

Combining Symbolic Execution and Model Checking to Verify MPI Programs

HENGBIAO YU, National University of Defense Technology, China

ZHENBANG CHEN, National University of Defense Technology, China

XIANJIN FU, National University of Defense Technology, China

JI WANG, National University of Defense Technology, China

ZHENDONG SU, University of California, Davis, USA

WEI DONG, National University of Defense Technology, China

CHUN HUANG, National University of Defense Technology, China

Message Passing Interface (MPI) is the standard paradigm of programming in high performance computing. MPI programming takes significant effort, and is error-prone. Thus, effective tools for analyzing MPI programs are much needed. On the other hand, analyzing MPI programs itself is challenging because of non-determinism caused by program inputs and non-deterministic operations. Existing approaches for analyzing MPI programs either do not handle inputs or fail to support programs with mixed blocking and non-blocking operations.

This paper presents MPI symbolic verifier (MPI-SV), the first symbolic execution based tool for verifying MPI programs having both blocking and non-blocking operations. To ensure soundness, we propose a blocking-driven matching algorithm to safely handle non-deterministic operations, and a method to soundly and completely model the equivalent behavior of a program execution path. The models of MPI program paths are generated on-the-fly during symbolic execution, and verified *w.r.t.* the expected properties by model checking. To improve scalability, MPI-SV uses the results of model checking to prune redundant paths.

We have implemented MPI-SV and evaluated it on the verification of deadlock freedom for 108 real-world MPI tasks. The pure symbolic execution based technique can successfully verify 61 out of the 108 tasks (56%) within one hour, while in comparison, MPI-SV can verify 94 tasks (87%), a 31% improvement. On average, MPI-SV also achieves 7.25X speedup on verifying deadlock freedom and 2.64X speedup on finding deadlocks. These experimental results are promising, and demonstrate MPI-SV's effectiveness and efficiency.

1 INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, an increasing number of high performance computing (HPC) applications have been developed to solve large-scale problems [Buyya et al. 1999]. The Message Passing Interface (MPI) [Snir 1998] is the current *de facto* standard programming paradigm for developing HPC applications. Many MPI programs are developed with significant human efforts. One of the reasons is that MPI programs are *error-prone* because of complex program features (such as *non-determinism* and *non-blocking*) and their large-scale operations. How to improve the reliability of MPI programs has been a challenging problem [Gopalakrishnan et al. 2011].

Program analysis [Nielson et al. 2015] is an effective technique for improving program reliability. Existing methods for analyzing MPI programs can be divided into *dynamic* and *static* approaches. Most existing methods are dynamic, such as correctness checking [Samofalov et al. 2005] and

Authors' addresses: Hengbiao Yu, College of Computer, National University of Defense Technology, China, hengbiaoyu@nudt.edu.cn; Zhenbang Chen, College of Computer, National University of Defense Technology, China, zbchen@nudt.edu.cn; Xianjin Fu, College of Computer, National University of Defense Technology, China, xianjinfu@nudt.edu.cn; Ji Wang, College of Computer, National University of Defense Technology, China, wj@nudt.edu.cn; Zhendong Su, Department of Computer Science, University of California, Davis, USA, su@cs.ucdavis.edu; Wei Dong, College of Computer, National University of Defense Technology, China, wdong@nudt.edu.cn; Chun Huang, College of Computer, National University of Defense Technology, China, chunhuang@nudt.edu.cn.

dynamic verification [Vakkalanka et al. 2008]. These approaches need concrete inputs to run MPI programs and perform analysis based on runtime information. Hence, dynamic approaches may miss input-related program errors. Static approaches [Botbol et al. 2017; Bronevetsky 2009; López et al. 2015; Siegel 2007] analyze abstract models of MPI programs and are confined by false alarms, automation, complex MPI features or scalability. In summary, existing automatic approaches either do not support *input-related* analysis or fail to support the analysis of *mixed blocking* and *non-blocking* MPI programs.

Symbolic execution [Godefroid et al. 2005; King 1976] naturally supports input-related analysis by systematically exploring a program's path space. In principle, symbolic execution provides a balance between concrete execution and static abstraction with improved input coverage or more precise program abstraction. However, all symbolic execution based analyses suffer from path explosion due to the exponential increase of program paths *w.r.t.* the number of conditional statements. The problem becomes even more severe when analyzing MPI programs, because of parallel execution and non-deterministic operations. Furthermore, when analyzing non-blocking MPI programs, it is also challenging to ensure soundness due to highly non-deterministic executions. TASS [Siegel and Zirkel 2011b] and MPISE [Fu et al. 2015] are the existing work of using symbolic execution to analyze MPI programs. TASS employs symbolic execution on automatically extracted models from MPI programs to verify standard safety properties, while MPISE symbolically executes MPI programs, and detects deadlocks and runtime errors. However, neither of these two approaches supports the analysis of non-blocking MPI programs.

This paper presents MPI-SV, the first symbolic execution based tool for verifying mixed blocking and non-blocking MPI programs. The key idea is to use symbolic execution to extract models from MPI programs and verify the models *w.r.t.* the expected properties by model checking [Clarke et al. 1999]. Symbolic execution and model checking complement each other: (1) symbolic execution abstracts the control and data dependences to generate verifiable models for model checking, and (2) model checking improves the scalability of symbolic execution through leveraging the model checking results to prune redundant paths, and enlarges the scope of verifiable properties of symbolic execution.

The main technical novelty of MPI-SV is the design of two algorithms: (1) symbolic execution of *non-blocking* MPI programs with *non-deterministic* operations, and (2) modeling the equivalent behavior of an MPI program path soundly and completely in terms of communicating sequential processes (CSP) [Roscoe 2005]. To safely handle non-deterministic operations, the first algorithm postpones message matchings of non-deterministic operations as late as possible, called *blocking-driven matching*, to ensure the exploration of different matching cases for these operations. To enlarge the scope of verifiable properties and boost symbolic execution, the second algorithm extracts a model from an MPI program path using CSP constructs, such as channel operations, choice and parallel composition. All the path's equivalent behavior by changing the interleavings and matchings of the communication operations in the path is represented by the model. Our modeling algorithm is proved to be sound and complete, and consistent with the MPI standard [Forum 2012]. The generated CSP models from the second algorithm can be fed into a model checker to perform verification *w.r.t.* the expected properties, such as *safety* and *liveness* properties in linear temporal logic (LTL) [Manna and Pnueli 1992]. If the extracted model from a path p satisfies the property φ , p 's equivalent paths can be safely pruned. Otherwise, if the model checker reports a counterexample, a violation of φ is found.

We have implemented MPI-SV for MPI C programs based on Cloud9 [Bucur et al. 2011] and PAT [Sun et al. 2009]. We have used MPI-SV to analyze 11 real-world MPI programs, totaling 47K lines of code (LOC), *w.r.t.* the deadlock freedom property and non-reachability properties. The experimental results demonstrate MPI-SV's effectiveness and efficiency. For all the 108 deadlock

freedom verification tasks, MPI-SV can complete 94 tasks within one hour, *i.e.*, deadlock reported or deadlock freedom verified, while pure symbolic execution can complete 61 tasks. MPI-SV provides a 31% improvement. For the 94 successfully completed tasks, MPI-SV achieves, on average, 7.25X speedup on verifying deadlock freedom and 2.64X speedup on finding a deadlock.

The main contributions of this paper are:

- A synergistic framework combining symbolic execution and model checking for verifying MPI programs that supports the detection of input-related violations, and boosts the scalability of verification;
- A method for symbolic execution of non-blocking MPI programs with non-deterministic operations, and the method is proved to be sound for reachability properties;
- A sound and complete method for modeling the equivalent behavior of an MPI path in terms of CSP, which enlarges the scope of the verifiable properties; and
- A tool for symbolic verification of MPI C programs and an extensive evaluation on real-world MPI programs.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly introduces MPI and illustrates MPI-SV with an example. Section 3 describes the symbolic execution algorithms of MPI-SV. Section 4 presents the approach of model checking based verification and boosting. The implementation and evaluation of MPI-SV are given in Section 5. We discuss related work in Section 6, and conclude in Section 7.

2 ILLUSTRATION

In this section, we first introduce key MPI operations and use an example to illustrate the problem that this work targets. Then, we demonstrate our approach by applying it to the example program.

2.1 Motivating Example

Existing MPI implementations, such as MPICH [Gropp 2002] and OpenMPI [Gabriel et al. 2004], provide the programming interfaces of message passing to support the development of parallel applications. An MPI program can be implemented in different languages, such as C and C++. This paper considers MPI programs written in C. An MPI program is run in many processes spanned across multiple machines. These processes communicate by message passing to accomplish a parallel task. Message passing can be *blocking* or *non-blocking*. First, we introduce some blocking operations:

- `Ssend(i)`: send a message to the *i*th process, and the sending process blocks until the message is received by the destination process.
- `Send(i)`: send a message to the *i*th process, and the sending process blocks until the message is copied into the local sending buffer.
- `Recv(i)`: receive a message from the *i*th process, and the receiving process blocks until the message from the *i*th process is received.
- `Recv(*)`: receive a message from *any* process, and the receiving process blocks until a message is received regardless which process sends the message.
- `Barrier`: block the process until all the processes have called `Barrier`.
- `Wait(req)`: the process blocks until the operation indicated by `req` is completed.

A `Recv(*)` operation, called *wildcard receive*, may receive a message from different processes under different runs, resulting in non-determinism. The blocking of a `Send(i)` operation depends on the size of the local message buffer, which may differ under different MPI implementations. In this paper, we assume that `Send(i)` has an infinite local buffer. Hence, each `Send(i)` operation

returns *immediately* after being issued. Our implementation can also configure the local buffer to be *zero* to find potential violations.

To improve the performance of MPI programs, the MPI library provides non-blocking operations to make computations and communications overlapped. The following are some non-blocking operations:

- `ISend(i, req)`: send a message to the i th process, and the sending process returns immediately after the operation is issued. The parameter `req` is used to indicate the status of the operation.
- `IRecv(i, req)`: receive a message from the i th process, and the receiving process returns immediately after being issued. Similarly, `IRecv(*, req)` is the non-blocking wildcard receive.

The aforementioned operations are key MPI operations. Complex operations, such as `MPI_Bcast` and `MPI_Gather`, can be implemented by composing these key operations. The non-determinism in MPI programs mainly comes from two sources: (1) inputs, which may influence the communications by control flows, and (2) wildcard receives, which lead to highly non-deterministic executions, especially when the number of processes is large.

P_0	P_1	P_2	P_3
Send(1)	if ($x \neq 'a'$) Recv(0) else IRecv(*, req); Recv(3)	Send(1)	Send(1)

Fig. 1. A motivating example of MPI programs.

Consider the MPI program in Figure 1, which is run in four processes. Process P_0 sends a message to P_1 and then terminates. For process P_1 , if input x is *not* equal to 'a', P_1 receives a message from P_0 in a blocking manner; otherwise, P_1 uses a non-blocking wildcard receive to receive a message. Then, P_1 receives a message from P_3 . Like P_0 , P_2 and P_3 only send a message to P_1 and terminate. When x equals 'a' and `IRecv(*, req)` receives the message from P_3 , a *deadlock* will happen, *i.e.* P_1 blocks at `Recv(3)`, and all the other processes terminate. Hence, for detecting the deadlock, we need to handle the non-determinism caused by the input x and the wildcard receive `IRecv(*, req)`. To cover the input, we adopt symbolic execution [King 1976] to systematically explore the path space.

However, there exist two key technical challenges for symbolic execution of MPI programs. The first challenge is how to *systematically explore the paths of an MPI program with non-blocking and wildcard operations*. To ensure soundness, all possible paths need to be explored. However, non-blocking and wildcard operations significantly increase the complexity of MPI programs. A non-blocking operation does not block but returns immediately, causing out-of-order completion. The problem of handling wildcard operations is how to get all the possible matched messages, especially for non-blocking wildcard operations.

The second challenge is how to *improve the scalability of the symbolic execution based analysis*. This challenge is inherent to symbolic execution [King 1976], *i.e.*, the path explosion problem. However, it becomes even more challenging when symbolically executing MPI programs. The MPI processes run concurrently, which leads to exponential number of program paths *w.r.t.* the number of processes. Furthermore, the path space also increases exponentially with the number of wildcard operations.

In the next subsection, we demonstrate how MPI-SV tackles these challenges by applying it to analyze the motivating example in Figure 1.

2.2 Our Approach

MPI-SV combines dynamic verification [Vakkalanka et al. 2008] and model checking [Clarke et al. 1999] to tackle the challenges during symbolic execution. Figure 2 shows the basic framework of MPI-SV.




Fig. 2. The framework of MPI-SV.

The inputs of MPI-SV are an MPI program and a property, *e.g.*, *deadlock freedom*, to be verified. MPI-SV uses the built-in symbolic executor to automatically explore the path space, and checks the property along with path exploration. For each path that violates the property, called a *violation path*, MPI-SV generates a test case that can trigger the violation. The test case contains the inputs of the MPI program, the interleaving sequence of MPI operations and the matchings of non-deterministic MPI operations. While for a *violation-free* path p , MPI-SV builds a CSP model Γ . Γ represents all the equivalent paths of p by changing the interleavings and matchings of the communication operations in p . Then, MPI-SV utilizes a CSP model checker to verify the model *w.r.t.* the property. If the model checker reports a counterexample, a violation is found. Otherwise, if the model satisfies the property, MPI-SV prunes the equivalent paths of the current path. The synergy of symbolic execution and model checking boosts both violation detection and verification.

Consider the MPI program in Figure 1 and the *deadlock freedom* property. Since MPI processes are memory independent, MPI-SV will select a process to execute in a *round-robin* manner to avoid exploring the complete interleavings of the processes. A process keeps running until it blocks or terminates, and the encountered MPI operations are collected instead of being executed. The intuition behind is to collect the message exchanges as thoroughly as possible, which helps find possible matchings for the wildcard receive operations. In this way, MPI-SV first symbolically executes P_0 , which only sends a message to P_1 . Note that the `Send(1)` operation returns immediately with the assumption of infinite local buffers. Hence, P_0 terminates, and the operation `Send(1)` is recorded. Then, MPI-SV starts to execute P_1 and explores both branches of the conditional statement as follows.

(1) True branch ($x \neq 'a'$). In this case, P_1 encounters a blocking receive `Recv(0)` and blocks. MPI-SV records the receive operation for P_1 , and starts executing P_2 . Similar to P_0 , P_2 executes operation `Send(1)` and terminates, after which P_3 is selected and behaves the same as P_2 . After P_3 terminates, only P_1 blocks, and all the other processes terminate. Hence, the global execution blocks. When this situation happens, MPI-SV matches the recorded operations, performs the message exchanges and continues to execute the matched processes. It is clear that the `Recv(0)` in P_1 should be matched with the `Send(1)` in P_0 . After executing the send and receive operations, P_1 is selected to execute, because P_0 has already terminated. Then, a `Recv(3)` is encountered, and P_1 blocks. Same as earlier, the global execution blocks and operation matching needs to be done. `Recv(3)` is matched

with the `Send(1)` in P_3 . After executing the `Recv(3)` and `Send(1)` operations, P_1 terminates. So, all the processes terminate successfully.

(2) False branch ($x == 'a'$). The execution of P_1 proceeds until reaching the blocking receive `Recv(3)`. Additionally, the two issued receive operations, *i.e.*, `IRecv(*, req)` and `Recv(3)`, are recorded. Similar to the true branch, when every process blocks or terminates, we handle operation matching. Here P_0 , P_2 and P_3 terminate, and P_1 blocks at the `Recv(3)` operation. `IRecv(*, req)` should be matched first because of the *non-overtaken* policy in the MPI standard [Forum 2012]. There are three `Send` operation candidates from P_0 , P_2 and P_3 , respectively. To ensure soundness, MPI-SV forks a state for each candidate. Suppose MPI-SV first explores the state where `IRecv(*, req)` is matched with `Send(1)` in P_0 . After matching and executing `Recv(3)` in P_1 and `Send(1)` in P_3 , the path terminates successfully.

Violation detection. In principle, MPI-SV continues to explore the remaining two cases. If no CSP-based boosting is used, the deadlock will be found in the last case (the *fourth* path), where `IRecv(*, req)` is matched with `Send(1)` in P_3 and P_1 blocks because `Recv(3)` has no matched operation. While MPI-SV will generate a CSP model Γ based on the deadlock free path of the first case where `IRecv(*, req)` is matched with `Send(1)` in P_0 . Each MPI process is modeled as a CSP process, and all the CSP processes are composed in parallel to form Γ . Notably, in Γ , we collect the possible matchings of a wildcard receive through statically matching the arguments of operations in the path. Additionally, the requirements in the MPI standard, *i.e.*, *completes-before* relations [Vakkalanka et al. 2008], are also modeled. A CSP model checker will verify deadlock freedom for Γ . For the motivating example, Γ does not satisfy the property, and the model checker reports a counterexample where `IRecv(*, req)` is matched with the `Send(1)` in P_3 . Hence, MPI-SV only needs *two* paths to detect the deadlock.

Pruning. Because CSP modeling is sound and complete (*cf.* Section 4), in addition to finding violations earlier, MPI-SV can also perform path pruning when the model satisfies the property. Suppose we change the program in Figure 1 to be the one where the last statement of P_1 is a `Recv(*)` operation. Then, the program is *deadlock free*. When the symbolic executor explores the first path after taking the false branch, the generated model is verified to be deadlock free, MPI-SV prunes all the remaining paths. Hence, only *two* paths are explored to verify the property. In contrast, without CSP-based model checking, we need to explore *eight* paths for verification.

Properties. Because our CSP modeling encodes the interleavings of the MPI operations in the MPI processes, the scope of the verifiable properties is enlarged. Suppose we change the property to be the one that requires the `Send(1)` operation in P_0 should be completed before the `Send(1)` operation in P_2 . If *only* symbolic execution is employed, the property is satisfied. However, the send operation in P_2 can be completed before the send operation in P_0 , due to the nature of parallel execution. When using CSP modeling, the verification of the model generated from the first path *w.r.t.* the property generates a counterexample, which means a violation of the temporal property exists in the MPI program.

3 SYMBOLIC EXECUTION OF MPI PROGRAMS

In this section, we first give the syntax and semantics of a core MPI language. Then, we use the notations in the language to illustrate MPI-SV's symbolic execution algorithms. Finally, we prove the correctness of MPI-SV's symbolic execution method.

3.1 Syntax and Semantics

Let \mathbb{T} be a set of types, \mathbb{N} a set of names, and \mathbb{E} a set of expressions. An MPI program \mathcal{MP} is defined by a *finite* set of processes $\{\text{Proc}_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq n\}$. Each MPI process `Proc` can be defined as follows, where $T \in \mathbb{T}$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $e \in \mathbb{E}$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

```

Proc ::= var l : T | l := e | Comm | Proc ; Proc |
      if e Proc else Proc | while e do Proc
Comm ::= Ssend(e) | Send(e) | Recv(e) | Recv(*) | Barrier |
      ISend(e, r) | IRecv(e, r) | IRecv(*, r) | Wait(r)

```

Fig. 3. Syntax of a core MPI language.

The statement $\text{var } l : T$ declares variable l with type T . The statement $l := e$ assigns the value of expression e to variable l . A process can be constructed from basic statements by using the composition operations including sequence, conditional and loop. For the sake of clarity, we incorporate the key communication operations in the syntax, where e indicates the identifier of the destination process. The meanings of communication operations are explained in Section 2.1. Note that the omitted features, such as pointer operations and the messages in the communication operations, are supported by MPI-SV.

Auxiliary Definitions. Before giving MPI program's semantics, we give some auxiliary definitions. Given an MPI program $\mathcal{MP} = \{\text{Proc}_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq n\}$, for the sake of simplicity, we use $\text{send}(dst)$ and $\text{recv}(src)$ to denote \mathcal{MP} 's send and receive operations¹, respectively, where $dst \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ and $src \in \{0, \dots, n\} \cup \{*\}$. We use $\text{op}(\mathcal{MP})$ to denote the set of all the MPI operations in \mathcal{MP} , $\text{rank}(\alpha)$ as the process identifier of operation α , and $\text{isBlocking}(\alpha)$ to indicate whether α is a blocking operation.

Definition 3.1. MPI Process State. An MPI process's state is a tuple $(\mathcal{M}, \text{Stat}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{R})$, where \mathcal{M} maps a variable to its value, Stat is the next program statement to execute, \mathcal{F} is the flag of process status and belongs to the set $\{\text{active}, \text{blocked}, \text{terminated}\}$, \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{R} are infinite buffers to store the issued MPI operations not yet matched and the matched MPI operations, respectively.

An element $elem$ of a process state s can be accessed by $s.elem$, e.g., $s.\mathcal{F}$ represents the status of s . The behavior of a process can be regarded as a sequence of statements, and we use $\text{index}(\alpha)$ to denote the index of operation α in the statement sequence. An MPI program's global state S is composed by the states of the MPI processes, i.e., $S = (s_0, \dots, s_n)$. An MPI program's semantics is a labeled transition system defined below.

Definition 3.2. Labeled Transition System. A labeled transition system (LTS) of an MPI program \mathcal{MP} is a quadruple $(\mathcal{G}, \Sigma, \rightarrow, \mathcal{G}_0)$, where \mathcal{G} is the set of global states, Σ denotes the set of actions defined below, $\rightarrow \subseteq \mathcal{G} \times \Sigma \times \mathcal{G}$ represents the set of transitions, and \mathcal{G}_0 is the set of initial states.

Actions. The action set Σ is $\{B, W, SR, SR^*\} \cup \{\text{issue}(o) \mid o \in \text{op}(\mathcal{MP})\}$, where B represents the synchronization of `Barrier`, W is the execution of `Wait` operation, SR represents the matching of message send and deterministic receive, SR^* represents the matching of message send and wildcard receive, and $\text{issue}(o)$ stands for the issue of an MPI operation o .

Transition Rules. We first clarify some definitions used by the rules. We use $\text{ready}(\alpha, s_i)$ to indicate whether operation α is ready to be matched in state s_i w.r.t. the MPI standard [Forum 2012], where $\beta \in s_i.\mathcal{B}$ represents that operation β is in the buffer \mathcal{B} of process state s_i and $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$.

$$\text{ready}(\alpha, s_i) = \begin{cases} \exists \beta \in \mathcal{R}, (\beta = \text{ISend}(k, r) \vee \beta = \text{IRecv}(k, r) \vee \beta = \text{IRecv}(*, r)) & \alpha = \text{Wait}(r) \\ \neg(\exists \beta \in s_i.\mathcal{B}, \text{index}(\beta) < \text{index}(\alpha) \wedge \beta = \text{send}(k)) & \alpha = \text{send}(k) \\ \neg(\exists \beta \in s_i.\mathcal{B}, \text{index}(\beta) < \text{index}(\alpha) \wedge (\beta = \text{recv}(k) \vee \beta = \text{recv}(*))) & \alpha = \text{recv}(k) \\ \neg(\exists \beta \in s_i.\mathcal{B}, \text{index}(\beta) < \text{index}(\alpha) \wedge \beta = \text{recv}(*)) & \alpha = \text{recv}(*). \end{cases}$$

¹ $\text{send}(dst)$ and $\text{recv}(src)$ can denote both blocking and unblocking operations, and we omit the req parameter for non-blocking ones for the sake of simplicity.

If the corresponding non-blocking operation is in \mathcal{R} , which indicates the waited operation has been matched, then $\text{Wait}(r)$ is ready to be matched. A $\text{send}(k)$ can be matched if there is no previously issued $\text{send}(k)$ not yet matched, *i.e.*, not in the buffer \mathcal{B} . For $\text{recv}(src)$, the MPI standard requires the previously issued $\text{recv}(src)$ to be matched first if they can receive the same message. It is worth noting the *conditional completes-before* pattern [Vakkalanka et al. 2008], *i.e.*, operation $\text{IRecv}(k, r)$ followed by a $\text{recv}(*)$, and the $\text{recv}(*)$ can complete first when the matched message is not from k . We introduce condition C later to ensure such relation.

If α and β are MPI operations, we use $\text{match}(\alpha, \beta)$ defined as follows to indicate whether α and β can be matched statically.

$$((\alpha, \beta) = (\text{send}(dst), \text{recv}(src)) \vee (\beta, \alpha) = (\text{send}(dst), \text{recv}(src))) \wedge (dst = src \vee src = *)$$

We use $s_i[\text{ops}]$ to denote the updates of the process state s_i with an update operation sequence ops . The operation $\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, \alpha)$ updates the process status *w.r.t.* α and is defined as follows.

$$\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, \alpha) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{F} := \text{active} & \mathcal{F} = \text{blocked} \wedge \text{isBlocking}(\alpha) \\ \mathcal{F} := \text{blocked} & \mathcal{F} = \text{active} \wedge \text{isBlocking}(\alpha) \\ \mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$\mathcal{B}.\text{push}(\alpha)$ represents adding MPI operation α to buffer \mathcal{B} , while $\mathcal{B}.\text{pull}(\alpha)$ represents removing α from \mathcal{B} and adding α to \mathcal{R} . We use Stat' to denote the statement next to Stat . The conditional completes-before relation is defined by $C(\alpha, s_i, \beta, s_j) = C_1(\alpha, s_i, \beta, s_j) \wedge C_1(\beta, s_j, \alpha, s_i)$, where $C_1(\alpha, s_i, \beta, s_j)$ is

$$\neg(\exists \beta' \in s_j.\mathcal{B}, (\beta = \text{IRecv}(*, r) \wedge \beta' = \text{IRecv}(i, r') \wedge \text{ready}(\beta', s_j) \wedge \text{match}(\alpha, \beta')))$$

There are four transition rules for MPI operations. For the sake of brevity, we omit the transition rules of local statements, which only update the mapping \mathcal{M} and the next statement Stat to execute.

$$\frac{s_i.\mathcal{F} = \text{active}}{S \xrightarrow{\text{issue}(s_i.\text{Stat})} (\dots, s_i[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, s_i.\text{Stat}), \text{Stat} := \text{Stat}', \mathcal{B}.\text{push}(s_i.\text{Stat})], \dots)} \quad \langle \text{ISSUE} \rangle$$

$$\frac{\exists \alpha \in s_i.\mathcal{B}, \exists \beta \in s_j.\mathcal{B}, \text{ready}(\alpha, s_i) \wedge \text{ready}(\beta, s_j) \wedge \text{match}(\alpha, \beta) \wedge C(\alpha, s_i, \beta, s_j)}{S \xrightarrow{\text{SR/SR}^*} (\dots, s_i[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, \alpha), \mathcal{B}.\text{pull}(\alpha)], \dots, s_j[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, \beta), \mathcal{B}.\text{pull}(\beta)], \dots)} \quad \langle \text{SR} \rangle$$

$$\frac{\forall i \in [0, n], s_i.\mathcal{F} = \text{blocked} \wedge (\exists \alpha \in s_i.\mathcal{B}, \alpha = \text{Barrier})}{S \xrightarrow{\text{B}} (s_0[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, \alpha), \mathcal{B}.\text{pull}(\alpha)], \dots, s_n[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, \alpha), \mathcal{B}.\text{pull}(\alpha)])} \quad \langle \text{B} \rangle$$

$$\frac{s_i.\mathcal{F} = \text{blocked} \wedge \exists \alpha \in s_i.\mathcal{B}, (\alpha = \text{Wait} \wedge \text{ready}(\alpha, s_i))}{S \xrightarrow{\text{W}} (\dots, s_i[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, \alpha), \mathcal{B}.\text{pull}(\alpha)], \dots)} \quad \langle \text{W} \rangle$$

Rule $\langle \text{ISSUE} \rangle$ describes the transition of issuing an MPI operation, which requires the issuing process to be active. After issuing the operation, the process status is updated, the next statement to execute becomes Stat' , and the issued operation is added to the buffer \mathcal{B} . Rule $\langle \text{SR} \rangle$ is about matchings of message send and receive. There are three required conditions to match a message send to a receive: (1) both have been issued to the buffer \mathcal{B} and are ready to be matched; (2) operation arguments are matched, *i.e.*, $\text{match}(\alpha, \beta)$; (3) comply with the conditional completes-before relation, *i.e.*, $C(\alpha, s_i, \beta, s_j)$. After matching, the matched operations will be removed from buffer \mathcal{B} and added to buffer \mathcal{R} , and the process status is updated. Rule $\langle \text{B} \rangle$ is for barrier synchronization, which requires all the processes have been blocked at the Barrier. After barrier synchronization, operation Barrier will be moved from buffer \mathcal{B} to buffer \mathcal{R} of each process and all the processes become active. Rule $\langle \text{W} \rangle$ is for the execution of Wait operation, which requires the corresponding

non-blocking operation has been finished. After executing `Wait` operation, the process becomes active and the `Wait` operation will be removed from buffer \mathcal{B} and added to buffer \mathcal{R} .

3.2 Symbolic Verification Framework

Traditional symbolic execution adopts a state-based procedure. The basic idea is to use symbolic values instead of concrete values to execute a program. A variable with a symbolic expression is called a *symbolic variable*. An unconstrained symbolic value represents any value in the type. A state S in the symbolic execution of a program \mathcal{P} is a triple $(\mathcal{M}, Stat, PC)$. \mathcal{M} maps a variable to a concrete value or a symbolic expression; $Stat$ is the next program statement to execute; PC is a *quantifier-free* first-order predicate of symbolic values, called *path condition*, i.e., the condition that the related program variables need to satisfy to make \mathcal{P} reach S . Usually, at the beginning of symbolic execution, \mathcal{M} maps a symbolic variable to an unconstrained symbolic value, and a normal variable to a concrete value, $Stat$ is the first statement of \mathcal{P} , and PC is *true*. When encountering computation statements of symbolic variables, symbolic computations are carried out instead of concrete computations. If a conditional statement c is encountered, the current state is forked into S_t and S_f w.r.t. the *true* and *false* branches, respectively. Then, an SMT solver is invoked to check the satisfiability of each branch. If $PC \wedge c$ is satisfiable, the path condition of S_t is updated to $PC \wedge c$; otherwise, S_t is aborted. A similar operation is applied to S_f . In this way, symbolic execution can systematically explore the state space of \mathcal{P} .

For symbolic execution of an MPI program $\mathcal{MP} = \{\text{Proc}_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq n\}$, the state of an MPI process during symbolic execution is a 6-tuple $(\mathcal{M}, Stat, PC, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{R})$, where \mathcal{M} maps a variable to a concrete value or a symbolic value, PC is the path constraint of the process, and the remaining elements are the same as those in Definition 3.1. In principle, executing a statement in any process of \mathcal{MP} advances the global state, and it makes the state space of \mathcal{MP} exponential to the number of processes. Hence, the path explosion problem is more severe for symbolic execution of MPI programs. Notably, we use a special variable Seq_i defined in \mathcal{M} to record the sequence of the issued MPI operations in Proc_i , and Seq to denote the set $\{Seq_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq n\}$. An MPI program *path* is a sequence of global states. Algorithm 1 gives the top-level framework of MPI-SV.

Algorithm 1: Symbolic Verification Framework

MPI-SV($\mathcal{MP}, \varphi, \text{Sym}$)

Data: \mathcal{MP} is $\{\text{Proc}_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq n\}$, φ is a property, and Sym is a set of symbolic variables

```

1 begin
2    $worklist \leftarrow \{S_{init}\}$ 
3   while  $worklist \neq \emptyset$  do
4      $S_c \leftarrow \text{Select}(worklist)$ 
5      $(\mathcal{M}_i, Stat_i, PC_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mathcal{B}_i, \mathcal{R}_i) \leftarrow \text{Scheduler}(S_c)$ 
6      $\text{Execute}(S_c, \text{Proc}_i, Stat_i, \text{Sym})$  // MPI-SV will exit when the execution violates  $\varphi$ 
7     if  $\forall s_i \in S_c, s_i.\mathcal{F} = \text{terminated}$  then // A violation-free path is generated
8        $\Gamma \leftarrow \text{GeneratePathCSP}(\text{path}(S_c))$  // Build the CSP model from the current path
9        $\text{ModelCheck}(\Gamma, \varphi)$  // Invoke model checking
10      if  $\Gamma \models \varphi$  then
11         $\text{Prune}(worklist)$  // Prune equivalent paths of the current path
12      else if  $\Gamma \not\models \varphi$  then
13         $\text{reportViolation}$  and Exit

```

We use *worklist* to store the states to be explored. Initially, *worklist* only contains S_{init} , composed of the initial states of all the processes. At Line 4, *Select* picks a state from *worklist* as the one to advance. Hence, different search heuristics, such as depth-first search (DFS) and breadth-first search (BFS), can be implemented in *Select*. Then, *Scheduler* selects a process $Proc_i$ to execute. Next, *Execute* (cf. Algorithm 2) will symbolically execute the statement $Stat_i$ in $Proc_i$, and may add new states into *worklist*. This procedure continues until *worklist* is empty (all the paths have been explored), detecting a violation or time out (omitted for brevity). After executing $Stat_i$, if all the processes in the current global state S_c terminate, i.e., a violation-free path terminates, we use Algorithm 4 to generate a CSP model Γ from the current path to S_c , denoted by $path(S_c)$ at Line 8. Then, we use a CSP model checker to verify Γ w.r.t. φ . If Γ satisfies φ (denoted by $\Gamma \models \varphi$), *Prune* removes the states forked by wildcard operations along the current path from *worklist* (Line 11); otherwise, if the model checker reports a counterexample, we report the violation and exit.

Since MPI processes are memory independent, no data race happens between processes. We employ partial order reduction (POR) [Clarke et al. 1999] to avoid full interleavings. *Scheduler* selects a process in a *round-robin* style from the current global state. In principle, *Scheduler* starts from the active MPI process with the smallest identifier, e.g., $Proc_0$ at the beginning, and an MPI process keeps running until it is blocked or terminated. Then, the next active process will be selected to execute. In this way, it significantly reduces the path space of symbolic execution, while ensuring a sound analysis w.r.t. reachability properties, which will be proved in Section 3.4. Fortunately, with the help of CSP modeling and model checking, MPI-SV can verify more properties, e.g., temporal safety properties. The details of such technical improvements will be given in Section 4.

3.3 Blocking-driven Matching Algorithm

Algorithm 2 shows how to execute a statement symbolically. Normal statements are handled in the traditional way [King 1976], and are omitted for brevity. We focus on MPI operations.

Algorithm 2: Symbolically Executing a Statement

Execute($S_c, Proc_i, Stat_i, Sym$)

Data: Global state S_c , MPI process $Proc_i$, Statement $Stat_i$, Symbolic variable set Sym

```

1 begin
2   switch ( $Stat_i$ ) do
3     case Send or ISend or IRecv do
4        $Seq_i \leftarrow Seq_i \cdot \langle Stat_i \rangle$  // Record the issued operation
5        $s_i.B.push(Stat_i)$ 
6       return
7     case Barrier or Wait or Ssend or Recv do
8        $Seq_i \leftarrow Seq_i \cdot \langle Stat_i \rangle$  // Record the issued operation
9        $s_i.B.push(Stat_i)$ 
10       $s_i.F \leftarrow blocked$ 
11      if GlobalBlocking then //  $\forall s_i \in S_c, (s_i.F = blocked \vee s_i.F = terminated)$ 
12         $Matching(S_c)$  // Match and execute the matched operations
13      return
14   default: Execute( $S_c, Proc_i, Stat_i, Sym$ ) as normal

```

The main idea is to *postpone* the executions of MPI operations *as late as possible* to ensure the soundness of analysis, i.e., does not miss any case of message matching. Instead of execution,

Algorithm 2 records each operation in an operation sequence for each MPI process (Lines 4&8). We also need to update the buffer according to the transitions about issuing an MPI operation (Lines 5&9). Then, if $Stat_i$ is a non-blocking operation, the execution returns immediately; otherwise, we block $Proc_i$ (Line 10, excepting the `Wait` of an `ISend` operation). When reaching `GlobalBlocking` (Lines 11&12, Algorithm 2), *i.e.*, every process is terminated or blocked, we use `Matching` (*cf.* Algorithm 3) to match recorded and not yet matched MPI operations and execute the matched operations. Since the opportunity of matching messages is `GlobalBlocking`, we call it blocking-driven matching.

Blocking-driven matching wants to obtain all the matched send operations for each wildcard receive. The main motivation behind blocking-driven matching is to delay the matching of a wildcard operation *as late as possible*. Due to non-blocking operations, the messages may be received out-of-order. Hence, matching the non-wildcard operations first *w.r.t.* the MPI standard helps to obtain the potential matchings of wildcard receives.

Algorithm 3: Blocking-driven Matching

`Matching(S_c)`
Data: Global state S_c

```

1 begin
2    $PS_W \leftarrow \emptyset$  //  $PS_W$  stores the matchings of wildcard operations
3    $pair_n \leftarrow match_N(S_c)$  // Return a matching of non-wildcard operations
4   if  $pair_n \neq empty$  then
5     | Fire( $S_c, pair_n$ )
6   else
7     |  $PS_W \leftarrow match_W(S_c)$  // Match the wildcard operations
8     | for  $pair_w \in PS_W$  do
9       |  $S'_c \leftarrow fork(S_c, pair_w)$ 
10      | worklist.insert( $S'_c$ )
11     | if  $PS_W \neq \emptyset$  then
12      | | worklist.remove( $S_c$ )
13   if  $pair_n = empty \wedge PS_W = \emptyset$  then // No action is enabled when GlobalBlocking
14   | | reportDeadlock and Exit

```

Algorithm 3 shows how to match the issued and not yet matched operations. We first use `matchN` to get a matching of non-wildcard operations (Line 3). If there is no matching for non-wildcard operations, we use `matchW` to match the wildcard operations (Line 7). Though the matching of wildcard operations is carried out after that of non-wildcard operations, matching should abide by the MPI standard [Forum 2012], especially the *non-overtaken* rules: (1) if two sends of a process send messages to the same destination, and both can match the same receive, the receive should match the first one; and (2) if a process has two receives, and both can match a send, the send should match the first receive.

To get a matching of non-wildcard operations, `matchN` works as follows:

- If for each $Proc_i$, $Barrier \in s_i.\mathcal{B}$, `matchN` returns the matching of `Barrier`.
- Else, we scan $s_i.\mathcal{B}$ in an ascending order of i , *i.e.*, from $s_0.\mathcal{B}$ to $s_n.\mathcal{B}$. During the scanning, if $Wait(r) \in s_i.\mathcal{B}$ and $ready(Wait(r), s_i)$, `matchN` returns `Wait(r)`; else, if $send(j) \in s_i.\mathcal{B}$ and $\exists recv(i) \in s_j.\mathcal{B} \wedge ready(recv(i), s_j)$, `matchN` returns $(send(j), recv(i))$.
- Otherwise, `matchN` returns an empty pair.

If $pair_n$ is not empty, we execute the matched operations and update the status of the involved processes, denoted by $Fire(S_c, pair_n)$ at Line 5. $match_W$ calculates the matchings of wildcard operations as follows.

$$\{(\alpha, \beta) \mid \exists \alpha \in s_i.\mathcal{B}, \beta \in s_j.\mathcal{B}, ready(\alpha, s_i) \wedge ready(\beta, s_j) \wedge match(\alpha, \beta) \wedge \beta = recv(*)\}$$

To ensure soundness, we fork a new state for each match in PS_W , then execute the two operations of the match and update the status of the two processes (Line 9). After that, we add the forked states to *worklist* and remove the original state (Lines 10&12). For each forked state, the unblocked processes can continue to execute. Once there is no match, a deadlock happens, and we report the deadlock and exit (Line 14). In addition, for the properties other than deadlock freedom, we also check the property during symbolic execution (omitted for brevity). If a violation is detected, symbolic executor generates a test case for replaying and exits. It is worth noting that once there exist multiple wildcard receives that are ready to be matched during $match_W$, we will fork every interleaving of the wildcard receives a state (omitted for clarity). For example, suppose $\alpha = recv(*) \wedge \alpha \in s_i.\mathcal{B} \wedge ready(\alpha, s_i)$ and $\beta = recv(*) \wedge \beta \in s_j.\mathcal{B} \wedge ready(\beta, s_j)$, there exist two interleavings for matching α and β , and we will fork each interleaving a state.

P_0	P_1	P_2
ISend(1, req ₁);	IRecv(*, req ₂);	Barrier;
Barrier;	Barrier;	ISend(1, req ₃);
Wait(req ₁)	Wait(req ₂)	Wait(req ₃)

Fig. 4. An example to illustrate blocking-driven matching.

We use the program in Figure 4 to illustrate blocking-driven matching. When all the processes block at Barrier, MPI-SV invokes blocking-driven matching to match the recorded operation in the buffers, i.e., $s_0.\mathcal{B} = \langle \text{ISend}(1, \text{req}_1), \text{Barrier} \rangle$, $s_1.\mathcal{B} = \langle \text{IRecv}(*, \text{req}_2), \text{Barrier} \rangle$, and $s_2.\mathcal{B} = \langle \text{Barrier} \rangle$. According to the MPI standard, every operation can be matched. Blocking-driven matching first invokes $match_N$ to match the non-wildcard operations (Line 3). Obviously, $pair_n$ is the matched Barrier operations, and function $Fire$ is invoked to perform barrier synchronization and the status of each process becomes active (Line 5). After that, MPI-SV continues to execute the active processes and record issued operations. Similarly, we match the issued operations in the buffers when reaching GlobalBlocking, i.e., P_0 and P_2 terminate, and P_1 blocks at $\text{Wait}(\text{req}_2)$. Now the buffers become $s_0.\mathcal{B} = \langle \text{ISend}(1, \text{req}_1), \text{Wait}(\text{req}_1) \rangle$, $s_1.\mathcal{B} = \langle \text{IRecv}(*, \text{req}_2), \text{Wait}(\text{req}_2) \rangle$, and $s_2.\mathcal{B} = \langle \text{ISend}(1, \text{req}_3), \text{Wait}(\text{req}_3) \rangle$. All the issued Wait operations are not ready to match, because the corresponding non-blocking operations should be matched first. So $pair_n$ is empty this time, and $match_W$ is invoked to match the wildcard operations (Line 7). PS_W contains two pairs, i.e., $(\text{IRecv}(*, \text{req}_2), \text{ISend}(1, \text{req}_1))$ and $(\text{IRecv}(*, \text{req}_2), \text{ISend}(1, \text{req}_3))$. Function $fork$ forks a state for each pair, and adds them to the *worklist* (Lines 9&10). In this way, blocking-driven matching explores the two different matching cases.

3.4 Correctness of Symbolic Execution for MPI Programs

Round-robin schedule and blocking-driven matching based symbolic execution is an instance of model checking with POR preserving reachability properties. Next, we prove the soundness of symbolic execution method *w.r.t.* reachability properties.

Definition 3.3. Reachability Property. A reachability property φ of an MPI program \mathcal{MP} can be defined as follows, where $\text{assertion}(S)$ represents an assertion of global state S , e.g., deadlock

and assertions of variables.

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma & ::= \text{true} \mid \gamma \vee \gamma \mid \neg\gamma \mid \text{assertion}(S) \\ \varphi & ::= \text{EF } \gamma \mid \neg\varphi \end{aligned}$$

$\text{EF } \gamma$ returns true iff there exists an \mathcal{MP} 's state that satisfies the formula γ .

We use $S \xrightarrow{a} S'$ to represent there exists a transition (S, a, S') in the transition set. We use $\text{enabled}(S)$ to represent the set of enabled actions at global state S , i.e., $\text{enabled}(S) = \{a \mid \exists S' \in \mathcal{G}, S \xrightarrow{a} S'\}$. If $S \xrightarrow{a} S'$, we use $a(S)$ to represent S' . Instead of exploring all the possible states, MPI-SV's symbolic executions method only executes a subset of $\text{enabled}(S)$ (denoted as $E(S)$) when reaching a state S . According to the workflow of MPI symbolic execution, we define $E(S)$ below, where

- $\text{minIssue}(S)$ is the minimum process identifier that can issue an MPI operation, i.e., $\min\{\text{rank}(o) \mid \text{issue}(o) \in \text{enabled}(S)\}$.
- $\text{minRank}(S) = \min\{\text{rank}_a(b) \mid b \in \text{enabled}(S)\}$ is the minimum process identifier of enabled actions. When b is a pair of message send and receive, $\text{rank}_a(b)$ is the process identifier of the send operation; when b is W , $\text{rank}_a(b)$ is the process identifier of the corresponding Wait operation.

$$E(S) = \begin{cases} \{\text{issue}(o)\} & \text{if } \text{issue}(o) \in \text{enabled}(S) \wedge \text{rank}(o) = \text{minIssue}(S) \\ \{B\} & \text{else if } B \in \text{enabled}(S) \\ \{W\} & \text{else if } W \in \text{enabled}(S) \wedge \text{rank}_a(W) = \text{minRank}(S) \\ \{SR\} & \text{else if } SR \in \text{enabled}(S) \wedge \text{rank}_a(SR) = \text{minRank}(S) \\ \text{enabled}(S) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

When $\text{issue}(o)$ is enabled in state S , we will select the one having smallest process identifier among the processes that can issue an operation as $E(S)$, which is in accordance with round-robin schedule. According to the blocking-driven matching, when all the processes blocked, we delay the matching of wildcard receive (SR^*) as late as possible. If B is enabled, we use $\{B\}$ as $E(S)$; else, we will use the deterministic matching (W or SR) having smallest process identifier (we will select W in case $\text{rank}_a(W) = \text{rank}_a(SR)$); otherwise, we use the enabled set as $E(S)$, i.e., $\forall a \in \text{enabled}(S), a = SR^*$.

Definition 3.4. Independence Relation ($\mathcal{I} \subseteq \Sigma \times \Sigma$). For $S \in \mathcal{G}$ and $(a, b) \in \mathcal{I}$, \mathcal{I} is a binary relation that if $(a, b) \in \text{enabled}(S)$ then $a \in \text{enabled}(b(S))$, $b \in \text{enabled}(a(S))$, and $a(b(S)) = b(a(S))$.

The dependence relation $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \Sigma \times \Sigma$ is the complement of \mathcal{I} , i.e., $(a, b) \in \mathcal{D}$, if $(a, b) \notin \mathcal{I}$. Given an MPI program \mathcal{MP} , whose LTS model is $M = (\mathcal{G}, \Sigma, \rightarrow, \mathcal{G}_0)$, an execution trace $T = \langle a_0, \dots, a_n \rangle \in \Sigma^*$ of \mathcal{MP} is a sequence of actions, such that $\exists S_i, S_{i+1} \in \mathcal{G}, S_i \xrightarrow{a_i} S_{i+1}$ for each $i \in [0, n]$ and $S_0 \in \mathcal{G}_0$. We use $r(T)$ to represent the result state of T , i.e., S_{n+1} , and $T \in M$ to represent T is an execution trace of \mathcal{MP} .

Definition 3.5. Execution equivalence $\equiv \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*$ is a reflexive and symmetric binary relation such that (1). $\forall a, b \in \Sigma, (a, b) \in \mathcal{I} \Rightarrow \langle a, b \rangle \equiv \langle b, a \rangle$. (2). $\forall T, T' \in \Sigma^*, T \equiv T'$ if there exists a sequence $\langle T_0, \dots, T_k \rangle$ that $T_0 = T, T_k = T'$, and for every $i < k, T_i = u \cdot \langle a, b \rangle \cdot v, T_{i+1} = u \cdot \langle b, a \rangle \cdot v$, where $(a, b) \in \mathcal{I}, u, v \in \Sigma^*$, and $u \cdot v$ is the concatenation of u and v .

Given an MPI program \mathcal{MP} , suppose \mathcal{MP} 's semantic model is M , and the $E(S)$ based model is M' , once $E(S)$ satisfies the following two conditions, i.e., C1 and C2, then for every execution trace T , if $T \in M \wedge T \notin M'$, there exists an equivalent execution trace T' in M' that $T \equiv T'$ [Penczek et al. 2000].

C1. $\forall a \in E(S)$, if $(a, b) \in \mathcal{D}$, then for every trace $S_0 \xrightarrow{a_0} S_1 \xrightarrow{a_1}, \dots, \xrightarrow{a_k} S_k \xrightarrow{\beta} S_{i+1}$, there exists $a_i \in E(S)$, where $0 \leq i \leq k$.

C2. On every cycle in M' , there exists at least one node S that $E(S) = \text{enabled}(S)$.

Before proving our selection of $E(S)$ satisfies C1 and C2, we first give a theorem to show the independence relation of co-enabled actions.

Theorem 3.1. *Given action $a \in \{\text{issue}(o), B, W, SR\}$ and action b , for $S \in \mathcal{G}$, if $a, b \in \text{enabled}(S)$, then $(a, b) \in \mathcal{I}$.*

PROOF. We only prove the case that a is $\text{issue}(o)$ for the sake of simplicity. The proofs for the other three cases are similar, and can be found in appendix. When $a = \text{issue}(o)$ and $a, b \in \text{enabled}(S)$, b can be $\text{issue}(o')$, W , SR , or SR^* w.r.t. the transition rules.

(1) $b = \text{issue}(o')$. Suppose $\text{rank}(o) = i$, $\text{rank}(o') = j$, then $i \neq j$. Since issued operation can only block its process, $b \in \text{enabled}(a(S))$ and $a \in \text{enabled}(b(S))$. In addition, $a(b(S)) = b(a(S)) = (\dots, s_i[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, o), \text{Stat} := \text{Stat}', \mathcal{B}.push(o)], \dots, s_j[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, o'), \text{Stat} := \text{Stat}', \mathcal{B}.push(o')], \dots)$. Hence, $(a, b) \in \mathcal{I}$.

(2) $b = W$. Suppose $\text{rank}(o) = i$, $\text{rank}_a(W) = j$, then $i \neq j$. Since $\text{issue}(o)$ can only block process i and W can only make process j active, $b \in \text{enabled}(a(S))$ and $a \in \text{enabled}(b(S))$. In addition, $a(b(S))$ equals $b(a(S))$, i.e., $(\dots, s_i[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, o), \text{Stat} := \text{Stat}', \mathcal{B}.push(o)], \dots, s_j[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, \text{Wait}), \mathcal{B}.pull(\text{Wait})], \dots)$. Hence, $(a, b) \in \mathcal{I}$.

(3) $b = SR \vee b = SR^*$. Suppose $b = (p, q)$, $\text{rank}(o) = i$, $\text{rank}(p) = j_1$, and $\text{rank}(q) = j_2$. For $i \neq j_1 \wedge i \neq j_2$: $\text{issue}(o)$ only updates the state s_i , and $\text{ready}(p, s_{j_1})$ and $\text{ready}(q, s_{j_2})$ will not be affected. On the other hand, b cannot make process i blocked. Hence $b \in \text{enabled}(a(S))$ and $a \in \text{enabled}(b(S))$. $a(b(S)) = b(a(S)) = (\dots, s_k[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, o), \text{Stat} := \text{Stat}', \mathcal{B}.push(o)], \dots, s_{j_1}[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, p), \mathcal{B}.pull(p)], \dots, s_{j_2}[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, q), \mathcal{B}.pull(q)], \dots)$. For $i = j_1$: since $\text{issue}(o)$ and b are co-enabled, $\text{index}(o) > \text{index}(p)$ and p is non-blocking. Due to $\text{index}(o) > \text{index}(p)$, $\text{issue}(o)$ has no effect on $\text{ready}(p, s_{j_1})$. On the other hand, since p is non-blocking, b cannot make process i blocked. Hence $b \in \text{enabled}(a(S))$ and $a \in \text{enabled}(b(S))$. Additionally, since p is non-blocking, $a(b(S)) = b(a(S)) = (\dots, s_i[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, o), \text{Stat} := \text{Stat}', \mathcal{B}.pull(p), \mathcal{B}.push(o)], \dots, s_{j_2}[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, q), \mathcal{B}.pull(q)], \dots)$. For $i = j_2$, the proof is similar. Hence $(a, b) \in \mathcal{I}$. \square

Theorem 3.2. *$E(S)$ preserves the satisfaction of global reachability properties.*

PROOF. We first prove the $E(S)$ satisfies condition C1 and C2, respectively.

C1: $\forall a \in E(S)$, if $(a, b) \in \mathcal{D}$, then for every trace $S_0 \xrightarrow{a_0} S_1 \xrightarrow{a_1} \dots \xrightarrow{a_k} S_k \xrightarrow{b} S_{i+1}$, there exists $a_i \in E(S)$, where $0 \leq i \leq k$.

Case 1: $E(S) = \text{enabled}(S)$, C1 holds because $a_0 \in E(S)$.

Case 2: $E(S) \neq \text{enabled}(S)$. In this case, $E(S)$ contains only one element, and can be $\text{issue}(o)$, B , W , or SR . Assume C1 does not hold, i.e., $a_i \neq a$. According to Theorem 3.1, $(a, a_i) \in \mathcal{I}$ and $a \in \text{enabled}(S_i)$. Because $a, b \in \text{enabled}(S_k)$, $(a, b) \in \mathcal{I}$, which conflicts with the premise that $(a, b) \in \mathcal{D}$. Hence C1 holds.

C2: Since there is no cycle in the labeled transition system of MPI programs, C2 holds.

Since $E(S) \subseteq \text{enabled}(S)$, M' is a sub model of M . Assume $E(S)$ does not preserve the satisfaction of global reachability property φ . According to Definition 3.3, if φ is $\text{EF } \gamma$, i.e., there exists a state S in M that satisfies γ , but no state in M' satisfying γ . Since $E(S)$ satisfies C1 and C2, suppose the execution trace to S is T , i.e., $r(T) = S$, then there must exist an equivalent execution trace $T' \in M'$. Obviously, commuting independent actions cannot change the result state, so $r(T') = S$, which conflicts with the assumption. If φ is $\neg \text{EF } \gamma$, i.e., each state in M does not satisfy γ , but there exists a state in M' satisfying γ , which conflicts with M' is a sub model of M . Hence the theorem holds. \square

4 CSP MODELING FOR VERIFICATION AND BOOSTING

This section first describes how to extract a model from an MPI program path using a subset of CSP. Then, both the soundness and completeness of our modeling method will be proved. Finally, we will discuss MPI-SV's blocking-driven matching and CSP modeling.

4.1 CSP Subset

Let Σ be a *finite* set of *events*, \mathbb{C} a set of channels, and X a set of variables. Figure 5 shows the syntax of the CSP subset that we will use, where P represents a CSP process, $a \in \Sigma$, $c \in \mathbb{C}$, $X \subseteq \Sigma$ and $x \in X$.

$$P := a \mid P ; P \mid P \square P \mid P \parallel_X P \mid c?x \rightarrow P \mid c!x \rightarrow P \mid \mathbf{skip}$$

Fig. 5. The syntax of a CSP subset.

The single event process a performs the event a and terminates. There are three operators: sequential composition ($;$), external choice (\square) and parallel composition with synchronization (\parallel_X). $P \square Q$ performs as P or Q , and the choice is made by the environment. Hence, $P \square Q$ refuses to perform an event e at the beginning if both of P and Q refuse to perform e at the beginning. Let PS be a finite set of processes, $\square PS$ denotes the external choice of all the processes in PS . $P \parallel_X Q$ performs P and Q in an interleaving manner, but P and Q synchronize on the events in X . The process $c?x \rightarrow P$ performs as P after reading a value from channel c , and the value is stored to variable x . The process $c!x \rightarrow P$ writes the value of variable x to channel c and then behaves as P . Process **skip** terminates immediately. To distinguish external choice from internal choice and model deadlocks, we adopt a stable-failure semantics of CSP [Roscoe 2005].

4.2 CSP Modeling

For each violation-free program path, a CSP model will be generated. The model contains all the possible communication behaviors by changing the matchings and interleavings of the communication operations along the path. Algorithm 4 describes how to generate a CSP model from a violation-free path.

The basic idea is to use the CSP subset in Figure 5 to model the communication operations in each process as a CSP process, then compose all the CSP processes in parallel to form the model. To model Proc_i , we scan its operation sequence Seq_i in reverse. For each operation, we generate its CSP model and compose the model with that of the remaining operations in Seq_i *w.r.t.* the semantics of the operation and the MPI standard [Forum 2012].

For send and receive operations, we use channel operations in CSP to model communications. Each executed send operation op has its own channel, denoted by $\text{Chan}(op)$. We use a zero-sized channel to model Ssend operation (Line 9), because the operation blocks until the message is received. A Send or ISend operation is completed immediately under the assumption of infinite local buffers. Hence, different from Ssend , we use a one-sized channel to model Send and ISend (Line 12), so the channel writing returns immediately. The modeling of a Barrier operation (Line 14) is to generate a synchronization event which requires all the parallel CSP processes synchronize on this event (Lines 14&29).

The modeling of a receive operation consists of three steps. The first step calculates the possible matched channels written by the send operations (Lines 16&21). The second step uses the external choice of reading actions of the matched channels (Lines 17&22), so as to model different cases of

Algorithm 4: CSP Model Generation from a Path

GeneratePathCSP(p)

Data: A violation-free path p

```

1 begin
2    $PS \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3   for  $i \leftarrow 0 \dots n$  do
4      $Req \leftarrow \emptyset$   $P_i \leftarrow \text{skip}$ 
5     for  $j \leftarrow \text{length}(Seq_i) - 1 \dots 0$  do    //  $Proc_i$ 's operation sequence  $Seq_i = \langle op_0, \dots, op_m \rangle$ 
6       switch  $op_j$  do
7         case  $S\text{send}(i)$  do
8            $c_1 \leftarrow \text{Chan}(op_j)$ 
9            $P_i \leftarrow c_1!x \rightarrow P_i$     // The size of  $c_1$  is 0
10        case  $\text{Send}(i)$  or  $I\text{Send}(i, r)$  do
11           $c_2 \leftarrow \text{Chan}(op_j)$ 
12           $P_i \leftarrow c_2!x \rightarrow P_i$     // The size of  $c_2$  is 1
13        case  $\text{Barrier}$  do
14           $P_i \leftarrow B; P_i$ 
15        case  $\text{Recv}(i)$  or  $\text{Recv}(\ast)$  do
16           $C \leftarrow \text{StaticMatchedChannel}(op_j, p)$     // Obtain the possible matched channels
17           $Q \leftarrow \text{Refine}(\square\{c?x \rightarrow \text{skip} \mid c \in C\})$     // Impose completes-before requirements
18           $P_i \leftarrow Q; P_i$ 
19        case  $I\text{Recv}(\ast, r)$  or  $I\text{Recv}(i, r)$  do
20           $Req \leftarrow Req \cup \{r\}$ 
21           $C \leftarrow \text{StaticMatchedChannel}(op_j, p)$     // Obtain the possible matched channels
22           $Q \leftarrow \text{Refine}(\square\{c?x \rightarrow \text{skip} \mid c \in C\})$     // Impose completes-before requirements
23           $e_w \leftarrow \text{WaitEvent}(op_j)$ 
24           $P_i \leftarrow (Q; e_w) \parallel P_i$ 
25                 $\{e_w\}$ 
26        case  $\text{Wait}(r)$  and  $r \in Req$  do
27           $e_w \leftarrow \text{GenerateEvent}(op_j)$ 
28           $P_i \leftarrow e_w; P_i$ 
29        $PS \leftarrow PS \cup \{P_i\}$ 
30    $P \leftarrow \parallel_{\{B\}} PS$ 
31 return  $P$ 

```

the receive operation. Finally, in the third step, the refined external choice process is composed with the remaining model. If the operation is blocking, the composition is sequential (Line 18). Otherwise, it is a parallel composition (Line 24).

$\text{StaticMatchedChannel}(op_j, p)$ returns the set of the channels written by the possibly matched send operations of the receive operation op_j in path p . Seq is scanned to obtain the possibly matched send operations of op_j . Given a receive operation $recv$ in process $Proc_i$ of path p , we use $\text{SMO}(recv, p)$ calculated as follows to denote the set of the matched send operations of $recv$:

- $\text{SMO}(recv, p)$ is $\{op \mid op \in Seq_j \wedge \text{match}(recv, op)\}$ if $recv$ is $\text{Recv}(j)$ or $I\text{Recv}(j, r)$, where $Seq_j \in Seq$ is the operation sequence of $Proc_j$ in path p .

- $SMO(recv, p)$ is $\{op \mid \exists Seq_j \in Seq, op \in Seq_j \wedge match(recv, op)\}$ if $recv$ is $Recv(*)$ or $IRecv(*, r)$.

$SMO(op, p)$ is a superset of the precise set of op 's matched operations. $SMO(op, p)$ can be optimized by removing the send operations that are definitely executed after the completion of op , and the ones whose messages are definitely received before the issue of op . For example, Let $Proc_0$ be $Send(1); Barrier; Send(1)$, and $Proc_1$ be $Recv(*); Barrier$. Through statically matching the arguments of operations, SMO will add the two send operations in $Proc_0$ to the matching set of the $Recv(*)$ in $Proc_1$. Since $Recv(*)$ is blocking and it must complete before barrier synchronization, we can remove the second send operation in $Proc_0$. We use $preB(\alpha)$ to denote the number of $Barrier$ operations that $index(Barrier) < index(\alpha)$. Then, $SMO(recv, p)$ can be optimized as follows.

- When $recv = Recv(j)$ or $recv = Recv(*)$, we remove all the operations in $\{op \mid op \in SMO(recv, p) \wedge preB(op) > preB(recv)\}$ from $SMO(recv, p)$.
- When $recv = IRecv(j, r)$ or $recv = IRecv(*, r)$, similar to the blocking case, all the operations in $\{op \mid op \in SMO(recv, p) \wedge preB(op) > preB(Wait(r))\}$ are removed from $SMO(recv, p)$.

Obviously, such optimization can reduce the scale of the CSP model. In subsequent discussions, we use $SMO(op, p)$ to denote the optimized set of matched send operations. Then, we can define the $StaticMatchedChannel(op_j, p)$ as $\{Chan(op) \mid op \in SMO(op_j, p)\}$.

To satisfy the MPI requirements, the CSP model of receive operations needs to be refined. $Refine(P)$ (Lines 17&22) denotes a procedure of modifying the input CSP process by imposing the completes-before requirements [Vakkalanka et al. 2008] of receive operations. The imposed requirements are as follows:

- For a receive operation, if there are multiple matched send operations from the same MPI process, the earlier issued send operation should be matched first. We ensure this requirement through checking the emptiness of the dependent channels in the model. For example, suppose there is an operation sequence $ISend(k, r_1); ISend(k, r_2)$ in a process and $Proc_k$ has a wildcard receive. The corresponding one-sized channel of $ISend(k, r_1)$ and $ISend(k, r_2)$ are ch_1 and ch_2 , respectively. Then, in the model of $Proc_k$, before the channel read of ch_2 , we will insert an emptiness checking action of ch_1 to ensure ch_1 will be read before ch_2 .
- The receive operations in the same MPI process should be matched *w.r.t.* their issue order if they are received from the same process, except for the *conditional completes-before* pattern [Vakkalanka et al. 2008]. We use a one-sized channel writing and reading operations to precisely model these requirements, *i.e.*, suppose operation β depends on non-blocking operation α , then $\alpha \rightarrow ch!x \rightarrow \mathbf{Skip} \parallel ch?x \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \mathbf{Skip}$ can model the dependence, where ch is a one-sized channel.

Only the $Wait$ operations of $IRecv$ operations are modeled, because $ISend$ operations are completed immediately under the assumption of infinite local message buffers. Hence, we only collect the identities of $IRecv$ operations (Line 20). $Wait$ operations are modeled by the synchronization in parallel processes. $GenerateEvent$ generates a new synchronization event e_w for each $Wait$ operation (Line 26). Then, e_w is produced after the corresponding non-blocking operation is completed (Line 24). The synchronization on e_w ensures a $Wait$ operation blocks until the corresponding non-blocking operation is completed.

We use the example in Figure 4 to demonstrate the modeling procedure. After generating a violation-free path, the recorded operation sequences are $Seq_0 = \langle ISend(1, req_1), Barrier, Wait(req_1) \rangle$, $Seq_1 = \langle IRecv(*, req_2), Barrier, Wait(req_2) \rangle$, and $Seq_2 = \langle Barrier, ISend(1, req_3), Wait(req_3) \rangle$. We first scan Seq_0 in reverse. $Wait(req_1)$ is not modeled, because it corresponds to $ISend$, which makes req_1 not in Req (Line 25). Then, we will create a single event process B

(synchronization event) for modeling Barrier (Lines 13&14). For the ISend(1, req₁), we model it by writing an element a to a one-sized channel $chan_1$, and use prefix operation to compose its model with B (Lines 10-12). In this way, CSP process $chan_1!a \rightarrow B; \mathbf{skip}$ (denoted by CP_0) is generated for Proc₀. Similarly, CSP process $chan_2!b \rightarrow B; \mathbf{skip}$ (denoted by CP_2) is generated for Proc₂, where $chan_2$ is also a one-sized channel and b is a channel element. For Proc₁, we generate a single event process e_w to model Wait(req₂), because it corresponds to IRecv (Lines 25-27). For IRecv(*, req₂), we first compute the matched channels using SMO (Line 21). Obviously, both $chan_1$ and $chan_2$ are contained in the set of matched channels. Then, CSP process $((chan_1?a \rightarrow \mathbf{skip} \square chan_2?b \rightarrow \mathbf{skip}); e_w) \parallel (B; e_w; \mathbf{skip})$ (denoted by CP_1) is generated. Finally, we compose the CSP processes using the parallel operator to generate the CSP model (Line 29), i.e., $CP_0 \parallel_{\{B\}} CP_1 \parallel_{\{B\}} CP_2$.

4.3 Soundness and Completeness of CSP Modeling

Our CSP modeling method is *sound* and *complete*. Given a path p , GeneratePathCSP(p) generates the CSP process CSP_p . Here, soundness means that CSP_p models all the possible paths by changing the matchings or interleavings of the communication operations in p , and completeness means that each trace in CSP_p represents a real path that can be derived from p by changing the matchings or interleavings of the communication operations. The soundness and completeness of the modeling method assumes that *no communication* in the program depends on the message contents of receive operations.

Since we compute $SMO(op, p)$ by statically matching the arguments of the recorded operations without considering the MPI semantics, $SMO(op, p)$ may contain some false matchings. Calculating the precise matched operations of op is NP-complete [Forejt et al. 2014], and we suppose such an ideal method exists. We use CSP_{static} and CSP_{ideal} to denote the generated models using $SMO(op, p)$ and the ideal method, respectively. Now, we first prove the equivalence of the two models, based on which we prove the soundness and completeness of our CSP modeling method. Let $\mathcal{T}(P)$ denote the trace set of CSP process P , and the definition of $\mathcal{T}(P)$ can be referred to the trace semantics of CSP [Roscoe 2005]. First, the following theorem implies the equivalence holds under the trace semantics of CSP.

Theorem 4.1. $\mathcal{T}(CSP_{static}) = \mathcal{T}(CSP_{ideal})$.

PROOF. First, we prove $\mathcal{T}(CSP_{static}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(CSP_{ideal})$ by contradiction. Suppose there exists a trace $t = \langle e_1, \dots, e_n \rangle$ that $t \in \mathcal{T}(CSP_{static})$ but $t \notin \mathcal{T}(CSP_{ideal})$. The only difference between CSP_{static} and CSP_{ideal} is that CSP_{static} introduces more channel read operations during the modeling of receive operations. Hence, there must exist a read operation of an extra channel in t . Suppose the first extra read is $e_k = c_e?x$, where $1 \leq k \leq n$. Therefore, c_e cannot be read in CSP_{ideal} when the matching of the corresponding receive operation starts, but c_e is not empty at e_k in CSP_{static} . Despite of the size of c_e , there must exist a write operation $c_e!y$ in $\langle e_1, \dots, e_{k-1} \rangle$. Because $\langle e_1, \dots, e_{k-1} \rangle$ is also a valid trace in CSP_{ideal} , it means c_e is not empty in CSP_{ideal} at e_k , which contradicts with the assumption that c_e cannot be read in CSP_{ideal} . Hence, $\mathcal{T}(CSP_{static}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(CSP_{ideal})$ holds.

Then, we prove $\mathcal{T}(CSP_{ideal}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(CSP_{static})$ also by contradiction. Suppose there exists a trace $t = \langle e_1, \dots, e_m \rangle$ that $t \in \mathcal{T}(CSP_{ideal})$ but $t \notin \mathcal{T}(CSP_{static})$. Because $SMO(op_j, p)$ is a superset of the precise set of op_j , t cannot be a terminated trace. So, CSP_{ideal} blocks at e_m . Because $t \notin \mathcal{T}(CSP_{static})$, there must exist a channel read operation $c_m?x$ that is enabled at e_m in CSP_{static} , i.e., c_m is not empty. Hence, there must exist a write operation $c_m!y$ in $\langle e_1, \dots, e_{m-1} \rangle$. Because $\langle e_1, \dots, e_{m-1} \rangle$ is valid in both of CSP_{static} and CSP_{ideal} , $c_m?x$ is also enabled at e_m in CSP_{ideal} , which contradicts

with the assumption that CSP_{ideal} blocks. Hence, $\mathcal{T}(\text{CSP}_{ideal}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\text{CSP}_{static})$ holds, and we can conclude that $\mathcal{T}(\text{CSP}_{static}) = \mathcal{T}(\text{CSP}_{ideal})$. \square

Next, we prove the equivalence also holds under the stable-failure semantics [Roscoe 2005] of CSP. $\mathcal{F}(P)$ denotes the failure set of CSP process P . Each element in $\mathcal{F}(P)$ is (s, X) , where $s \in \mathcal{T}(P)$ is a trace, and X is the set of events P refuses to perform after s .

Theorem 4.2. $\mathcal{F}(\text{CSP}_{static}) = \mathcal{F}(\text{CSP}_{ideal})$.

PROOF. $\mathcal{T}(\text{CSP}_{static}) = \mathcal{T}(\text{CSP}_{ideal})$ holds according to Theorem 4.1. Suppose there exists $(s, X) \in \text{CSP}_{static}$ but $(s, X) \notin \text{CSP}_{ideal}$. It means there exists an event e in X that is refused by CSP_{static} at s , but enabled by CSP_{ideal} at s . Because there is no internal choice in the CSP models, we have $s \cdot \langle e \rangle \notin \mathcal{T}(\text{CSP}_{static})$ [Roscoe 2005] and $s \cdot \langle e \rangle \in \mathcal{T}(\text{CSP}_{ideal})$, which conflicts with Theorem 4.1. The contradiction of the case in which $(s, X) \notin \text{CSP}_{static}$ but $(s, X) \in \text{CSP}_{ideal}$ can be proved similarly. \square

Theorem 4.3. CSP_{static} is consistent with the MPI semantics.

PROOF. If the path of generating CSP_{static} is p , then we can get an MPI program \mathcal{MP}_p from the operation sequence Seq of p , where each process Proc_i of \mathcal{MP}_p is the sequential composition of the operations in Seq_i . Suppose the LTS model of \mathcal{MP}_p is M_p , and the LTS after hiding [Roscoe 2005] all the $issue(o)$ actions in M_p is \hat{M}_p . Then, CSP_{static} is consistent with the MPI semantics iff $\{(M_t(s), M_s(X)) \mid (s, X) \in \mathcal{F}(\text{CSP}_{static})\} = \{(T, X) \mid T \in \hat{M}_p \wedge X \subseteq M_s(\Sigma) \setminus \text{enabled}(r(T))\}$, where Σ is the event set of CSP_{static} , $M_t(s)$ and $M_s(X)$ maps the events in the sequence t and the set X to the corresponding actions in MPI semantics, respectively. This can be shown by proving that Algorithms 4 with a precise SMO ensures all the *completes-before* relations [Vakkalanka et al. 2008] of MPI semantics (*cf.* semantic rules in Section 3.1). The relations between send operations and those between receive operations (including conditional *completes-before* relation) are ensured by $\text{Refine}(P)$. The communications of *send* and *recv* operations are modeled by CSP channel operations and process compositions. The requirements of *wait* and *barrier* operations are modeled by the process compositions defined in Algorithm 4. Hence, we can conclude that CSP_{ideal} is consistent with the MPI semantics. Then, by Theorem 4.2, we can prove CSP_{static} is consistent with the MPI semantics. \square

4.4 Discussion

In principle, the soundness of MPI-SV is ensured by both blocking-driven matching and CSP modeling. Symbolic execution employing POR can only verify global reachability properties. For the *non-reachability* properties, the analysis supported by pure symbolic execution may be *unsound* because of the incomplete interleavings. However, the CSP model extracted from an MPI program path encodes all the possible interleavings of the MPI operations along the path. Hence, MPI-SV can soundly verify any model checker supported properties of communication behavior, except existential path quantifier properties [Clarke and Emerson 1982], which can also be supported by adjusting MPI-SV's framework. Notably, when the verified property is out of the scope of pure symbolic execution, MPI-SV may give unknown for verification once the model checker produces a timeout, in which case MPI-SV can only be used to find violations.

Model checking can also boost symbolic execution. Given a property φ and a violation-free path p , if the model checker gives $\text{CSP}_p \models \varphi$ where CSP_p denotes the CSP model extracted from p , we can safely prune the states forked by the wildcard operations along p , because our modeling method is sound. On the other hand, if the model checker gives a counterexample, we can report the violation, because of completeness. In this way, MPI-SV can quickly find violations or verify

the MPI program satisfies φ . Our CSP modeling algorithm is efficient, and has a polynomial time complexity *w.r.t.* the length of the MPI path (*cf.* Section 4.2). However, our modeling method does not consider the situation where communications depend on the message contents of receive operations, such as the master-slave pattern.

The master-slave pattern is frequently adopted to achieve a dynamic load balancing. When using the pattern, the master process uses wildcard operations to receive job results from slave processes. When the master process receives a job result from a slave process, the master will dispatch another job to the idle process whose result is just being received. On the other hand, the slave process is in charge of doing task and sending result back to master process until receiving the message for termination. Figure 6 is an example program.

P_0	P_1	P_2	P_3
Send(1);	while (true) do {	while (true) do {	while (true) do {
Send(2);	Recv(\emptyset);	Recv(\emptyset);	Recv(\emptyset);
Send(3);	if (...)	if (...)	if (...)
while (...) do {	break;	break;	break;
Recv(*, r);	Send(\emptyset);	Send(\emptyset);	Send(\emptyset);
Send(r.src)	}	}	}
}			
...			

Fig. 6. An example program using master-slave pattern.

In the example program, P_0 is the master process, and the remaining three processes are slave processes. P_0 first dispatches one job to each slave process. Then, P_0 will iteratively receive a job result from any slave process (Recv(*, r)) and dispatch another job to the process whose result is just being received (Send(r.src)). Each slave process iteratively receives job message (Recv(\emptyset)), completes the job (omitted for the sake of simplicity) and sends the job result to P_0 (Send(\emptyset)). The **if** condition becomes true when the received message is for termination. The total number of jobs is controlled by the **while** loop in P_0 . Finally, after all the jobs have been completed, P_0 will notify all the slave processes to exit and collect the remaining results (omitted for simplicity).

The communication behavior of master-slave pattern is highly dynamic, *i.e.*, the communication operations in a program path vary with the matchings of the Recv(*, r) operations in master process. MPI-SV can be extended to handle master-slave pattern as follows.

- The using of mater-slave pattern can be automatically detected during symbolic execution by tracking the message variables of receive operations. When the variables are used as the destination parameters of send operations or have effects on control flows, a case of using the pattern is identified.
- We can extend our modeling method to handle dynamic features of master-slave pattern. The basic idea is to use a *recursive* CSP process to model each slave process and a conditional statement for master process to model the communication behaviors of different matchings. The dynamic nature of slave processes is modeled by recursive CSP processes. For the send operations in slave processes, the process identifier of a slave process will be sent through the channels of send operations. The model of the master process uses a global variable to store the received process identifier, and uses the variable to decide the destinations of the later send operations for job dispatching. Because master process has an accurate number of communication operations, the model of master process controls the total number of communications in the CSP model after parallel composed with the models of slave processes.

The general way to handle the situation that communications depend on the message contents is to make the received message symbolic. For example, suppose a message content is stored in a local variable x , and following is “`if($x > 10$) Send(0); else Send(1)`”. We can make x symbolic once we detect that there exist communications that depend on it, so that MPI-SV will not miss a branch. As mentioned above, we can build a sound and complete model from a path of an MPI program even having communications depend on message contents, which also makes MPI-SV different from MOPPER [Forejt et al. 2014] where only MPI programs without dynamic nature, called *single-path programs*, are supported. The supporting of master-slave pattern and more dynamic patterns is left to be future work.

5 EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

This section first introduces the implementation of MPI-SV, then describes the experimental setup, and finally presents and discusses the experimental results.

5.1 Implementation

We have implemented MPI-SV based on Cloud9 [Bucur et al. 2011], which is built upon KLEE [Cadar et al. 2008], and enhances KLEE with more complete support for POSIX environment and parallel symbolic execution. Our main implementation strategy is to simulate an MPI program using a multi-threaded version of it. Hence, Cloud9’s support for multi-threaded programs can be leveraged. We employ a multi-threaded library for MPI, called AzequiaMPI [Rico-Gallego and Martín 2011], as the MPI environment model for symbolic execution. MPI-SV contains three main modules: program preprocessing, symbolic execution, and model checking. The program preprocessing module generates the input for symbolic execution. We use Clang to compile an MPI program to LLVM bytecode, which is then linked with the pre-compiled MPI library AzequiaMPI. The symbolic execution module is in charge of path exploration and property checking. Inside this module, blocking-driven matching and CSP model generation are implemented. To support a full simulation of MPI programs, we have implemented a mechanism supporting thread-specific global variables. The third module utilizes the state-of-the-art CSP model checker PAT [Sun et al. 2009] to verify CSP models, and uses the output of PAT to boost the symbolic executor.

5.2 Setup

Table 1 lists the programs analyzed in our experiments. All the programs are real-world open source MPI programs. DTG is a testing program from a PhD dissertation [Vakkalanka 2010]. `Integrate_mw` and `Diffusion2d` come from the FEVS benchmark suite [Siegel and Zirkel 2011a]. `Integrate_mw`² calculates the integrals of trigonometric functions, and `Diffusion2d` is a parallel solver for two-dimensional diffusion equation. `Gauss_elim` is an MPI implementation for gaussian elimination used in Xue et al. [2009]. `Heat` is a parallel solver for heat equation used in Müller et al. [2011]. We downloaded `Pingpong`, `Mandelbrot`, and `Image_manip` from github. `Pingpong` is a testing program for communication performance. `Mandelbrot` parallel draws the mandelbrot set for a bitmap. `Image_manip` is an MPI program for image manipulations, e.g., shifting, rotating and scaling. The remaining three programs are large parallel applications. `Depsolver` is a parallel multi-material 3D electrostatic solver, `Kfray` is a ray tracing program that can create realistic images, and `ClustalW` is a popular tool for aligning multiple gene sequences.

In order to evaluate MPI-SV further, we mutate [Just et al. 2014] the programs. Mutants are generated by rewriting a randomly selected receive using the following two rules: (1) replace `Recv(i)` with `if($x > a$){Recv(i)} else {Recv(*)}`; (2) replace `Recv(*)` with `if($x > a$){Recv(*)} else {Recv(j)}`.

²`Integrat_mw` is adopted from Forejt et al. [2014], in which a static schedule is employed

Table 1. The programs in the experiments

Program	LOC	Brief Description
DTG	90	Dependence transition group
Integrate_mw	181	Integral computing
Diffusion2d	197	Simulation of diffusion equation
Gauss_elim	341	Gaussian elimination
Heat	613	Heat equation solver
Pingpong	220	Comm performance testing
Mandelbrot	268	Mandelbrot set drawing
Image_manip	360	Image manipulation
DepSolver	8988	Multimaterial electrostatic solver
Kfray	12728	KF-Ray parallel raytracer
ClustalW	23265	Multiple sequence alignment
Total	47251	11 open source programs

Here x is an input variable, a is a random value, and j is generated randomly from the scope of the process identifier. The mutations for $\text{IRecv}(i, r)$ and $\text{IRecv}(*, r)$ are similar. The goal of rule 1 is to improve program performance and simplify programming, while rule 2 is to make the communication more deterministic. Since communications tend to depend on inputs in complex applications, such as the last three programs in Table 1, we also introduce input related conditions. For each program, we generate five mutants if possible, or generate as many as the number of receives.

We use MPI-SV to verify deadlock freedom of MPI programs. Most of the programs are run under 6, 8, and 10 processes, respectively. DTG and Pingpong are verified for 5 and 2 processes, because they are developed for a fixed number of processes. We only run Diffusion under 4 and 6 processes because of its huge path space. In our experiments, we run MPI-SV under two configurations: (1) No Modeling, *i.e.*, using DFS for path exploration, and (2) CSP Modeling, *i.e.*, using model checking based boosting. The time threshold of each verification task is one hour. There are three possible verification results: finding a deadlock, no deadlock, or timeout. All the tasks are carried out in parallel on three identical servers, each having 256GB memory and four 2.13GHz XEON CPUs with 32 cores.

5.3 Experimental Results

Table 2 lists the detailed experimental results. The first column shows program names, and #Procs indicates the number of running processes. T specifies whether the analyzed program is mutated, where o denotes the original program, and m_i represents a mutant. A verification task comprises a program and the number of running processes. Column **Deadlock** indicates whether a task is deadlock free, where 0, 1, and -1 denote *no deadlock*, *deadlock* and *unknown*, respectively. We use unknown for the case that both configurations fail to complete the task. Columns **Time(s)** and **#Iterations** show verification time and the number of explored paths, respectively, where TO stands for timeout. Note that we set the results where CSP Modeling performs better in gray background.

For the 108 verification tasks in total, MPI-SV can complete 94 tasks (87%) within one hour, whereas 61 tasks (56%) for No Modeling, with a 31% improvement. CSP Modeling can detect deadlocks in 49 tasks, while the number for No Modeling is 45. For the 49 tasks having deadlocks,

Table 2. Experimental results

Program (#Procs)	T	Deadlock	Time(s)		#Iterations	
			No Modeling	CSP Modeling	No Modeling	CSP Modeling
DTG (5)	<i>o</i>	0	10.7	8.4	3	1
	<i>m</i> ₁	0	18.3	9.4	10	2
	<i>m</i> ₂	1	10.6	8.2	4	1
	<i>m</i> ₃	1	10.1	8.3	4	1
	<i>m</i> ₄	1	10.8	7.8	4	1
Integrate_mw (6/8/10)	<i>o</i>	0/0/0	106.8/to/to	8.5/12.6/154.7	120/2658/2249	1/1/1
	<i>m</i> ₁	1/1/1	7.2/9.6/11.4	7.9/12.3/178.5	2/2/2	1/1/1
	<i>m</i> ₂	1/-1/-1	7.18/to/to	8.0/to/to	2/2575/2046	1/97/22
	<i>o</i>	0/0	419.7/to	14.1/25.7	90/458	1/1
	<i>m</i> ₁	0/1	454.7/20.6	14.3 /24.5	90/2	1/1
Diffusion2d (4/6)	<i>m</i> ₂	0/1	to/28.4	34.8 /34.2	3030/3	16/2
	<i>m</i> ₃	0/0	to/to	47.5/555.9	1847/2723	16/64
	<i>m</i> ₄	1/1	17.0 /22.0	17.2/29.57	3/2	2/1
	<i>m</i> ₅	1/0	12.3/to	13.4/ 27.8	2/461	1/1
	Gauss_elim (6/8/10)	<i>o</i>	0/0/0	to/to/to	10.9/30.0/572.5	821/671/526
<i>m</i> ₁		1/1/1	409.8/to/to	9.8/35.9/568.8	121/631/487	1/2/1
Heat (6/8/10)	<i>o</i>	1/1/1	21.2/44.4/46.3	20.0/28.6/43.1	2/2/2	1/1/1
	<i>m</i> ₁	1/1/1	29.6/46.5/54.9	24.6/41.4/40.8	2/2/2	1/1/1
	<i>m</i> ₂	1/1/1	25.2/34.4/45.7	26.8/ 31.0 / 39.8	2/2/2	1/1/1
	<i>m</i> ₃	1/1/1	31.9/41.8/55.0	22.3/40.8/48.7	3/3/3	1/1/1
	<i>m</i> ₄	1/1/1	41.8/49.3/64.6	26.7/40.7/42.8	9/9/9	1/1/1
Pingpong (2)	<i>m</i> ₅	1/1/1	48.9/62.5/90.3	25.1/31.0/48.7	7/7/7	1/1/1
	<i>o</i>	0	43.6	41.7	4	4
	<i>m</i> ₁	0	222.4	234.2	32	32
	<i>m</i> ₂	0	71.7	72.3	32	32
	<i>m</i> ₃	-1	to	to	2979	1046
Mandelbrot (6/8/10)	<i>m</i> ₄	0	134.3	164.8	32	32
	<i>m</i> ₅	0	181.9	209.7	32	32
	<i>o</i>	0/-1/-1	to/to/to	560.77 /to/to	358/301/288	9/9/7
	<i>m</i> ₁	-1/-1/-1	to/to/to	to/to/to	649/516/515	112/74/41
Image_mani (6/8/10)	<i>m</i> ₂	-1/-1/-1	to/to/to	to/to/to	625/778/656	109/151/136
	<i>m</i> ₃	1/1/1	11.4/14.9/17.9	10.5 / 12.8 /27.0	2/2/2	1/1/1
	<i>o</i>	0/0/0	135.1/149.6/172.4	21.7/27.2/50.2	96/96/96	4/4/4
DepSolver (6/8/10)	<i>m</i> ₁	1/1/1	14.2/15.4/17.0	11.4 / 15.1 /18.8	2/2/2	1/1/1
	<i>o</i>	0/0/0	122.8/216.1/312.7	117.0 / 188.6 /356.7	3/3/3	3/3/3
Kfray (6/8/10)	<i>o</i>	0/0/0	to/to/to	32.1/123.2/1793.9	631/534/643	1/1/1
	<i>m</i> ₁	1/1/1	27.5/25.7/31.9	30.0/113.4/1885.6	2/2/2	1/1/1
	<i>m</i> ₂	-1/-1/-1	to/to/to	to/to/to	1087/881/751	218/27/3
	<i>m</i> ₃	1/1/1	26.1/30.9/29.9	30.7/118.8/1920.2	2/2/2	1/1/1
Clustalw (6/8/10)	<i>o</i>	0/0/0	to/to/to	40.2/115.3/1673.2	771/664/492	1/1/1
	<i>m</i> ₁	0/0/0	to/to/to	42.5/116.2/1700.5	753/587/554	1/1/1
	<i>m</i> ₂	0/0/0	to/to/to	43.0/111.7/1689.9	781/621/504	1/1/1
	<i>m</i> ₃	1/1/1	3105.00/to/to	244.5/106.6/1645.7	599/646/513	16/1/1
	<i>m</i> ₄	0/0/0	to/to/to	43.7/116.5/1720.3	745/572/569	1/1/1
<i>m</i> ₅	0/0/0	to/to/to	43.2/112.9/1698.3	689/664/564	1/1/1	

MPI-SV on average offers an average 2.64X speedup for detecting deadlocks.³ On the other hand, CSP Modeling can successfully verify deadlock freedom for 45 tasks, while only 16 tasks for No

³We count one hour for those programs that timed out, so the actual speedup would be higher.

Modeling. MPI-SV also achieves an average 7.25X speedup for completing path exploration. In addition, compared with No Modeling, CSP Modeling needs fewer paths to detect the deadlocks and complete path exploration. On average, the speedups are 48.81X and 96.47X, respectively.





Fig. 7. Completed tasks under a time threshold. Fig. 8. Comparison for non-isomorphic paths.

Figure 7 shows the efficiency of verification for the two configurations. The X-axis varies the time threshold from 5 minutes to one hour, while the Y-axis is the number of completed verification tasks. Clearly, CSP Modeling can complete more tasks than No Modeling under the same time threshold, demonstrating MPI-SV’s efficiency. For the 94 tasks completed by CSP Modeling within one hour, there are 80(85%)/92(94%) tasks that can be completed in 5/30 minutes, respectively, thus also demonstrating MPI-SV’s effectiveness.

When both configurations fail to complete a task, we measure efficiency by counting the paths that have exclusive path conditions. Because different paths having the same path condition are isomorphic *w.r.t.* deadlock detection, the number of non-isomorphic paths reflects the efficiency of path exploration. The results are shown in Figure 8, where the X-axis displays the tasks that both configurations fail to complete, and the Y-axis shows the number of non-isomorphic paths. Clearly, CSP Modeling can cover a larger portion of the path space for Integrate and mandelbrot. However, No Modeling behaves better for Kfray and Pingpong. There are two reasons: (1) the paths contain hundreds of non-wildcard operations, and the corresponding CSP models are huge, making model checking time-consuming; (2) the number of wildcard receives or possible matchings for every wildcard receive is very small, which makes deadlock freedom prune only a small part of the path space.

Non-reachability properties. We further evaluate MPI-SV on the verification of temporal safety properties. We specify two temporal properties, *i.e.*, φ_1 for Integrate_mw and φ_2 for Mandelbrot, where φ_1 requires process one cannot receive a message before process two, and φ_2 requires process one cannot send a message before process two. Both φ_1 and φ_2 can be represented by an LTL formula $G(!a U b)$, which requires event *a* cannot happen before event *b*. We run Integrate_mw and Mandelbrot under 6 processes. The verification results show that MPI-SV detects the violations of φ_1 and φ_2 with the help of CSP modeling, while symbolic execution employing POR fails to detect violations.

6 RELATED WORK

MPI-SV is closely related to the existing work of analyzing MPI programs using different techniques, including debugging [Allinea 2002; Wave 2009] and testing [Hilbrich et al. 2012; Samofalov et al.

2005], dynamic verification [Vakkalanka et al. 2008; Vo et al. 2010], model checking [Siegel 2007], symbolic execution [Fu et al. 2015; Siegel and Zirkel 2011b], *etc.*

Debugging and testing tools are frequently used to develop MPI programs, with better feasibility and scalability. DDT [Allinea 2002] and TotalView [Wave 2009] provide facilities, such as breakpoint and replay, to help developers in debugging MPI programs. However, reproducing concurrency bugs, *e.g.*, bugs related to schedules, is also challenging. Unlike the debugging and testing tools, MPI-SV verifies MPI programs automatically, and provides a concrete input and a schedule for replaying the detected violations. MARMOT [Krammer et al. 2004], Intel Trace Analyzer [Samofalov et al. 2005] and MUST [Hilbrich et al. 2012], provide facilities to test MPI programs. They run MPI programs and intercept MPI operations to record the runtime information, based on which they perform runtime or offline checking. However, these work depends on specific inputs and the schedules of the running. Compared with them, MPI-SV provides both input and schedule coverages.

Dynamic verification techniques, such as ISP [Vakkalanka et al. 2008] and DAMPI [Vo et al. 2010], run MPI programs multiple times to cover the schedules under the same inputs. These approaches can detect the bugs depending on specific matchings of wildcard operations, but still may miss inputs related bugs. Compared with them, MPI-SV supports both input and schedule coverages, a larger scope of verifiable properties and leverages model checking to boost the analysis. MOPPER [Forejt et al. 2014] proposes a predictive analysis of deadlocks in MPI program based on ISP, and encodes the deadlock detection problem under concrete inputs in a SAT equation. The encoding has been proved to be sound and complete. While MPI-SV uses CSP to encode MPI paths, which enables a more expressive modeling, *e.g.*, conditional completes-before [Vakkalanka et al. 2008] is modeled by MPI-SV but not by MOPPER. Huang et al. [2013] encode the trace of MCAPI programs to an SMT formula, which is specific for reasoning assertion violations. Huang and Mercer [2015] extend the path-level SMT encoding to reason about the existence of deadlocks, but the work is only for the zero-buffer mode. MPI-SV supports both the zero-buffer and infinite buffer modes. Additionally, our CSP modeling enables the verification of safety and liveness properties in LTL, and can support the conditional happens-before pattern and be extended to support the master-slave pattern. Böhm et al. [2016] propose a state-space reduction framework for the MPI program with *non-deterministic synchronization*. However, like MOPPER, the framework is specially for verifying deadlock freedom, while MPI-SV enables the verification of a larger scope of properties and provides input coverage.

Existing static approaches of analyzing MPI program are fewer than dynamic approaches. MPI-SPIN [Siegel 2007] manually models MPI programs in Promela [Holzmann 2012], and the model can be verified *w.r.t.* LTL properties [Manna and Pnueli 1992] by SPIN [Holzmann 1997]. Bronevetsky [2009] proposes parallel control flow graph (pCFG) for MPI programs, which captures the interactions between arbitrary processes. But the static analysis using pCFG is hard to be automated. ParTypes [López et al. 2015] uses type checking and deductive verification to verify MPI programs against a protocol. ParTypes's verification results are sound but incomplete, and independent with the number of processes. ParTypes does not support the verification of the MPI programs having wildcard receives or non-blocking operations. MPI-Checker [Droste et al. 2015] is a recent static analysis tool built on Clang Static Analyzer [Clang 2016]. MPI-Checker only supports intraprocedural analysis of local properties such as double non-blocking and missing wait, and syntactical checking such as type mismatch and invalid argument type. Botbol et al. [2017] abstract the MPI programs to symbolic transducers, and obtain the reachability set based on abstract interpretation [Cousot and Cousot 1977]. However, the symbolic transducer based analysis only supports blocking MPI operations and may generate false positives.

MPI-SV is also related to the existing work on symbolic execution [King 1976], which has been advanced significantly during the last decade [Bucur et al. 2011; Cadar et al. 2008; Godefroid et al. 2005, 2008; Tillmann and de Halleux 2008]. Many methods have been proposed to prune paths during symbolic execution [Boonstoppel et al. 2008; Cui et al. 2013; Guo et al. 2015; Jaffar et al. 2013]. The basic idea is to use the techniques such as slicing [Jhala and Majumdar 2005] and interpolation abstraction [McMillan 2005] to safely prune the paths of a program point. Contrast to these approaches, MPI-SV only prunes the paths of the same path constraint but different message matchings or interleavings.

Furthermore, there exists work of combining symbolic execution and model checking [Daca et al. 2016; Nori et al. 2009; Su et al. 2015]. YOGI [Nori et al. 2009] and Abstraction-driven concolic testing [Daca et al. 2016] combine dynamic symbolic execution (DSE) [Godefroid et al. 2005] with counterexample-guided abstraction refinement (CEGAR) [Clarke et al. 2000]. The synergy uses the results of CEGAR to guide DSE towards unverified paths, and the violation paths detected by DSE to refine the abstraction model in CEGAR. Compared with them, MPI-SV focuses on parallel programs, and the models fed to model checking are generated from program paths instead of programs. CIVL [Luo et al. 2017] uses symbolic execution to generate a model for the whole program, then performs model checking on the model. While MPI-SV uses symbolic execution to generate path-level models, and exploits the results of model checking to prune redundant paths. In addition, CIVL does not support non-blocking operations, which are widely used in real-world MPI programs.

7 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This paper has presented MPI-SV for verifying MPI programs with both non-blocking and non-deterministic operations. By synergistically combining symbolic execution and model checking, MPI-SV provides a general framework for verifying MPI programs. We have implemented MPI-SV and extensively evaluated it on real-world MPI programs. The results demonstrate MPI-SV's effectiveness and efficiency. Future work lies in several directions: (1) enhancing MPI-SV to overcome the limitations discussed in Section 4.4 and support more MPI operations, e.g., MPI_Probe and MPI_Test; (2) developing methods based on MPI-SV for performance tuning of MPI programs; and (3) improving MPI-SV's scalability and feasibility, and releasing it to benefit MPI developers.

REFERENCES

- Allinea. 2002. Allinea DDT. <http://www.allinea.com/products/ddt/>. (2002).
- Stanislav Böhm, Ondrej Meca, and Petr Jancar. 2016. State-Space Reduction of Non-deterministically Synchronizing Systems Applicable to Deadlock Detection in MPI. In *FM*. 102–118.
- Peter Boonstoppel, Cristian Cadar, and Dawson Engler. 2008. RWset: attacking path explosion in constraint-based test generation. In *TACAS*. 351–366.
- Vincent Botbol, Emmanuel Chailoux, and Tristan Le Gall. 2017. Static Analysis of Communicating Processes Using Symbolic Transducers. In *VMCAI*. 73–90.
- Greg Bronevetsky. 2009. Communication-sensitive static dataflow for parallel message passing applications. In *CGO*. 1–12.
- Stefan Bucur, Vlad Ureche, Cristian Zamfir, and George Candea. 2011. Parallel symbolic execution for automated real-world software testing. In *EuroSYS*. 183–198.
- Rajkumar Buyya and others. 1999. High performance cluster computing: architectures and systems. *Prentice Hall* (1999), 999.
- C. Cadar, D. Dunbar, and D. Engler. 2008. KLEE: Unassisted and automatic generation of high-coverage tests for complex systems programs. In *OSDI*. 209–224.
- Clang. 2016. Clang Static Analyzer. <http://clang-analyzer.llvm.org>. (2016).
- Edmund Clarke, Orna Grumberg, Somesh Jha, Yuan Lu, and Helmut Veith. 2000. Counterexample-guided abstraction refinement. In *CAV*. 154–169.
- Edmund M. Clarke and E. Allen Emerson. 1982. Design and Synthesis of Synchronization Skeletons Using Branching-Time Temporal Logic. In *Logic of Programs*. 52–71.

- Edmund M Clarke, Orna Grumberg, and Doron Peled. 1999. *Model checking*. MIT press.
- Patrick Cousot and Radhia Cousot. 1977. Abstract Interpretation: A Unified Lattice Model for Static Analysis of Programs by Construction or Approximation of Fixpoints. In *POPL*. 238–252.
- Heming Cui, Gang Hu, Jingyue Wu, and Junfeng Yang. 2013. Verifying systems rules using rule-directed symbolic execution. In *ASPLOS*. 329–342.
- Przemysław Daga, Ashutosh Gupta, and Thomas A Henzinger. 2016. Abstraction-driven Concolic Testing. In *VMCAI*. 328–347.
- Alexander Droste, Michael Kuhn, and Thomas Ludwig. 2015. MPI-checker: static analysis for MPI. In *LLVM-HPC*. 3:1–3:10.
- Vojtěch Forejt, Daniel Kroening, Ganesh Narayanaswamy, and Subodh Sharma. 2014. Precise predictive analysis for discovering communication deadlocks in MPI programs. In *FM*. 263–278.
- MPI Forum. 2012. MPI: A Message-Passing Interface Standard Version 3.0. <http://mpi-forum.org>. (2012).
- Xianjin Fu, Zhenbang Chen, Yufeng Zhang, Chun Huang, Wei Dong, and Ji Wang. 2015. MPISE: Symbolic Execution of MPI Programs. In *HASE*. 181–188.
- Edgar Gabriel, Graham E Fagg, George Bosilca, Thara Angskun, Jack J Dongarra, Jeffrey M Squyres, Vishal Sahay, Prabhanjan Kambadur, Brian Barrett, Andrew Lumsdaine, and others. 2004. Open MPI: Goals, concept, and design of a next generation MPI implementation. In *EuroMPI*. 97–104.
- Patrice Godefroid, Nils Klarlund, and Koushik Sen. 2005. DART: directed automated random testing. In *PLDI*. 213–223.
- Patrice Godefroid, Michael Y. Levin, and David A. Molnar. 2008. Automated Whitebox Fuzz Testing. In *NDSS*.
- Ganesh Gopalakrishnan, Robert M. Kirby, Stephen F. Siegel, Rajeev Thakur, William Gropp, Ewing L. Lusk, Bronis R. de Supinski, Martin Schulz, and Greg Bronevetsky. 2011. Formal analysis of MPI-based parallel programs. *Commun. ACM* (2011), 82–91.
- William Gropp. 2002. MPICH2: A new start for MPI implementations. In *EuroMPI*. 7–7.
- Shengjian Guo, Markus Kusano, Chao Wang, Zijiang Yang, and Aarti Gupta. 2015. Assertion guided symbolic execution of multithreaded programs. In *FSE*. 854–865.
- Tobias Hilbrich, Joachim Protze, Martin Schulz, Bronis R de Supinski, and Matthias S Müller. 2012. MPI runtime error detection with MUST: advances in deadlock detection. In *SC*. 30.
- Gerard J Holzmann. 1997. The model checker SPIN. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* (1997), 279–295.
- Gerard J. Holzmann. 2012. Promela manual pages. <http://spinroot.com/spin/Man/promela.html>. (2012).
- Yu Huang and Eric Mercer. 2015. Detecting MPI Zero Buffer Incompatibility by SMT Encoding. In *NFM*. 219–233.
- Yu Huang, Eric Mercer, and Jay McCarthy. 2013. Proving MCAPI executions are correct using SMT. In *ASE*. 26–36.
- Joxan Jaffar, Vijayaraghavan Murali, and Jorge A Navas. 2013. Boosting concolic testing via interpolation. In *FSE*. 48–58.
- Ranjit Jhala and Rupak Majumdar. 2005. Path slicing. In *PLDI*. 38–47.
- René Just, Darioush Jalali, Laura Inozemtseva, Michael D Ernst, Reid Holmes, and Gordon Fraser. 2014. Are mutants a valid substitute for real faults in software testing?. In *FSE*. 654–665.
- J.C. King. 1976. Symbolic execution and program testing. *Commun. ACM* (1976), 385–394.
- Bettina Krammer, Katrin Bidmon, Matthias S Müller, and Michael M Resch. 2004. MARMOT: An MPI analysis and checking tool. *Advances in Parallel Computing* (2004), 493–500.
- Hugo A. López, Eduardo R. B. Marques, Francisco Martins, Nicholas Ng, César Santos, Vasco Thudichum Vasconcelos, and Nobuko Yoshida. 2015. Protocol-based verification of message-passing parallel programs. In *OOPSLA*. 280–298.
- Ziqing Luo, Manchun Zheng, and Stephen F. Siegel. 2017. Verification of MPI programs using CIVL. In *EuroMPI*. 6:1–6:11.
- Zohar Manna and Amir Pnueli. 1992. *The temporal logic of reactive and concurrent systems - specification*. Springer.
- Kenneth L. McMillan. 2005. Applications of Craig Interpolants in Model Checking. In *TACAS*. 1–12.
- Matthias Müller, Bronis de Supinski, Ganesh Gopalakrishnan, Tobias Hilbrich, and David Lecomber. 2011. Dealing with MPI bugs at scale: Best practices, automatic detection, debugging, and formal verification. http://sc11.supercomputing.org/schedule/event_detail.php?evid=tut131, (2011).
- Flemming Nielson, Hanne R Nielson, and Chris Hankin. 2015. *Principles of program analysis*. Springer.
- Aditya V Nori, Sriram K Rajamani, SaiDeep Tetali, and Aditya V Thakur. 2009. The YOGI Project: Software property checking via static analysis and testing. In *TACAS*. 178–181.
- Wojciech Penczek, Maciej Szreter, Rob Gerth, and Ruurd Kuiper. 2000. Improving Partial Order Reductions for Universal Branching Time Properties. *Fundam. Inform.* (2000), 245–267.
- Juan A. Rico-Gallego and Juan Carlos Diaz Martín. 2011. Performance Evaluation of Thread-Based MPI in Shared Memory. In *EuroMPI*. 337–338.
- Bill Roscoe. 2005. *The theory and practice of concurrency*. Prentice-Hall.
- Victor Samofalov, V. Krukov, B. Kuhn, S. Zheltov, Alexander V. Kononov, and J. DeSouza. 2005. Automated Correctness Analysis of MPI Programs with Intel(r) Message Checker. In *PARCO*. 901–908.
- Stephen F. Siegel. 2007. Verifying Parallel Programs with MPI-Spin. In *PVM/MPI*. 13–14.

- Stephen F Siegel and Timothy K Zirkel. 2011a. FEVS: A functional equivalence verification suite for high-performance scientific computing. *Mathematics in Computer Science* (2011), 427–435.
- Stephen F. Siegel and Timothy K. Zirkel. 2011b. TASS: The Toolkit for Accurate Scientific Software. *Mathematics in Computer Science* (2011), 395–426.
- Marc Snir. 1998. *MPI—the Complete Reference: The MPI core*. Vol. 1. MIT press.
- Ting Su, Zhoulai Fu, Geguang Pu, Jifeng He, and Zhendong Su. 2015. Combining symbolic execution and model checking for data flow testing. In *ICSE*. 654–665.
- Jun Sun, Yang Liu, Jin Song Dong, and Jun Pang. 2009. PAT: Towards flexible verification under fairness. In *CAV*. 709–714.
- Nikolai Tillmann and Jonathan de Halleux. 2008. Pex-White Box Test Generation for .NET. In *TAP*. 134–153.
- Sarvani Vakkalanka. 2010. *Efficient dynamic verification algorithms for MPI applications*. Ph.D. Dissertation. The University of Utah.
- Sarvani S. Vakkalanka, Ganesh Gopalakrishnan, and Robert M. Kirby. 2008. Dynamic Verification of MPI Programs with Reductions in Presence of Split Operations and Relaxed Orderings. In *CAV*. 66–79.
- Anh Vo, Sriram Aananthakrishnan, Ganesh Gopalakrishnan, Bronis R De Supinski, Martin Schulz, and Greg Bronevetsky. 2010. A scalable and distributed dynamic formal verifier for MPI programs. In *SC*. 1–10.
- Rogue Wave. 2009. TotalView Software. <http://www.roguewave.com/products/totalview>. (2009).
- Ruini Xue, Xuezheng Liu, Ming Wu, Zhenyu Guo, Wenguang Chen, Weimin Zheng, Zheng Zhang, and Geoffrey Voelker. 2009. MPIWiz: subgroup reproducible replay of MPI applications. *ACM Sigplan Notices* (2009), 251–260.

A APPENDIX

A.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Theorem 3.1 Given an action $a \in \{\text{issue}(o), B, W, SR\}$ and action b , for $S \in \mathcal{G}$, if $a, b \in \text{enabled}(S)$, then $(a, b) \in \mathcal{I}$.

PROOF. Case 1: $a = \text{issue}(o)$. When $a = \text{issue}(o)$ and $a, b \in \text{enabled}(S)$, b can be $\text{issue}(o')$, W , SR , or SR^* w.r.t. the transition rules.

(1) $b = \text{issue}(o')$. Suppose $\text{rank}(o) = i$, $\text{rank}(o') = j$, and $i \neq j$. Since issue action can only block its process, $b \in \text{enabled}(a(S))$ and $a \in \text{enabled}(b(S))$. In addition, $a(b(S)) = b(a(S)) = (\dots, s_i[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, o), \text{Stat} := \text{Stat}', \mathcal{B}.push(o)], \dots, s_j[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, o'), \text{Stat} := \text{Stat}', \mathcal{B}.push(o')], \dots)$. Hence, $(a, b) \in \mathcal{I}$.

(2) $b = W$. Suppose $\text{rank}(o) = i$, $\text{rank}_a(W) = j$, and $i \neq j$. Since $\text{issue}(o)$ can only block Proc_i and W can only make Proc_j active, $b \in \text{enabled}(a(S))$ and $a \in \text{enabled}(b(S))$. In addition, $a(b(S)) = b(a(S)) = (\dots, s_i[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, o), \text{Stat} := \text{Stat}', \mathcal{B}.push(o)], \dots, s_j[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, \text{Wait}), \mathcal{B}.pull(\text{Wait})], \dots)$. Hence, $(a, b) \in \mathcal{I}$.

(3) $b = SR \vee b = SR^*$. Suppose $b = (p, q)$, $\text{rank}(o) = i$, $\text{rank}(p) = j_1$, and $\text{rank}(q) = j_2$. For $i \neq j_1 \wedge i \neq j_2$: since $\text{issue}(o)$ only updates the state of Proc_i , $\text{ready}(p, s_{j_1})$ and $\text{ready}(q, s_{j_2})$ will not be affected. On the other hand, executing (p, q) cannot make Proc_i blocked. Hence $b \in \text{enabled}(a(S))$ and $a \in \text{enabled}(b(S))$. $a(b(S)) = b(a(S)) = (\dots, s_i[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, o), \text{Stat} := \text{Stat}', \mathcal{B}.push(o)], \dots, s_{j_1}[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, p), \mathcal{B}.pull(p)], \dots, s_{j_2}[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, q), \mathcal{B}.pull(q)], \dots)$. For $i = j_1$: since $\text{issue}(o)$ and b are co-enabled, $\text{index}(o) > \text{index}(p)$ and p is non-blocking. Due to $\text{index}(o) > \text{index}(p)$, $\text{issue}(o)$ has no effect on $\text{ready}(p, s_{j_1})$. On the other hand, since p is non-blocking, executing (p, q) cannot make Proc_i blocked. Hence $b \in \text{enabled}(a(S))$ and $a \in \text{enabled}(b(S))$. $a(b(S)) = b(a(S)) = (\dots, s_i[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, o), \text{Stat} := \text{Stat}', \mathcal{B}.pull(p), \mathcal{B}.push(o)], \dots, s_{j_2}[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, q), \mathcal{B}.pull(q)], \dots)$. For $i = j_2$, the proof is similar. Hence $(a, b) \in \mathcal{I}$.

Case 2: $a = B$. When $a = B$ and $a, b \in \text{enabled}(S)$, b can be $(p, q) \in \{SR, SR^*\}$, where both p and q are non-blocking operations. Suppose $\text{rank}(p) = i$ and $\text{rank}(q) = j$, executing (p, q) does not affect $B \in s_i.\mathcal{B}$ and $B \in s_j.\mathcal{B}$. On the other hand, executing B only pull Barrier from $s_i.\mathcal{B}$ and $s_j.\mathcal{B}$, which has no effect on $\text{ready}(p, s_i)$ and $\text{ready}(q, s_j)$. So $b \in \text{enabled}(a(S))$ and $a \in \text{enabled}(b(S))$. Compared with all the other local states, in addition to updating process status and removing Barrier from the buffer of each process, s_i and s_j remove p and q from the buffer, respectively. $a(b(S)) = b(a(S)) =$

$(s_0[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, \text{Barrier}), \mathcal{B}.pull(\text{Barrier})], \dots, s_i[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, \text{Barrier}), \mathcal{B}.pull(\text{Barrier}), \mathcal{B}.pull(p)], \dots, s_j[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, \text{Barrier}), \mathcal{B}.pull(\text{Barrier}), \mathcal{B}.pull(q)], \dots, s_n[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, \text{Barrier}), \mathcal{B}.pull(\text{Barrier})])$). Hence, $(a, b) \in \mathcal{I}$.

Case 3: $a = W$. When $a = W$ and $a, b \in \text{enabled}(S)$, b can be $\text{issue}(o)$, W , and $(p, q) \in \{SR, SR^*\}$. Since \mathcal{I} is symmetric and $(\text{issue}(o), W) \in \mathcal{I}$, $(W, \text{issue}(o)) \in \mathcal{I}$.

(1) $b = W$. Suppose $a = \text{Wait}(r_1)$, $b = \text{Wait}(r_2)$, $\text{rank}_a(a) = i$, and $\text{rank}_a(b) = j$ ($i \neq j$). Executing $\text{Wait}(r_1)/\text{Wait}(r_2)$ cannot affect $\text{ready}(\text{Wait}(r_2), s_j)/\text{ready}(\text{Wait}(r_1), s_i)$, so $b \in \text{enabled}(a(S))$ and $a \in \text{enabled}(b(S))$. $a(b(S)) = b(a(S)) = (\dots, s_i[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, \text{Wait}(r_1)), \mathcal{B}.pull(\text{Wait}(r_1))], \dots, s_j[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, \text{Wait}(r_2)), \mathcal{B}.pull(\text{Wait}(r_2))], \dots)$. Hence, $(a, b) \in \mathcal{I}$.

(2) $b = SR \vee b = SR^*$. Suppose $b = (p, q)$, $\text{rank}_a(W) = i$, $\text{rank}(p) = j_1$ and $\text{rank}(q) = j_2$. For $i \neq j_1 \wedge i \neq j_2$: executing Wait has no effect on $\text{ready}(p, s_{j_1})$ and $\text{ready}(q, s_{j_2})$. On the other hand, executing (p, q) does not affect $\text{ready}(\text{Wait}, s_i)$. So $b \in \text{enabled}(a(S))$ and $a \in \text{enabled}(b(S))$. $a(b(S)) = b(a(S)) = (\dots, s_i[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, \text{Wait}), \mathcal{B}.pull(\text{Wait})], \dots, s_{j_1}[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, p), \mathcal{B}.pull(p)], \dots, s_{j_2}[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, q), \mathcal{B}.pull(q)], \dots)$. For $i = j_1$: p is non-blocking and $\text{index}(W) > \text{index}(p)$. Clearly, executing Wait has no effect on $\text{ready}(p, s_{j_1})$. Besides, $\text{ready}(q, s_{j_2})$ and $\text{ready}(\text{Wait}, s_i)$ are not affected by executing (p, q) . So $b \in \text{enabled}(a(S))$ and $a \in \text{enabled}(b(S))$. $a(b(S)) = b(a(S)) = (\dots, s_i[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, \text{Wait}), \mathcal{B}.pull(p), \mathcal{B}.pull(\text{Wait})], \dots, s_{j_2}[\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, q), \mathcal{B}.pull(q)], \dots)$. The proof for $i = j_2$ is similar. Hence, $(a, b) \in \mathcal{I}$.

Case 4: $a = SR$. When $a = SR$ and $a, b \in \text{enabled}(S)$, b can be $\text{issue}(o)$, B , W , and $(p, q) \in \{SR, SR^*\}$. Since \mathcal{I} is symmetric and $(\text{issue}(o), SR)$, (B, SR) , $(W, SR) \in \mathcal{I}$, $(SR, \text{issue}(o))$, (SR, B) , $(SR, W) \in \mathcal{I}$.

$b = SR \vee b = SR^*$. Suppose $a = (p_1, p_2)$ and $b = (q_1, q_2)$. Executing SR/SR^* pulls the corresponding operations from the buffer. The co-enableness of a and b ensures that the pulled action is not in the match pair of the other. So $b \in \text{enabled}(a(S)) \wedge a \in \text{enabled}(b(S))$. If $\forall i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, $\text{rank}(p_i) \neq \text{rank}(q_j)$, changing the order of updating the status of different processes is insensitive to the resulting state. Once $\exists i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, $\text{rank}(p_i) = \text{rank}(q_j)$, suppose $\text{index}(p_i) < \text{index}(q_j)$, then p_i must be non-blocking. Similar to the second case ($i = j_1$) when $a = W \wedge (b = SR \vee b = SR^*)$ (cf., **Case 3**), changing the order of $\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, p_i)$ and $\text{update}(\mathcal{F}, q_j)$ cannot change the result state. On the other hand, whatever the relationship of $\text{rank}(p_i)$ and $\text{rank}(q_j)$ is, changing the order of buffer pulling operations makes no difference for the resulting state. So $a(b(S)) = b(a(S))$. Hence $(a, b) \in \mathcal{I}$.

In conclusion, theorem holds. \square