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ABSTRACT
Multithreaded programs are notoriously prone to synchronization errors. Much prior work has tackled the problem of detecting such errors. This paper focuses on the subsequent problem of synchronization correction. We present a constraint-based analysis that, given an erroneous program, automatically infers (where possible) what additional locking operations should be inserted in order to yield a correctly-synchronized program. For performance reasons, our algorithm also attempts to minimize the number of additional lock acquires and the duration for which the acquired locks are held. We present experimental results that validate this approach on a number of standard Java library classes.

1. INTRODUCTION
Multithreaded programs are notoriously prone to errors due to incorrect synchronization. Earlier work in this area focused on detecting synchronization errors that cause race conditions [24, 23, 28, 29, 1, 4, 9, 11], atomicity violations [14, 8, 10, 12, 19, 31], and other consistency violations [2, 30]. Of course, detecting defects is useful only if it is followed by a second step of defect correction. In this work, we focus on this subsequent defect correction phase, and in particular on the problem of providing automated support for correcting synchronization errors.

The goal of this work is, given a program that fails to satisfy its atomicity specification, to modify the program (for example, by introducing additional synchronization operations) so that it satisfies its specification. In addition, we try to minimize the number of additional locks required (to reduce synchronization overhead) and to only hold these locks for short durations (to reduce lock contention [3]). We assume some methods in the original program are documented as atomic, which means that they should include sufficient synchronization so that their execution is serializable (i.e., they can be considered to execute without interleaved actions of concurrent threads).

Inferring which additional synchronization operations are necessary to satisfy this atomicity specification requires performing a deep analysis on the program’s synchronization structure. In previous work, we (1) developed Rec/Sat, an analysis for inferring protecting locks for each field [11], and (2) a constraint-based framework for inferring the most precise atomicity for each method [12]. In this paper, we extend this line of research to tackle the more difficult problem of synchronization correction.

Inserting additional synchronization can introduce the potential for deadlock. We do not explicitly reason about deadlock, and instead assume the programmer ensures deadlock-freedom by code inspection or via some other static or dynamic analysis.

We present preliminary results that validate this analysis on three standard Java library classes that are known to have synchronization errors. For each class, our analysis can automatically infer the additional synchronization operations that are necessary to correct these defects. We
also performed defect-injection experiments, which demonstrated that the analysis is capable of correcting the vast majority of randomly-inserted synchronization defects in Java library classes.

2. MOTIVATING EXAMPLE

We illustrate the behavior of our analysis on the example shown in Figure 1, in which a Stack is represented as a linked List of Elements. The underlined annotations specify the program’s locking structure. For example, the field List.elems is guarded by this, the implicit lock of the List object. This lock also guards the fields List.elems.num and List.elems.next, since elems has type Elem(List.this), and in Elems the ghost parameter x guards the num and next fields.

These underlined type annotations can be automatically inferred by the Rec/Sat type inference algorithm [11].

The class Stack is intended to be thread-safe, and so its push and dup methods are declared as atomic. However, the given program violates this atomicity specification. For example, push and dup call add without acquiring any locks, resulting in race conditions. Synchronizing on this inside add corrects this race condition and ensures that push is atomic, but dup is still incorrect, since a concurrent thread could modify the stack between dup’s two calls to add. Thus, inferring the necessary synchronization operations requires reasoning about both race conditions and atomicity violations.

Given this incorrect program, our algorithm automatically generates the corrected program of Figure 2(b), where the methods add and dup contain additional synchronization. (Alternatively, inserting synchronization into push and dup would also suffice.) Our algorithm also infers the most precise atomicity for each unannotated method. For example, the method add is assigned the conditional atomicity “this?move:atomic”, which states that if the lock this is already held, then add is a move (that is, its execution commutes with steps of concurrent threads); if this is not held, then add is atomic (that is, it can be assumed to execute in a serial manner, without interleaved steps of concurrent threads).

Our analysis works in four phases.

1. The first phase encloses each program statement $e$ in the tagged synchronization operations:

   \[
   \text{sync}?!l_1 (l_1) \{ \ldots \text{sync}?!l_n (l_n) \{ e \} \ldots \}
   \]

   where $l_1, \ldots, l_n$ are all locks in scope, and the $l_i$ are tags that uniquely identify each inserted synchronization operation. This phase also inserts atomicity variables $\alpha_i$ for methods without declared atomicities, such as add, producing the program shown in Figure 2(a).

   The goal of our analysis is then to determine a set $T$ of tags denoting which of these tagged synchronization operations are necessary and sufficient to yield a correctly synchronized program. As part of its reasoning, the analysis also needs to infer an assignment $A$ mapping atomicity variables $\alpha_i$ to atomicities.

2. The second phase of the analysis translates the program with tagged synchronization operations (as in Figure 2(a)) into a collection of constraints $C$ over the tag set $T$ and assignment $A$.

3. The third phase solves these constraints using an iterative least fixed point algorithm, to yield the program of Figure 2(a) with the grayed-out synchronization operations removed. This program is correctly synchronized, but still contains some unnecessary synchronization operations.

4. The fourth phase then identifies and removes these redundant synchronization operations, yielding the final program of Figure 2(b).

This constraint-based approach extends our earlier work on detecting synchronization errors [12], but for synchronization correction the addition of tagged synchronization operations requires an extended constraint language and new constraint solving algorithms.

The presentation of our results proceeds as follows. Section 3 describes the idealized Java subset that we used to formalize our analysis. Section 4 presents our constraint language. Section 5 describes how to generate constraints, which are then solved by the algorithm of Section 6. This solution is then optimized in Section 7. Our implementation and experiments are described in Section 8. Section 9 discusses related work, and Section 10 concludes.

A preliminary version of this work will be presented at the SCOOL Workshop, Oct. 2005.

3. THE SOURCE LANGUAGE AJC

We formalize our ideas in terms of the idealized language AJC (Atomic Java with Correction), whose syntax is summarized in Figure 3. For simplicity, the idealized language AJC does not support subclassing, although it is supported in our implementation [12].

As in Java, each field declaration includes the name and type of the field. Additionally, in AJC, each field also has an associated guard $g$, which states that the field is either (1) final, (2) unguarded, or (3) guarded by some lock $l$, which must be held at each access (i.e., read or write) to that field. Sometimes the fields of a class need to be protected by a lock external to the class. For this purpose, each AJC class declaration includes a binding for a sequence of ghost variables denoting locks that can be used to protect fields of the class. Ghost variables are only used during type checking and do not exist at run time. A class type $cn(l^*)$ includes a class name cn and an appropriate number of lock parameters for that class. The Rec/Sat type inference algorithm can infer appropriate guards and lock parameters for unannotated programs [11].

A method declaration can also include a number of ghost variable bindings, for which corresponding lock expressions must be provided at call sites. Each method declaration also includes an atomicity specification $s$, as well as atomic or this?move:atomic, as described in Section 4.4.

AJC expressions include object allocation, field access and update, method invocation, variable binding and reference, conditionals, and while loops. Object allocation $new; c(e’)$ includes a sequence of expressions used to initialize the object fields. For technical reasons, the new keyword is subscribed by $y$, which is a ghost variable bound to the object being created while evaluating the field initialization expressions. This enables the types of the initialization expressions to refer to the new object. We omit the binding from examples when it is not needed.
Figure 2: Class Stack with Atomicity Annotations and Corrected Synchronization

a) Program with Atomicity Annotations

```java
class Elem(ghost x) {
    int num guarded by x;
    Elem(x) next guarded by x;
}

class List {
    Elem(this) elems guarded by this;
    void add(int v) {
        this elems = new Elem(v, this elems);
    }
    int removeFirst() {
        let int x = this elems.num in {
            this elems = this elems.next;
            return x;
        }
    }
}

class Stack {
    final List data;
    atomic void push(int x) {
        data.add(x);
    }
    atomic int dup() {
        let int x = data.removeFirst() in {
            data.add(x);
        }
    }
}
```

b) Program with Correct Synchronization

```java
class Elem(ghost x) {
    int num guarded by x;
    Elem(x) next guarded by x;
}

class List {
    Elem(this) elems guarded by this;
    this?mover:atomic void add(int v) {
        this elems = new Elem(v, this elems);
    }
    this?mover:atomic int removeFirst() {
        let int x = this elems.num in {
            this elems = this elems.next;
            return x;
        }
    }
}

class Stack {
    final list data;
    atomic void push(int x) {
        data.add(x);
    }
    atomic int dup() {
        let int x = data.removeFirst() in {
            data.add(x);
        }
    }
}```
4. ATOMICITY CONSTRAINTS

4.1 Basic Atomicities

Our approach to verifying atomicity is based on classifying expressions according to what actions they may perform, and in particular how these actions may interact with actions of concurrent threads. For this purpose, we introduce the following five basic atomicities:

\[ b := \text{const} \mid \text{mover} \mid \text{atomic} \mid \text{cmpd} \mid \text{error} \]

The informal meaning of these basic atomicities is as follows:

- **const** expressions do not access any mutable state, and hence always yield the same result when evaluated in the same environment. Such expressions may include calls to **const** methods, etc.

- **mover** expressions can access mutable state, but only if that mutable state is either local to the current thread or protected by a lock held by the current thread. In addition, **mover** expressions cannot acquire or release locks. Thus, **mover** expressions commute with actions of concurrent threads.

- **atomic** expressions, in addition to accessing thread-local or protected state, may also acquire and release locks according to the two-phase locking discipline. That is, nested synchronization, as in:

\[ \text{sync } l_1 \{ \ldots \text{sync } l_2 \{ \ldots \} \ldots \} \]

is **atomic**, but the sequential composition of synchronization operations, as in:

\[ \text{sync } l_1 \{ \ldots \} ; \text{sync } l_2 \{ \ldots \} \]

is not **atomic**. By Lipton’s theory of reduction [20], **atomic** expressions are serializable, and are therefore amenable to sequential reasoning techniques, which significantly facilitates subsequent formal and informal reasoning [14]. Our previous investigation showed that the vast majority of methods in multithreaded Java programs are atomic [10, 12].

- **cmpd** expressions do not follow the two-phase locking discipline, but which always hold the correct protecting lock when accessing any guarded field. Such expressions are not serializable and are therefore not amenable to sequential reasoning.

- **error** expressions violate the program’s synchronization discipline by accessing a field without holding the guarding lock. Programs with **error** expressions do not type check.

Basic atomicities are ordered by the subatomicity relation \( \sqsubseteq_b \):

\[ \text{const} \sqsubseteq_b \text{mover} \sqsubseteq_b \text{atomic} \sqsubseteq_b \text{cmpd} \sqsubseteq_b \text{error} \]

Let \( \sqsubseteq_b \) denote the corresponding join operator for basic atomicities. Suppose that the basic atomicities \( b_1 \) and \( b_2 \) reflect the behavior of \( e_1 \) and \( e_2 \) respectively. Then:

- The atomicity \( b_1 \sqsubseteq_b b_2 \) reflects the non-deterministic choice between executing either \( e_1 \) or \( e_2 \).

- The **sequential composition** \( b_1 ; b_2 \) reflects the behavior of executing \( e_1 ; e_2 \), and is defined as:

\[ b_1; b_2 = \begin{cases} \text{cmpd} & \text{if } b_1 = b_2 = \text{atomic} \\ b_1 \sqsubseteq_b b_2 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]

- The **iterative closure** \( b_1^* \) reflects the behavior of executing \( e_1 \) an arbitrary number of times, and is defined as:

\[ b_1^* = \begin{cases} \text{cmpd} & \text{if } b_1 = \text{atomic} \\ b_1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]

**LEMMA 1.** The operations \( b_1 \sqsubseteq_b b_2 \) and \( b_1; b_2 \) and \( b_1^* \) are monotonic in both \( b_1 \) and \( b_2 \).

4.2 Atomicity Expressions

We follow a constraint-based approach to atomicity inference and synchronization correction. For each method body, we generate an **atomicity expression** \( d \) that encodes the various operations performed by that method body. The syntax of atomicity expressions (see Figure 4) includes the following constructs:

- **Basic atomicities.**
Atomicity expressions (that is, to atomicity expressions that do not contain atomicity variables): 
\[ \alpha \in \text{AtomVar} \]
\[ A \in \text{Assignment} \Rightarrow \text{AtomVar} \rightarrow \text{ClosedAtomExp} \]

- Sequential composition, join, and iterative closure of atomicity expressions (which correspond to sequential composition, branching, and looping operations in the original code).
- The conditional atomicity \( l \not\in d_1 : d_2 \), which is equal to \( d_1 \) if the lock \( l \) is held, and is equal to \( d_2 \) otherwise. For example, the atomicity of an access to a field protected by lock \( l \) is \( l \not\in \) mover: error, formalizing that an access to the field has atomicity mover if \( l \) is held, and has atomicity error otherwise.
- The atomicity expression \( S(l, d) \) yields the atomicity for a synchronized expression sync \( l \) \( e \), where \( d \) is the atomicity expression for \( e \).
- The construct \( R(t, l, d) \) is generated for each tagged synchronization operation sync \( t \) \( l \) \( e \). If the inferred tag set \( T \) includes the tag \( t \), then this synchronization operation is chosen for insertion, and \( R(t, l, d) \) is equivalent to \( S(l, d) \). If the inferred tag set does not include \( t \), then \( R(t, l, d) \) is equivalent to \( d \). More formally, the application of a tag set \( T \) to an atomicity expression is the compatible closure of the following function:
\[
T(R(t, l, d)) = \begin{cases} 
S(l, d) & \text{if } t \in T \\
L & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]
- The delayed substitution operation \( d \cdot \theta \) is used when changing scopes, where the substitution \( \theta \) is a finite map from variables to lock expressions. For example, if a method’s atomicity refers to a formal method parameter, then this formal parameter must be replaced by the corresponding actual parameter to derive the correct atomicity for a call to that method.
- The construct \( \text{wfa}(P, E, d) \) yields the smallest (i.e., most precise) atomicity that is at least as large as \( d \) and that only depends on locks that are in scope in the environment \( E \). This construct is used when \( d \) may refer to a variable that is going out of scope, such as at the end of a let construct.

An atomicity expression is closed if it does not contain atomicity variables. An atomicity expression is tag-free if it does not contain the construct \( R(t, l, d) \).

4.3 Atomicities

We formalize the meaning of a closed atomicity expression as a map from the set of lock held by the current thread to a basic atomicity, and we refer to this map as an atomicity.

\[
L \in \text{LockSet} = 2^{\text{Lock}} \\
a \in \text{Atomicity} = \text{LockSet} \rightarrow \text{BasicAtomicity}
\]

The function \([\cdot]\), defined in Figure 5, maps closed, tag-free atomicity expressions to atomicities. (For clarity, we write “\([d] = \ldots\)” to abbreviate “[\(d\) = \(L\) \ldots”).

We order atomicities according to the point-wise extension \(\sqsubseteq\) of the ordering relation \(\sqsubseteq_a\) on basic atomicities, with corresponding minimal element \(\bot\) and join operation \(\sqcup\). We also extend the sequential composition and iterative closure operations to atomicities in a point-wise manner.

\[
a_1 \sqsubseteq_a a_2 \quad \text{iff} \quad \forall L \subseteq \text{Lock}. \ (a_1(L) \sqsubseteq_b a_2(L))
\]
\[
a_1 \sqcup_a a_2 \quad \text{def} \quad \lambda L. \ (a_1(L) \sqcup_b a_2(L))
\]
\[
a^* \quad \text{def} \quad \lambda L. \ (a(L))^*
\]
\[
a_1 ; a_2 \quad \text{def} \quad \lambda L. \ (a_1(L); a_2(L))
\]

We order assignments according to the point-wise extension \(\sqsubseteq_A\) of the ordering relation \(\sqsubseteq_a\) on atomicities, with corresponding minimal element \(\bot\) and join operation \(\sqcup\):

\[
A_1 \sqsubseteq_A A_2 \quad \text{iff} \quad \forall \alpha. \ (A_1(\alpha) \sqsubseteq_a [A_2(\alpha)])
\]
\[
A_1 =_A A_2 \quad \text{iff} \quad \forall \alpha. \ ([A_1(\alpha)] = [A_2(\alpha)])
\]
\[
A \sqcup_A A_2 \quad \text{def} \quad \lambda \alpha. \ \text{const}
\]
\[
A_1 ;_A A_2 \quad \text{def} \quad \lambda \alpha. \ (A_1(\alpha) \sqcup [A_2(\alpha)])
\]

We extend assignments in a compatible manner to be maps from atomicity expressions to atomicity expressions. Given an \(A\) and a tag-free atomicity expression \(d\), the atomicity expression \(A(d)\) is then closed and tag-free, and its meaning is the atomicity \([A(d)]\). Furthermore, this meaning function is monotonic in \(A\) (a necessary prerequisite for performing our least fixpoint analysis).

**Lemma 2 (Monotonicity).** For all tag-free atomicity expressions \(d\), the function \(\lambda A. \ [A(d)]\) is monotonic.

**Proof.** By induction on the structure of \(d\). □
4.4 Atomicity Constraints

A syntactic atomicity \( s \) is either an atomicity variable or a closed, tag-free atomicity expression. Each method declaration includes a corresponding syntactic atomicity. For example, a programmer could specify a precise atomicity for a method, such as \texttt{atomic}. More commonly, the programmer might omit this specification, in which case the type checker uses a fresh atomicity variable as the method’s declared atomicity.

Given a program \( P \), for each method with declared atomicity \( s \) and method body \( e \), we generate an atomicity expression \( d \) for the method body \( e \) (as described in the following section) and produce the constraint \( d \sqsubseteq s \). Thus, a constraint is a subatomicity relation between an atomicity expression and a syntactic atomicity. An assignment \( A \) satisfies a constraint \( d \sqsubseteq s \) with respect to a tag set \( T \) (written \( A; T \models C \)) if

\[
\left[ A(T(d)) \right] \sqsubseteq_s \left[ A(s) \right]
\]

Generating a constraint for each method yields a constraint set \( C \) for the entire program. The assignment \( A \) satisfies a set \( C \) with respect to \( T \) (written \( A; T \models C \)) if \( A \) satisfies each constraint in \( C \). Thus, our goal is to find an assignment \( A \) and a tag set \( T \) such that \( A \) satisfies \( C \) with respect to \( T \). The tag set \( T \) then specifies which tagged synchronization operations need to be inserted into the program in order to yield a corrected program that satisfies the desired atomicity specifications.

Since the type checker introduces a fresh atomicity variable for each unannotated method, each atomicity variable \( \alpha \) annotates exactly one method, and so \( \alpha \) has a unique lower bound \( d \) such that the constraint \( d \sqsubseteq \alpha \) occurs in \( C \). We use the notation \( C(\alpha) \) to refer to this lower bound \( d \). We refer to such constraints with a variable as an upper bound as propagation constraints, and we refer to all other constraints (with a closed atomicity expression as upper bound) as checking constraints.

5. PHASE 2: CONSTRAINT GENERATION

We express the algorithm for converting a program with previously-inserted tagged synchronization operations into a collection of constraints \( C \) as a set of rules for reasoning about the judgment:

\[
P; E \vdash e : c \cdot d \cdot C
\]

Here, \( c \) is the type inferred for the expression \( e \); \( d \) is the atomicity expression generated for \( e \); and \( C \) is the set of constraints generated from this expression. The program \( P \) is included to provide access to class declarations, and \( E \) is an environment providing types for the free program and ghost variables of the expression \( e \):

\[
E ::= e \mid E, c \ x \mid E, \text{ghost} \ x
\]

The complete set of type judgments and rules is contained in Figure 6. We briefly describe some of the more important rules.

\[ \text{[LOCK EXP]} \] The judgment \( P; E \vdash \text{lock} \ l : C \) checks that \( l \) is a well-formed lock expression in environment \( E \). The lock expression \( l \) can be either a ghost variable or a program expression \( e \). In the latter case, \( e \) must denote a fixed lock throughout the execution of the program to ensure soundness. Thus, we require that \( e \) has atomicity \texttt{const}.

In addition, we require the size \(|e|\) of the lock expression to be bounded by the constant \texttt{MaxLockSize}. This requirement ensures that there is only a finite number of valid lock expressions at any program point, which in turn bounds the size of conditional atomicities and number of possible tagged synchronization statements. This ensures termination of our correction algorithm.

\[ \text{[EXP VAR]} \] A variable access has \texttt{const} atomicity, since all variables are immutable in AJC.

\[ \text{[EXP IF]} \] The atomicity of a conditional expression is the atomicity of the test subexpression, sequentially composed with the join of the atomicities of the \texttt{then} and \texttt{else} branches.

\[ \text{[EXP LET]} \] This rule for \texttt{let} \( x = e_1 \text{ in } e_2 \) infers atomicity expressions \( d_1 \) and \( d_2 \) for \( e_1 \) and \( e_2 \), respectively. Since the atomicity expression \( d_2 \) may refer to the let-bound variable \( x \), we apply the substitution \( \theta \) immediately because \( \alpha \) may later resolve to \( x \). Instead, we use the \texttt{delayed substitution form} \( d_2 \theta \) to delay this substitution until after atomicity variables are resolved.

First, \( e_1 \) may not be \texttt{const} (in general, we cannot determine which expressions are \texttt{const} until after type inference), in which case \( d_2 \theta \) may not be a valid atomicity. Therefore, we use the well-formed atomicity construct \( wfa(P, E, d_2 \theta) \) to yield a valid atomicity for \( e_2 \) that is well-formed in environment \( E \). The meaning of this construct is defined via:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[wfa}(P, E, d_2 \theta)]_L &= [d_2]_{L'} \\
\text{where } L' &= \{ l \in L \mid P; E \vdash \text{lock} \ l : C; \text{and } \bot_A; \theta \vdash C \}
\end{align*}
\]

As described above, the judgment \( P; E \vdash \text{lock} \ l \) checks that \( l \) is a well-formed lock expression in an environment \( E \) and program \( P \) provided the constraints \( C \) holds. Since the meaning function \([.]\), is defined only on closed, tag-free atomicity expressions, \( C \) will also be closed and tag-free, and so we check that it satisfies via \( \bot_A; \theta \vdash C \). Thus, \( L' \) contains only locks that are held and that are valid in the environment \( E \), and \( d \) is evaluated in the context of these held and valid locks.

\[ \text{[EXP REF]} \] The rule for a field access \( e.fn \) first checks that \( e \) is of some type \( cn(l_{1..n}) \), and that \( cn \) is a class parameterized by \( n \) ghost variables, say \( x_{1..n} \), that declares a field \( fn \) of some type \( t \). The type \( t \) may refer to the variables \texttt{this} and \( x_{1..n} \) in scope at the field declaration. Since these variables are not in scope at the field access, the type rule introduces a substitution \( \theta \) that replaces them with the corresponding expressions \( e \) and \( l_{1..n} \), and ensures that \( \theta(t) \) is a well-formed type.

The \[ \text{[EXP REF]} \] rule performs a case analysis on the field’s guard. If the field is \texttt{final}, then the read operation has atomicity \texttt{const}, since there can be no concurrent writers. If the field is \texttt{unguarded}, then the read operation is \texttt{atomic}, since it may not commute with concurrent writes. If the field is \texttt{guarded} by \( l \), then the lock \( \theta(l) \) must be held and the read operation is a move.
Figure 6: AJC Constraint Generation Rules

[EXP NULL]

\[ P, E ⊢ e \dashv c \cdot d \cdot C \]

[EXP REF]

\[ P, E ⊢ e : cn(l_{1,n}) \cdot d' \cdot C \]
\[ class cn(ghost x_{1,n}) \{ \ldots \} \in P \]
\[ \theta = \{ this := e, c_{j} := l_{j} \} \]
\[ (g \equiv \text{guarded_by} l) \Rightarrow (d = \theta(l) \cdot \text{mover} \cdot \text{error}) \]
\[ (g \equiv \text{final}) \Rightarrow (d = \text{const}) \]
\[ (g \equiv \text{unguarded}) \Rightarrow (d = \text{atomic}) \]
\[ P, E ⊢ e.f_n : \theta(c) \cdot (d \cdot \text{ufa}(P, E, d)) \cdot (C \cup C') \]

[EXP NEW]

\[ \theta = \{ x_{j} := l_{j} \} \]
\[ P, E, \text{ ghost } y \vdash e_{i} : \theta(c_{i}) \cdot d_{i} \cdot C_{i} \quad \forall i \in 1..k \]
\[ class cn(ghost x_{1,n}) \{ \{ \text{field}_{i,j} \cdot \text{meth}_{i,j} \} \in \ldots \} \in P \]
\[ \theta = \{ c_{j} := f_{n}, c_{j} : y \} \quad \forall i \in 1..k \]
\[ \theta = \{ c_{j} := cn(l_{j-1,n}) \cdot \} \]
\[ C' = C_{1} \cup C_{i} \]
\[ P, E \vdash \text{new}_{y} cn(l_{1,n})(e_{1,k}) \vdash cn(l_{1,n}) \cdot (d_{1} \cdot P) \cdot C'' \]

[EXP WHILE]

\[ P, E \vdash e_{1} : c_{1} \cdot d_{1} \cdot C_{1} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2 \]
\[ d = \text{dil}(d_{1}) \]
\[ P, E \vdash \text{while } e_{1} \text{ e}_{2} : c_{2} \cdot d_{2} \cdot (C_{1} \cup C_{2}) \]

[EXP LET]

\[ P, E \vdash e_{1} : c_{1} \cdot d_{1} \cdot C_{1} \]
\[ P, E, t_{1} \vdash x_{2} : c_{2} \cdot d_{2} \cdot C_{2} \]
\[ \theta = \{ x := e_{1} \} \]
\[ P, E \vdash \theta(c_{2}) \cdot C_{3} \]
\[ d = \text{dil}(d_{1} \cdot \text{pdfa}(P, E, d_{2}, \theta)) \]
\[ P, E \vdash \text{let } e_{1} = x_{1} \text{ in } e_{2} : \theta(c_{2}) \cdot d_{2} \cdot (C_{1} \cup C_{2} \cup C_{3}) \]

[LOCK EXP]

\[ P, E \vdash e : c \cdot d \cdot C \quad |e| \leq \text{MaxLockSize} \]
\[ P, E \vdash \text{lock } e : (C \cup \{ d \subseteq \text{const} \}) \]

[EXP DEF]

\[ P, E \vdash e : \hat{C} \]

[ENV EMPTY]

\[ P, E \vdash e : \emptyset \]
\[ P, E \vdash \text{lock } e : C \]
\[ P, E \vdash \text{field } e : C \]

[ENV X]

\[ P, E \vdash e : \emptyset \quad x \notin \text{Dom}(E) \]
\[ P, E \vdash (E, e, x) : C \]
\[ P, E \vdash \text{field } e : C \]

[ENV GHOST]

\[ P, E \vdash e : \hat{C} \quad x \notin \text{Dom}(E) \]
\[ P, E \vdash (E, \text{ghost } x, E) : C \]

[PROG]

\[ \text{ClassOnce}(P) \cdot \text{FieldsOnce}(P) \cdot \text{MethodsOnce}(P) \]
\[ P = \text{def}_{i=1} \cdot e \cdot c \cdot d \cdot C \]
\[ P = \text{def}_{i=1} \cdot n \cdot e \]
\[ P \vdash \text{define } : C_{i} \quad \forall i \in 1..n \]
\[ P \vdash e : c \cdot d \cdot C \]
\[ P = \text{def}_{i=1} \cdot n \cdot e \]
\[ P \vdash \text{define } : C_{i} \quad \forall i \in 1..n \]
\[ P \vdash e : c \cdot d \cdot C \]
6. PHASE 3: CONSTRAINT SOLVING

Having generated a constraint set \( \bar{\mathcal{C}} \) over the tags and atomicity variables in the program, the next step is to solve these constraints. If the program does not contain any tagged synchronization operations, then the generated constraints are tag-free, and our earlier work presents an algorithm for solving such constraints [12]. In this paper, we now tackle the harder problem of solving a constraint set \( \bar{\mathcal{C}} \) in the case where some constraints may include the tagged synchronization construct \( \text{sync } t \), which corresponds to an automatically-inserted tagged synchronization operation \( \text{sync}\? t \) in the source program.

The behavior of these tagged synchronization constructs depends on the chosen tag set \( T \). If \( t \in T \), then a real synchronization operation is inserted into the original program at this point, and \( \mathcal{R}(t, l, d) \) behaves exactly like \( S(l, d) \). If \( t \notin T \), then this potential synchronization point is ignored, and \( \mathcal{R}(t, l, d) \) behave like \( d \).

We wish to find a suitable choice of tag set \( T \) and assignment \( A \) such that \( A; T \models \bar{\mathcal{C}} \). We use an iterative least fixed point algorithm to compute the minimal assignment \( A \) that satisfies \( \bar{\mathcal{C}} \), but this assignment will of course depend on the chosen tag set. Hence, on each iteration of the algorithm, we choose the tag set that yields the smallest possible assignment for use in the next iteration.

Choosing a tag set in this manner is possible if atomicity expressions are well-formed. An atomicity expression \( d \) is well-formed if (1) each tag occurs at most once in \( d \), and (2) whenever \( d \) contains a conditional atomicity \( l?d_1:d_2 \) then

1. \( [d_1] \subseteq [d_2] \).
2. atomically \( \subseteq [d_2] \), and
3. \( d_1 \) and \( d_2 \) mention the same lock expressions and atomicity variables.

The constraint generation rules only generate well-formed atomicity expressions, and well-formedness is preserved by the various operations we perform on atomicity expressions.

The function \( \text{min}(d) \), defined in Figure 8 returns a tag set \( T \) that minimizes \([d]\), where \( d \) is a closed, well-formed atomicity expression.

\textbf{Lemma 3.} Suppose that \( d \) is closed and well-formed, and let \( T = \text{min}(d) \). Then \( T \) only contains tags that occur in \( d \), and for all \( T' \), \([T(d)] \subseteq [T'(d)] \).

\textbf{Proof.} By structural induction on \( d \). □
The following function \( f_C \) describes each iteration of our algorithm. For each variable \( \alpha \), the function \( f_C(A) \) computes the closed atomicity expression \( d = A(\bar{C}(\alpha)) \), computes the tag set \( T \) that minimizes \( d \), and then returns this minimal atomicity \( [T(d)] \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{min} & : \text{ClosedAtomExpr} \rightarrow 2^\text{Tag} \\
\text{min}(\emptyset) & = \emptyset \\
\text{min}(d_1 \cup d_2) & = \text{min}(d_1) \cup \text{min}(d_2) \\
\text{min}(d) & = \text{min}(d) \\
\text{min}(\alpha) & = \text{min}(d) \\
\text{min}([\alpha]) & = \text{min}(d) \\
\text{min}(\text{R}(t, l, d)) & = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
T \cup \{t\} & \text{if } [T(d)] \text{ depends on } t \\
T & \text{otherwise}
\end{array} \right. \\
& \quad \text{where } T = \text{min}(d)
\end{align*}
\]

Suppose \( A \) is the least fixpoint of \( f_C \), that is, \( A = \text{fix}(f_C, \bot_A) \), where we define the fixpoint operator to terminate once it reaches assignments that are semantically equivalent with respect to \( =_A \):

\[\text{fix}(F, X) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \text{if } X =_A F(X) \text{ then } X \text{ else } \text{fix}(F, F(X))\]

The tag set \( T \) defined by

\[
T = \{ d \subseteq s \mid s \in C \}
\]

minimizes all atomicity expressions in \( \bar{C} \). Now consider any propagation constraint \( d \subseteq \alpha \) in \( C \). We have that

\[A(\alpha) = f_C(A)(\alpha) = [T(A(\bar{C}(\alpha)))] = [T(A(d))]\]

and so \( A; T \models d \subseteq \alpha \). Thus, \( A \) satisfies all propagation constraints in \( C \) with respect to \( T \), and it simply remains to check if \( A \) also satisfies the checking constraints in \( C \). The following function \( \text{solve} \) performs this analysis:

\[
\text{solve}(\bar{C}) = \begin{cases} \\
\langle A, T \rangle & \text{if } A = \text{fix}(f_C, \bot_A) \\
\text{undef} & \text{otherwise} \\
\end{cases}
\]

\textbf{Lemma 4.}

1. If \( \text{solve}(\bar{C}) = \text{undef} \) then \( \bar{C} \) is unsatisfiable.
2. If \( \text{solve}(\bar{C}) = \langle A, T \rangle \) then \( A; T \models \bar{C} \).

Proving that the \( \text{solve} \) algorithm terminates is non-trivial, because delayed substitutions could lead to arbitrarily large lock expressions and infinite ascending chains of atomicities and assignments. We bound the size of lock expressions to exclude this possibility. A lock expression \( l \) is \textit{bounded} if \( |l| < \text{MaxLockSize} \). Similarly, an atomicity is \textit{bounded} if it only contains bounded lock expressions, and an assignment is \textit{bounded} if it only yields bounded atomicities. An atomicity expression or constraint is \textit{bounded} if it is only conditional on bounded lock expressions, and every delayed substitution occurs inside the construct \( \text{wfa}(P, E, \cdot) \). The \textit{solve} algorithm terminates on the bounded constraint systems produced by the constraint generation rules.

\textbf{Theorem 5 (Termination).} The constraint solving algorithm terminates on bounded constraint systems.

\textbf{Proof.} See [12]. \( \square \)

The algorithm computes the following solution for our Stack example:

\[
\begin{align*}
A(a_1) & = \text{this?mover:atomic} \\
A(a_2) & = \text{this?mover:atomic} \\
T & = \{ t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4, t_5, t_8, t_{10}, t_{12}, t_{14}, t_{16} \}
\end{align*}
\]

In particular, the algorithm concludes that the tagged synchronization operations \( t_6, t_7, t_9, t_{11}, t_{13} \) and \( t_{15} \) do not decrease the atomicity of their containing methods, and so do not contribute to yielding a correctly-synchronized program. These omitted tagged synchronization operations are grayed-out in Figure 2(a). The remaining tagged synchronization operations in \( T \) yield a correctly synchronized program, but incur an unnecessarily-large synchronization overhead, since many of them are redundant. The next section describes how to eliminate the redundant operations.

\section{Phase 4: Synchronization Optimization}

Having computed a tag set \( T \) and assignment \( A \) such that \( \langle A, T \rangle = \text{solve}(\bar{C}) \), it remains to relax the synchronization (by reducing \( T \)) while preserving the satisfiability of the constraints. For this purpose, we use a greedy algorithm, where the tags \( T \) are ordered by some heuristic into a worklist \( Z \) and are iteratively removed:

\textbf{Figure 9: Phase 4 (version 1)}

\[
\begin{align*}
Z & := T; \\
\text{foreach } z \in Z & \text{ do} \\
T' & := T \setminus \{ z \}; \\
\text{if } T'(\bar{C}) & \text{ is satisfiable then } T := T'; \\
\text{end foreach}
\end{align*}
\]

The correctness of this basic algorithm is fairly straightforward to verify. However, the algorithm performs a lot of redundant computation in checking the satisfiability of \( \bar{C} \) for various tag sets. As a first step towards optimizing this algorithm, we inline some of the operations being performed by this routine:

\textbf{Figure 10: Phase 4 (version 2)}

\[
\begin{align*}
Z & := T; \\
\text{foreach } z \in Z & \text{ do} \\
T' & := T \setminus \{ z \}; \\
\bar{D} & := T'\setminus\{z\}; \\
A' & := \text{fix}(f_D, \bot_A); \\
\text{if } \forall(d \subseteq s) \in \bar{D}, [A'(d)] \subseteq_a [s] & \text{ then } T := T'; \\
\text{end foreach}
\end{align*}
\]

It is now clear that the main performance overhead is in the repeated iterative fixpoint computation of \( \text{fix}(f_D, \bot_A) \), which always begins with the least assignment \( \bot_A \). However, there is a key monotonicity property that we can exploit. By maintaining an assignment \( A \) such that \( A = \)}
fix(f_{T(C)}, \bot_A), we can more efficiently compute the fixpoint
fix(f_{T(C)}, \bot_A), where T' \subseteq T, by starting from the current
assignment A rather than the minimal assignment \bot_A. The
following lemma ensures the correctness of this optimization.

Lemma 6. Suppose
\[ (A_0, T_0) = \text{solve}(C) \]
\[ A_0 \subseteq_A A \]
\[ T \subseteq T_0 \]
\[ D = T'(C) \]

Then \( A \subseteq_A \text{fix}(f_D, \bot_A) \) and \( \text{fix}(f_D, \bot_A) =_A \text{fix}(f_D, A) \).

Our optimized algorithm is then:

Figure 11: Phase 4 (version 3)

\[
Z := T; \\
\text{foreach } z \in Z \text{ do} \\
\quad // \text{invariant: } A = \text{fix}(f_{T(C)}, \bot_A); \\
\quad T' := T \setminus \{z\}; \\
\quad D := T'(C); \\
\quad A' := \text{fix}(f_D, A); \\
\quad \text{if } w(d \in_a A) \text{ then } \\
\quad \quad A := A'; \\
\quad T := T'; \\
\quad \text{end if} \\
\text{end foreach}
\]

This algorithm computes the following assignment and tag
set for the Stack program.

\[
A(a_1) = \text{this?mover:atomic}; \\
A(a_2) = \text{this?mover:atomic}; \\
T = \{t1,t10\}
\]

All redundant synchronization operations are now elimi-
nated, and Figure 2(b) shows the code with the two syn-
chronization operations that fix the program. Different or-
derings for the work list may yield different results. For
example, the following is also a solution:

\[
A(a_1) = \text{this?mover:atomic}; \\
A(a_2) = \text{this?mover:atomic}; \\
T = \{t1,t10\}
\]

One interesting aspect of this algorithm is that we can order
the work list to achieve specific effects. Trying to remove
tags for outermost synchronization statements first may help
reduce the size of critical sections, whereas removing tags
for innermost statements first may improve performance by
reducing the number of synchronization operations.

8. IMPLEMENTATION

We have implemented synchronization correction in Bohr,
our tool for detecting and correcting errors in Java pro-
grams [12]. Bohr takes as input source code that may
optionally contain atomicity specifications in stylized com-
ments starting with "#", as in "/## mover */. Bohr runs in
two phases. The first phase uses the Rcc/Sat tool to in-
ferr appropriate guards for each field and appropriate formal
and actual ghost parameters for class and method declara-
tions and uses. Rcc/Sat is somewhat resilient to errors and
will infer the most likely synchronization information, even
if a small number of race conditions do exist. For more de-
tails on Rcc/Sat, we refer the interested reader to our earlier

Our present work is included in the second phase of Bohr,
which computes any unspecified atomicities and inserts syn-
chronization operations to correct errors. Bohr outputs a
fully annotated version of the source code, including any
synchronization statements necessary to satisfy the speci-

ied atomicity requirements. If errors cannot be fixed by
our algorithm, the checker prints warning messages for each
atomicity violation identified.

We applied Bohr to three standard Java 1.4.2 library
classes to validate its effectiveness at fixing defects. These
three classes are designed to be thread-safe, meaning that
all public methods should be atomic. The following table
summarizes the results of running Bohr with and without
synchronization correction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Atomicity Warnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String</td>
<td>2,307</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StringBuffer</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vector</td>
<td>3,546</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “Lines” column includes the size of the class of inter-
est and all superclasses. We annotated all referenced library
classes with appropriate atomicities, and, for simplicity, we
assumed that all subclasses of Collection are internally
synchronized. Bohr successfully corrected for the warnings
reported in our previous work [12]. The StringBuffer and
Vector warnings are real defects. The String warning is
due to benign races and is spurious, although Bohr did
add synchronization to remove the races.

To further assess the effectiveness of Bohr, we performed
an experiment on Java 1.4.2 library classes in which we
added atomicity specifications and then randomly removed
a small number of synchronization operations and measured
how many operations Bohr would correctly reinsert. We
removed one, two, or five synchronization operations at a
time, and repeated each scenario multiple times. The fol-
lowing table summarizes the percentage of inserted defects
that were identified and fixed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Time (sec)</th>
<th>Correction Rate per Number of Defects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observable</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflater</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deflater</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zipfile</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StringBuffer</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String</td>
<td>2,307</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vector</td>
<td>3,546</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SynchronizedList</td>
<td>3,837</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No result is reported for String with five defects since
that class has fewer than five synchronization operations.
Bohr performed well when a small number of defects were
introduced. For the larger numbers of defects, the precision
decreased because Rcc/Sat did not always infer the appro-
priate locking discipline, due to the large number of data
races introduced on specific object fields. Rcc/Sat can be
adjusted to withstand a higher number, but the mere fact
that a large number of races exists is often an indication of
a fundamental problem with the design of the code (as
opposed to more local programming errors). Interestingly,
Bohr determined that several synchronization operations in these classes are redundant and unnecessary.

Results from applying Bohr to small, complete programs are similarly promising. The application of our current implementation to significantly larger programs is limited by the lack of precise atomicity specifications for libraries, and by incomplete support in our current implementation for some synchronization idioms such as protecting locks [12].

9. RELATED WORK

Since an atomicity annotation describes aspects of the behavior or effect of an expression, we are essentially performing a form of effect reconstruction [27, 26]. Our work differs from most of the work on effect systems and dependent types [6] by investigating automated techniques for correcting errors. Sasturkar et al [22] have also developed a type inference algorithm for atomicity. Unlike Bohr, their system includes a notion of object ownership [4] and uses a dynamic analysis to infer race condition information. They have not explored synchronization correction.

Lipton [20] first proposed reduction as a way to reason about deadlocks without considering all possible interleavings. Partial-order reduction techniques are based on similar ideas [16]. Several papers have have used Lipton’s theory of reduction to improve the efficiency of model checking [5, 25, 13].

The use of model checking for verifying atomicity is being explored by Hatcliff et al [19]. This model checking approach is more expressive than our type-based analysis, but it is vulnerable to state-space explosion. Their results suggest that verifying atomicity via model-checking is feasible for unit-testing. A more general (but more expensive) technique for verifying atomicity during model checking is commit-atomicity [8]. Several tools have explored verifying atomicity dynamically [10, 31], but these tools are sensitive to test case coverage.

View consistency is another approach to preventing threads interference [2, 30]. A view is the set of variables accessed within a synchronized block. Thread A is view consistent with B if all views from the execution of A, intersected with the maximal view of B, are ordered by subset inclusion. We believe view consistency could be extended with an analogous idea of synchronization correction.

Recent approaches to supporting atomicity include lightweight transactions [18, 32, 21, 17] and automatic generation of synchronization code from high-level specifications [7]. Lightweight transactions in particular seem like a promising, and complementary, approach to providing atomicity guarantees. An interesting avenue of future work is to explore how to best merge synchronization-based and transaction-based approaches.

10. CONCLUSIONS

Synchronization errors are a common source of defects in software systems. Our synchronization correction algorithm enables us to not only identify concurrency errors statically, but also correct them in many situations. Preliminary experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach at correcting existing and randomly-inserted defects. We hope to further validate our approach on larger programs. This would also give us the opportunity to explore different optimization approaches in the final step of the algorithm. In addition, we plan to integrate a deadlock detection analysis into Bohr so that the tool can avoid introducing any potential for deadlock when inserting synchronization operations.
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