due to necessary fixes to benchmark programs, our inability to run their tool, and inconsistent assertion counts in the paper, the numbers are not directly comparable. Nevertheless, for their scalability tests, the reported runtimes for WATTS are up to two orders of magnitude worse than ours. For a more detailed discussion, see Appendix I.

⁵ The analyzer is single-threaded, so it only used one (virtual) core per analysis job.

Table 2: Summary of evaluation results, with individual programs grouped together. For each group the number of programs and the total number of assertions are given. ✓ indicates all assertions proven, ✗ none proven, otherwise the number of proven assertions is given. (—) indicates invalid results produced.

Set	Group	# Asserts		Our analyzer				NR-GOBLINT w/ interval	DUET
				Interval (Sec. 4)	Octagon (Sec. 4)	TIDs (Sec. 7)	Clusters (Sec. 8)		
Our	Basic	3	4	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	3
	Relational	10	35	✗	✓	✓	✓	4	2
	TID	12	19	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	2
	Cluster	2	3	✗	✗	1	✓	✗	1
GOBLINT	POSIX	5	1679	1146	1490	✓	✓	1582	—
	SV-COMP	7	360	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	—
WATTS	Created	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	✗
	SV-COMP	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	✗
	LKMPG	1	2	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
	DDVERIFY	28	1071	1043	1043	✓	✓	1043	—
	Scalability	5	740	735	735	✓	✓	735	—
RATCOP		19	34	4	14	18	18	6	4

RATCOP *benchmarks* [42]. These were JAVA programs. After manual translation to C, our analyzer succeeded in proving all assertions any configuration of RATCOP could with *Octagons*, while RATCOP required polyhedra in one case.

Internal comparison We evaluated our analyses in more detail on the GOBLINT benchmark set [48]. Fig. 13a shows sizes of the benchmark programs (in Logical LoC) and the number of thread *ids* as found by the analysis from Section 6. The high number of threads identified as *unique* is encouraging. For a detailed precision evaluation, we compared the abstract values at each program point (joined over all contexts). Fig. 13a shows for what proportion of program points precision is increased by tracking thread *ids*. There were no program points where precision decreased or abstract values became incomparable, while for some programs gains of more than 50% were observed.


Fig. 13b illustrates the runtimes of these analyses. In 9 out of 12 cases, performance differences between our relational analyses are negligible. In all the cases, using clusters incurs no additional cost. Therefore, the more precise analysis using clusters of size at most 2 seems to be the method of choice for thread-modular relational abstract interpretation.

10 Related Work

Since its introduction by Miné [36, 37], the weakly relational numerical domain of *Octagons* has found wide-spread application for the analysis and verification

Name	LLoC	#TIDs (unique)	TIDs \sqsubset Octagon
pfscan	550	3 (2)	19.0%
aget	581	6 (4)	0.0%
ctrace	651	3 (3)	0.0%
knot	973	9 (5)	0.0%
smtprc	3013	2 (2)	0.8%
iowarrior	1358	4 (4)	17.1%
adutux	1509	4 (4)	0.0%
w83977af	1515	6 (4)	12.1%
tegra20	1560	7 (5)	0.0%
nsc	2394	11 (7)	32.2%
marvell1	2476	6 (5)	59.5%
marvell2	2476	6 (5)	58.4%

(a) Number of discovered thread *ids* and proportion of program points where analysis with thread *ids* is more precise.



(b) Analysis times.

Fig. 13: Precision and performance evaluation on the GOBLINT benchmark set.

of programs [8, 14]. Since tracking relations between *all* variables may be expensive, pre-analyses have been suggested to identify *clusters* of numerical variables whose relationships may be of interest [8, 14, 26, 45]. A *dynamic* approach to decompose relational domains into non-overlapping clusters based on learning is proposed by Singh et al. [53]. While these approaches trade (unnecessary) precision for efficiency, others try to *partition* the variables into clusters without compromising precision [15, 23, 24, 44, 52, 54]. These types of clustering are orthogonal to our approach and could, perhaps, be combined with it.

The integration of relational domains into thread-modular abstract interpretation was pioneered by Miné [39]. His analysis is based on *lock invariants* which determine for each mutex a relation which is meant to hold whenever the mutex is *not* held. *Weak interferences* then are used to account for asynchronous accesses to variables. For practical analyses, a relational abstraction only for the lock invariants is proposed, while using a coarse, non-relational abstraction for the weak interferences. This framework closely follows the corresponding framework for non-relational analysis [38], while abandoning *background locksets*. Our relational analysis, on the other hand, maintains at each mutex *a* only relations between variables write-protected by *a*. For these relations more precise results can be obtained, since they are incorporated into the local state at locks by *meet* (while [39] uses *join*).

Monat and Miné [40] present an analysis framework which we consider orthogonal to our approach. It is tailored to the verification of algorithms that do not rely on explicit synchronization via mutexes such as the *Bakery* algorithm. Suzanne and Miné [55] extend the previous work to handle weak memory effects (PSO, TSO) by incorporating memory buffers into the thread-local se-

mantics. The notion of interferences is also used by Sharma and Sharma [50] for the analysis of programs under the Release/Acquire Memory Model of C11 by additionally tracking abstractions of *modification sequences* for global variables. They consider fixed finite sets of threads only, and do not deal with thread creation or joining.

Earlier works on thread-modular relational analysis rely on DATALOG rules to model interferences in the sense of Miné in combination with abstract interpretation applied to the Data-Flow Graph [19] or the Control-Flow Graph [31] (later extended to weak memory [32]), respectively. Botbol et al. [10] give a non-thread-modular analysis of multi-threaded programs with message-passing concurrency by encoding the program semantics as a symbolic transducer.

All these approaches have in common that clusters of variables, if there are any, are predefined and not treated specially by the analysis. This is different in the thread-modular relational analysis proposed by Mukherjee et al. [42]. It propagates information from unlock to lock operations. It is relational for the locals of each thread, and within *disjoint* subsets of globals, called *regions*. These regions must be determined beforehand with the specific requirement to satisfy *region-race freedom*. In contrast, the only extra a priori information required by our analysis, are the sets of (write) protecting mutexes of globals – which can be computed during the analysis itself. The closest concept within our approach to a *region* is the set of globals jointly protected by mutexes. These sets may overlap – which explicitly is exploited by the analysis. Like ours, their proof of correctness refers to a thread-local semantics. Unlike ours, it is based on interleavings and thus overly detailed. The concrete semantics on which our analyses are based, is a collecting local trace semantics extending the semantics of Schwarz et al. [48] by additionally taking thread termination and joins into account. The analyses in [48], however, are non-relational. No refinement via further finite abstractions of local traces, such as thread *ids* is provided.

The thread *id* analysis perhaps most closely related to ours, is by Feret [20] who computes *ids* for agents in the π -calculus as abstractions of the sequences of encountered create edges. Another line of analysis of concurrent programs deals with determining which critical events may possibly happen in parallel (MHP) [1–4, 7, 17, 43, 57] to detect possible programming errors like, e.g., data races, or identifying opportunities for optimization. Mostly, MHP analyses are obtained as abstractions of a *global* trace semantics of concurrent programs [18]. Here, we apply related techniques for improving thread-modular analyses – but based on a *local* trace semantics. Like MHP analyses, we take thread creation and joining histories into account as well as sets of currently held mutexes. Additionally, we also consider crucial aspects of the modification history of globals and provide a general framework to obtain further refinements.

In a sequential setting, splitting control locations according to some abstraction of reaching traces is a common technique for improving the precision of dataflow analyses [9, 27] or abstract interpretation [25, 34, 41, 47]. Control point splitting can be understood as an instance of the reduced cardinal power domain [12, 13, 22]. For the analysis of multi-threaded programs, Miné [39] applies

the techniques of Mauborgne and Rival [34] to *single* threads, i.e., independently of the actions of all other threads. Our approach, on the other hand, may take arbitrary properties of *local* traces into account, and thus is more general.

11 Conclusion and Future Work

We have presented thread-modular relational analyses of global variables tailored to decomposable domains. In some cases, more precise results can be obtained by considering smaller clusters. For k -decomposable domains, however, we proved that the *optimal* result can already be obtained by considering clusters of size at most k . We have provided a framework to incorporate finite abstractions of local traces into the analysis. Here, we have applied this framework to take creation as well as joining of threads into account, but believe that it paves the way to seamlessly enhance the precision of thread-modular abstract interpretation. The evaluation of our analyses on benchmarks proposed in the literature indicates that our implementation is competitive both w.r.t. precision and efficiency. In future work, we would like to experiment with further abstractions of local traces, perhaps tailored to particular programming idioms, and also explore the potential of non-numerical 2-decomposable domains.

Bibliography

- [1] Agarwal, S., Barik, R., Sarkar, V., Shyamasundar, R.K.: May-happen-in-parallel analysis of x10 programs. In: PPOPP '07, p. 183–193, ACM (2007), DOI: 10.1145/1229428.1229471
- [2] Albert, E., Flores-Montoya, A., Genaim, S.: Analysis of may-happen-in-parallel in concurrent objects. In: Giese, H., Rosu, G. (eds.) Formal Techniques for Distributed Systems - Joint 14th IFIP WG 6.1 International Conference, FMOODS 2012 and 32nd IFIP WG 6.1 International Conference, FORTE 2012, Stockholm, Sweden, June 13–16, 2012. Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 7273, pp. 35–51, Springer (2012), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-30793-5_3, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-30793-5_3
- [3] Albert, E., Genaim, S., Gordillo, P.: May-happen-in-parallel analysis for asynchronous programs with inter-procedural synchronization. In: Blazy, S., Jensen, T.P. (eds.) Static Analysis - 22nd International Symposium, SAS 2015, Saint-Malo, France, September 9–11, 2015, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 9291, pp. 72–89, Springer (2015), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-662-48288-9_5, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-48288-9_5
- [4] Albert, E., Genaim, S., Gordillo, P.: May-happen-in-parallel analysis with returned futures. In: D’Souza, D., Kumar, K.N. (eds.) Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis - 15th International Symposium, ATVA 2017, Pune, India, October 3–6, 2017, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 10482, pp. 42–58, Springer (2017), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-68167-2_3, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-68167-2_3
- [5] Apinis, K., Seidl, H., Vojdani, V.: Side-effecting constraint systems: a swiss army knife for program analysis. In: APLAS '12, pp. 157–172, Springer (2012), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-35182-2_12
- [6] Arceri, V., Oliaro, M., Cortesi, A., Ferrara, P.: Relational string abstract domains. In: Finkbeiner, B., Wies, T. (eds.) Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation - 23rd International Conference, VMCAI 2022, Philadelphia, PA, USA, January 16–18, 2022, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 13182, pp. 20–42, Springer (2022), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-94583-1_2, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-94583-1_2
- [7] Barik, R.: Efficient computation of may-happen-in-parallel information for concurrent Java programs. In: LCPC '06, vol. 4339 LNCS, pp. 152–169, Springer (2006), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-540-69330-7_11
- [8] Blanchet, B., Cousot, P., Cousot, R., Feret, J., Mauborgne, L., Miné, A., Monniaux, D., Rival, X.: A static analyzer for large safety-critical software. In: Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 2003 Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, p.

- 196–207, PLDI '03, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2003), ISBN 1581136625, DOI: 10.1145/781131.781153, URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/781131.781153>
- [9] Bodík, R., Gupta, R., Soffa, M.L.: Refining data flow information using infeasible paths. *SIGSOFT Softw. Eng. Notes* **22**(6), 361–377 (Nov 1997), ISSN 0163-5948, DOI: 10.1145/267896.267921, URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/267896.267921>
- [10] Botbol, V., Chailloux, E., Gall, T.L.: Static analysis of communicating processes using symbolic transducers. In: Bouajjani, A., Monniaux, D. (eds.) *Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation - 18th International Conference, VMCAI 2017, Paris, France, January 15-17, 2017, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 10145, pp. 73–90, Springer (2017), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-52234-0_5, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-52234-0_5
- [11] Chen, L., Liu, J., Miné, A., Kapur, D., Wang, J.: An abstract domain to infer octagonal constraints with absolute value. In: Müller-Olm, M., Seidl, H. (eds.) *Static Analysis - 21st International Symposium, SAS 2014, Munich, Germany, September 11-13, 2014. Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 8723, pp. 101–117, Springer (2014), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-10936-7_7, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10936-7_7
- [12] Cortesi, A., Costantini, G., Ferrara, P.: A survey on product operators in abstract interpretation. In: Banerjee, A., Danvy, O., Doh, K., Hatcliff, J. (eds.) *Semantics, Abstract Interpretation, and Reasoning about Programs: Essays Dedicated to David A. Schmidt on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday, Manhattan, Kansas, USA, 19-20th September 2013, EPTCS*, vol. 129, pp. 325–336 (2013), DOI: 10.4204/EPTCS.129.19, URL <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.129.19>
- [13] Cousot, P., Cousot, R.: Systematic design of program analysis frameworks. In: Aho, A.V., Zilles, S.N., Rosen, B.K. (eds.) *Conference Record of the Sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, San Antonio, Texas, USA, January 1979, pp. 269–282, ACM Press (1979), DOI: 10.1145/567752.567778, URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/567752.567778>
- [14] Cousot, P., Cousot, R., Feret, J., Mauborgne, L., Miné, A., Rival, X.: Why does astrée scale up? *Form. Methods Syst. Des.* **35**(3), 229–264 (dec 2009), ISSN 0925-9856, DOI: 10.1007/s10703-009-0089-6, URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10703-009-0089-6>
- [15] Cousot, P., Giacobazzi, R., Ranzato, F.: a^2i : Abstract² interpretation. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **3**(POPL) (Jan 2019), DOI: 10.1145/3290355, URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290355>
- [16] Cousot, P., Halbwachs, N.: Automatic discovery of linear restraints among variables of a program. In: Aho, A.V., Zilles, S.N., Szymanski, T.G. (eds.) *Conference Record of the Fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, Tucson, Arizona, USA, January

- 1978, pp. 84–96, ACM Press (1978), DOI: 10.1145/512760.512770, URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/512760.512770>
- [17] Di, P., Sui, Y., Ye, D., Xue, J.: Region-based may-happen-in-parallel analysis for C programs. In: ICPP, pp. 889–898, IEEE (2015), ISBN 978-1-4673-7587-0, DOI: 10.1109/ICPP.2015.98
- [18] Dwyer, M.B., Clarke, L.A.: Data flow analysis for verifying properties of concurrent programs. ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes **19**(5), 62–75 (dec 1994), DOI: 10.1145/195274.195295
- [19] Farzan, A., Kincaid, Z.: Verification of parameterized concurrent programs by modular reasoning about data and control. In: Proceedings of the 39th Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, p. 297–308, POPL '12, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2012), ISBN 9781450310833, DOI: 10.1145/2103656.2103693, URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2103656.2103693>
- [20] Feret, J.: Abstract interpretation of mobile systems. J. Log. Algebraic Methods Program. **63**(1), 59–130 (2005), DOI: 10.1016/j.jlap.2004.01.005, URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlap.2004.01.005>
- [21] Fulara, J., Durnoga, K., Jakubczyk, K., Schubert, A.: Relational abstract domain of weighted hexagons. Electron. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci. **267**(1), 59–72 (2010), DOI: 10.1016/j.entcs.2010.09.006, URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcs.2010.09.006>
- [22] Giacobazzi, R., Ranzato, F.: The reduced relative power operation on abstract domains. Theor. Comput. Sci. **216**(1-2), 159–211 (1999), DOI: 10.1016/S0304-3975(98)00194-7, URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(98\)00194-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(98)00194-7)
- [23] Halbwachs, N., Merchat, D., Gonnord, L.: Some ways to reduce the space dimension in polyhedra computations. Formal Methods in System Design **29**(1), 79–95 (Jul 2006), ISSN 1572-8102, DOI: 10.1007/s10703-006-0013-2, URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10703-006-0013-2>
- [24] Halbwachs, N., Merchat, D., Parent-Vigouroux, C.: Cartesian factoring of polyhedra in linear relation analysis. In: Cousot, R. (ed.) Static Analysis, pp. 355–365, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2003), ISBN 978-3-540-44898-3
- [25] Handjjeva, M., Tzolovski, S.: Refining static analyses by trace-based partitioning using control flow. In: Levi, G. (ed.) Static Analysis, pp. 200–214, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (1998), ISBN 978-3-540-49727-1
- [26] Heo, K., Oh, H., Yang, H.: Learning a variable-clustering strategy for octagon from labeled data generated by a static analysis. In: Rival, X. (ed.) Static Analysis, pp. 237–256, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2016), ISBN 978-3-662-53413-7
- [27] Holley, L.H., Rosen, B.K.: Qualified data flow problems. In: Proceedings of the 7th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, p. 68–82, POPL '80,

- Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (1980), ISBN 0897910117, DOI: 10.1145/567446.567454, URL <https://doi-org.eaccess.ub.tum.de/10.1145/567446.567454>
- [28] Howe, J.M., King, A.: Logahedra: A new weakly relational domain. In: Liu, Z., Ravn, A.P. (eds.) Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis, 7th International Symposium, ATVA 2009, Macao, China, October 14-16, 2009. Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 5799, pp. 306–320, Springer (2009), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-04761-9_23, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-04761-9_23
- [29] Jeannet, B., Miné, A.: APRON: A library of numerical abstract domains for static analysis. In: Bouajjani, A., Maler, O. (eds.) Computer Aided Verification, 21st International Conference, CAV 2009, Grenoble, France, June 26 - July 2, 2009. Proceedings, LNCS, vol. 5643, pp. 661–667, Springer (2009), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-02658-4_52, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-02658-4_52
- [30] Karr, M.: Affine relationships among variables of a program. *Acta Informatica* **6**, 133–151 (1976), DOI: 10.1007/BF00268497, URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00268497>
- [31] Kusano, M., Wang, C.: Flow-sensitive composition of thread-modular abstract interpretation. In: Proceedings of the 2016 24th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Foundations of Software Engineering, p. 799–809, FSE 2016, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2016), ISBN 9781450342186, DOI: 10.1145/2950290.2950291, URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2950290.2950291>
- [32] Kusano, M., Wang, C.: Thread-modular static analysis for relaxed memory models. In: Proceedings of the 2017 11th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering, p. 337–348, ESEC/FSE 2017, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2017), ISBN 9781450351058, DOI: 10.1145/3106237.3106243, URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3106237.3106243>
- [33] Logozzo, F., Fähndrich, M.: Pentagons: A weakly relational abstract domain for the efficient validation of array accesses. In: Proceedings of the 2008 ACM Symposium on Applied Computing, p. 184–188, SAC '08, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2008), ISBN 9781595937537, DOI: 10.1145/1363686.1363736, URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1363686.1363736>
- [34] Mauborgne, L., Rival, X.: Trace partitioning in abstract interpretation based static analyzers. In: Sagiv, M. (ed.) Programming Languages and Systems, pp. 5–20, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2005), ISBN 978-3-540-31987-0
- [35] Miné, A.: A new numerical abstract domain based on difference-bound matrices. In: Danvy, O., Filinski, A. (eds.) Programs as Data Objects, Second Symposium, PADO 2001, Aarhus, Denmark, May 21-23, 2001, Proceedings, LNCS, vol. 2053, pp. 155–172, Springer (2001), DOI: 10.1007/3-540-44978-7_10, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-44978-7_10

- [36] Miné, A.: The octagon abstract domain. In: WCRE' 01, p. 310, IEEE Computer Society (2001), DOI: 10.1109/WCRE.2001.957836
- [37] Miné, A.: The octagon abstract domain. Higher Order Symbol. Comput. **19**(1), 31–100 (mar 2006), ISSN 1388-3690, DOI: 10.1007/s10990-006-8609-1, URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10990-006-8609-1>
- [38] Miné, A.: Static analysis of run-time errors in embedded real-time parallel C programs. Logical Methods in Computer Science **8**(1), 1–63 (mar 2012), DOI: 10.2168/LMCS-8(1:26)2012
- [39] Miné, A.: Relational thread-modular static value analysis by abstract interpretation. In: VMCAI '14, vol. 8318 LNCS, pp. 39–58, Springer (2014), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-54013-4_3
- [40] Monat, R., Miné, A.: Precise thread-modular abstract interpretation of concurrent programs using relational interference abstractions. In: VMCAI '17, vol. 10145 LNCS, pp. 386–404, Springer (2017), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-52234-0_21
- [41] Montagu, B., Jensen, T.: Trace-based control-flow analysis. In: PLDI '21, p. 482–496, ACM (2021), DOI: 10.1145/3453483.3454057, URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3453483.3454057>
- [42] Mukherjee, S., Padon, O., Shoham, S., D'Souza, D., Rinetzkky, N.: Thread-local semantics and its efficient sequential abstractions for race-free programs. In: SAS '17, vol. LNCS 10422, pp. 253–276, Springer (2017), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-66706-5_13
- [43] Naumovich, G., Avrunin, G.S., Clarke, L.A.: An efficient algorithm for computing mhp information for concurrent Java programs. In: ESEC/FSE '99, vol. 1687 LNCS, pp. 338–354, Springer (1999), DOI: 10.1007/3-540-48166-4_21
- [44] Oh, H., Heo, K., Lee, W., Lee, W., Park, D., Kang, J., Yi, K.: Global sparse analysis framework. ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst. **36**(3) (sep 2014), ISSN 0164-0925, DOI: 10.1145/2590811, URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2590811>
- [45] Oh, H., Lee, W., Heo, K., Yang, H., Yi, K.: Selective x-sensitive analysis guided by impact pre-analysis. ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst. **38**(2) (Dec 2015), ISSN 0164-0925, DOI: 10.1145/2821504, URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2821504>
- [46] Péron, M., Halbwachs, N.: An abstract domain extending difference-bound matrices with disequality constraints. In: Cook, B., Podelski, A. (eds.) Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation, 8th International Conference, VMCAI 2007, Nice, France, January 14-16, 2007, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 4349, pp. 268–282, Springer (2007), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-540-69738-1_20, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-69738-1_20
- [47] Rival, X., Mauborgne, L.: The trace partitioning abstract domain. ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst. **29**(5), 26–es (Aug 2007), ISSN 0164-0925, DOI: 10.1145/1275497.1275501, URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1275497.1275501>

- [48] Schwarz, M., Saan, S., Seidl, H., Apinis, K., Erhard, J., Vojdani, V.: Improving thread-modular abstract interpretation. In: SAS '21, vol. 12913 LNCS, pp. 359–383, Springer (2021), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-88806-0_18
- [49] Seidl, H., Vogler, R.: Three improvements to the top-down solver. *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.* **31**(9), 1090–1134 (2021), DOI: 10.1017/S0960129521000499, URL <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129521000499>
- [50] Sharma, D., Sharma, S.: Thread-modular analysis of release-acquire concurrency. In: Dragoi, C., Mukherjee, S., Namjoshi, K.S. (eds.) *Static Analysis - 28th International Symposium, SAS 2021, Chicago, IL, USA, October 17-19, 2021, Proceedings, LNCS*, vol. 12913, pp. 384–404, Springer (2021), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-88806-0_19, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-88806-0_19
- [51] Simon, A., King, A., Howe, J.M.: Two variables per linear inequality as an abstract domain. In: Leuschel, M. (ed.) *Logic Based Program Synthesis and Transformation, 12th International Workshop, LOPSTR 2002, Madrid, Spain, September 17-20, 2002, Revised Selected Papers, LNCS*, vol. 2664, pp. 71–89, Springer (2002), DOI: 10.1007/3-540-45013-0_7, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45013-0_7
- [52] Singh, G., Püschel, M., Vechev, M.: Fast polyhedra abstract domain. In: *Proceedings of the 44th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, p. 46–59, POPL 2017, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2017), ISBN 9781450346603, DOI: 10.1145/3009837.3009885, URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3009837.3009885>
- [53] Singh, G., Püschel, M., Vechev, M.: Fast numerical program analysis with reinforcement learning. In: Chockler, H., Weissenbacher, G. (eds.) *Computer Aided Verification*, pp. 211–229, Springer International Publishing, Cham (2018), ISBN 978-3-319-96145-3
- [54] Singh, G., Püschel, M., Vechev, M.: A practical construction for decomposing numerical abstract domains. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **2**(POPL) (dec 2018), DOI: 10.1145/3158143, URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3158143>
- [55] Suzanne, T., Miné, A.: Relational thread-modular abstract interpretation under relaxed memory models. In: *APLAS '18*, vol. LNCS 11275, pp. 109–128, Springer (dec 2018), DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-02768-1_6
- [56] Vojdani, V., Apinis, K., Rötov, V., Seidl, H., Vene, V., Vogler, R.: Static Race Detection for Device Drivers: The Goblint Approach. In: *ASE '16*, pp. 391–402, ACM (2016), DOI: 10.1145/2970276.2970337
- [57] Zhou, Q., Li, L., Wang, L., Xue, J., Feng, X.: May-happen-in-parallel analysis with static vector clocks. In: *CGO '18*, pp. 228–240, ACM (2018), DOI: 10.1145/3168813

A Details on the Local Trace Semantics

We first detail the handling of local variables and guards for the local trace semantics that are omitted in the main text. Then, we give an example formalism for local traces that extends the one proposed in [48] for handling thread joins and returns.

A.1 Local Variables and Guards

In our setting, all expressions r occurring as guards or as non-variable right-hand sides of assignments may contain only *local* variables, not globals. A corresponding right-hand side function for guards and assignments to local variables can then be given by

$$\llbracket u, A \rrbracket \eta = (\emptyset, \llbracket e \rrbracket (\eta[u]))$$

That is, the computation is entirely local, and no side-effects are triggered.

A.2 Formalism for Local Traces

The concrete concurrency semantics imposes *restrictions* onto when binary actions are defined. In particular, a binary operation $\llbracket e \rrbracket$ may only be defined for a pair of local traces t_0 and t_1 if certain parts of t_0 and t_1 represent the same computation. To make such restrictions explicit, we recall the concrete representation of local traces presented in [48] and enhance it for returning from and joining of threads.

A *raw* (finite) trace of single thread $i \in \mathcal{I}$ is a sequence $\lambda = \bar{u}_0 \text{act}_1 \dots \bar{u}_{n-1} \text{act}_n \bar{u}_n$ for states $\bar{u}_j = (u_j, \sigma_j)$ with $\sigma_j \text{self} = i$, and actions $\text{act}_j \in \mathcal{Act}$ corresponding to the local state transitions of the thread i starting in configuration \bar{u}_0 and executing actions act_j . In that sequence, every action $\text{lock}(m)$ is assumed to succeed, and when accessing a global g , any value may be read. The same applies to the return value of an action $x = \text{join}(x')$.

One can view λ as an acyclic graph whose nodes are the 3-tuples (j, u_j, σ_j) , $j = 0, \dots, n$, and whose edges are $((j-1, u_{j-1}, \sigma_{j-1}), \text{act}_j, (j, u_j, \sigma_j))$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. Let $V(\lambda)$ and $E(\lambda)$ denote the set of nodes and edges of this graph, respectively.

Let $\Lambda(i)$ denote the set of all individual raw traces for thread i , and Λ the union of all these sets.

A *raw global trace* is an acyclic graph $\tau = (\mathbf{V}, \mathcal{E})$ where $\mathbf{V} = \bigcup \{V(\lambda_i) \mid i \in I\}$ and $\mathcal{E} = \bigcup \{E(\lambda_i) \mid i \in I\}$ for a set I of thread *ids* and raw local traces $\lambda_i \in \Lambda(i)$. On the set \mathbf{V} , we define the *program order* as the set of all pairs $\bar{u} \rightarrow_p \bar{u}'$ for which there is an edge $(\bar{u}, \text{act}, \bar{u}')$ in \mathcal{E} . To formalize our notion of local traces, we extend the program order to a *causality order* which additionally takes the order in which threads are created and joined, as well as the order in which mutexes are acquired and released, into account.

For $a \in \mathbf{M}$, let $a^+ \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ denote the set of nodes \bar{u} where an incoming edge labeled $\text{lock}(a)$ exists, i.e., $\exists x (x, \text{lock}(a), \bar{u}) \in \mathcal{E}$, and a^- analogously for $\text{unlock}(a)$. Analogously, let J and R denote the sets of nodes in \mathbf{V} having an incoming

edge labeled $x=\text{join}(x')$, and **return** x , respectively, for any local variables x, x' . On the other hand, let C denote the set of nodes with an *outgoing* edge labeled $x=\text{create}(u_1)$ (for any local variable x and program point u_1). Let S denote the set of minimal nodes w.r.t. to \rightarrow_p , i.e., the points at which threads start and let $\mathbf{0}$ the node $(0, u_0, \sigma_0)$ where $\sigma_0 \text{self} = 0$.

A *global trace* t then is represented by a tuple $(\tau, \rightarrow_c, \rightarrow_j, (\rightarrow_a)_{a \in \mathbf{M}}, (\rightarrow_s)_{s \in \mathbf{S}})$ where τ is a raw global trace and the relations $\rightarrow_c, \rightarrow_j, \rightarrow_a$ ($a \in \mathbf{M}$) are the create, join, and locking orders as introduced in Section 3. The *causality order* \leq of t then is defined as the reflexive and transitive closure of the union

$$\rightarrow_p \cup \rightarrow_c \cup \rightarrow_j \cup \bigcup_{a \in \mathbf{M}} \rightarrow_a$$

These orders need to satisfy the following properties:

- **Causality order** \leq is a partial order with unique least element $(0, u_0, \sigma_0)$ where $\sigma_0 \text{self} = 0$;
- **Create order**: $\rightarrow_c \subseteq C \times (S \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\})$: $\forall s \in (S \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}) : |\{z \mid z \rightarrow_c s\}| = 1$, that is, every thread except the initial thread is created by exactly one **create**(...) action and $\forall x : |\{z \mid x \rightarrow_c z\}| \leq 1$, i.e., each **create**(...) action creates at most one thread. Additionally, for $((j-1, u_{j-1}, \sigma_{j-1}), x=\text{create}(v), (j, u_j, \sigma_j)) \in \mathcal{E}$ and $(j-1, u_{j-1}, \sigma_{j-1}) \rightarrow_c (0, v, \sigma'_0)$ $\sigma'_0 = \sigma_{j-1} \oplus \{\text{self} \mapsto i'\}$ for some thread *id* i' where $\sigma_j x = i'$, i.e., the creating and the created thread agree on the thread *id* of the created thread;
- **Join order**: $\rightarrow_j \subseteq R \times J$: $\forall j' \in J : |\{z \mid z \rightarrow_j j'\}| = 1$ and $\forall r' \in R : |\{z \mid r' \rightarrow_j z\}| \leq 1$, that is, each join action in the traces joins exactly one thread also appearing in the trace and each thread is joined at most once. Additionally, for $((j-1, u_{j-1}, \sigma_{j-1}), x=\text{join}(x'), (j, u_j, \sigma_j)) \in \mathcal{E}$ and $((j'-1, u_{j'-1}, \sigma'_{j'-1}), \text{return } y, (j', u_{j'}, \sigma'_{j'})) \in \mathcal{E}$ and $(j', u_{j'}, \sigma'_{j'}) \rightarrow_j (j, u_j, \sigma_j)$: $\sigma_{j-1} x' = \sigma'_{j'-1} \text{self}$, and $\sigma_j x = \sigma'_{j'-1} y$, i.e., the thread that is being joined has the thread *id* stored in x' and after the join, the return value is assigned to x ;
- **Locking order**: $\forall a \in \mathbf{M} : \rightarrow_a \subseteq (a^- \cup \mathbf{0}) \times a^+$: $\forall x \in (a^- \cup \mathbf{0}) : |\{z \mid x \rightarrow_a z\}| \leq 1$ and $\forall y \in a^+ : |\{z \mid z \rightarrow_a y\}| = 1$, that is, for a mutex a every lock is preceded by exactly one unlock (or it is the first lock) of a , and each unlock is directly followed by at most one lock

Additionally, we require a consistency condition on values read from globals. For $((j-1, u_{j-1}, \sigma_{j-1}), x = g, (j, u_j, \sigma_j)) \in \mathcal{E}$, there is a *unique* maximal node $(j', u_{j'}, \sigma_{j'})$ with respect to \leq such that $((j'-1, u_{j'-1}, \sigma_{j'-1}), g = y, (j', u_{j'}, \sigma_{j'})) \in \mathcal{E}$ and $(j', u_{j'}, \sigma_{j'}) \leq (j-1, u_{j-1}, \sigma_{j-1})$. The uniqueness of such a maximal node is ensured by \rightarrow_{m_g} , as every write to a global g is immediately succeeded by an **unlock**(m_g) operation and every read of global g is immediately preceded by a **lock**(m_g) operation. Then $\sigma_j x = \sigma_{j'-1} y$, i.e., the value read for a global is the last value written to it.

A global trace t is *local* if it has a unique maximal element $\bar{u} = (j, u, \sigma)$ (w.r.t. \leq). For a local trace t , we define a function $\text{sink } t$ to extract the tuple (u, σ) , and a function $\text{loct } t$ to obtain the program point u of the sink node. The function

last, on the other hand, extracts the last action `act` of the ego thread (if there is any) and returns \perp otherwise. The partial functions `new` u u_1 for program points u and u_1 and $\llbracket e \rrbracket$ for control-flow edges e then are defined by extending a given local trace appropriately.

B Soundness Proof for the Analysis from Section 4

Let the constraint system for the analysis from Section 4 be called \mathcal{C}^\sharp , and let the constraint system Eq. (3) for the concrete semantics from Section 3 be called \mathcal{C} . We first modify \mathcal{C} to obtain a new constraint system \mathcal{C}' that has the same unknowns as \mathcal{C}^\sharp , except for thread *ids*. This means that each unknown $[u]$ for program point u is replaced with the set of unknowns $[u, S]$, $S \subseteq \mathbf{M}$, and each unknown $[a]$ for mutex a is replaced with the set of unknowns $[a, Q]$, $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a$. We remark that there is at least one such unknown for each mutex a , as we require $\mathcal{Q}_a \neq \emptyset$. The unknowns for thread *ids* and mutexes remain unmodified. Accordingly, the constraint system \mathcal{C}' consists of these constraints:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\eta, \eta[u_0, \emptyset]) &\sqsupseteq (\{[a, Q] \mapsto \text{init} \mid a \in \mathbf{M}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a\}, \text{init}) \\
 (\eta, \eta[u', S \cup \{a\}]) &\sqsupseteq \llbracket [u, S], \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket \eta \quad (\text{for } (u, \text{lock}(a), u') \in \mathcal{E}, S \subseteq \mathbf{M}) \\
 (\eta, \eta[u', S \setminus \{a\}]) &\sqsupseteq \llbracket [u, S], \text{unlock}(a) \rrbracket \eta \quad (\text{for } (u, \text{unlock}(a), u') \in \mathcal{E}, S \subseteq \mathbf{M}) \\
 (\eta, \eta[u', S]) &\sqsupseteq \llbracket [u, S], \text{act} \rrbracket \eta \quad (\text{for } (u, \text{act}, u') \in \mathcal{E}, S \subseteq \mathbf{M}, \text{other actions act})
 \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where the right-hand sides are modified to consult the appropriate unknown $[u, S]$ instead of $[u]$. Additionally, the right-hand sides for locking and unlocking mutexes are modified to consult and side-effect to the appropriate $[a, Q]$, $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket [u, S], \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket \eta &= \left(\emptyset, \llbracket e \rrbracket \left(\eta[u, \bigcap_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a} (\eta[a, Q]) \right) \right) \\
 \llbracket [u, S], \text{unlock}(a) \rrbracket \eta &= \mathbf{let } T = \llbracket e \rrbracket (\eta[u]) \mathbf{in} \\
 &\quad (\{[a, Q] \mapsto T \mid Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a\}, T)
 \end{aligned}$$

First, we relate the unique least solutions of \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' to each other. Let η be the unique least solution of \mathcal{C} . We construct from it a mapping η' from the unknowns of \mathcal{C}' to $2^{\mathcal{T}}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \eta'[u, S] &= \eta[u] \cap \mathcal{T}_S \quad (\text{for } u \in \mathcal{N}, S \subseteq \mathbf{M}) \\
 \eta'[i] &= \eta[i] \quad (\text{for } i \in \mathcal{I}) \\
 \eta'[a, Q] &= \eta[a] \quad (\text{for } a \in \mathbf{M}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a)
 \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{T}_S denotes the set of all traces where the ego thread holds the lockset S at the sink node.

Proposition 1. *η' is the least solution of \mathcal{C}' if and only if η is the least solution of \mathcal{C} .*

Proof. The proof of Proposition 1 is by fixpoint induction.

Before moving on to the soundness proof, we require the following insight into the analysis from Section 4.

Proposition 2. *Let η^\sharp be a solution of \mathcal{C}^\sharp computed by the analysis from Section 4. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \eta^\sharp [u, S] &= \eta^\sharp [u, S] \Big|_{\mathcal{X} \cup \{g \mid g \in \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{M}[g] \cap S \neq \emptyset\}} \quad (\text{for } u \in \mathcal{N}, S \subseteq \mathcal{M}) \\ \eta^\sharp [i] &= \eta^\sharp [i] \Big|_{\{\text{ret}\}} \quad (\text{for } i \in \mathcal{V}_T^\sharp) \\ \eta^\sharp [a, Q] &= \eta^\sharp [a, Q] \Big|_Q \quad (\text{for } a \in \mathcal{M}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof of Proposition 2 is once more by fixpoint induction using idempotence of the operation *restrict*.

To relate solutions of \mathcal{C}' and \mathcal{C}^\sharp to each other, we extend the function $x \mapsto t(x)$ that extracts from a local trace t the value of the local variable x at the sink node, to also extract the *last* value of a global appearing in t . Let Σ the set of all mappings $\sigma : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ assigning values to local variables. Recall that in a local trace t , there is for each global g ever written in t , a unique *last* (w.r.t. the causality ordering) write operation $((j-1, u_{j-1}, \sigma_{j-1}), g = x, (j, u_j, \sigma_j))$. Let $\text{last_write}_g : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow ((\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathcal{N} \times \Sigma) \times \mathcal{Act} \times (\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathcal{N} \times \Sigma)) \cup \{\perp\}$ be a function to extract such a last write to g from a local trace, where \perp indicates that g has not been written to. Let $\text{last_value}_g : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ be a function to extract the *last* value of a global appearing in a local trace. If a write to the global appears in the local trace, this is the value written at *last* write. Otherwise, the last value is the initial value of the global, i.e., 0.

$$\text{last_value}_g t = \begin{cases} \sigma_{j-1} x & \text{if } \text{last_write}_g t = ((j-1, u_{j-1}, \sigma_{j-1}), g = x, _) \\ 0 & \text{if } \text{last_write}_g t = \perp \end{cases}$$

Then, we define, for a local trace $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and $x \in (\mathcal{G} \cup \mathcal{X})$

$$t(x) = \begin{cases} \sigma x & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{X}, \text{sink } t = (_, \sigma) \\ \text{last_value}_g t & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{G} \end{cases}$$

Let us now relate solutions of \mathcal{C}' and \mathcal{C}^\sharp to each other. To this end, we define for a local trace t the function $\beta : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow (\mathcal{Vars} \rightarrow \mathcal{V})$ by

$$\beta t = \{x \mapsto t(x) \mid x \in (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{G})\}$$

Based on this, we provide dedicated concretization functions for the unknowns of \mathcal{C}^\sharp . For a local state $r \in \mathcal{R}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{u,S}(r) &= \{t \mid t \in \mathcal{T}_S, \text{loc } t = u, \exists v : (\beta t \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto v\}) \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} r\} \\ \gamma_i(r) &= \{t \mid t \in \mathcal{T}, \text{last } t = (\text{return } x), \sigma = \beta t, (\sigma \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto \sigma x\}) \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} r\} \\ \gamma_a(r) &= \{t \mid t \in \mathcal{T}, (\text{last } t = \text{unlock}(a) \vee t \in \text{init}), \exists v : (\beta t \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto v\}) \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} r\} \end{aligned}$$

and remark that these concretization functions are monotonic. Additionally, we require for the operation $\nu^\sharp : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_T^\sharp$ that it is sound w.r.t. to the thread *ids* of created threads in the concrete.

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{V}_T^\sharp}(\nu^\sharp u u_1 r) \supseteq \{t'(\text{self}) \mid t' = \text{new } u u_1 t, t \in \gamma_{u,S}(r)\}$$

For a solution η^\sharp of \mathcal{C}^\sharp , we then construct a mapping η' by:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta'[u, S] &= \gamma_{u, S}(\eta^\sharp[u, S]) && \text{(for } u \in \mathcal{N}, S \subseteq \mathbf{M}) \\ \eta'[i] &= \bigcup \{ \gamma_i(\eta^\sharp[i^\sharp]) \mid i \in \gamma_{\mathcal{V}^\sharp} i^\sharp \} && \text{(for } i \in \mathcal{I}) \\ \eta'[a, Q] &= \gamma_a(\eta^\sharp[a, Q]) && \text{(for } a \in \mathbf{M}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a) \end{aligned}$$

Altogether, the soundness of the constraint system \mathcal{C}^\sharp follows from the following theorem.

Theorem 6. *Every solution of \mathcal{C}^\sharp is sound w.r.t. the local trace semantics.*

Proof. Recall from Proposition 1, that the least solution of \mathcal{C}' is sound w.r.t. the local trace semantics as specified by the constraint system \mathcal{C} . It thus suffices to prove that the mapping η' constructed from a solution η^\sharp of \mathcal{C}^\sharp as above, is a solution of the constraint system \mathcal{C}' . We verify by fixpoint induction that for the j -th approximation η^j to the least solution of \mathcal{C}' , $\eta^j \subseteq \eta'$ holds. To this end, we verify for the start point u_0 and the empty lockset, that

$$(\{[a, Q] \mapsto \text{init} \mid a \in \mathbf{M}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a\}, \text{init}) \subseteq (\eta', \eta'[u_0, \emptyset])$$

holds and for each edge (u, act, v) of the control-flow graph and each possible lockset S , that

$$\llbracket [u, S], \text{act} \rrbracket' \eta^{j-1} \subseteq (\eta', \eta'[v, S'])$$

holds.

We exemplify this for the constraints corresponding to program start, locking of a mutex, and returning from a thread. The proof proceeds analogously for all other constraints.

First, for the start point u_0 and the empty lockset:

$$(\{[a, Q] \mapsto \text{init} \mid a \in \mathbf{M}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a\}, \text{init}) \subseteq (\eta', \eta'[u_0, \emptyset])$$

First, for the value of the unknown $[u_0, \emptyset]$: $\text{init} \subseteq \eta'[u_0, \emptyset]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{init}^\sharp \eta = \mathbf{let} \ \rho = \left\{ [a, Q] \mapsto \llbracket \{g \leftarrow 0 \mid g \in Q\} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\sharp \top \mid a \in \mathbf{M}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a \right\} \ \mathbf{in} \\ (\rho, \llbracket \mathbf{self} \leftarrow^\sharp i_0 \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\sharp \top) \end{aligned}$$

Let $\eta^\sharp[u_0, \emptyset] = r^\sharp$ the value provided by \mathcal{C}^\sharp for the start point and the empty lockset. Since η^\sharp is a solution of \mathcal{C}^\sharp , $(\llbracket \mathbf{self} \leftarrow i_0 \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\sharp \top) \subseteq r^\sharp$. By definition,

$$\eta'[u_0, \emptyset] = \gamma_{u_0, \emptyset}(r^\sharp) = \{t \mid t \in \mathcal{T}_\emptyset, \text{loc } t = u_0, \exists v : (\beta t \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto v\}) \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} r^\sharp\}$$

For every trace $t \in \text{init}$, let $r = \beta t \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto 0\}$. Then,

$$r \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} \left(\llbracket \mathbf{self} \leftarrow^\sharp i_0 \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\sharp \top \right) \subseteq \gamma_{\mathcal{R}}(r^\sharp)$$

and thus $t \in \gamma_{u_0, \emptyset}(r^\sharp) = \eta'[u_0, \emptyset]$ for all $t \in \text{init}$.

Then, for the side-effects we need to verify that for all $a \in \mathbf{M}$, $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a$: $\text{init} \subseteq \gamma_a \left(\llbracket \{g \leftarrow 0 \mid g \in Q\} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^{\#} \top \right)$, i.e., the side-effect in the abstract covers all the side-effects in the concrete. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_a \left(\llbracket \{g \leftarrow 0 \mid g \in Q\} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^{\#} \top \right) &= \{t \mid t \in \mathcal{T}, \\ &\quad (\text{last } t = \text{unlock}(a) \vee t \in \text{init}), \\ &\quad \exists v : (\beta t \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto v\}) \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} \left(\llbracket \{g \leftarrow 0 \mid g \in Q\} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^{\#} \top \right) \\ &\quad \} \end{aligned}$$

Consider $t \in \text{init}$, and let $\sigma = \beta t \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto 0\}$. Then $\forall g \in \mathcal{G} : \sigma g = 0$, as all globals initially have the value 0. Then $\sigma \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} \left(\llbracket \{g \leftarrow 0 \mid g \in Q\} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^{\#} \top \right)$ and thus for all $t \in \text{init}$ $t \in \gamma_a \left(\llbracket \{g \leftarrow 0 \mid g \in Q\} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^{\#} \top \right)$, i.e., all side-effects are accounted for.

Next, for locking of a mutex a :

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket [u, S], \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket^{\#} \eta^{\#} &= \mathbf{let} \ r^{\#} = \eta^{\#} [u, S] \ \mathbf{in} \\ &\quad \mathbf{let} \ r^{\#'} = r^{\#} \sqcap \left(\prod_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a} \eta^{\#} [a, Q] \right) \ \mathbf{in} \\ &\quad (\emptyset, r^{\#'}) \end{aligned}$$

Let $r^{\#} = \eta^{\#} [u, S]$ and $r^{\#'} = \eta^{\#} [v, S \cup \{a\}]$ be the value provided by $\eta^{\#}$ for the start and endpoint of the edge, respectively. Since $\eta^{\#}$ is a solution of $\mathcal{C}^{\#}$, $r^{\#'} \sqsubseteq r^{\#}$.

Then, by definition:

$$\eta' [v, S \cup \{a\}] = \{t \mid t \in \mathcal{T}_{S \cup \{a\}}, \text{loc } t = v, \exists v' : (\beta t \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto v'\}) \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} r\}$$

For any trace $t_0 \in \eta^{i-1} [u, S]$, let $\beta t_0 = \sigma_0$. By induction hypothesis, $\exists v' : \sigma_0 \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto v'\} \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} (r^{\#})$. For any trace $t_1 \in \bigcap_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a} (\eta^{i-1} [a, Q])$, let $\beta t_1 = \sigma_1$. By induction hypothesis, $\exists v'' : \sigma_1 \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto v''\} \in \bigcap_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a} (\gamma_{\mathcal{R}} (\eta^{\#} [a, Q]))$.

For any $t' \in \llbracket [e] \rrbracket (\{t_0\}, \{t_1\})$, $\text{loc}(t') = v$ and $t' \in \mathcal{T}_{S \cup \{a\}}$. Let $\sigma' = \beta t' = \{x \mapsto t'(x) \mid x \in (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{G})\}$. Then $\forall x \in \mathcal{X} : \sigma' x = \sigma_0 x$. For all globals $g \in \mathcal{G} [a]$ on the other hand, one of the following holds:

- (a) $S \cap \mathcal{M}[g] \neq \emptyset \wedge t'(g) = t_0(g) = t_1(g)$.
- (b) $S \cap \mathcal{M}[g] = \emptyset \wedge t'(g) = t_1(g)$.

Since $\mathcal{C}^{\#}$ maintains the invariant that r at a program point does not contain information about unprotected globals, and r for a mutex and cluster does not maintain information for locals or those globals that are not protected by it or not part of the cluster (Proposition 2), and the \sqcap operation in \mathcal{R} is sound w.r.t. to the intersection of concretizations we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma' \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto v'\} \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} (r^{\#}) \cap \bigcap_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a} (\gamma_{\mathcal{R}} (\eta^{\#} [a, Q])) \\ \subseteq \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} \left(r^{\#} \sqcap \left(\prod_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a} \eta^{\#} [a, Q] \right) \right) = \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} (r^{\#'}) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $t' \in \gamma_{v, S \cup \{a\}} r^{\sharp'}$ and thus $t' \in \eta' [v, S \cup \{a\}]$. We conclude that the return value of $\llbracket [u, S], \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket \eta^{i-1}$ is subsumed by $\eta' [v, S \cup \{a\}]$. Since the constraint causes no side-effects, the claim holds.

Next, for an edge corresponding to a return from a thread.

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket [u, S], \text{return } x \rrbracket \eta^{\sharp} &= \mathbf{let } r^{\sharp} = \eta^{\sharp} [u, S] \mathbf{ in} \\ &\quad \mathbf{let } r^{\sharp''} = \left(\llbracket \text{ret} \leftarrow x \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^{\sharp} r^{\sharp} \right) \Big|_{\{\text{ret}\}} \mathbf{ in} \\ &\quad \mathbf{let } \rho = \left\{ \llbracket \text{unlift } r^{\sharp} \text{ self} \rrbracket \mapsto r^{\sharp''} \right\} \mathbf{ in} \\ &\quad (\rho, r^{\sharp}) \end{aligned}$$

Let $r^{\sharp} = \eta^{\sharp} [u, S]$ and $r^{\sharp'} = \eta^{\sharp} [v, S]$ be the value provided by η^{\sharp} for the start and endpoint of the edge, respectively. Since η^{\sharp} is a solution of \mathcal{C}^{\sharp} , $r^{\sharp} \sqsubseteq r^{\sharp'}$. For any trace $t \in \eta^{i-1} [u, S]$, let $\beta t_0 = \sigma_0$. By induction hypothesis, $\exists v' : \sigma_0 \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto v'\} \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}}(r^{\sharp})$. Let $t' = \llbracket e \rrbracket \{t\}$. Then $\beta t' = \sigma_1 = \sigma_0$. Thus,

$$\sigma_1 \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto v'\} \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}}(r^{\sharp}) \subseteq \gamma_{\mathcal{R}}(r^{\sharp'})$$

and $t' \in \gamma_{v, S} r^{\sharp'}$ and thus $t' \in \eta' [v, S]$.

Next for the side-effects caused for an individual trace t :

$$\left\{ \llbracket t(\text{self}) \rrbracket \mapsto \llbracket e \rrbracket (t) \right\} \quad \left\{ \llbracket \text{unlift } r^{\sharp} \text{ self} \rrbracket \mapsto \left(\llbracket \text{ret} \leftarrow x \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^{\sharp} r^{\sharp} \right) \Big|_{\{\text{ret}\}} \right\}$$

As before, consider $t' = \llbracket e \rrbracket (t)$ and $\beta t' = \sigma_1 = \beta t = \sigma_0$. We have $\exists v' : \sigma_0 \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto v'\} \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}}(r^{\sharp})$. Now set $\sigma' = \sigma_0 \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto \sigma_0 x\}$. Then

$$\sigma' \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} \left(\llbracket \text{ret} \leftarrow x \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^{\sharp} r^{\sharp} \right) \subseteq \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} \left(\left(\llbracket \text{ret} \leftarrow x \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^{\sharp} r^{\sharp} \right) \Big|_{\{\text{ret}\}} \right) = r^{\sharp''}$$

Let $i = t(\text{self})$. Then $t' \in \gamma_i (r^{\sharp''})$, i.e., the value that is side-effected in the concrete semantics is abstracted by the abstract value side-effected in the abstract semantics. What remains to be shown is that all side-effects in the concrete are accounted for in the abstract. By induction hypothesis, and the requirements on \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{V}^{\sharp} (Fig. 1), we have $i \in \gamma_{\mathcal{V}^{\sharp}}(\text{unlift } r^{\sharp} \text{ self})$. By construction of η' , and with η^{\sharp} being a solution of \mathcal{C}^{\sharp} then

$$t' \in \gamma_i (r^{\sharp''}) \subseteq \gamma_i (\eta^{\sharp} [\text{unlift } r^{\sharp} \text{ self}]) \subseteq \eta' [i]$$

Thus, the side-effect is accounted for and the claim holds for this constraint.

C Complete Constraint System for the Refined Analysis

Consider the abstract constraint system from Section 4. The complete definition of the refined constraint system instantiated to the actions considered in this

$$\begin{aligned}
(\eta, \eta [u_0, \emptyset, A']) &\sqsupseteq \text{init}_{A'}^\# \eta \\
&\text{for start point } u_0, A' \in \text{init}_{\mathcal{A}}^\# \\
(\eta, \eta [v, S \cup \{a\}, A']) &\sqsupseteq \llbracket [u, S, A_0], \text{lock}(a), A_1 \rrbracket^\# \eta \\
&\text{for } (u, \text{lock}(a), v) \in \mathcal{E}, S \subseteq \mathbf{M}, A_0 \in \mathcal{A}, A_1 \in \mathcal{A}, A' \in \llbracket [u, \text{lock}(a)] \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^\# (A_0, A_1) \\
(\eta, \eta [v, S \setminus \{a\}, A']) &\sqsupseteq \llbracket [u, S, A_0], \text{unlock}(a), A' \rrbracket^\# \eta \\
&\text{for } (u, \text{unlock}(a), v) \in \mathcal{E}, S \subseteq \mathbf{M}, A_0 \in \mathcal{A}, A' \in \llbracket [u, \text{unlock}(a)] \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^\# (A_0) \\
(\eta, \eta [v, S, A']) &\sqsupseteq \llbracket [u, S, A_0], x'=\text{join}(x), A_1 \rrbracket^\# \eta \\
&\text{for } (u, x'=\text{join}(x), v) \in \mathcal{E}, S \subseteq \mathbf{M}, A_0 \in \mathcal{A}, A_1 \in \mathcal{A}, A' \in \llbracket [u, x'=\text{join}(x)] \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^\# (A_0, A_1) \\
(\eta, \eta [v, S, A']) &\sqsupseteq \llbracket [u, S, A_0], \text{return } x, A' \rrbracket^\# \eta \\
&\text{for } (u, \text{return } x, v) \in \mathcal{E}, S \subseteq \mathbf{M}, A_0 \in \mathcal{A}, A' \in \llbracket [u, \text{return } x] \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^\# (A_0) \\
(\eta, \eta [v, S, A']) &\sqsupseteq \llbracket [u, S, A_0], \text{act} \rrbracket^\# \eta \\
&\text{for } (u, \text{act}, v) \in \mathcal{E}, S \subseteq \mathbf{M}, \text{other action act}, A_0 \in \mathcal{A}, A' \in \llbracket [u, \text{act}] \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^\# (A_0),
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 14: Constraint system with refinement.

paper and unknowns for program points enriched with locksets then is shown in Fig. 14 where the right-hand sides of the system refined with control-point splitting, are determined by the original right-hand sides as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket [u, S, A_0], \text{lock}(a), A_1 \rrbracket^\# \eta &= \text{let } \eta' [x] = \text{if } [x] = [u, S] \text{ then } \eta [u, S, A_0] \\
&\quad \text{else } \eta [x, A_1] \text{ in} \\
&\quad \text{let } (\emptyset, v) = \llbracket [u, S], \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket^\# \eta' \text{ in} \\
&\quad (\emptyset, v) \\
\llbracket [u, S, A_0], \text{unlock}(a), A' \rrbracket^\# \eta &= \text{let } \eta' [x] = \eta [x, A_0] \text{ in} \\
&\quad \text{let } (\rho, v) = \llbracket [u, S], \text{unlock}(a) \rrbracket^\# \eta' \text{ in} \\
&\quad \text{let } \rho' = \{[a, Q, A'] \mapsto v' \mid ([a, Q] \mapsto v') \in \rho\} \\
&\quad (\rho', v) \\
\llbracket [u, S, A_0], x'=\text{join}(x''), A_1 \rrbracket^\# \eta &= \text{let } \eta' [x''] = \text{if } [x] = [u, S] \text{ then } \eta [u, S, A_0] \\
&\quad \text{else } \eta [x, A_1] \text{ in} \\
&\quad \text{let } (\emptyset, v) = \llbracket [u, S], x'=\text{join}(x') \rrbracket^\# \eta' \text{ in} \\
&\quad (\emptyset, v) \\
\llbracket [u, S, A_0], \text{return } x', A' \rrbracket^\# \eta &= \text{let } \eta' [x] = \eta [x, A_0] \text{ in} \\
&\quad \text{let } (\{[i] \mapsto v'\}, v) = \llbracket [u, S], \text{return } x \rrbracket^\# \eta' \text{ in} \\
&\quad (\{[i, A'] \mapsto v'\}, v) \\
\llbracket [u, S, A_0], x=\text{create}(u_1) \rrbracket^\# \eta &= \text{let } \eta' [x] = \eta [x, A_0] \text{ in} \\
&\quad \text{let } (\{[u_1, \emptyset] \mapsto v'\}, v) = \llbracket [u, S], x=\text{create}(u_1) \rrbracket^\# \eta' \text{ in} \\
&\quad (\{[u_1, \emptyset, A'] \mapsto v' \mid A' \in \text{new}_{\mathcal{A}}^\# u u_1 A_0\}, v)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{init}_{A'}^{\sharp} \eta &= \mathbf{let} \ \eta' \ _ = \perp \ \mathbf{in} \\ &\quad \mathbf{let} \ (\rho, v) = \text{init}^{\sharp} \eta' \ \mathbf{in} \\ &\quad \mathbf{let} \ \rho' = \{[a, Q, A'] \mapsto v' \mid ([a, Q] \mapsto v') \in \rho\} \\ &\quad (\rho', v) \end{aligned}$$

and, for all other actions act , by

$$\llbracket [u, S, A_0], \text{act} \rrbracket^{\sharp} \eta = \mathbf{let} \ \eta' [x] = \eta [x, A_0] \ \mathbf{in} \llbracket [u, S], \text{act} \rrbracket^{\sharp} \eta'$$

Let us call this constraint system instantiated with the analysis from Section 4 \mathcal{C}^{\sharp} .

D Soundness Proof for the Refinement from Section 5

Consider a modified concrete constraint system, where we associate with each unknown also information from \mathcal{A} :

$$\begin{aligned} (\eta, \eta [u_0, \emptyset, A]) &\quad \supseteq (\{[a, Q, A] \mapsto \{t \mid t \in \text{init}, A = \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}(t)\} \mid a \in \mathbf{M}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a\}, \\ &\quad \{t \mid t \in \text{init}, A = \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}(t)\}) \\ (\eta, \eta [u', S \cup \{a\}, A']) &\quad \supseteq (\llbracket [u, S, A_0], \text{lock}(a), A_1 \rrbracket \eta) \\ &\quad \text{for } (u, \text{lock}(a), u') \in \mathcal{E}, S \subseteq \mathbf{M}, A' \in \llbracket [u, \text{lock}(a)] \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp}(A_0, A_1) \\ (\eta, \eta [u', S \setminus \{a\}, A']) &\quad \supseteq (\llbracket [u, S, A_0], \text{unlock}(a), A' \rrbracket \eta) \\ &\quad \text{for } (u, \text{unlock}(a), u') \in \mathcal{E}, S \subseteq \mathbf{M}, A' \in \llbracket [u, \text{unlock}(a)] \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp}(A_0) \\ (\eta, \eta [u', S \cup \{a\}, A']) &\quad \supseteq (\llbracket [u, S, A_0], x=\text{join}(x'), A_1 \rrbracket \eta) \\ &\quad \text{for } (u, x=\text{join}(x'), u') \in \mathcal{E}, S \subseteq \mathbf{M}, A' \in \llbracket [u, x=\text{join}(x')] \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp}(A_0, A_1) \\ (\eta, \eta [u', S, A']) &\quad \supseteq (\llbracket [u, S, A_0], \text{act} \rrbracket \eta) \\ &\quad \text{for } (u, \text{act}, u') \in \mathcal{E}, S \subseteq \mathbf{M}, A' \in \llbracket [u, \text{act}] \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp}(A_0), \text{other actions act} \end{aligned}$$

The right-hand sides are modified to access the corresponding unknowns with appropriate digests and also re-direct side-effects accordingly in a similar manner to what was done in the abstract in Appendix C. We exemplify this for the locking of a mutex a here:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket [u, S, A_0], \text{lock}(a), A_1 \rrbracket \eta'' &= \mathbf{let} \ \eta' [x] = \mathbf{if} \ [x] = [u, S] \ \mathbf{then} \ \eta'' [u, S, A_0] \\ &\quad \mathbf{else} \ \eta'' [x, A_1] \ \mathbf{in} \\ &\quad \mathbf{let} \ (\emptyset, v) = \llbracket [u, S], \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket \eta' \ \mathbf{in} \\ &\quad (\emptyset, v) \end{aligned}$$

Let this constraint system be called \mathcal{C}'' .

Let η' be the unique least solution of constraint system \mathcal{C}' from (8). We construct from it a mapping η'' from the unknowns of \mathcal{C}'' to $2^{\mathcal{T}}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \eta'' [u, S, A] &= \eta' [u, S] \cap \mathcal{T}_A & (u \in \mathcal{N}, S \subseteq \mathbf{M}, A \in \mathcal{A}) \\ \eta'' [i, A] &= \eta' [i] \cap \mathcal{T}_A & (i \in \mathcal{I}, A \in \mathcal{A}) \\ \eta'' [a, Q, A] &= \eta' [a, Q] \cap \mathcal{T}_A & (a \in \mathbf{M}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a, A \in \mathcal{A}) \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{T}_A denotes the subset of local traces where $\{t \mid t \in \mathcal{T}, \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}(t) = A\}$.

Proposition 3. *Provided that $\alpha_{\mathcal{A}}$, $\text{new}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp}$, and $\llbracket u, \text{act} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp}$ fulfill the requirements (4), (5), and (6) from Section 5, η'' is the least solution of \mathcal{C}'' if and only if η' is the least solution of \mathcal{C}' .*

Proof. The proof of Proposition 3 is by fixpoint induction.

Now let us relate solutions of the refined abstract constraint system $\mathcal{C}^{\sharp'}$ and the refined concrete constraint system \mathcal{C}'' . Let $\eta^{\sharp'}$ a solution of $\mathcal{C}^{\sharp'}$. We construct from it a mapping η'' by reusing the definition of concretizations γ from Appendix B:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta''[u, S, A] &= \gamma_{u,S}(\eta^{\sharp'}[u, S, A]) \cap \mathcal{T}_A & (u \in \mathcal{N}, S \subseteq \mathbf{M}, A \in \mathcal{A}) \\ \eta''[i, A] &= \bigcup \left\{ \gamma_i((\eta^{\sharp'}[i^{\sharp}, A])) \mid i \in \gamma_{\mathcal{V}^{\sharp}} i^{\sharp} \right\} \cap \mathcal{T}_A & (i \in \mathcal{I}, A \in \mathcal{A}) \\ \eta''[a, Q, A] &= \gamma_a((\eta^{\sharp'}[a, Q])) \cap \mathcal{T}_A & (a \in \mathbf{M}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a, A \in \mathcal{A}) \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 7. *Assume that $\alpha_{\mathcal{A}}$, $\text{new}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp}$, and $\llbracket u, \text{act} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp}$ fulfill the requirements (4), (5), and (6). Then any solution of the refined constraint system is sound relative to the collecting local trace semantics.*

Proof. By Proposition 3 any solution of \mathcal{C}'' is sound w.r.t. to \mathcal{C}' , and from Proposition 1 that any solution of \mathcal{C}' is sound w.r.t. to the collecting local trace semantics as specified by \mathcal{C} . It thus suffices to prove that the mapping η'' as constructed from a solution of $\mathcal{C}^{\sharp'}$ is a solution of \mathcal{C}'' .

We verify by fixpoint induction that for the j -th approximation η^j to the least solution of \mathcal{C}'' , $\eta^j \subseteq \eta''$ holds. To this end, we verify for the start point u_0 and the empty lockset, and all $A \in \mathcal{A}$

$$\begin{aligned} &(\{[a, Q, A] \mapsto \{t \mid t \in \text{init}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a, A = \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}(t)\}\}, \{t \mid t \in \text{init}, A = \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}(t)\}) \\ &\subseteq (\eta'', \eta''[u_0, \emptyset, A]) \end{aligned}$$

and for each edge (u, act, v) of the CFG and each possible lockset S and digest A , that

$$\llbracket [u, S, A_0], \text{act} \rrbracket \eta^{j-1} \subseteq (\eta'', \eta''[v, S', A'])$$

holds (where additional arguments A_1 and A' are passed to the right-hand sides as required by the constraint system). We exemplify this for an edge corresponding to a *lock* operation for some mutex a . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket [u, S, A_0], \text{lock}(a), A_1 \rrbracket \eta'' &= \mathbf{let} \ \eta_c[x] = \mathbf{if} \ [x] = [u, S] \ \mathbf{then} \ \eta''[u, S, A_0] \\ &\quad \mathbf{else} \ \eta''[x, A_1] \ \mathbf{in} \\ &\quad \mathbf{let} \ (\emptyset, v) = \llbracket [u, S], \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket \eta_c \ \mathbf{in} \\ &\quad (\emptyset, v) \\ \llbracket [u, S, A_0], \text{lock}(a), A_1 \rrbracket^{\sharp} \eta^{\sharp} &= \mathbf{let} \ \eta_a^{\sharp}[x] = \mathbf{if} \ [x] = [u, S] \ \mathbf{then} \ \eta^{\sharp}[u, S, A_0] \\ &\quad \mathbf{else} \ \eta^{\sharp}[x, A_1] \ \mathbf{in} \\ &\quad \mathbf{let} \ (\emptyset, v^{\sharp}) = \llbracket [u, S], \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket^{\sharp} \eta_a^{\sharp} \ \mathbf{in} \\ &\quad (\emptyset, v^{\sharp}) \end{aligned}$$

By induction hypothesis, $\eta^{j-1} \subseteq \eta''$. Then, by construction for η_c and η_a^\sharp and every unknown x of the non-refined constraint system,

$$\eta_c x \subseteq \gamma_x(\eta_a^\sharp x)$$

and thus, by Theorem 6

$$v \subseteq \gamma_{v, S \cup \{a\}}(v^\sharp)$$

Since η^\sharp is a solution of C^\sharp , $v^\sharp \sqsubseteq \eta^\sharp[v, S \cup \{a\}, A']$. Also, by Eq. (4) $\left| \llbracket u, \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket_A^\sharp(A_0, A_1) \right| \leq 1$ holds. Altogether, then

$$v = v \cap T_{A'} \subseteq \gamma_{v, S \cup \{a\}}(v^\sharp) \cap T_{A'} \subseteq \gamma_{v, S \cup \{a\}}(\eta^\sharp[v, S \cup \{a\}, A']) \cap T_{A'} = \eta''[v, S \cup \{a\}, A']$$

Since the constraint causes no side-effects, the claim holds. The proof proceeds analogously for all other constraints.

E Further Increasing Precision of the Analysis from Section 7

The analysis as presented in Section 7 does not make use of components C forming part of unknowns $[a, Q, (i, C)], [i, C]$ (a a mutex, $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a$, i an abstract thread id). This information can be exploited to exclude a further class of writes – namely, those that are performed by a creating thread before the ego thread or its ancestor was created. Any writes that the created thread may read from the creating thread before the created thread is created are already accounted for in the start state of the created thread, so only those that happened after the creation of the current thread need to be considered. To this end, one sets

$$\text{acc}((i, C), (L, W, r)) (i', C') = (\text{unique } i \wedge i = i') \vee (\text{lcu_anc } i' i = i' \wedge \exists \langle u, u' \rangle \in C' : ((i' \circ \langle u, u' \rangle) = i) \vee \text{may_create}(i' \circ \langle u, u' \rangle) i)$$

Example 12. Consider the following program where $\mathcal{M}[g] = \{a, m_g\}$ and $\mathcal{M}[h] = \{a, m_h\}$ and assume $\mathcal{Q}_a = \{\{g, h\}\}$.

```

main:
lock(a);
g = 5; h = 8;
unlock(a);
lock(a);
g = 10; h = 10;
unlock(a);
x = create(t1);
lock(a);
g = 20; h = 20;
unlock(a);
y = join(x);
lock(a);
// ASSERT(g==20); (2)
unlock(a);

t1:
lock(a);
// ASSERT(g==h); (1)
unlock(a);
return 0;
    
```

Here, if we make use of the additional information on which create edges have been encountered, the analysis can determine that assertion (1) in thread t_1 holds. \square

The analysis still may incur an unnecessary loss of precision when past writes of a thread are propagated to a thread it creates, and then back to the creating thread upon *join*. This may happen when the created thread has not written to some globals, but the original thread has overwritten them locally in the meantime.

Example 13. Consider again Example 12. Here, the assertion (2) cannot be proven, as the stale information in $L(a, \{g, h\})$ in t_1 (which includes the fact that g may be 10) is incorporated into the main thread upon join. This can be prevented by tracking, for each thread, the set \bar{W} of global variables that *may* have been written by it or any thread it has joined, and then only joining in the L information of the joined thread if at least one protected global has been written. \square

We do not detail this improvement here, but use it in our implementation.

Further useful abstractions to maintain in the ego thread may, e.g., track for each created thread t' , the set of globals that has been potentially written to by the *join-local* part of the ego thread since the creation $W_C t'$. Then, upon joining t' , for mutexes a and clusters $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a$ where $Q \cap W_C T' = \emptyset$, the $L(a, Q)$ information of the joined thread definitely contains the most up-to-date information, and $L(a, Q)$ of the ego thread can be discarded.

F Analysis and Exploiting of Thread Joins

We detail here the enhanced analysis that also tracks in the local state, the set J of thread *ids* for which join has definitely been called in the *join-local* part of the local trace. Recall the refined definition of *acc* that takes J into account:

$$\text{acc}((i, C), (J, L, W, r)) (i', C') = \text{unique } i' \wedge (i = i' \vee i' \in J)$$

We proceed to give the *interesting* right-hand sides, all others simply propagate this value locally, and pass it as an additional argument to *acc*.

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket [u, S, (i, C)], \text{return } x, (i, C) \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \text{let } (J, L, W, r) = \eta[u, S, (i, C)] \text{ in} \\ & \text{let } v = \left(\llbracket \text{ret} \leftarrow x \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r \right) \Big|_{\{\text{ret}\}} \text{ in} \\ & \text{let } \rho = \{(i, C)\} \mapsto (J, L, v) \text{ in} \\ & (\rho, (L, W, r)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket [u, S, (i, C)], x' = \text{join}(x), (i', C') \rrbracket^\# \eta = & \text{let } (J, L, W, r) = \eta[u, S, (i, C)] \text{ in} \\ & \text{if } (i' \sqcap ((\text{unlift } r) x) = \perp) \vee \\ & \quad \text{acc}((i, C), (J, L, W, r)) (i', C') \\ & \text{then } \perp \\ & \text{else let } (J', L', v) = \eta[(i', C')] \text{ in} \\ & \quad \text{let } r' = \llbracket x' \leftarrow^\# (\text{unlift } v) \text{ret} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{R}}^\# r \text{ in} \\ & \quad (\emptyset, (J \cup J' \cup \{i'\}, L \sqcup L', W, r')) \end{aligned}$$

We remark that, in the analysis, when performing a thread join, if there are different thread *ids* for which join might be called, there is one constraint for each, and the resulting values will be joined to obtain the new value after the join edge. Here, the lattice *join* for J is intersection. This handles the case where multiple threads are joined by different threads for which the thread *ids* may be stored in x .

Recall that the function `acc` now is given by:

$$\text{acc}((i, C), (J, L, W, r))(i', C') = \text{unique } i' \wedge (i = i' \vee i' \in J)$$

Example 14. Consider the following program where $\mathcal{M}[g] = \{a, m_g\}$ and $\mathcal{M}[h] = \{a, m_h\}$ and assume $\mathcal{Q}_a = \{\{g, h\}\}$.

```

main:                                     t1:
x = create(t1);                          lock(a);
lock(a);                                  g = 4; h = 8;
g = 20; h = 20;                          unlock(a);
unlock(a);                                 x = ?;
y = join(x);                              lock(a);
lock(a);                                  g = x; h = x;
// ASSERT(g==h); (1)                    unlock(a);
g = 5; h = 5;                             return 0;
unlock(a);
lock(a);
// ASSERT(g==5); (1)
unlock(a);
    
```

Here, both assertions can be proven. At (1) the thread t_1 , is must-joined. Its last write is accounted for in $L(a, \{g, h\})$, thus the unknown $[a, \{g, h\}, t_1]$ where the abstract relationship $g = h$ does not hold is not consulted. As the updates in L are destructive, after the *main* thread writes 5 to g , this is also the only value it reads for g , meaning (2) is proven as well. \square

To gain additional precision, the set J of must-joined threads could be published together with the protected globals at an unlock. In this way, a thread need not read from another thread, that does all its writes after the first thread has already been *must* joined. A further increase in precision may be obtained by tracking J as an additional component in \mathcal{A} .

G Soundness Proof of Analysis with Joins

The proof proceeds in the following manner. We provide a modified instance of \mathcal{A} that tracks, in addition to the information from Section 6, for each mutex the information of which abstract thread id (computed in the same manner as in Section 6) did the last unlock immediately succeeding a thread-local write to a global protected by that mutex, and how many such unlocks have happened since the start of the program. For that, we choose $\mathcal{A} = (I^\sharp \times 2^P) \times (\mathbb{M} \rightarrow (\mathbb{N}_0 \times (I^\sharp \times 2^P)))$. For convenience, we here (intermediately) allow control-point

splitting even for an *infinite* set. The abstract function $\llbracket u, \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp}$ for a mutex a , e.g., is given by

$$\llbracket u, \text{lock}(a) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\sharp}((i, C), H) ((i', C'), H') = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \emptyset \\ \left\{ \left((i, C), \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \begin{array}{l} \{a \mapsto H a \mid a \in \mathbf{M}, (M a)_1 \geq (H' a)_1\} \\ \cup \{a \mapsto H' a \mid a \in \mathbf{M}, (M a)_1 < (H' a)_1\} \end{array} \right) \right\} \end{array} \right\} \text{else} \quad \neg \text{can_be_started}(i, C) (M' a)_2$$

where $(\cdot)_k$ is shorthand for accessing the k -th component of a tuple. The concretization for abstract values at unknowns at a mutex $[a, Q, ((i, C), H)]$ is defined such that it contains any local trace ending in an $\text{unlock}(a)$ in which the last thread-local write to a global in $\mathcal{G}[a]$, was by the thread with the thread id $(H a)_2$.

For local traces, we again introduce a function $\beta : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow (2^{\mathcal{I}} \times (\mathbf{M} \rightarrow (\mathcal{V}ars \rightarrow \mathcal{V}) \times 2^{\mathcal{G}} \times (\mathcal{V}ars \rightarrow \mathcal{V})))$ which we will then use to define appropriate concretization functions. Let $\text{last_tl_write}_g : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow ((\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathcal{N} \times \Sigma) \times \mathcal{A} \times (\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathcal{N} \times \Sigma)) \cup \{\perp\}$ be a function to extract the last thread-local write to g if it exists, and return \perp otherwise.

If there is a thread-local lock for a mutex a , there also is a *last* thread-local lock of a . Let $\text{last_tl_lock}_a : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow ((\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathcal{N} \times \Sigma) \times \mathcal{A} \times (\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathcal{N} \times \Sigma)) \cup \{\perp\}$ be a function to extract this last thread-local lock of a if it exists, and return \perp otherwise. Analogously for last_tl_unlock_a .

Let $\text{jl_joins} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow 2^{((\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathcal{N} \times \Sigma) \times \mathcal{A} \times (\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathcal{N} \times \Sigma))}$ be a function to extract from a local trace the set of all calls to join that are *join-local* to it.

Let $\text{jl_unlock_after_write}_a : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow ((\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathcal{N} \times \Sigma) \times \mathcal{A} \times (\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathcal{N} \times \Sigma)) \cup \{\perp\}$ be a function to extract, for a mutex a , the first *join-local* $\text{unlock}(a)$ action that immediately succeeds the last *join-local* write to a global in $\mathcal{G}[a]$. If mutex a is currently held, $\text{jl_unlock_after_write}_a$ only considers the subtrace that ends with the ego-thread acquiring a .

Let $\text{unlock_after_write}_a : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow ((\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathcal{N} \times \Sigma) \times \mathcal{A} \times (\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathcal{N} \times \Sigma)) \cup \{\perp\}$ be a function to extract, for a mutex a , the first $\text{unlock}(a)$ action that immediately succeeds the last write to a global in $\mathcal{G}[a]$.

Also, for a node \bar{u}' appearing in a local trace t , let $(\bar{u}') \downarrow_t$ the local sub-trace ending in that node.

$\beta t = (J, L, W, r)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} J &= \{\sigma_i x' \mid ((i, u_i, \sigma_i), x = \text{join}(x'), _) \in \text{jl_joins } t\} \\ L &= \{(a, Q) \mapsto \{x \mapsto t'(x) \mid g \in (\mathcal{G} \cup \mathcal{X})\} \mid a \in \mathbf{M}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a, \\ &\quad \text{jl_unlock_after_write}_a t = \perp, t' = (u_0, 0, \sigma_0) \downarrow_t\} \\ &\quad \cup \{a \mapsto \{x \mapsto t'(x) \mid g \in (\mathcal{G} \cup \mathcal{X})\} \mid a \in \mathbf{M}, \\ &\quad \text{jl_unlock_after_write}_a t = (\bar{u}_i, _, _), t' = (\bar{u}_i) \downarrow_t\} \\ W &= \bigcup_{a \in \mathbf{M}} \{g \mid g \in \mathcal{M}[a], \text{last_tl_write}_g t = (\bar{u}_i, _, _), \\ &\quad ((\text{last_tl_unlock}_a t = (\bar{u}_j, _, _) \wedge \bar{u}_j \leq \bar{u}_i) \vee \text{last_tl_unlock}_a t = \perp)\} \\ r &= \{x \mapsto t(x) \mid x \in (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{G})\} \end{aligned}$$

Based on this, we provide dedicated concretization functions for the unknowns of the constraint system:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{u,S,((i,C),H)}(J^\#, L^\#, W^\#, r^\#) = \{t \mid t \in \mathcal{T}_S \cap \mathcal{T}_{(i,C)}, \text{loc } t = u, (J, L, W, r) = \beta t, \\ \bigcup \{\gamma_{\mathcal{I}^\#} i \mid i \in J^\#\} \subseteq J, \\ \forall a \in \mathbf{M}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}_a : \exists v : (L(a, Q) \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto v\}) \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}}(L^\#(a, Q)), \\ W^\# \supseteq W, \exists v : (r' \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto v\}) \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} r^\# \\ \} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{((i,C),H)}(J^\#, L^\#, r^\#) = \{t \mid t \in \mathcal{T}_{(i,C)}, \text{last } t = (\text{return } x), (J, L, W, r) = \beta t, \\ \bigcup \{\gamma_{\mathcal{I}^\#} i \mid i \in J^\#\} \subseteq J, \\ \forall a \in \mathbf{M} : \exists v : (L a \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto v\}) \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}}(L^\# a), \\ \exists v : (r' \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto v\}) \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} r^\# \\ \} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{a,Q,((i,C),H)}(r) = \{t \mid t \in \mathcal{T}, (\text{last } t = \text{unlock}(a), \\ \text{unlock_after_write}_a t = (\bar{u}_i, _, _), \\ t' = (\bar{u}_i) \downarrow t, t' \in \mathcal{T}_{(Ha)_2}, (J, L, W, r) = \beta t', \\ \exists v : (\beta t \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto v\}) \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} r \\ \} \cup \{t \in \mathcal{T}_{(Ha)_2} \cap \text{init}, (J, L, W, r) = \beta t, \exists v : (\beta t \cup \{\text{ret} \mapsto v\}) \in \gamma_{\mathcal{R}} r\} \end{aligned}$$

and remark that these concretization functions are monotonic.

Side-effecting in the abstract constraint system then can be abandoned whenever the ego thread definitely did not write to any global from $\mathcal{G}[a]$ since acquiring a . The latter holds whenever $W^\# \cap \mathcal{G}[a] = \emptyset$ at the given $\text{unlock}(a)$. By the same argument, whenever the ego thread has actually written a global from $\mathcal{G}[a]$ since acquiring a , its thread id coincides with the thread id of the thread executing the last $\text{unlock}(a)$ after a write to any global from $\mathcal{G}[a]$. The correctness proof of this construction follows along the same lines as the proofs of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.

In the last step, control-point splitting at mutexes is then reduced to only consider the thread id of the ego-thread at the last $\text{unlock}(a)$ immediately succeeding the last write to a global protected by a , i.e., Ha . Likewise, control-point splitting at program points and thread ids is reduced back to the original \mathcal{A} information proposed in Section 6. We remark that in this way, the infinite splitting of control-points disappears once again. \square

H One-element Clusters

The following program illustrates that one-element clusters cannot be abandoned. Assume that a protects both g and h .

```

main:                                t1:
x = create(t1);                       lock(a);
y = create(t2);                       g =- 1;
lock(a);                               //ASSERT(g<=h); (3)
h = 31;                               unlock(a);
unlock(a);                             return 0;
lock(a);
h = 12;                                t2:
unlock(a);                             lock(a);
lock(a);                               h = ?;
// ASSERT(g<=h); (1)                  h = 12;
// ASSERT(h==12); (2)                 unlock(a);
unlock(a);                             return 0;

```

When running the clustered analysis with the cluster $\mathcal{Q}_a = \{\{g, h\}\}$ alone, the side-effect at the `unlock(a)` in t_1 preserves the relationship $g \leq h$, implying that the assertions (1) and (3) succeed. No precise information on the value of h is preserved at the unknown $[a, \{g, h\}, t_1]$. Consequently, when the *main* thread performs a `lock(a)` for the third time, the assertion (2) cannot be verified. A clustered analysis, though, that additionally tracks the cluster $\{h\}$, will record $h = 12$ at $[a, \{h\}, t_2]$ and nothing at $[a, \{h\}, t_1]$. Therefore, assertion (2) can be verified.

I Extended Description of Benchmarks

Here, we provide additional details on some of the benchmarks presented in Section 9.

I.1 GOBLINT Benchmark Suite

We considered the benchmarks from [48]. The benchmarks were augmented with asserts which were generated by our tool, using the *Clusters* configuration. We excluded `ybind` from the experiments, as it spawns a thread from an unknown function pointer that our analysis of thread *ids* cannot handle. We executed our tool, as well as NR-GOBLINT and DUET on the resulting benchmarks. Results are shown in Table 3. For nine benchmarks, NR-GOBLINT and all configurations of our analyzer could prove all asserts, while our runs of DUET did not produce valid results. In the table, the results for these benchmarks are summarized in one row. For the three remaining benchmark programs, using the *Octagon* configuration instead of *Interval* resulted in more proven asserts. Interestingly, NR-GOBLINT could prove more asserts than our *Interval* configuration. Adding the analysis for thread *ids* to our tool yielded more proven asserts on `pfscan`. Indeed, for this set of benchmarks, all asserts can be proven with the *TIDs* configuration.

Table 3: Results of executing our analyzer (with presented analyses), NR-GOBLINT [48] (with intervals) and DUET [19] on the benchmark set by Schwarz et al. [48], for which we automatically generated invariants using the analysis from Section 8. Checkmark (✓) indicates all invariants proven and otherwise the number of proven invariants is given. For brevity, we summarize benchmarks that were fully proven by all analyzers except DUET, which reported on fewer invariants than present or timed out, so we consider those results invalid (—).

Benchmark	Invariants	Our analyzer				NR-GOBLINT w/ interval	DUET
		Interval (Sec. 4)	Octagon (Sec. 4)	TIDs (Sec. 7)	Clusters (Sec. 8)		
pfscan	221	14	32	✓	✓	165	—
aget	10	2	✓	✓	✓	✓	—
ctrace	1448	1130	✓	✓	✓	1407	—
(Other)	0–200	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	—

I.2 WATTS Benchmark Suite

While we were not able to run WATTS, we executed our analysis on the benchmarks reported on in [31]. We took the benchmarks as available from the GitHub repository⁶. The benchmarks proposed in this paper consist of two set of C-source files containing multi-threaded code with asserts. Unlike the other sets of benchmarks considered, there was a significant number of `assert(0)` statements in the benchmark files, where code should be proven to be unreachable. Consequently, for these benchmarks, we include the number of asserts that could be proven unreachable in the number of verified asserts we report.

The first set of benchmarks consists of 37 C-files, originating from different sources, that were adapted for [31]. We took the benchmark set as-is, except for removing an obviously misplaced semicolon in the `wdt977_02` benchmark that rendered one `assert(0)` to be reachable in the concrete. The analysis setting *TIDs* succeeded to verify that none of the asserts in 31 of these benchmarks fail. The six benchmark files for which in total seven asserts could not be proven, contain data-dependent thread-synchronization that our tool cannot handle.

The second set of benchmarks consists of five versions of the benchmark `i8xx_tco_03`, contained in the first benchmarks set, instrumented to create different numbers of threads. In [31], the number of threads created in the benchmarks varies from 30 to 70. In the repository, there were two files creating 40 threads, and no file that created 30, rendering one test case redundant. Thus, we removed ten thread creates from `i8xx_tco_03_thr01`. We also fixed the number of function stubs in that file to be the same as in the other benchmark files.

The runtimes of our tool can be seen in Table 4. Our most expensive analysis takes around two seconds to complete on this benchmark. While exact runtimes are not reported in [31], the graph (found in Fig. 11 of that paper) indicates that

⁶ <https://github.com/markus-kusano/watts>

Table 4: Runtimes, in seconds, of our analyzer on the five scalability benchmarks from [31]. The second column indicates the number of concrete threads in the benchmark program (including the `main` thread). Runtimes are considerably lower than those reported for WATTS, but were obtained on different hardware.

Benchmark	#Threads	Our analyzer			
		Interval (Sec. 4)	Octagon (Sec. 4)	TIDs (Sec. 7)	Clusters (Sec. 8)
i8xx_tco_03_thr01	31	0.15	0.16	0.43	0.51
i8xx_tco_03_thr02	41	0.17	0.17	0.66	0.77
i8xx_tco_03_thr03	51	0.19	0.19	1.01	1.11
i8xx_tco_03_thr04	61	0.20	0.20	1.35	1.45
i8xx_tco_03_thr05	71	0.23	0.22	1.83	1.99

the runtime of their most expensive analysis was close to 400 seconds, while the least expensive configuration still took more than 200 seconds on the benchmark creating 70 threads. We remark that while runtimes reported for WATTS in [31] were obtained on a different machine and the numbers are thus not directly comparable, the comparison is still meaningful as the magnitudes differ greatly.

I.3 Comparison with DUET

We considered comparing to DUET on the benchmark set proposed in [19], but encountered problems. The archive of benchmarks was obtained from the DUET website⁷. This archive contains (1) the C source files of a set of Linux device drivers, without a harness function; (2) a version of these drivers as binary `goto`-files, that were instrumented with DDVERIFY and compiled with an unknown version of CBMC. However, neither the current version of DUET accepts `goto`-files as input, nor any of the other tools considered. We were also not able to decompile the `goto`-files using the current version of CBMC. Thus, these benchmarks were not used for experiments in the present paper.

While we managed to run DUET successfully on some benchmarks, our configuration of the tool did not produce valid results for others: For dealing with code containing function calls, DUET relies on inlining. As the inlining implemented in the most recent version of DUET available at the time of writing was not working on some examples, we contacted the author, who sent us a fixed version of the module responsible for inlining. In the experiments, we executed the tool with this implementation of inlining (and Octagons enabled); however, there were still cases in which our configuration of the tool reported a too low number of reachable asserts, indicating that some reachable code was not considered by the tool. Thus, for these benchmarks, no results are reported for DUET. Further, we do not report results for DUET when execution did not complete within 15 minutes.

⁷ <http://duet.cs.toronto.edu/>