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Abstract

Correctness of concurrent objects is defined in terms of conditions that determine allowable relationships between histories of a concurrent object and those of the corresponding sequential object. Numerous correctness conditions have been proposed over the years, and more have been proposed recently as the algorithms implementing concurrent objects have been adapted to cope with multicore processors with relaxed memory architectures.

We present a formal framework for defining correctness conditions for multicore architectures, covering both standard conditions for totally ordered memory and newer conditions for relaxed memory, which allows them to be expressed in uniform manner, simplifying comparison. Our framework distinguishes between order and commitment properties, which in turn enables a hierarchy of correctness conditions to be established. We consider the Total Store Order (TSO) memory model in detail, formalise known conditions for TSO using our framework, and develop sequentially consistent variations of these. We present a work-stealing deque for TSO memory that is not linearizable, but is correct with respect to these new conditions. We present a work-stealing deque for TSO memory that is not linearizable, but is correct with respect to these new conditions. Using our framework, we identify a new non-blocking compositional condition, fence consistency, which lies between known conditions for TSO, and aims to capture the intention of a programmer-specified fence.
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1 Introduction

This paper studies correctness conditions for concurrent objects, i.e., objects consisting of operations acting on shared data that may be executed concurrently by multiple processes. Because the operation calls of concurrent objects may overlap (as opposed to occurring one after another), their correctness is judged using a correctness condition, which is a relation on the behaviours of the concurrent object and its sequential specification object, i.e., a
Correctness condition provides an answer to the question: In what sense does a concurrent object implement its sequential specification?

Correctness conditions for concurrent objects has been the subject of study for nearly three decades and numerous conditions have been proposed. Shavit makes the case that different correctness conditions are needed in different circumstances [31]; weaker conditions provide greater scope for optimisation, but fewer behavioural guarantees. One cannot however, continually weaken correctness conditions in search of greater performance. Programmers require strong correctness conditions that ensure an abstract specification object (whose behaviours are understandable) can be safely substituted by a concurrent object (which provides better performance) within the programs that use these objects. The existence of these two opposing goals has meant that the number of accepted correctness conditions has actually increased over time (e.g., [31, 25]), instead of being consolidated into a unified correctness notion.

Most correctness conditions, including linearizability [23], have been developed under the assumption that hardware ensures totally ordered memory, where reads and writes within a process are guaranteed to be executed in program order. Due to their use of local buffers, modern multicore architectures are not totally ordered, and only provide relaxed memory guarantees [1, 33], meaning memory instructions may be executed in a different order to that specified by the program. Such reorderings can be avoided by introducing fence instructions in the program code, however, because fence instructions hamper performance, programmers try to limit their usage. This however, causes a direct tension between correctness and optimisation possibilities. For example, it has been shown that to ensure linearizability of many data structures under relaxed memory, there are “laws of order” that force fence instructions to be used, and hence, linearizability itself has become a bottleneck to efficiency [3]. In the face of this result, we once again look to define suitable correctness conditions weaker than linearizability [12, 32].

Although numerous correctness conditions exist (and more are proposed each year), a unified framework within which different correctness conditions can be defined and formally compared has thus far not been developed. With the advent of correctness conditions for relaxed memory architectures, it is becoming difficult to judge the comparative strengths of different conditions. This paper presents a systematic study of correctness conditions for concurrent objects executed in multicore architectures. We do not aim to characterise the memory models themselves (for such a study see [2]), but rather characterise properties of a concurrent object executing in some memory architecture.

We make the following contributions.

1. We develop a framework that enables one to systematically develop and reason about correctness conditions for concurrent objects. For each property we distinguish between its order conditions, which define allowable orderings of concrete operations, and commit conditions, which provide guarantees about the operations whose effect must have taken place. This distinction is the first, to our knowledge, providing a separation of concerns when defining correctness.

2. Within this framework, we formalise well-known correctness conditions for totally ordered memory, providing insight into the relationships between them.

3. To cope with relaxed memory, we define partial commitment conditions where the effects

---

1 Architectures with totally ordered memory are also referred to as sequentially consistent architectures [26]. In this paper, we use sequential consistency to refer to a property on the histories of a concurrent object as done in [4]. Sequential consistency is formalised in Definition 10.
of some completed operation calls are delayed beyond their returns due to pending writes in the buffers of the calling processes.

4. We study a specific weak memory model, TSO, and formalise known correctness conditions for it (weak flush consistency [12] and weak $\xi$-quiescent consistency [32]) that are weaker than linearizability, as they allow more reorderings and only ensure partial commitment.

5. Using our framework, we develop a new condition, fence consistency, a non-blocking compositional condition that lies between the existing conditions for TSO memory.

6. We show that the Chase-Lev work-stealing deque [7] where the put operation returns without fencing is not linearizable under TSO memory, but does satisfy a weaker condition, flush consistency, which is a sequentially consistent version of the condition defined in [12]. This condition is strictly weaker than linearizability and stronger than $\xi$-quiescent consistency (which is the sequentially consistency version of the condition in [32]).

7. We prove a hierarchy for the correctness conditions in this paper based on order and commitment properties.

2 Background

This section provides the background for the rest of the paper; we introduce the Chase-Lev work-stealing deque (as defined by [7]), which serves as a running example for the rest of this paper. We also informally introduce notions of correctness for concurrent objects for totally ordered memory, and the Total Store Order memory model.

2.1 Work-Stealing Deque

Work-stealing double ended queues (abbreviated to deques) are often used for load balancing in multiprocessor systems. Each worker process has a deque, which it uses to record tasks to be performed. Thus, a worker executes put and take operations that, respectively, add tasks to and remove tasks from its deque. Load balancing is achieved by allowing other, so-called “thief” processes, whose own deques are empty, to execute steal operations that remove elements from the deque. To avoid contention between the worker and thief processes, put and take operate at different ends of the deque from steal operations – a worker adds and removes tasks at the tail, whereas thieves steal tasks from the head. Because the worker and thieves operate at different ends of the deque, contention between the worker and thieves occurs when the deque has one element. Resolving these cases is in general difficult [13].

Fig. 1 presents a simplified version of the Chase-Lev work-stealing deque. The shared state consists of an array, items, of tasks (represented as integers) and variables Head and Tail, which mark the part of the array containing the elements of the deque. The other variables are local to the operations in which they occur.

2.2 Correctness Conditions

Correctness of a concurrent object is judged with respect to an abstract sequential specification [22]. The abstract specification of the deque object implementation in Fig. 1 is given in Fig. 2, consisting of a deque variable $dq$, represented as a sequence of tasks, and atomic operations put, take and steal; task is a local variable within the take and steal operations.

An object cannot execute by itself; rather it is the clients of an object that execute its operations. Correctness defines a relationship between histories of the concrete and abstract systems, which record the interactions between the client and an object via the object’s external interface. Typically, a history records invocation and return events of operation
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```c
void put(int task) {
    P1 tl := Tail;
    P2 items[tl] := task;
    P3 Tail := tl + 1;
}

int steal() {
    S1 while true {
        S2 hd := Head;
        S3 if hd ≥ Tail
            S4 return emp;
        S5 task := items[hd];
        S6 if cas(Head, hd, hd+1)
            S7 return task;
        S8 return emp;
    }
}

int take() {
    T1 tl := Tail - 1;
    T2 Tail := tl;
    T3 hd := Head;
    T4 if hd > tl {
        T5 Tail := hd;
        T6 return emp;
    }
    T7 task := items[tl];
    T8 if tl > hd
        T9 return task;
    else return emp;
}
```

**Figure 1** Chase-Lev work-stealing deque.

```c
void put(int task) {
    atomic {
        dq := dq ≪⟨ task ⟩
    }
}

int steal {
    atomic {
        if dq = ⟨⟩ then return emp
        else
            task := head(dq);
            dq := tail(dq);
            return task
    }
}

int take {
    atomic {
        if dq = ⟨⟩ then return emp
        else
            task := last(dq);
            dq := init(dq);
            return task
    }
}
```

**Figure 2** Abstract work-stealing deque.

calls. Concurrent histories may consist of both overlapping and non-overlapping operation calls, inducing a partial order on events. Correctness conditions define how, if at all, this order is maintained in the corresponding abstract history. There are several well-known existing correctness conditions for totally ordered memory [22].

- **Sequential consistency** is a simple condition requiring the order of operation calls in a concrete history for a single process to be preserved. Operation calls performed by different processes may be reordered in the abstract history even if the operation calls do not overlap in the concrete history.

- **Linearizability** strengthens sequential consistency by requiring the order of non-overlapping operations to be preserved. Operation calls that overlap in the concrete history may be reordered when mapping to an abstract history.

- **Quiescent consistency** is weaker than linearizability, but is incomparable to sequential consistency. A concurrent object is said to be quiescent at some point $m$ in its history if none of its operations are executing at $m$. Quiescent consistency requires the order of operation calls separated by a quiescent point to be preserved. Operation calls that are not separated by a quiescent point may be reordered, including operations performed by the same process.

It has already been shown that the Chase-Lev deque from Fig. 1 is linearizable [7]. Since linearizability implies both sequential and quiescent consistency, the Chase-Lev deque is also both sequentially and quiescently consistent.

### 2.3 Total Store Order (TSO) Memory

Modern multi-core architectures use local buffers to allow more efficient use of shared memory (see Fig. 3). For optimisation purposes, many architectures only provide relaxed
memory guarantees. We consider Total Store Order (TSO) memory as implemented by x86 processors. A general definition of TSO is given in [1], an operational semantics in [30], and an interval-based semantics in [14].

Here, a write by a processor core is not immediately committed to shared memory. Instead it is enqueued as a pending write in the local buffer and only becomes visible to other processes after it is flushed, which commits the pending write in the buffer to shared memory. Hence, there is a discrepancy between the time at which a write is executed and the time at which the effect of the write becomes visible to other processes. In TSO, pending writes are flushed in a FIFO order. In addition, using a method known as Intra-Process Forwarding [1], when reading a memory location, a processor core fetches the value of the last pending write from its local buffer if available and from shared memory otherwise. Due to pending writes and intra-process forwarding, from an external perspective, read and write instructions within a process appear to be reordered [1], i.e., total memory order is not maintained.

Example 1. Consider the program in Fig. 4, where processes \( p \) and \( q \) modify shared variables \( x \) and \( y \), both of which are initialised to 0. Under totally ordered memory, when the program terminates, at least one of \( r_1 \) or \( r_2 \) would have the value 1. However, under TSO memory, it is possible for the program to terminate so that both \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) read the original values of \( x \) and \( y \), i.e., both \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) are 0 at termination. One such execution sequence is \( \langle p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2, \text{flush}(p), \text{flush}(p), \text{flush}(q), \text{flush}(q) \rangle \), where \( p_1 \) denotes execution of the statement at line \( p_1 \) (similarly \( p_2 \), etc.), and \( \text{flush}(p) \) denotes execution of a hardware-controlled flush event for process \( p \) (similarly \( \text{flush}(q) \)). The write to \( x \) at \( p_1 \) is not seen by process \( q \) until \( p \)’s buffer is flushed, and symmetrically for the write to \( y \) at \( q_1 \). Hence, it is possible for \( q \) to read a value 0 for \( x \) at \( q_2 \) even though \( q_2 \) is executed after \( p_1 \).

To avoid instruction reordering, a core may acquire a global lock (depicted in Fig. 3), which prevents all other cores from accessing shared memory. This lock is used to implement (coarse-grained) atomic operations such as cas [30]. In particular, a cas operation locks the buffer, performs the compare and swap, fully flushes the buffer, then releases the lock.

Example 2. Suppose we wish to establish the postcondition that either \( r_1 \) or \( r_2 \) has value 1 for the program in Fig. 4. The only possibility is to introduce fence instructions between \( p_1 \) and \( p_2 \), and between \( q_1 \) and \( q_2 \) in Fig. 4. Note that both fence instructions are necessary, otherwise, \( r_1 = r_2 = 0 \) remains a possible outcome of the program.

Defining Correctness for Concurrent Objects

The correctness conditions described in Section 2.2 are all defined in terms of an abstract sequential history which is related in a certain way to a given execution of the concurrent object in question. This relationship can be defined more precisely in terms of a mapping function that maps elements in the concrete history to those of the corresponding abstract history. Mapping functions are inspired by the encoding of linearizability in [10], which has
led to a complete simulation-based method for proving linearizability [29]. Our conditions for relaxed memory are also amenable to integration with such proof methods.

### 3.1 A Framework for Specifying Correctness

As already discussed, correctness conditions are defined in terms of histories of the abstract (sequential) and concrete (concurrent) systems. In order to make these comparable, while capturing the relevant information about concurrent executions, histories record just the invocation and return of each operation call. In a concurrent history, operation calls may be interleaved with those of other processes, so the invocation and return of a given call may be separated by any number of invocations and returns of other processes, while in a sequential history, the invocation of an operation call is immediately followed by its corresponding return.

For correctness conditions under totally ordered memory it turns out that invocation and response events are all that must be recorded. However, relaxed memory architectures often require additional events such as buffer flushes to be recorded [5, 17, 6]. Thus, assuming that response events are all that must be recorded. However, relaxed memory architectures often require additional events such as buffer flushes to be recorded [5, 17, 6]. Thus, assuming that sequences are amenable to integration with such proof methods.

We generally use $\mathbb{Z}$ mathematical notation [34]. This definition says that any element of $\text{Event}$ is of the form $\text{inv}(p, i, v)$ or $\text{ret}(p, i, v)$, where $p \in P$, $i \in I$ and $v \in V$. We also write $\text{inv}(p, \text{op})$ for invocations with no inputs, and $\text{ret}(p, \text{op})$ for returns with no outputs. In this paper, we assume that sequences are indexed from 0 onwards.

\[\text{Event} \triangleq \text{inv}(P \times I \times V) \cup \text{ret}(P \times I \times V)\]

where $\text{Event}_C \supseteq \text{Event}$ is the set of concrete events; the set $\text{Event}_C$ will be specialised in later sections. We say that two events $e_1$ and $e_2$ are matching if they form an invocation/return pair for the same operation performed by the same process:

\[\text{matching}(e_1, e_2) \triangleq \text{inv}(e_1) \land \text{ret}(e_2) \land e_1.p = e_2.p \land e_1.i = e_2.i\]

where $\text{inv}$? and $\text{ret}$? are true for invocation and return events, respectively, and $e.p$ and $e.i$ denote the process and operation corresponding to an event $e$, respectively; similarly, $e.v$ denotes $e$'s input/outputs. Indices $m$ and $n$ form a matching pair in a history $h$ if they identify a pair of matching events and there is no invocation or return performed by the same process between them:

\[\text{mp}(m, n, h) \triangleq \text{matching}(h(m), h(n)) \land \forall k : \text{dom } h \bullet m < k < n \land h(k) . p = h(m) . p \Rightarrow h(k) \notin \text{Event}\]

Note that in the case of totally ordered memory $\text{Event}_C = \text{Event}$, i.e., all elements of a history $h$ are in $\text{Event}$. Hence, the second conjunct of $\text{mp}(m, n, h)$ simplifies to $\forall k : \text{dom } h \bullet m < k < n \Rightarrow h(k).p \neq h(m).p$. However, this is not the case for the histories in Section 4, and there, the consequent of the second conjunct does not trivially reduce to false.

An index $m$ is a pending invocation in history $h$ if $h(m)$ is an invocation that is not followed by a matching return in $h$:

\[\text{pi}(m, h) \triangleq \text{inv}? (h(m)) \land \forall k : \text{dom } h \bullet m < k \Rightarrow \neg \text{matching}(h(m), h(k))\]

A history is sequential if it is either empty or an alternating sequence of matching invocations and returns starting with an invocation:

\[\text{sequential}(h) \triangleq h = \langle \rangle \lor (\text{inv}? (h(0)) \land \forall k : \text{dom } h \bullet \text{inv}? (h(k)) \land k + 1 \in \text{dom } h \Rightarrow \text{matching}(h(k), h(k + 1))\]

---

2 We generally use $\mathbb{Z}$ mathematical notation [34]. This definition says that any element of $\text{Event}$ is of the form $\text{inv}(p, i, v)$ or $\text{ret}(p, i, v)$, where $p \in P$, $i \in I$ and $v \in V$. We also write $\text{inv}(p, \text{op})$ for invocations with no inputs, and $\text{ret}(p, \text{op})$ for returns with no outputs. In this paper, we assume that sequences are indexed from 0 onwards.
As in [23], we assume each process calls at most one operation at a time. We say a history \( h \) is well formed if each \( h_p \) is sequential, where \( h_p \) denotes a history \( h \) restricted to all events by process \( p \); for the rest of this paper we assume that all histories are well-formed. A history \( h \) is legal if each return is preceded by some matching invocation:

\[
\text{legal}(h) \triangleq \forall n : \text{dom } h \bullet \text{ret}?(h(n)) \Rightarrow \exists m : \text{dom } h \bullet m < n \land \text{mp}(m, n, h)
\]

A correctness condition between a concurrent history \( h \) and a sequential history \( hs \) is defined in terms of a mapping function, \( f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \), which is an injective partial function from indices of \( h \) to indices of \( hs \). Injectivity ensures that each element of \( h \) occurs at most once in \( hs \), while partiality provides the flexibility needed to represent delayed operation calls under relaxed memory architectures (where some completed operation calls may not appear in the abstract history).

\section*{Example 3.} Consider concurrent history \( h \) and sequential history \( hs \) below:

\[
h = (\text{inv}(q_1, \text{steal}), \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, 1), \text{ret}(q_1, \text{steal}, \text{emp}), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}))
\]

\[
hs = (\text{inv}(q_1, \text{steal}), \text{ret}(q_1, \text{steal}, \text{emp}))
\]

The mapping function from \( h \) to \( hs \) is \( \{0 \mapsto 0, 2 \mapsto 1\} \). In this example, we assume that due to TSO the put operation has not yet taken effect.

In our framework, one only needs to define predicates on \( h \) and \( f \); the corresponding sequential history is \( hs = \{f(k) \mapsto h(k) \mid k \in \text{dom } f\} \).

\section*{Example 4.} Sequence \( h = \langle a, b, c, d \rangle \) is the set of mappings \( \{0 \mapsto a, 1 \mapsto b, 2 \mapsto c, 3 \mapsto d\} \). Hence, if \( f = \{2 \mapsto 0, 0 \mapsto 1, 1 \mapsto 2, 3 \mapsto 3\} \) then \( hs = \{0 \mapsto c, 1 \mapsto a, 2 \mapsto b, 3 \mapsto d\} = \langle c, a, b, d \rangle \).

We distinguish between two types of predicates on \( h \) and \( f \): order conditions, which describe the allowable orders of events when mapping \( h \) to \( hs \) (via \( f \)), and commitment conditions, which describe the events of \( h \) that must occur in \( hs \) (due to occurrence of their corresponding index in \( f \)). We write \( P(\varpi) \) if \( P \) is a predicate with free variables \( \varpi \).

\section*{Definition 5.} Suppose \( Q(h, f) \) is a predicate on history \( h \) and mapping function \( f \); \( \overline{m} \) is a vector over type \( \mathbb{N} \), \( P(h, \overline{m}) \) is a predicate on \( h \) and \( \overline{m} \), and \( QR(f, \overline{m}) \) and \( QD(f, \overline{m}) \) are predicates on \( f \) and \( \overline{m} \). We say that \( Q(h, f) \) is:

- an order condition iff \( Q(h, f) \) is of the form \( \forall \overline{m} : \text{dom } f \bullet P(h, \overline{m}) \Rightarrow QR(f, \overline{m}) \), where \( QR(f, \overline{m}) \) is a predicate on the range of \( f \) and \( \overline{m} \) only, and
- a commitment condition iff \( Q(h, f) \) is of the form \( \forall \overline{m} : \text{dom } h \bullet P(h, \overline{m}) \Rightarrow QD(f, \overline{m}) \), where \( QD(f, \overline{m}) \) is a predicate on the domain of \( f \) and \( \overline{m} \) only.

To reduce clutter, for predicates \( R, R_1 \) and \( R_2 \) on a history \( h \), mapping function \( f \), and boolean operator \( \oplus \), we define:

\[
\begin{align*}
R_1 &\equiv R_2 \triangleq \forall h, f \bullet \text{legal}(h) \Rightarrow R_1(h, f) = R_2(h, f) \\
R_1 &\Rightarrow R_2 \triangleq \forall h, f \bullet \text{legal}(h) \land R_1(h, f) \Rightarrow R_2(h, f) \\
(R_1 \oplus R_1)(h, f) &\triangleq R_1(h, f) \oplus R_2(h, f)
\end{align*}
\]

Using these concepts, we now define what it means for a mapping function to be valid. We formalise this definition using an order property \( \text{vmf}_{-\text{ord}} \), which ensures that for any matching pair \( m, n \) in \( h \) mapped by \( f \), index \( f(n) \) immediately follows \( f(m) \):

\[
\text{vmf}_{-\text{ord}}(h, f) \triangleq \forall m, n : \text{dom } f \bullet \text{mp}(m, n, h) \Rightarrow f(n) = f(m) + 1
\]
and a commitment property \( vmf\_com \), which ensures that for any matching pair \( m, n \) in \( h \), the invocation \( h(m) \) is mapped by \( f \) iff the return \( h(n) \) is also mapped by \( f \):

\[
vmf\_com(h, f) \equiv \forall m, n : \text{dom } h \bullet mp(m, n, h) \Rightarrow (m \in \text{dom } f \Leftrightarrow n \in \text{dom } f)
\]

Note that \( vmf\_ord \) conforms to the structure of an order condition as defined in Definition 5, since predicate \( P(h, \overline{m}) \) is instantiated to \( mp(m, n, h) \) and \( QR(f, \overline{m}) \) is instantiated to \( f(n) = f(m) + 1 \). Similarly, \( vmf\_com \) conforms to the structure of a commitment condition as defined in Definition 5; \( P(h, \overline{m}) \) is instantiated to \( mp(m, n, h) \) and \( QD(h, \overline{m}) \) instantiated to \( m \in \text{dom } f \Leftrightarrow n \in \text{dom } f \).

We say a function \( f \) is a valid mapping function if, for any history \( h \), the domain of \( f \) is contained in the domain of \( h \), the range of \( f \) is a consecutive sequence starting from 0, only invocation/return events are mapped by \( f \), matching pairs in \( h \) are mapped to consecutive events in the target abstract history, and \( f \) only maps matching pairs. Assuming \([m..n]\) is the set of naturals from \( m \) to \( n \) inclusive, we formalise validity for mapping functions as follows:

\[
VMF(h, f) \equiv \text{dom } f \subseteq \text{dom } h \land (\exists n : \mathbb{N} \bullet \text{ran } f = [0..n - 1]) \land \\
(\forall n : \text{dom } f \bullet h(n) \in \text{Event}) \land vmf\_ord(h, f) \land vmf\_com(h, f)
\]

We can now define a correctness condition to be a conjunction of ordering and commitment conditions, along with a requirement that we have a valid mapping function.

**Definition 6.** A correctness condition is a predicate \( R(h, f) \) over a history \( h \) and mapping function \( f \), whose definition has the form:

\[
R(h, f) \equiv VMF(h, f) \land (\bigwedge_i OC_i(h, f)) \land (\bigwedge_j CC_j(h, f))
\]

where each \( OC_i \) is an order condition and each \( CC_j \) is a commitment condition.

Note that the conjunct \( vmf\_ord \) in \( VMF \) means that pending invocations in \( h \) are never mapped by \( f \). However, when formalising correctness conditions, one must also consider incomplete histories, which contain pending invocations whose effects have already taken place and are observable to other processes [23].

**Example 7.** Consider a history \( HE_1 \equiv \langle \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, 7), \text{inv}(q, \text{steal}), \text{ret}(q, \text{steal}, 7) \rangle \) of the Chase-Lev deque (Fig. 1). This history is incomplete because the invocation of the \text{put} operation has not returned. However, its effect has clearly taken place because the \text{steal} operation returns 7.

To reason about such histories, Herlihy and Wing [23] consider history extensions, which are constructed from a history \( h \) by concatenating a sequence of returns corresponding to some of the pending invocations of \( h \). For example, \( HE_1 \) may be extended to \( HE_1 \land \langle \text{ret}(w, \text{put}) \rangle \) to enable the extended history to be mapped abstractly. Note that a history may have several possible extensions. For example, for the history:

\( HE_2 \equiv \langle \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, 7), \text{inv}(q_1, \text{steal}), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}), \text{inv}(q_2, \text{steal}) \rangle \)

the following are some of many possible extensions:

\( HE_3 \equiv HE_2 \land \langle \text{ret}(q_1, \text{steal}, \text{emp}) \rangle \)

\( HE_4 \equiv HE_2 \land \langle \text{ret}(q_2, \text{steal}, 7), \text{ret}(q_1, \text{steal}, \text{emp}) \rangle \)

Pending invocations in an incomplete history may remain pending in the extended history. For example, in \( H_3 \), the second steal operation is still pending. Herlihy and Wing define a
function complete to remove all pending histories from a history, and define linearizability of a history \( h \) in terms of complete(he), where he is some extension of \( h \). However, reasoning about complete(he) is often cumbersome because removal of pending invocations causes the indices of he to shift. This is exacerbated by the non-determinism of history extensions.

In our framework, because correctness is defined using an explicit mapping function, we can avoid using the complete function. In particular, after extending an incomplete history with return events, we can simply leave out pending invocations when mapping this extended history, simplifying the definitions and the proofs. We now lift correctness to the level of concurrent objects. This definition is tied to the fact that every concurrent object is inherently an implementation of some sequential abstract counterpart.

\[\text{Definition 8.} \quad \text{A concurrent object } \mathcal{C} \text{ implementing an abstract object } \mathcal{A} \text{ is correct with respect to a correctness condition } \mathcal{R}, \text{ denoted } \mathcal{C} \models_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{R}, \text{ iff for any legal history } h \text{ of } \mathcal{C}, \text{ there exists an extension } he \text{ of } h, \text{ a mapping function } f \text{ such that } R(he, f) \text{ holds, and a valid sequential history } hs \text{ of } \mathcal{A} \text{ such that } hs = \{ f(k) \mapsto he(k) \mid k \in \text{dom } f \}. \]

The next theorem states that if a concurrent object implements an abstract object for some notion of correctness, then it also implements the abstract object with respect to a weaker correctness condition.

\[\text{Theorem 9.} \quad \text{Suppose } \mathcal{C} \text{ is a concurrent object, } \mathcal{A} \text{ an abstract object and } \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2 \text{ are correctness conditions such that } \mathcal{R}_1 \Rightarrow \mathcal{R}_2. \text{ If } \mathcal{C} \models_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{R}_1 \text{ then } \mathcal{C} \models_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{R}_2. \]

The proof is straightforward by expanding the definitions and using the fact that legal is extension closed, i.e., if legal(h) holds and he is an extension of h, then legal(he) holds.

### 3.2 Specifying Correctness Conditions for Totally Ordered Memory

We now use our framework to formalise the conditions for totally ordered memory from Section 2.2: sequential consistency, linearizability and quiescent consistency. There are already existing formalisations of each of these in the literature, e.g., using partial orders. However, using our framework, we are able to distinguish between the different types of properties that form each condition.

Each correctness condition in Section 2.2 implies a total commitment condition, which means that all completed operation calls in a given history \( h \) must be mapped by \( f \) to some operation call in a sequential history.

\[
\text{total}(h, f) \equiv \forall m : \text{dom } f \bullet h(m) \in \text{Event} \land \neg \text{pi}(m, h) \Rightarrow m \in \text{dom } f
\]

Sequential consistency is defined in terms of an order condition sc, which states operation calls in \( h \) by the same process are not reordered by \( f \) when mapped to a sequential history.

\[
\text{sc}(h, f) \equiv \forall m, n : \text{dom } f \bullet m < n \land h(m).pr = h(n).pr \land \text{ret?}(h(m)) \land \text{inv?}(h(n)) \Rightarrow f(m) < f(n)
\]

\[\text{Definition 10.} \quad \text{A concurrent object } \mathcal{C} \text{ implementing an abstract object } \mathcal{A} \text{ is sequentially consistent iff } \mathcal{C} \models_{\mathcal{A}} \text{SC}, \text{ where } \text{3 } \text{SC} \equiv \text{VMF} \land \text{sc} \land \text{total}. \]

3 Note that by definition of \( \equiv \) and pointwise lifting, \( \text{SC}(h, f) \equiv \text{VMF}(h, f) \land \text{sc}(h, f) \land \text{total}(h, f) \) for any history \( h \) and mapping function \( f \).
Linearizability [23] is a straightforward extension to sequential consistency, strengthening the order condition so that an operation call is not reordered with another operation call that is invoked after the first operation returns.

\[
\text{lin}(h,f) \triangleq \forall m, n : \text{dom } f \cdot m < n \land \text{ret}(h(m)) \land \text{inv}(h(n)) \Rightarrow f(m) < f(n)
\]

Definition 11. A concurrent object \( C \) implementing an abstract object \( A \) is linearizable iff \( C \models_A \text{LIN} \), where \( \text{LIN} \triangleq \text{VMF} \land \text{lin} \land \text{total} \).

It is straightforward to link this definition to the formalisation by Derrick et al [10], which has in turn been linked with Herlihy and Wing’s original definition.

Quiescent consistency, as informally described by Shavit [31], has been formalised in [9] and is defined in terms of bijections between a concurrent history and its corresponding abstract history. We first define a quiescent point as an index \( m \) in a history \( h \) at which there are no pending invoked operation calls. We use \( h[m..n] \) to denote the projection of the elements of \( h \) from index \( m \) to \( n \), inclusive, i.e., \( h[m..n] = (h(m), h(m+1), \ldots, h(n-1), h(n)) \).

\[
\text{qp}(m, h) \triangleq \forall n : \text{dom } h \cdot (n \leq m \Rightarrow \neg \text{pi}(n, h[0..m]))
\]

The ordering condition for quiescent consistency states that \( f \) does not reorder two indices in \( h \) separated by a quiescent point.

\[
\text{qc_ord}(h,f) \triangleq \forall m, k, n : \text{dom } f \cdot m < k < n \land \text{qp}(k, h) \Rightarrow f(m) < f(n)
\]

Definition 12. A concurrent object \( C \) implementing an abstract object \( A \) is quiescent consistent iff \( C \models_A \text{QC} \), where \( \text{QC} \triangleq \text{VMF} \land \text{qc_ord} \land \text{total} \).

A benefit of our formalisation is that it is now straightforward to formally prove that linearizability implies both sequential consistency and quiescent consistency, the former is because \( \text{lin} \Rightarrow \text{sc} \) holds, while the latter is because \( \text{lin} \Rightarrow \text{qc} \). It is well known that \( \text{SC} \Rightarrow \text{LIN} \) and \( \text{QC} \Rightarrow \text{LIN} \) are both false; constructing counter-examples is straightforward [22].

4 Correctness Conditions for Total Store Order Memory

We now explore notions of correctness for concurrent objects in relaxed memory architectures. In particular, we focus on the potential for optimisation for TSO architectures. To simplify development of correctness conditions, we present each correctness condition as an instantiation of a number of high-level steps. We formalise two recently defined notions of correctness [12, 32], develop sequentially consistent variations of these, then develop a new correctness condition, fence consistency.

4.1 Minimising fence instructions in TSO

Correctness conditions that hold for a concurrent object under totally ordered memory may no longer hold in the presence of relaxed memory. For our running example, under TSO memory, consider the following scenario. After initialisation, suppose two complete put operations as well as their flushes have been executed. Thus, the deque is of size two with tasks \( a_0 \) and \( a_1 \) at array indices 0 and 1, and Head = 0 and Tail = 2. Suppose \( w \) invokes a take, which executes up to line \( T_4 \) without executing any flushes, setting its local variables hd and tl to 0 and 1, respectively. Now suppose two thief processes \( q_1 \) and \( q_2 \) invoke and execute steal operations up to completion, stealing both \( a_0 \) and \( a_1 \). The worker may now continue executing take, and return some unspecified value for task because the test at \( T_8 \)
Figure 5 Chase-Lev take operation modified for TSO.

succeeds. Such an execution cannot be proved to implement Fig. 2 for any sensible definition of correctness.

Liu et al. [27] have shown that linearizability can be restored provided (i) a fence is introduced immediately after P3 in the put operation, and (ii) the take operation in Fig. 1 is replaced by the take in Fig. 5, where a fence has been introduced after T2. As memory barriers in the form of fence instructions are expensive, our question is: Are there conditions weaker than linearizability that would allow only one fence to be used such that the behaviours one obtains are still sensible? Although removing a single fence instruction may not seem like a big change, because a client may execute several put operations consecutively, there is a potential for a high level of efficiency gains. Furthermore, since data structures such as deques are used to implement underlying system mechanisms such as schedulers [16] and operating system kernels [28], avoiding fence instructions can provide system-wide benefits.

It turns out that a fence after T2 is needed to avoid the scenario described above. In the other case, it turns out that the object is not linearizable, because the following is possible:

\[
\langle \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, x), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}), \text{inv}(q, \text{steal}), \text{ret}(q, \text{steal}, \text{emp}) \rangle
\]

This occurs because the effect of a put operation only occurs after the write at P3 is flushed. Therefore, the steal operation may read an older value causing it to return emp. We argue that such histories should be allowed – it is perfectly sensible for the steal and put operations to be reordered because the effect of the put has merely been delayed by buffer effects, whereby the put operation continues to execute beyond its return event. We therefore, set out to formally define correctness conditions that would accept histories such as (1), e.g., for the Chase-Lev deque under TSO memory where no fence instructions are introduced after P3.

Behaviours in TSO memory in which the effect of an operation is delayed beyond its return are already accepted as being correct for many implementations, e.g., spinlock [12, 28], Burns’ mutex [35] and the sequence lock [32]. However, a precise notion of correctness in these scenarios has thus far not been developed. Even less is known about the implications of accepting more histories than allowed by linearizability.

4.2 Defining Correctness Conditions

It turns out that there are several possibilities for interpreting correctness for delayed operations. We describe a sequence of steps for defining correctness conditions for TSO memory, where each step identifies an aspect of the condition that must be considered. Picking a particular instantiation at each step, leads to a particular correctness condition.

▶ Step 1 (Determine the events to be recorded in histories). For the conditions on totally ordered memory in Section 2.2, histories only needed to record invocation/response events.
For TSO memory, it is often necessary to record additional events, with rules on how these events are recorded. Formally, these additional events are recorded by instantiating $Event_C$.

For example, for weak $\xi$-quiescent consistency (as defined in Section 4.3), we record an additional event $\xi(p)$, thus $Event_C := Event | \xi(P)$. Event $\xi(p)$ is triggered (i.e., recorded) if either (i) a transition causes the buffer of process $p$ to become empty, or (ii) if process $p$ returns from an operation call when $p$’s buffer is empty. For case (i), $\xi(p)$ is concatenated, while for case (ii) the two-event sequence $\langle\text{ret}(p, op, v), \xi(p)\rangle$ is concatenated to the end of the history. Note that a transition causing $p$’s buffer to become empty may be caused by a CPU-controlled buffer flush, which may occur after $p$ has already returned. We assume $\xi(p)$ is not recorded if the buffer of $p$ is already empty in the prestate of a non-return transition, and if $p$ returns when its buffer is non-empty, then only $\langle\text{ret}(p, op, v)\rangle$ is concatenated to the end of the history.

We explain the next two steps assuming $Event_C := Event | \xi(P)$ has been fixed as defined in Step 1. For our examples below, we assume that the deque is initially empty, $w$ denotes the worker process, and $q_1$, $q_2$ and $q_3$ denote thief processes.

**Step 2 (Determine what operations can be reordered).** A common feature of the correctness conditions discussed in Section 2.2 is that operation calls whose active intervals overlap may be reordered. For totally ordered memory, an operation call may be considered to be active from its invocation to its return.

In the context of TSO memory, because some operation calls may return with non-empty buffers, there is additional flexibility in defining what counts as an active operation [12, 32, 35]. One possibility is to think of an operation call by a process $p$ as being active until buffer of process $p$ becomes empty. Consider the following history, which is possible for the deque in Fig. 1 but with the take operation from Fig. 5.

$$HC_1 \equiv \langle inv(w, put, x), ret(w, put), inv(q_1, steal), ret(q_1, steal, emp), \xi(q_1),
inv(q_2, steal), ret(q_2, steal, emp), \xi(q_2), ret(q_3, steal, x), \xi(q_3)\rangle$$

$HC_1$ cannot be linearized with respect to the abstract deque (Fig. 2) — $HC_1$ restricted to invocations and responses only is sequential and the steal occurs after the put has completed, yet the steal returns empty. However, in the context of TSO memory with the interpretation that returned operations calls by process $p$ are active until $p$’s buffer is empty, $HC_1$ can be explained by the following sequential history:

$$\langle inv(q_1, steal), ret(q_1, steal, emp), inv(q_2, steal), ret(q_2, steal, emp),
inv(w, put, x), ret(w, put), inv(q_3, steal), ret(q_3, steal, x)\rangle$$

It turns out that there are varying ways of defining active operations. In this paper we explore two possibilities: the first (inspired by [32]) allows an operation call to be active as long as the buffer of its calling process is non-empty, and the second (inspired by [12]) is more restricted, allowing an operation call to be active only as long as the final write corresponding to the operation call has not been flushed.

**Step 3 (Determine the commitment conditions).** The conditions in Section 2.2 for totally ordered memory are all total, i.e., any operation call that has returned must be mapped to some abstract operation call. Total conditions are appropriate for such architectures because

---

4 Note that there are other alternatives to recording case (ii) in the history; e.g., one could use a special “return empty” event that is distinct from ret events to obtain $Event_C := Event | \xi(P | O \times V) | \xi(P)$. 
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hardware guarantees that each write is immediately committed to shared memory when the
write instruction is executed, making its effect visible to other concurrent threads.

On the other hand, in relaxed memory models, write instructions may be cached in local
buffers, and thus not seen by other processes until the buffers are flushed. Hence, when an
operation call returns, the effect of the operation may not have have occurred in shared
memory. We refer to a returned operation call that has taken effect as a committed operation
call and as uncommitted, otherwise. To take delayed operation calls (due to buffer effects) into
account, we allow correctness conditions to be defined using partial commitment conditions,
allowing some completed operation calls to not be mapped to any abstract operations. When
specifying partial commitment conditions, it turns out that one must additionally define
conditions that dictate when an operation must become committed.

For TSO memory, one possible instantiation of this step is to require that all operation
calls of process \( p \) that have returned prior to \( \xi(p) \) occurring must have committed. For
example, consider the following history:

\[
HC_2 \equiv \langle \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, x), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}), \xi(w), \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, y), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}),
\text{inv}(q, \text{steal}), \text{ret}(q, \text{steal}, x), \xi(q) \rangle
\]

History \( HC_2 \) cannot be judged consistent against sequential histories \( \langle \rangle \) or \( \langle \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, x), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}) \rangle \) because due to \( \xi(w) \), the first put operation must be committed, and due to
\( \xi(q) \), the steal must have also been committed. Note that \( \xi(p) \) represents that latest point
at which commitments of completed operations of process \( p \) must occur; the commitment
condition does not prevent operations from committing earlier. Thus, for example, both
sequential histories below satisfy the requirement:

\[
\langle \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, x), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}), \text{inv}(q, \text{steal}), \text{ret}(q, \text{steal}, x) \rangle
\]
\[
\langle \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, x), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}), \text{inv}(q, \text{steal}), \text{ret}(q, \text{steal}, x), \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, y), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}) \rangle
\]

Note that the conditions in Section 2.2 can also be defined using these three steps. For all
three conditions, \( \text{Event}_C := \text{Event} \) (Step 1), and the commitment condition is total, which
states completed operation calls must appear in any corresponding sequential history (Step
3). The three conditions only differ in terms of their order properties, \( sc, \text{lin} \) and \( qc \), which
are different instantiations of Step 2.

### 4.3 Weak \( \xi \)-Quiescent Consistency

Smith et al. [32] prove correctness of a sequence lock algorithm in TSO memory with respect
to quiescent consistency [31]. An object is considered to be quiescent in a history if none of
its operations calls are pending in the history and the buffer of each process that has called
an operation of the object is empty. Note that the buffer of a process calling an operation
may become empty after the operation has returned. Reordering of operations across a
quiescent point is disallowed.

This condition may be formalised by instantiating the steps in Section 4.2. For Step 1, we use
\( \text{Event}_C := \text{Event} \upharpoonright \{\xi(P)\} \) because we must reason about empty buffers. We say such
a history \( h \) is legal iff \( h \upharpoonright \text{Event} \) (i.e., \( h \) restricted to invocations and return events) is legal.
Histories of this type are extension closed. For Step 2, as in [32], we say an operation call is
active until the object becomes quiescent. Finally, for Step 3, we require that all operation
calls be committed when the object becomes quiescent – until then operation calls remain
uncommitted.

An index \( m \) is quiescent iff the last completed operation call for each process \( p \) has been
followed by \( \xi(p) \). We say that \( p \in P \) is quiescent between indices \( m \) and \( n \) of history \( h \) iff \( m \) is
We now formalise the correctness condition defined by Derrick et al. [12], which we refer to as weak flush consistency. Informally, weak flush consistency captures the idea that an operation call may be considered to be active only until the last pending write corresponding to the operation call is flushed. This differs from weak ξ-quiescent consistency, since an operation call may become inactive even if the buffer of the calling process is non-empty.

Derrick et al. [12] define weak flush consistency in terms of linearizability of transformed histories. Their (deterministic) transformation algorithm proceeds as follows: (i) the final flush corresponding to each operation call is located, (ii) the actual return is moved to this flush, and (iii) all remaining flushes are removed from the history. The standard definition of linearizability is then applied to the transformed histories. For example, consider the history where \( \phi^1(p) \) denotes \( k \) consecutive flush events of process \( p \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(inv}(w, \text{put}, x), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}), \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, y), \text{inv}(q, \text{steal}), \phi(q), \phi^3(w), \\
\text{ret}(q, \text{steal}, \text{emp}), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}))
\end{align*}
\]

This history is transformed to

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(inv}(w, \text{put}, x), \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, y), \text{inv}(q, \text{steal}), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}), \text{ret}(q, \text{steal}, \text{emp}), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}))
\end{align*}
\]
then judged consistent because it is linearizable with respect to the sequential history:

\[ \langle \text{inv}(q, \text{steal}), \text{ret}(q, \text{steal}, \text{emp}), \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, x), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}), \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, y), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}) \rangle \]

Using our framework, we can define weak flush consistency directly, i.e., without performing such a history transformation. This involves two small extensions to the Event type. First, we record each flush event. Second, because the number of writes each operation call performs is potentially non-deterministic, we additionally record each write event to identify the last flush corresponding to each operation call. Thus, for Step 1, we define

\[ \text{Event}_C := \text{Event} \mid \omega(P) \mid \phi(P) \].

Here, \( \omega(p) \) denotes a write by process \( p \), and \( \phi(p) \) records a flush for process \( p \). We assume \( \text{write}(e) \) and \( \text{flush}(e) \) hold iff event \( e \) is a write and flush, respectively. We assume that only writes and flushes executed by the concurrent object in question are recorded in the histories, and that writes are executed between matching invocations and responses. Hence, we say such a history \( h \) is legal iff \( h_{\text{Event}} \) is legal and \( \omega(p) \) only occurs in \( h \) when \( p \) is executing some operation. Legality of histories of this type are also extension closed.

For Step 2, we say an operation call that completes after executing \( l \) writes remains active until each of these \( l \) writes have been flushed, or until the return occurs, whichever is later. To formalise this, we define a function \( \text{num} \), which counts the number of events in \( h \) that satisfy event predicate \( ep \) (mapping an event to a boolean) up to and including index \( m \):

\[ \text{num}(ep, m, h) \equiv \text{size}([h(k) \mid 0 \leq k \leq m \land ep(h(k))]) \]

The order condition for weak flush consistency counts the number of writes, say \( l \), that have occurred when an operation call, say \( L \), by process \( p \) returns. Any operation invoked after these \( l \) flushes have occurred may not be reordered with \( L \). Thus, we obtain:

\[ \text{wflc}_{\text{ord}}(h, f) \equiv \forall m, n : \text{dom } f \bullet
\left( \exists p : P \bullet m < n \land \text{ret}_p(h(m)) \land \text{inv}_p(h(n)) \land \text{num}(\text{write}_p, m, h) \leq \text{num}(\text{flush}_p, n, h) \right) \Rightarrow f(m) < f(n) \]

Note that \( \text{num}(\text{write}_p, m, h) \) counts all writes by process \( p \) since initialisation.

For Step 3, we say that completed operation calls whose last write has been flushed must commit. Weak flush consistency has two commitment conditions. The first condition, \( \text{wflc}_{\text{com}1} \), states that an operation call is committed whenever all writes executed by that operation call have been flushed and the call returns. The second, \( \text{wflc}_{\text{com}2} \), requires that an operation call \( L \) that executes \( l \) writes that are not flushed before \( L \) returns is committed whenever \( l \) flushes of the calling process have occurred.

\[ \text{wflc}_{\text{com}1}(h, f) \equiv \forall n : \text{dom } f \bullet
\left( \exists p : P \bullet \text{ret}_p(h(n)) \land \text{num}(\text{flush}_p, n, h) = \text{num}(\text{write}_p, n, h) \right) \Rightarrow n \in \text{dom } f \]

\[ \text{wflc}_{\text{com}2}(h, f) \equiv \forall k, n : \text{dom } f \bullet
\left( \exists p : P \bullet n < k \land \text{ret}_p(h(n)) \land \text{flush}_p(k) \land \text{num}(\text{write}_p, n, h) = \text{num}(\text{flush}_p, k, h) \right) \Rightarrow n \in \text{dom } f \]

\[ \textbf{Definition 14.} \text{ A concurrent object } C \text{ implementing an abstract object } A \text{ is weakly flush consistent iff } C \models_A \text{ WFLC}, \text{ where WFLC} \equiv \text{VMF} \land \text{wflc}_{\text{ord}} \land \text{wflc}_{\text{com}1} \land \text{wflc}_{\text{com}2}. \]

\[ \textbf{Example 15.} \text{ Consider the histories below, neither of which is linearizable, where } \omega^k(p) \text{ denotes } k \text{ consecutive } \omega(p) \text{ events.} \]
The argument is complex and combines the most sophisticated types of reasoning from linearizability proofs (i.e., those that require reasoning about future behaviour [29, 21] and about linearization points in other operations [11, 8]) with the additional complexities of reasoning about delayed operations [12, 32]. We use the term commit point to refer to the atomic program statement that causes the effect of an operation to be felt abstractly; this is analogous to a linearization point in a linearizability proof [10, 8]. We provide a proof sketch for this argument below.

\begin{align}
&\langle \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, x), \omega^3(w), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}), \phi^2(w), \text{inv}(q, \text{steal}), \phi(w), \omega^3(q), \\
&\phi^3(q), \text{ret}(q, \text{steal}, \text{emp}) \rangle \\
&\langle \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, x), \omega^3(w), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}), \phi^2(w), \text{inv}(q, \text{steal}), \omega^3(q), \phi^3(q), \\
&\text{ret}(q, \text{steal}, \text{emp}) \rangle
\end{align}

History (2) is weakly flush consistent; the steal operation is invoked before the final flush of the put occurs, and hence the active intervals of the put and steal overlap, allowing the steal to be ordered before the put, i.e., (2) is flush consistent with respect to sequential history \(\langle \text{inv}(q, \text{steal}), \text{ret}(q, \text{steal}, \text{emp}), \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, x), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}) \rangle\). On the other hand, (3) is not weakly flush consistent because the active intervals of put and steal do not overlap, namely, the steal is invoked after the final flush of put has occurred, and hence, cannot be ordered before the put.

4.5 Sequential Consistency for TSO Memory

Both weak \(\xi\)-quiescent consistency and weak flush consistency allow operation calls for the same process to be reordered, i.e., sequential consistency may be violated. If sequential consistency is required, the following history should be judged incorrect even though both put operation calls are “active” over the interval in which the steal occurs.

\[ HC_3 \equiv \langle \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, x), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}), \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, y), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}), \text{inv}(q, \text{steal}), \xi(q), \text{ret}(q, \text{steal}, y), \xi(q), \xi(w) \rangle \]

Because put operations add elements to the end of the deque and steal operations remove elements from the beginning, the only way to explain \(HC_3\) is by reordering the first two put calls, violating sequential consistency. It turns out that sequential consistency is an important property. In fact, it is equivalent to observational refinement between a concrete object and its abstract specification for data independent clients [15]. The notion of observational refinement is based on observing the initial and final values of variables of client programs.

An implementation \(C\) of a data structure is an observational refinement of an implementation \(A\) of the same data structure, if every observable behaviour of any client program using \(C\) can also be observed when the program uses \(A\) instead. [15, pg 412]

Data independence states that each process accesses only local variables or resources in its client operations. We therefore define sequentially consistent versions of weak \(\xi\)-quiescent consistency and weak flush consistency. This is straightforward in our framework and involves adding the already defined order condition \(sc\) as a conjunct, i.e., the sequentially consistent versions are obtained via a different instantiation of Step 2.

\textbf{Definition 16.} Suppose \(C\) is a concurrent object implementing an abstract object \(A\). We say \(C\) is

- \(\xi\)-quiescent consistent iff \(C \models_A QC_\xi\), where \(QC_\xi \equiv WQC_\xi \land sc\)
- flush consistent iff \(C \models_A FLC\), where \(FLC \equiv WFLC \land sc\).

It is possible to prove that the deque in Fig. 1 is flush consistent under TSO memory. The argument is complex and combines the most sophisticated types of reasoning from linearizability proofs (i.e., those that require reasoning about future behaviour [29, 21] and about linearization points in other operations [11, 8]) with the additional complexities of reasoning about delayed operations [12, 32]. We use the term commit point to refer to the atomic program statement that causes the effect of an operation to be felt abstractly; this is analogous to a linearization point in a linearizability proof [10, 8]. We provide a proof sketch for this argument below.
Proposition 17. The work-stealing deque in Fig. 1 is flush consistent under TSO with respect to the abstract deque in Fig. 2.

Proof. A standard representation relation is used to relate the concrete array used by Fig. 1 with the abstract sequence in Fig. 2. We assume the existence of a program counter variable \( p_c_p \) for each process \( p \), with value \textit{idle} if \( p \) is currently not invoking any operation and value \( P_1, \ldots, P_3, S_1, \ldots S_7, T_1, \ldots T_{14} \) corresponding to the labels in Fig. 1, otherwise.

To cope with delayed operations, we record operation calls that have returned without committing in an auxiliary variable \( g \in P \to \text{seq Event} \). Each invocation by process \( p \) appends a corresponding invoke event in \( g(p) \), and each return that has not committed appends the corresponding return event to \( g(p) \). Therefore, \( g(p) \) records the sequence of uncommitted calls by \( p \) in real-time order. To ensure sequential consistency, pending operations are committed by process \( p \) by removing the first two elements from \( g(p) \) (which must be an invocation/return), then executing the corresponding operation abstractly. The commit points of the algorithm are as follows.

- A \texttt{flush} by a worker process of a pending write to \texttt{Tail} when \( p_{cw} \in \{\text{idle}, T_1, T_2\} \). The only possible pending operation in this case is \texttt{put}, which is committed.

- A \texttt{flush} by a worker process of a pending write to \texttt{Tail} when \( p_{cw} = T_3 \), which commits the first pending operation \( g(w) \). There are two cases depending on the value of \texttt{head}(\texttt{g}(w)). If \texttt{head}(\texttt{g}(w)).\texttt{i} = \texttt{put}, then the \texttt{flush} corresponds to committing a completed \texttt{put} (that has already returned). Otherwise, there are 3 further cases. The two simpler cases are: (i) if \texttt{Tail} > \texttt{Head} in the post state, then the \texttt{flush} must commit the currently executing \texttt{take} operation, and (ii) if \texttt{Tail} < \texttt{Head}, then the \texttt{flush} must commit a \texttt{take} that returns \texttt{emp}. The difficult case is if \texttt{Tail} = \texttt{Head} in the post state, which signifies the case where there is only one task in the deque, causing the current \texttt{take} operation to race with a \texttt{steal} operation executed by another process. If there is an active \texttt{steal} operation at \texttt{S4} or \texttt{S5}, there are two possible outcomes, depending on the \textit{future} execution of the program:
  - the active \texttt{steal} operation succeeds and the \texttt{take} returns \texttt{emp} (via \texttt{T14}), or
  - the \texttt{take} succeeds and the \texttt{steal} tries again.

One of the two outcomes must be determined at this \texttt{flush} because any other operations \texttt{steal} invoked (by a third process) after the \texttt{flush} has been executed will return \texttt{emp}. Note that if there is no active \texttt{steal} operation at line \texttt{S4} or \texttt{S5}, then the only possible future outcome is that the \texttt{take} succeeds.

- The \texttt{fence} at \texttt{T3}. This commits all pending \texttt{put} operations. Then, commits the executing \texttt{take}, or a \texttt{take} and a \texttt{steal} depending on whether \texttt{Tail} > \texttt{Head}, \texttt{Tail} < \texttt{Head} or \texttt{Tail} = \texttt{Head} holds in the post state, as in the \texttt{flush} case described above.

- A successful \texttt{cas} at \texttt{S6}. Assuming the \texttt{steal} is executed by a process \( p \neq w \), there are two cases, depending on the value of \( g(p) \). If \( g(p) = \langle \text{inv}(p, \text{steal}, \bot) \rangle \), then the \texttt{steal} has not yet been committed earlier, and the successful \texttt{cas} commits the \texttt{steal}. Otherwise, \( g(p) = \langle \text{ret}(p, \text{steal}, \text{tout}) \rangle \) holds, i.e., the \texttt{steal} has been committed earlier (by a \texttt{flush} or \texttt{fence} as above), and hence, the \texttt{cas} is not a commit point.

Interestingly, the \texttt{cas} at \texttt{T12} is not a commit point because the \texttt{take} operation must have already been committed either at the \texttt{fence} at \texttt{T3} or an earlier \texttt{flush}.

Using a weaker condition than linearizability has allowed us to prove correctness with respect to a standard sequential abstract specification. This differs from [6, 17], where linearizability is established, but the abstract specification differs from what one would
expect. In particular, [6] uses an abstraction that executes using TSO semantics, whereas [17] includes additional non-determinism to cope with buffer effects at the concrete level.

4.6 Fence Consistency

\(\xi\)-quiescent consistency is simple, but provides relatively weak guarantees about a program’s behaviour; flush consistency on the other hand is a conservative weakening of linearizability (providing strong behavioural guarantees), but is relatively complex as both writes and flushes need to be recorded in a history. Following the formalisations in the preceding sections, we identify a new correctness condition, fence consistency, that is weaker than flush consistency, but stronger than \(\xi\)-quiescent consistency. The condition aims to capture the fact that in many cases, if the buffer of a process \(p\) becomes empty at index \(m\) of a history, then completed operation calls for \(p\) before \(m\) should not be reordered with operations invoked after \(m\). This means that the event corresponding to a “buffer becoming empty” is a barrier to reordering, which is precisely the intention of a programmer specified fence instruction. This condition is potentially useful for developing algorithms that offer more optimisation possibilities than flush consistency.

Fence consistency has the characteristics of both flush consistency and \(\xi\)-quiescent consistency. Like \(\xi\)-quiescent consistency, for Step 1 we instantiate Event \(C := \text{Event} | \xi\langle P\rangle\) and record \(\xi(p)\) for \(p \in P\) events in the same way. Step 2 is similar to flush consistency: we say an operation call is active until the buffer of the calling process is empty; operation calls may only be reordered if the intervals in which they are active overlap. For Step 3, we require operation calls executed by process \(p\) to be committed when \(p\)’s buffer becomes empty. Finally, we require sequential consistency. The ordering condition for fence consistency states that if \(\xi(p)\) occurs at an index \(k\) of history \(h\), then any operation calls of process \(p\) (i.e., returned) before \(k\) are not reordered with an operation call by any process invoked after \(k\), i.e.,

\[
fc_{\text{ord}}(h,f) \triangleq \forall m,n : \text{dom } f \bullet \text{ret}(h(m)) \land \text{inv}(h(n)) \land \\
(\exists k : \text{dom } h \bullet m < k < n \land \text{empty}(h(k)) \land h(m).pr = h(k).pr) \\
\Rightarrow f(m) < f(n)
\]

Furthermore, if \(\xi(p)\) occurs at an index \(k\) of history \(h\), then all completed operation calls of \(p\) occurring before \(k\) must have been committed, i.e.,

\[
fc_{\text{com}}(h,f) \triangleq \forall n,k : \text{dom } h \bullet n < k \land \text{ret}(h(n)) \land \text{empty}(h(k)) \land \\
h(n).pr = h(k).pr \Rightarrow n \in \text{dom } f
\]

\textbf{Definition 18.} A concurrent object \(C\) implementing an abstract object \(A\) is fence consistent iff \(A \models FC\), where \(FC \equiv \text{VMF} \land \text{sc} \land fc_{\text{ord}} \land fc_{\text{com}}\).

\textbf{Example 19.} In a fence consistent history, \(\xi(p)\) does not prevent an operation call for \(p\) that is still executing from being reordered. This is for good reason. For example, consider the following history of the Chase-Lev deque:

\[
(\text{inv}(w,\text{put},x), \xi(w), \text{ret}(w,\text{put}), \text{inv}(q,\text{steal}), \text{ret}(q,\text{steal},\text{emp}), \xi(q), \xi(w))
\]

Here, we know that even though an \(\xi(w)\) occurs between \(\text{inv}(w,\text{put},x)\) and \(\text{ret}(w,\text{put})\), process \(w\)’s buffer is non-empty when the \(\text{put}\) returns because \(\text{ret}(w,\text{put})\) is not immediately followed by \(\xi(w)\). Therefore, a \text{steal} operation may read an old value of \text{Tail}. Fence consistency states that the \text{put} operation is active until the second \(\xi(w)\) occurs, allowing (4) to be judged consistent with respect to to the sequential history:

\[
(\text{inv}(q,\text{steal}), \text{ret}(q,\text{steal},\text{emp}), \text{inv}(w,\text{put},x), \text{ret}(w,\text{put}))
\]
Example 20. Fence consistency does not require an operation call to commit unless \( \xi(p) \) occurs after the operation call has returned. For example, the history
\[
\langle \text{inv}(w, \text{put}, x), \xi(w), \text{ret}(w, \text{put}), \text{inv}(q, \text{steal}), \text{ret}(q, \text{steal}, \text{emp}), \xi(q) \rangle
\]
is fence consistent with respect to history \( \langle \text{inv}(q, \text{steal}), \text{ret}(q, \text{steal}, \text{emp}) \rangle \), where the effect of the put has not yet been reflected abstractly.

The next two theorems establish that fence consistency is both non-blocking and compositional. The non-blocking property pertains to total operations, which are operations for which a return is well-defined in any system state. A correctness condition is non-blocking iff total operations can always complete, i.e., are never prevented from completing by the correctness condition itself. A correctness condition \( R \) is compositional if for any multi-object system, the system as a whole satisfies \( R \) iff each object of the system satisfies \( R \), which ensures that \( R \) can be proved in a modular manner. The lack of compositionalty of sequential consistency was a key motivation for Herlihy and Wing to introduce linearizability, which is compositional [23], and hence, we see compositionalty as being an important property.

Lemma 21. Suppose \( m \in \text{dom } h \) such that \( \pi(m, h) \) holds, \( h(m).i \) is a total operation, and \( e \) is an event such that \( \text{matching}(h(m), e) \) holds. Then, \( \text{FC}(h, f) \Rightarrow \exists f' \bullet \text{FC}(h \bowtie (e), f') \).

Lemma 22. Suppose \( h \) is a history, \( f \) is a mapping function, \( hr \) is a sequence of returns and \( hr' \) a permutation of \( hr \). Then \( \text{FC}(h \bowtie hr, f) \Rightarrow \exists f' \bullet \text{FC}(h \bowtie hr', f') \).

Theorem 23 (Fence consistency is non-blocking). Suppose \( \text{FC}(he, f) \), where \( he \) extends history \( h \) and \( f \) is a mapping function. If \( m \in \text{dom } h \) is an index such that \( \pi(m, h) \) and \( h(m).i \) is a total operation, then there exists an event \( e \) such that \( \text{matching}(h(m), e) \), an extension \( he' \) of \( h \bowtie (e) \), and a mapping function \( f' \) such that \( \text{FC}(he', f') \).

Proof. Suppose \( he = h \bowtie hr \). Because \( h(m).i \) is total, the return event \( e \) is well defined. We must now show that \( he \) is fence consistent.

- If \( m \in \text{dom } f \), then because \( \pi(m, h) \land \text{emf_com}(he, f) \) holds, \( e \in \text{ran } hr \). Furthermore, by Lemma 22, there must exist an \( hr' \) such that \( \text{ran}(hr') = \text{ran}(hr) \setminus \{e\} \) (i.e., \( (e) \bowtie hr' \) is a permutation of \( hr \)) and \( \text{FC}(h \bowtie (e) \bowtie hr', f') \) holds.

- Otherwise, i.e., \( m \notin \text{dom } f \), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{FC}(he, f) & \Rightarrow \exists f' \bullet \text{FC}(he \bowtie (e), f') \quad \text{by Lemma 21} \\
& \equiv \exists f' \bullet \text{FC}(h \bowtie hr \bowtie (e), f') \quad \text{definition of } he \\
& \equiv \exists f'' \bullet \text{FC}(h \bowtie (e) \bowtie hr, f') \quad \text{Lemma 22} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Compositionality refers to histories of multiple concurrent objects [22]. To formalise this, one must consider histories in which the object corresponding to each event may be distinguished, and hence the event types above must be extended with object names. We assume \( e.obj \) returns the object corresponding to event \( e \). For an object \( z \) and history \( h \), we let \( h_{iz} \) denote the subhistory of \( h \) with all events of object \( z \). Prior to our new result that fence consistency is compositional (Theorem 24), we give a new proof of compositionality for linearizability.

Theorem 24 (Linearizability is compositional). For any history \( h \), there exists an extension \( he \) of \( h \) and a mapping function \( f \) such that \( \text{LIN}(he, f) \) if, and only if, for each object \( z \), there exists an extension \( he_z \) of \( h_{iz} \) and a mapping function \( f_z \) such that \( \text{LIN}(he_z, f_z) \).
Thus, we assume valid sequential history in which the order of operation calls are minimal. Thus, we assume valid sequential history in which the order of operation calls are minimal, then pick contradiction to minimality of operation calls where he(n) returns before he(m'), and f reorders these calls when mapping to hs. Suppose he(n).obj = z and he(m').obj = z', and let an and am' be the operation calls corresponding to he(n) and he(m') in hs, respectively. If z = z', we get an immediate contradiction to the assumption that there exists an he_z and f_z such that LIN(he_z, f_z) holds. Therefore, we assume z ≠ z'.

Now, pick an f such that the number of reordered operation calls that invalidate lin(he, f) are minimal, then pick n, m' ∈ dom f such that f(n) − f(m') is minimal and n, m' violate lin(he, f). Because ret?(he(n)) ∧ inv?(he(m')) is the smallest possible value of f(n) − f(m') is 3, which occurs if, in hs, the operation call an occurs immediately after am'. However, in this case, because z ≠ z', operation calls an and am' commute, i.e., there must exist another valid sequential history in which the order of an and am' are swapped, and we obtain a contradiction to f(n) > f(m'). Therefore, assume f(n) − f(m') > 3, i.e., some finite number of operation calls a_1, a_2, ..., a_k, occur between f(m') and f(n) in hs.

Consider a_1, and suppose the invocation/return events corresponding to a_1 occur at m_1 and n_1 in he, respectively. We must have m_1 < n ∧ m' < n_1, otherwise, we obtain a contradiction to minimality of f(n) − f(m') (see Fig. 6). Let y = a_1.obj be the object corresponding to a_1. We now have two cases.

- Case y ≠ z'. Because operations of different objects commute, calls a_1 and am' may be swapped in hs, to produce another valid sequential history hs' and mapping f' such that f'(n) − f'(m') < f(n) − f(m'), contradicting minimality of f(n) − f(m') (see Fig. 7).
- Case y = z'. Here, a_1 and am' may not be swapped, however, we must have a_2.obj = a_3.obj = ... = a_k.obj = z', otherwise, we may swap the first a_1 such that a_i.obj ≠ z' with each of am', a_1,...,a_{k−1} to again contradict minimality of f(n) − f(m'). However, we now have a_k.obj = z' and an.obj = z, i.e., a_k.obj ≠ an.obj, so a_k and an may be swapped to produce a valid sequential history, giving us our final contradiction.

Proof. The only if direction is trivial.

For the other direction, for each object z, suppose LIN(he_z, f_z) holds for some extension he_z of h_z and mapping function f_z. The proof is by contradiction. Suppose that for every extension he of h, and every mapping f to a sequential history, we have:

$$\neg LIN(he, f) = \neg VMF(he, f) \lor \neg lin(he, f) \lor \neg total(he, f),$$

by definition

$$VMF(he, f) \land total(he, f) \Rightarrow \neg lin(he, f),$$

by logic

Thus, we assume VMF(he, f) ∧ total(he, f) and prove ¬lin(he, f).

For ¬lin(he, f) to hold, by definition, there must exist indices n, m' in he such that n < m' ∧ ret?(he(n)) ∧ inv?(he(m')) ∧ f(n) > f(m'), i.e., n and m' are indices of operation calls where he(n) returns before he(m'), and f reorders these calls when mapping to hs. Suppose he(n).obj = z and he(m').obj = z', and let an and am' be the operation calls corresponding to he(n) and he(m') in hs, respectively. If z = z', we get an immediate contradiction to the assumption that there exists an he_z and f_z such that LIN(he_z, f_z) holds. Therefore, we assume z ≠ z'.

Now, pick an f such that the number of reordered operation calls that invalidate lin(he, f) are minimal, then pick n, m' ∈ dom f such that f(n) − f(m') is minimal and n, m' violate lin(he, f). Because ret?(he(n)) ∧ inv?(he(m')) is the smallest possible value of f(n) − f(m') is 3, which occurs if, in hs, the operation call an occurs immediately after am'. However, in this case, because z ≠ z', operation calls an and am' commute, i.e., there must exist another valid sequential history in which the order of an and am' are swapped, and we obtain a contradiction to f(n) > f(m'). Therefore, assume f(n) − f(m') > 3, i.e., some finite number of operation calls a_1, a_2, ..., a_k, occur between f(m') and f(n) in hs.

Consider a_1, and suppose the invocation/return events corresponding to a_1 occur at m_1 and n_1 in he, respectively. We must have m_1 < n ∧ m' < n_1, otherwise, we obtain a contradiction to minimality of f(n) − f(m') (see Fig. 6). Let y = a_1.obj be the object corresponding to a_1. We now have two cases.

- Case y ≠ z'. Because operations of different objects commute, calls a_1 and am' may be swapped in hs, to produce another valid sequential history hs' and mapping f' such that f'(n) − f'(m') < f(n) − f(m'), contradicting minimality of f(n) − f(m') (see Fig. 7).
- Case y = z'. Here, a_1 and am' may not be swapped, however, we must have a_2.obj = a_3.obj = ... = a_k.obj = z', otherwise, we may swap the first a_1 such that a_i.obj ≠ z' with each of am', a_1,...,a_{k−1} to again contradict minimality of f(n) − f(m'). However, we now have a_k.obj = z' and an.obj = z, i.e., a_k.obj ≠ an.obj, so a_k and an may be swapped to produce a valid sequential history, giving us our final contradiction.
Theorem 25 (Fence consistency is compositional). For any history \( h \), there exists an extension \( h' \) of \( h \) and a mapping function \( f \) such that \( FC(h', f) \) if, and only if, for each object \( z \), there exists an extension \( h'_z \) of \( h_z \) and a mapping function \( f_z \) such that \( FC(h'_z, f_z) \).

Proof. The only if direction is trivial.

For the other direction, for each object \( z \), suppose \( FC(h'_z, f_z) \) holds for some extension \( h'_z \) of \( h_z \) and mapping function \( f_z \). The proof is by contradiction. Suppose that for every extension \( h' \) of \( h \), and every mapping \( f \) to a sequential history, we have:

\[
\neg FC(h', f) = \neg VMF(h', f) \vee \neg sc(h', f) \vee \neg fc_{ord}(h', f) \vee \neg fc_{com}(h', f) \quad , \text{by definition}
\]

\[
VMF(h', f) \land sc(h', f) \land fc_{com}(h', f) \Rightarrow \neg fc_{ord}(h', f) \quad , \text{by logic}
\]

Assuming \( VMF(h', f) \land sc(h', f) \land fc_{com}(h', f) \) holds, we attempt to prove \( \neg fc_{ord}(h', f) \).

For \( \neg fc_{ord}(h', f) \), by definition, there must exist indices \( n, m' \) in \( h' \) such that

\[
n < l < m' \land f(n) > f(m') \quad (6)
\]

\[
\text{ret}(h(n)) \land \text{empty}(h(l)) \land \text{inv}(h(m')) \land h(n).pr = h(l).pr \quad (7)
\]

By (6), \( f \) reorder operation calls \( h(n) \) and \( h(m') \), and by (7), \( n, l, \) and \( m' \) are indices corresponding to a return, empty and invocation, respectively and both \( h(n) \) and \( h(l) \) correspond to the same process. We assume \( h(e).obj = z \) and \( h(m').obj = z' \), and let \( an \) and \( am' \) be the operation calls corresponding to \( h(e) \) and \( h(m') \) in \( hs \), respectively. If \( z = z' \), we get an immediate contradiction to the existence of an extension \( h'_e \) of \( h_e \) and mapping function \( f_z \) such that \( FC(h'_e, f_z) \). Therefore, we assume \( z \neq z' \).

Pick an \( f \) as well as indices \( n \) and \( m' \) as in Theorem 24. For the minimal value of \( f(n) - f(m') \) (i.e., if \( f(n) - f(m') = 3 \)) we obtain a contradiction as in Theorem 24. Therefore, assume \( f(n) - f(m') > 3 \), i.e., some finite number of operation calls \( a_1, a_2, ..., a_k \), occur between \( f(m') \) and \( f(n) \) in \( hs \). Consider \( a_k \), and suppose the invocation/return events corresponding to \( a_k \) occur at \( m_k \) and \( n_k \) in \( h \), respectively. We have that \( a_k.obj \neq z \) (otherwise we get a contradiction to minimality by swapping \( a_k \) and \( am' \)) and cases:

- If \( l < m_k \) or \( n_k < l \), because \( a_k.obj \neq z \) we obtain an immediate contradiction to the assumption that \( an \) and \( am' \) are different objects such that \( f(n) - f(m') \) is minimal.
- Else if \( m_k < n \land m' < n_k \), the proof proceeds as in Theorem 24.
- Else if \( n < m_k < l \), then \( a_k.obj = z \), otherwise we can swap \( a_k \) and \( an \) to contradict minimality of \( f(n) - f(m') \). In fact \( a_i.obj = z \) must hold for all \( 1 \leq i \leq k \). But now \( am'.obj \neq a_i.obj \), and hence can be swapped, once again contradicting minimality.
- Finally, if \( l < n_k < m' \), we obtain our final contradiction to minimality of \( f(n) - f(m') \) using a similar argument to \( n < m_k < l \).

5 A Correctness Condition Hierarchy

As we’ve seen, there are several different correctness conditions that are appropriate for different types of algorithms over different memory architectures. The literature includes many others (e.g., \( k \)-linearizability [20], eventual consistency [36], quantitative quiescent consistency [25]), which we have not covered in this paper.

Using our framework, for the conditions we have considered, it is possible to formally establish a hierarchy based on order and commitment properties. We first link \( \xi \)-quiescent, fence and flush consistency. Fence and flush consistency are defined on histories that consider slightly different aspects of a system’s behaviour. To relate the two conditions, we
consider histories in which writes and flushes as well as buffer empty events are recorded. To this end, we define $\text{Event}_f := \text{Event} \mid \langle \phi(P) \rangle$, $\text{Event}_e := \text{Event} \mid \omega \langle P \rangle$ and $\text{Event}_C := \text{Event}_f \mid \text{Event}_e$, with the understanding that $\langle \phi(p), \xi(p) \rangle$ is concatenated to the history if the flush $\phi(p)$ causes the buffer of process $p$ to become empty, while $\langle \text{ret}(p, \text{op}, \text{out}), \xi(p) \rangle$ is concatenated whenever $\text{ret}(p, \text{op}, \text{out})$ occurs and the buffer of $p$ is empty. A history $h$ is legal if both $h_{\text{Event}_e}$ and $h_{\text{Event}_f}$ are legal. This definition of legal is also extension closed.

**Proposition 26.**
1. $\text{FLC} \Rightarrow \text{FC}$, but not vice versa, and
2. $\text{FC} \Rightarrow \text{QC}_\xi$, but not vice versa.

**Proof.**
1. The forward direction follows by expanding the definitions of $\text{FLC}$ and $\text{FC}$, then using the fact that both $\text{wflc}\_\text{ord} \Rightarrow \text{fc}\_\text{ord}$ and $\text{wflc}\_\text{com} \Rightarrow \text{fc}\_\text{com}$. To show the other direction does not hold, consider the following history, where $p, q \in P$ and $\text{enq, deq}$ are enqueue and dequeue operations on a concurrent queue, respectively. The history is clearly a legal fence consistent history, but it is not flush consistent.

$$\langle \text{inv}(p, \text{enq}, 1), \omega(p), \text{ret}(p, \text{enq}), \text{inv}(p, \text{enq}, 2), \omega(p), \phi(p), \text{inv}(q, \text{deq}), \text{ret}(p, \text{enq}), \phi(p), \xi(p), \text{ret}(q, \text{deq, emp}), \xi(q) \rangle$$

2. The forward direction follows by expanding the definitions of $\text{FC}$ and $\text{WQC}_\xi$, then using the fact that both $\text{fc}\_\text{ord} \Rightarrow \text{wqc}\_\text{ord}_\xi$ and $\text{fc}\_\text{com} \Rightarrow \text{wqc}\_\text{com}_\xi$ hold. To show the other direction does not hold, consider the following history, where $q_1, q_2, q_3 \in P$ and $\text{enq, deq}$ are enqueue and dequeue operations on a concurrent queue, respectively. The history is clearly $\xi$-quiescent consistent, but not fence consistent.

$$\langle \text{inv}(q_1, \text{enq}, 1), \text{ret}(q_1, \text{enq}), \text{inv}(q_2, \text{enq}, 2), \xi(q_1), \text{inv}(q_3, \text{enq}, 3), \text{ret}(q_2, \text{enq}), \xi(q_2), \text{ret}(q_3, \text{enq}), \xi(q_3), \text{inv}(q_1, \text{deq}), \text{ret}(q_1, \text{deq}, 3) \rangle$$

It is also possible to link correctness conditions on totally ordered memory with those on TSO memory. It is straightforward to prove the following propositions.

**Proposition 27.** If $h$ is legal, then for any mapping function $f$, $\text{LIN}(h, f) \Rightarrow \text{FLC}(h, f)$.

One may think of totally ordered memory as being a special case of TSO memory where the buffer is always empty. Here, using the strategy for recording histories of type $\text{History}_f$ described in Section 4.2, under totally ordered memory, the return for each process $p$ is immediately followed by $\xi(p)$, i.e.,

$$\text{ret}_\text{emp}(h) \equiv \forall n : \text{dom } h, p : P \bullet \text{ret}_p?(h(n)) \Rightarrow n + 1 \in \text{dom } h \land \text{empty}_p?(h(n + 1))$$

**Proposition 28.** If $h$ is legal and $\text{ret}_\text{emp}(h)$ holds, then for any mapping function $f$, $\text{LIN}(h, f) \Leftrightarrow \text{FC}(h, f)$ and $\text{QC}(h, f) \Leftrightarrow \text{WQC}_\xi(h, f)$.

One may also think of totally ordered memory as being a type of TSO memory where flushes occur immediately after each write. Here, using the strategy for recording histories of type $\text{History}_f$ defined in Section 4.4, we obtain the following property, which states that for any process $p$, a flush for $p$ immediately follows each write by $p$.

$$\text{imm}\_\text{fl}(h) \equiv \forall n : \text{dom } h, p : P \bullet \omega_p?(h(n)) \Rightarrow n + 1 \in \text{dom } h \land \phi_p(h(n + 1))$$

**Proposition 29.** Suppose $h \in \text{History}_f$ is legal and $\text{imm}\_\text{fl}(h)$ holds. Then for any mapping function $f$, $\text{LIN}(h, f) \Leftrightarrow \text{FLC}(h, f)$. 
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Figure 8 Relationships between correctness conditions for a history \( h \) and mapping function \( f \). The arrows represent implication with dashed versions representing conditional implication; the label on each arrow represents the required condition. The conditions within solid boxes ensure sequential consistency.

An overview of the hierarchy is presented in Fig. 8, where we assume \( h \) is a legal history and \( f \) a mapping function. Each solid arrow in Fig. 8 denotes implication, and each dashed arrow denotes conditional implication with the condition corresponding to the label. Note that Fig. 8 allows one to easily deduce transitivity properties, e.g., if \( FC(h, f) \) and \( ret\_emp(h) \) hold, then \( SC(h, f) \) holds.

6 Conclusions

Correctness of a concurrent object is defined with respect to a correctness condition, which is a relation on its behaviours against those of a sequential specification object. Algorithms implementing such objects must cope with the additional challenges of distributed memory; the low-level effects of write buffers in most modern processors (e.g., x86, ARM) only provide relaxed memory guarantees. The end goals of programmers that use concurrent objects and designers that develop algorithms for concurrent objects differ, a large number of correctness conditions have been defined in the literature. We have provided a framework within which these can be formalised, which in turn allows the relative strengths of different conditions to be compared.

Within our framework, we have defined well-known conditions for totally ordered memory (sequential consistency, linearizability and quiescent consistency), as well as newly developed conditions for TSO memory (weak \( \xi \)-quiescent consistency and weak flush consistency). To characterise implementations that are also sequentially consistent, we define stricter variations of both conditions that guarantee sequential consistency. We identify and develop a new compositional condition for TSO architectures, fence consistency, which is weaker than flush consistency, but stricter than \( \xi \)-quiescent consistency. Notable in our framework is the capability of specifying partial commitment properties, which provide the flexibility needed to cope with delayed operation effects due to relaxed memory.

The study of correctness conditions for concurrent objects under relaxed memory is new [12, 32, 35, 17, 6]. Of these, [12, 17, 6, 35] consider linearizability, but [17, 6] facilitate optimisation (via fence removal) by weakening the abstract specification, while [12, 35] weaken definition of linearizability so that the interval of execution for an operation is expanded. We believe flush consistency to be equivalent to the weaker definition of linearizability given in [35], however because Travkin et al. [35] do not provide a formal definition, this is difficult to verify. Jagadeesan et al [24] provide a framework that enables one to develop correctness conditions for many different relaxed memory models by decoupling buffer effects from the correctness conditions at hand, however, they only formalise sequential consistency and linearizability. More recently, Batty et al. [5] have developed methods for proving observational refinement
directly for C11 specifications, which are weaker than TSO. They develop a compositional correctness condition that is stricter than linearizability when C11 is restricted to totally ordered behaviours. Using our framework to formalise their correctness condition to compare them to the conditions in this paper is a subject of further study. Future work will also consider correctness conditions for software transactional memory [19].

This paper has mainly considered correctness conditions from an algorithm designer’s perspective. Satisfying the requirements of programmers introduces another dimension to this problem (e.g., [18]). Our work does not differ from, say [17, 6], in that observational refinement is only assured for data independent clients. Extending our results to cope with other real-world issues such as ownership transfer (like [17, 6]) is a subject of future work.
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