

# Highly-Efficient Persistent FIFO Queues<sup>\*</sup>

Panagiota Fatourou<sup>1,2</sup>, Nikos Giachoudis<sup>1</sup>, and George Mallis<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> FORTH ICS, Greece {faturu,ngiachou}@ics.forth.gr

<sup>2</sup> University of Crete, Greece csd4165@csd.uoc.gr

**Abstract.** In this paper, we study the question whether techniques employed, in a conventional system, by state-of-the-art concurrent algorithms to avoid contended hot spots are still efficient for recoverable computing in settings with Non-Volatile Memory (NVM). We focus on concurrent FIFO queues that have two end-points, head and tail, which are highly contended.

We present a persistent FIFO queue implementation that performs a pair of persistence instructions per operation (enqueue or dequeue). The algorithm achieves to perform these instructions on variables of low contention by employing Fetch&Increment and using the state-of-the-art queue implementation by Afek and Morrison (PPoPP'13). These result in performance that is up to 2x faster than state-of-the-art persistent FIFO queue implementations.

**Keywords:** Non-volatile memory (NVM) · NVM-based computing · Persistence · Recoverable algorithms · Recoverable data structures · Concurrent data structures · FIFO queue · Lock-freedom · Persistence cost analysis.

## 1 Introduction

Non-Volatile Memory (NVM) has been proposed as an emerging memory technology to provide the persistence capabilities of secondary storage at access speeds that are close to those of DRAM. In systems with NVM, concurrent algorithms can be designed to be *recoverable* (or *persistent*), by persisting parts of the data they use. This enables to restore their states after system-crash failures. In this direction, a vast amount of papers that appear in the literature propose persistent implementations for a wide collection of concurrent data structures, including stacks [9,23], queues [9,11,25], heaps [9], and many others. Moreover, a lot of papers have focused on designing general transformations [1,2,9] and universal constructions [3,4,9,22] that can be applied on many conventional concurrent data structures to get their persistent analogs. (This list of references is by no means exhaustive.)

In this paper, we study the question whether techniques employed, in a conventional system, by state-of-the-art concurrent algorithms, to avoid contended hot spots, are still efficient for persistent computing in settings with NVMs. We focus on concurrent queues that have two end-points, head and tail, which are highly contended. Accesses to the queue's endpoints result in bottlenecks, making most existing concurrent queue implementations non-scalable. Several papers have proposed techniques for reducing this cost. One approach uses software combining [6,5,7,8,18,13], a technique that attempts to reduce synchronization by having a thread, the *combiner*, to collect and apply operations (of the same type) on each of the endpoints. Other papers [5,7,10,20] use *Fetch&Increment* (*FAI*) to avoid hotspots; *FAI* is an *atomic* primitive which increases by one the value of a shared variable it takes as a parameter, and returns its previous value. Avoiding hotspots using *FAI*, when designing a concurrent FIFO queue, resulted in LCRQ, the state-of-the-art concurrent queue implementation, for which it has been experimentally shown [20] to significantly outperform the previously-proposed state-of-the-art algorithm [6], which was based on software-combining.

The performance power of software combining in persistence has been studied in [6]. The combining-based persistent FIFO queue implementation [6] has been shown to outperform all other persistent queue implementations, specialized or not. As specialized algorithms take into

---

<sup>\*</sup> Supported by the Hellenic Foundation for Research and Innovation (HFRI) under the "Second Call for HFRI Research Projects to support Faculty Members and Researchers" (project number: 3684).

consideration the semantics of the data structure to make design decisions in favor of performance, this was kind of surprising. However, the specialized persistent queues that are proposed in the literature [11,25] are not based on state-of-the-art queue implementations [20,9].

In this paper, we examine whether the use of *FAI* is a more promising approach for designing persistent queues than employing combining. Specifically, we focus on the state-of-the-art queue implementation (LCRQ) [20], and study the correctness and performance implications of different persistence choices to make it persistent. We end up with a persistent FIFO queue implementation, called PERLCRQ, that performs much better than any previous such implementation.

LCRQ is inspired by the simple idea of using an infinite array,  $\mathcal{Q}$  (which initially contains  $\perp$ ), and two *FAI* objects, `Tail` and `Head` (initially 0). An enqueueer executes a *FAI* on `Tail` to get an index  $i$  of the array where the new item should be enqueued. Then, it performs a `GET&SET` to swap the element to be inserted with the current value of  $\mathcal{Q}[i]$  (which in a successful enqueue it should be  $\perp$ ). Similarly, a dequeueer executes *FAI* on `Head`, to get the array index from where it will dequeue an item by swapping the value of that element with  $\top$ . This way, each element of the array has at most one enqueueer that tries to insert an element in it and at most one dequeueer that tries to dequeue from it. This simple algorithm, which we call IQ, is not practical, as it requires an array of infinite size. Moreover, it may result in a livelock with an enqueueer and a dequeueer always interfering with one another without ever making progress. CRQ [20] follows similar ideas as IQ but it uses a circular array (of bounded size) to store the new items. This introduces many more cases where synchronization is needed between enqueueers and dequeueers, but results in a more practical algorithm. To solve the live-lock problem (and the space limitation of the static array), LCRQ employs several CRQ instances, connected in a linked list to form a queue as in the well-known lock-free queue implementation in [19]. (Section 3 presents the details of IQ, CRQ and LCRQ.)

Our effort focuses on making LCRQ persistent with the least possible *persistence cost* (Section 4), i.e. without paying a high performance overhead to support persistence, in periods of time where no failures occur. A shared variable can be persisted by executing a pair of persistence instructions: `pwb`, which requests the system to flush back the current value of a shared variable to NVM and works in a non-blocking way, and `psync`, that blocks until flushing has been completed for all preceding `pwb`s. Persistence can easily be supported on top of an existing concurrent algorithm by persisting all shared variables [15] every time they are updated. However, this technique would have excessive performance overhead. On the other hand, the simple approach of persisting only `Head` (`Tail`) every time a *FAI* is executed on it, results also in excessive performance cost as it violates two major persistence principles crucial for performance [1]: a) it executes many persistence instructions per operation, and b) it applies persistence instructions on highly contended shared variables accessed by all threads.

We focused first on achieving persistence with a single pair of persistence instructions per operation, which is optimal. Starting from IQ, we managed to persist only once per operation. This required careful design of the algorithms' *recovery functions* (the recovery function of an implementation is executed by the system, after a crash, to bring the data structure in a coherent state). It also required long argumentation to prove that the proposed algorithms are indeed correct (i.e., they satisfy *durable linearizability* [16]). We consider these to be main contributions of the paper, as the persistence part of the algorithms themselves (without considering the recovery functions) had to be maintained as simple and minimal as possible for achieving our performance goals. We next observed that even when we persist only once, we cannot beat the state-of-the-art combining based approaches [9], if persistence instructions are executed on `Head` and `Tail` that are highly contended. So, we came up with persistent variants of the algorithms, where an enqueue operation *op* persists only the last value it writes into  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Moreover, for IQ, we came up with PERIQ, where dequeue operations persist also only the last value they write

into  $Q$ . As each position of the array is accessed by only two threads, both persistence principles mentioned above are respected by PERIQ. This results in low performance overhead.

Respecting the persistence principles [1], when designing PERCRQ (the persistent version of CRQ) was more challenging. A position  $i$  of  $Q$  can now be accessed by any operation that reads  $i + kR$  in `Tail` (or `Head`), where  $k \geq 0$  is an integer and  $R$  is the size of the circular array. This leads to the necessity to persist `Head` every time an item is dequeued to ensure durable linearizability. However, as explained previously, doing so has considerable performance overhead. To avoid this cost, we introduce the following technique. Each thread maintains a local copy of `Head`. Every time it is about to complete a dequeue operation, it persists the local copy of `Head` (instead of its shared version, on which `FAI` is executed to get an index in  $Q$ ). Since the local copies of `Head` are single-writer, single-reader variables, this significantly reduces the cost of persistence (Section 5, Figures 2, 3). We believe that this technique is of independent interest and can be used to get persistent versions of many other state-of-the-art concurrent algorithms.

Our experimental analysis (Section 5) shows that PERLCRQ is at least 2x faster than its best competitor, PBQUEUE [9]. We also provide experiments to support all our claims above.

Performing a single pair of persisting instructions per operation in PERIQ introduces some recovery cost. (The *recovery cost* is the time needed to execute the recovery function.) The *recovery function* of PERIQ has to scan  $Q$  until it finds a streak of  $n$  subsequent  $\perp$  values. This might end up to be expensive, as bigger parts of  $Q$  has to be scanned as the time is progressing. On the other hand, we may choose to trade performance at normal execution time (where no failures occur) by periodically persisting `Head` and `Tail`. This illustrates an interesting tradeoff between the performance at normal execution time and the recovery cost: better performance at normal execution time results in higher cost at recovery (and vice versa). It is an interesting problem to study whether this trade-off appears when designing the persistence versions of other state-of-the-art techniques for ensuring synchronization and for designing concurrent data structures in a conventional (non-NVM) setting. We believe that this trade-off is inherent in many cases.

We provide experiments (Section 5) to simulate failures which allows us to measure the recovery cost. To the best of our knowledge, none of the papers on persistent data structures in shared memory systems provide experiments to measure the recovery cost.

Summarizing, the main contributions of this paper are the following:

- (1) We present PERLCRQ, a persistent implementation of a FIFO queue that is much faster than existing state-of-the-art persistent queue implementations. PERLCRQ promotes the idea of starting from the state-of-the-art implementation of a concurrent data structure (DS) to come up with an efficient persistent implementation of it. This departs from the approach followed in previous specialized persistent FIFO queue implementations [11,25].
- (2) We illustrate an interesting tradeoff between the persistence cost of an algorithm at normal execution time and its recovery cost.
- (3) We provide a framework to simulate failures and measure the recovery cost.
- (4) Our experimental analysis shows that a) PERLCRQ is at least two times faster than its competitors, and that b) respecting the persistence principles presented in [1] is indeed crucial for performance.
- (5) Based on our experiments, we propose a new technique for reducing the persistence cost, namely using local copies of highly-contended shared variables by each thread and persisting them instead. This technique transfers part of the persistence cost from normal execution time to recovery, and is of independent interest.

## 2 Preliminaries

We consider a system where  $n$  asynchronous threads run concurrently and communicate using shared objects. In addition to read/write objects, that support atomic *reads* and *writes* on/to the state of the object, the system also provides the following *atomic* primitives: a)

FETCH&INCREMENT( $V$ ) (*FAI*), which adds 1 to  $V$ 's current value and returns the value that  $V$  had before the increment, b) GET&SET( $V, v'$ ), which stores value  $v'$  into  $V$  and returns  $V$ 's previous value, c) COMPARE&SWAP( $V, v_{old}, v_{new}$ ) (*CAS*), which checks the value of  $V$  and if it is  $v_{old}$ , it changes its value to  $v_{new}$  and returns **true**, otherwise it makes no change and returns **false**. A variant of *CAS* is CAS2( $V, (v_0^{old}, v_1^{old}), (v_0^{new}, v_1^{new})$ ), which operates atomically on an array  $V$  of two elements. Specifically, it checks if  $V[0] == v_0^{old} \wedge V[1] == v_1^{old}$  and if this is true it changes the value of  $V$  to  $\{v_0^{new}, v_1^{new}\}$  and returns **true**; otherwise it returns **false** without changing  $V$ . Finally, TEST&SET( $B$ ) changes the value of a shared bit  $B$  to 1 and returns its value before the change; it comes together with RESET( $B$ ), which resets the value of  $B$  to 0. In the pseudocodes in later sections, the names of shared objects start with a capital letter. We assume the *Total Store Order (TSO)* model, where writes become visible in program order.

The system's memory is comprised of a non-volatile part and its volatile components (registers, caches, DRAM). We study persistence under the *full-system crash failure* (or *system-wide crash failure*) model [17]. When a failure occurs, the values of all variables stored in volatile memory are lost and are reset to their initial values at recovery time. On the contrary, any data that was written back (*persisted*) to NVM persist (i.e., they are available at recovery time).

We assume *explicit epoch persistency* [17], where a write-back to the persistent memory is initiated through a specific instruction called *persistent write-back (pwb)*; **pwb** is asynchronous, i.e., the order in which **pwb**s take effect may not be preserved inherently. To enforce ordering when necessary, a **pfence** instruction ensures that all **pwb** instructions performed before the **pfence**, are realized before those that follow it. However, **pfence** is also asynchronous, so it does not provide any guarantee that the **pwb**s that preceded it have occurred by the time of a crash. A **psync** instruction causes a thread to block until all prior **pwb** instructions have been realized (i.e., the data they flush have indeed been written back to the NVM). We collectively refer to **pwb**, **pfence**, and **psync** as the set of *persistence instructions*. The *persistence cost* of an operation's instance (an execution) is the time overhead incurred from executing its persistence instructions.

We assume that a recoverable implementation has an associated *recovery function* (for the system as a whole). After a system failure, the recovery function is invoked to bring the system in a consistent state. Then, the system may (asynchronously) recover failed threads, which start by invoking new operations. The *recovery cost* of an implementation is the time needed to execute its recovery function. We usually measure it by taking the average among several runs, in each of which the recovery function is executed at the end after a system-wide failure (see details in Section 5).

Consider an execution  $\alpha$ , and let  $c_1, c_2, \dots$  be crash events in  $\alpha$ , in order. We divide  $\alpha$  into *epochs*  $E_1, E_2, \dots$ . The first epoch starts at  $C_0$  and ends with  $c_1$ , if  $C_1$  exists, otherwise  $E_1$  is the entire execution. For each  $k > 0$ , epoch  $E_k$  starts with the event following  $c_{k-1}$  and ends with  $c_k$ , if  $c_k$  exists in  $E_k$ . If  $c_k$  does not exist,  $E_k$  is the suffix of  $\alpha$  after  $c_{k-1}$ .

An operation  $op$  has an *invocation* and may have a *response*;  $op$ 's *execution interval* starts with its invocation and ends with its response (if it exists) or it is the suffix of an execution starting with its invocation (otherwise). An implementation is *lock-free*, if in every infinite execution it produces, it holds that if the number of failures is finite, an infinite number of operations respond.

In a conventional setting where threads never recover after a crash, an execution  $\alpha$  is *linearizable* [14] if there exists a sequential execution  $\sigma$  which contains all completed operations in  $\alpha$  (and possibly some of the uncompleted ones), such that a) the response of every operation in  $\alpha$  is the same as that of the corresponding operation in  $\sigma$ , and b) the order of operations in  $\sigma$  respects the partial order induced by the execution intervals of operations in  $\alpha$ . An algorithm is *linearizable*, if all the executions it produces are linearizable.

We now consider a setting where failed threads may recover. Briefly, an execution is *durably linearizable* [17], if the state of the object after every crash reflects all the changes performed by the operations that have completed by the time of the crash (and possibly by some of the

uncompleted operations). Our goal is to design durably linearizable implementations of FIFO queues with low persistence cost.

### 3 LCRQ: A Brief Description

LCRQ [20] uses multiple instances of a static circular FIFO queue implementation, called CRQ. CRQ is based on a simple but impractical algorithm, which we call IQ and we discuss it first.

**The IQ algorithm.** In IQ (black lines in Algorithm 1), the queue is represented as an array ( $Q$ ) of infinite size, initialized with  $\perp$  in all of its cells, and two variables **Head** and **Tail**, initially 0. **Head** stores the index of  $Q$ 's item that is going to be dequeued next, whereas **Tail** stores the index of the next available  $Q$ 's cell to store a new item.

Enqueue uses *FAI* to read **Tail** and get the current available index of  $Q$ . It then attempts to store the new item there using *GET&SET*. If the *GET&SET* returns  $\perp$ , the enqueue is successful. Otherwise, it re-tries by applying the steps described above. A dequeue uses *FAI* to identify the next item to be removed by reading **Head**. It then attempts to read that item and replace it with  $\top$  by using *GET&SET*. If *GET&SET* returns a not  $\perp$  item, the dequeue is successful and returns it. If *GET&SET* returns  $\perp$  and **Head**  $>$  **Tail**, the dequeue returns **EMPTY** (i.e., the queue is empty). Otherwise, these steps are repeated until either some non- $\perp$  value or **EMPTY** is returned.

The IQ algorithm is very simple but unrealistic, because of the infinite table it uses. Another issue of the IQ algorithm is that if a dequeue operation continuously swaps  $\top$  in cells that an enqueue operation is trying to access, we would have a *livelock*.

**The CRQ algorithm.** To address the infinite array issue, CRQ (see black lines of Algorithm 3) implements  $Q$  as a circular array, of size  $R$ . As in IQ, **Head** and **Tail** are implemented as *FAI* objects, whose values are incremented indefinitely. Each enqueue (dequeue) reads the value  $i$  in **Tail** (**Head**). Consider an enqueue (dequeue) operation that reads index  $i$  by executing *FAI* on **Tail** (**Head**) and stores (removes) an element in (from)  $Q[i \bmod R]$ . We say that the *index* of the operation is  $i$ . A pair of enqueue and dequeue operations that both have index  $i$  are called *matching operations*, and we denote them by  $enq_i$  and  $deq_i$ .

Every cell in the array now stores a 3-tuple object  $(s, i, v)$ , containing the *safe bit*, an *index*, and the *value* of the item it stores; its initial value is  $(1, u, \perp)$ , where  $u$  is the actual index of each cell of the array. If the node's value is  $\perp$  then that node is *unoccupied*, otherwise it is *occupied*. An enqueue with index  $i$  and value  $v$  tries to store the triplet  $(1, v, i)$  in  $Q[i \bmod R]$ , if this array cell is unoccupied. CRQ ensures that only the dequeue with index  $i$  can dequeue this item.

The use of a circular array results in several synchronization challenges between enqueueers and dequeuers. Specifically, CRQ copes with the following cases: a) a dequeue  $deq$  finds an element of  $Q$  it accesses to store an index less than or equal to the index it uses and be unoccupied (*empty transition*), and b)  $deq$  finds  $Q$ 's element occupied by an item that an enqueue other than its matching one has inserted (*unsafe transition*). A *transition* is a change of the value of an array cell. A dequeue operation  $deq$  performs a *dequeue transition* if it successfully executes the CAS2 in line 34, changing the value of item  $Q[t \bmod R]$  from  $(s, t, v)$  to  $(s, t + R, \perp)$ . In order to have that transition,  $t$  should match the index  $i$  of the cell, and the cell must be also occupied (line 32).  $deq$  executes an *empty transition* if it arrives before the enqueue that gets index  $t$  stores its item in the cell, and finds the cell unoccupied. Then, the CAS2 is called (line 41) to change the index of that cell to  $t + R$ . This prevents an  $enq$  that reads  $i$  in **Tail** to add its item in this array element. This is needed to ensure linearizability, as there will be no dequeuer to dequeue this item (a dequeuer has already *exhausted* index  $i$ ). Finally,  $deq$  performs an *unsafe transition*, if it arrives while the cell is occupied with index  $t - kR$ , where  $k > 0$ . Then,  $deq$  executes the CAS2 of line 38 to change the safe bit to 0. This way it informs later enqueueers to be careful, as the items they want to store in this position may never be removed. An enqueueer has to check whether **Head**  $>$   $i$  and if this is so, the dequeuer may have already passed from this position, so they try the insertion with the next available index.

---

**Algorithm 1** Persistent IQ (PERIQ). Ignore code in blue to get the pseudocode for IQ.

---

```

1: function ENQUEUE( $x$ : Item)
2:   while true do
3:      $t \leftarrow \text{FETCH\&INCREMENT}(\text{Tail})$ 
4:     if GET&SET( $\mathcal{Q}[t], x$ ) ==  $\perp$  then
5:       pwb( $\mathcal{Q}[t]$ ); psync()
6:       return OK
7: function DEQUEUE
8:   while true do
9:      $h \leftarrow \text{FETCH\&INCREMENT}(\text{Head})$ 
10:     $x \leftarrow \text{GET\&SET}(\mathcal{Q}[h], \top)$ 
11:    if  $x \neq \perp$  then
12:      pwb( $\mathcal{Q}[h]$ ); psync()
13:      return  $x$ 
14:    if  $\text{Tail} \leq h + 1$  then
15:      pwb( $\mathcal{Q}[h]$ ); psync()
16:      return EMPTY
17: function RECOVERY
18:    $\text{count}_{\perp} = 0$ 
19:   while  $\text{count}_{\perp} < n$  do
20:     if  $\mathcal{Q}[\text{Tail}] == \perp$  then  $\text{count}_{\perp} = \text{count}_{\perp} + 1$ 
21:     else  $\text{count}_{\perp} = 0$ 
22:      $\text{Tail} \leftarrow \text{Tail} + 1$ 
23:    $\text{Tail} \leftarrow \text{Tail} - n + 1$ 
24:    $\text{Head} \leftarrow \text{Tail}$ 
25:   while  $\mathcal{Q}[\text{Head}] \neq \top$  and  $\text{Head} \geq 0$  do
26:      $\text{Head} \leftarrow \text{Head} - 1$ 
27:    $\text{Head} \leftarrow \text{Head} + 1$ 

```

---

Before attempting its insertion, a thread executing an `ENQUEUE( $\text{crq}, x$ )`, that reads  $t$  in `Tail` (line 4), checks that: a) the index  $i$  of cell  $\mathcal{Q}[t \bmod R]$  is at most as big as the value  $t$  (line 14) (otherwise, the enqueue operation tries the next potentially available cell, as another operation with index higher than  $t$  has already processed this item), b) the safe bit  $s$  is equal to 1 or `Head` is at most  $t$  (line 14) (the second condition ensures that the dequeue with index  $t$  has not started its execution yet, so the signal through the safe bit does not concern it). An *enqueue transition* succeeds when the CAS2 operation in line 14 succeeds.

Linearizability of IQ and CRQ are discussed in [20]. CRQ implements a *tantrum* queue, i.e. a FIFO queue with relaxed semantics: any enqueue operation may return a special value `CLOSED` (which identifies that the array is full or that it faces a livelock when trying to insert a new element in it); as soon as an enqueue returns `CLOSED` on an instance of CRQ, all other enqueue operations on the same CRQ instance should also return `CLOSED`.

**The LCRQ implementation.** The main idea of LCRQ (see black lines of Algorithm 5) is to use a linked list of nodes, each representing an instance of CRQ. The linked list together with two pointers (`First` and `Last`) to its endpoints, implement a FIFO queue, which closely follows the lock-free FIFO queue implementation by Michael and Scott [19]. When an enqueue on the current instance of CRQ returns `CLOSED`, it creates a new CRQ instance containing the item to be inserted and appends it to the list. When a dequeue on the CRQ instance pointed by `First`, returns `EMPTY`, it dequeues this node by moving `First` to point to the next CRQ node in the list. LCRQ is a linearizable implementation of a FIFO queue [20].

## 4 Persistent FIFO Queue Algorithm

### 4.1 Persistent IQ

PERIQ (Algorithm 1) works like IQ and persists just the last write into  $\mathcal{Q}$  of each operation. This is optimal, but also it ensures low persistence cost due to low contention [1], as IQ ensures that each element of  $\mathcal{Q}$  is accessed by at most two threads. Note that persisting `Head` and `Tail`, instead, could also work, but it would be more expensive in terms of performance, since these variables are accessed by all threads and thus they are highly contended (see Section 5, Figure 6).

On the other hand, avoiding writing back `Head` and `Tail`, adds complexity, and thus also performance overhead, to the recovery function. To recover `Tail`, PERIQ searches the array for the first continuous streak of  $n$  unoccupied cells, where  $n$  is the total number of threads in the system. Note that when a crash happens, some of the active enqueueers may already have inserted their items into  $\mathcal{Q}$  (and their write-backs to NVM has taken effect) but others might not. However, all the unoccupied positions between two occupied are taken from enqueue operations that are active at the time of the crash. Since there are  $n$  processes running concurrently, it is

---

**Algorithm 2** PERIQ linearization procedure

---

Execution  $\alpha$  and set of epochs  $\mathcal{E} := \{E_1, E_2, \dots\}$  in  $\alpha$

- 1: **LinQ** auxiliary infinite array
- 2:  $head(\mathbf{LinQ})$  accessor to head index of **LinQ**
- 3:  $tail(\mathbf{LinQ})$  accessor to tail index of **LinQ**
  
- 4: **for** each epoch  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  **do**
- 5:     **for** each event  $j = 1, 2, \dots$  in epoch  $E_k$  **do**
- 6:         **if**  $e_j = \langle t \leftarrow \text{FETCH\&INCREMENT}(\mathbf{Tail}) \rangle$  **then**
- 7:             Let  $enq(x)$  be the enqueue that executes  $e_j$
- 8:             **if**  $e_j$  is the last *FAI* of  $enq(x)$  and  $enq(x)$  is persisted  
               **or**  $\exists$  matching deque  $\in E_k$  for  $enq(x)$ , which is persisted **then**
- 9:                  $\mathbf{LinQ}[t] \leftarrow x$
- 10:                  $tail(\mathbf{LinQ}) \leftarrow t + 1$
- 11:                 Linearize that enqueue operation at  $e_j$
- 12:             **else if**  $e_j$  is a **Tail** read by  $\langle deg: per \rangle$  such that  
               **Tail**  $\leq$  **Head** at the time of the read **then**
- 13:                 Linearize that dequeue operation at  $e_j$
- 14:             **while**  $head(\mathbf{LinQ}) < tail(\mathbf{LinQ})$  **do**
- 15:                  $h \leftarrow \min\{i: \mathbf{LinQ}[i] \neq \perp\}$
- 16:                 Let  $deg()$  be the dequeue whose *FAI* returns  $h$
- 17:                 **if**  $deg()$  not active in  $e_1, \dots, e_j$  of  $E_k$  **then**
- 18:                     **break**
- 19:                 **if**  $deg()$  is persisted **or**  $\exists$  a following persisted dequeue to  $deg()$  in  $E_k$  **then**
- 20:                      $x \leftarrow \mathbf{LinQ}[h]$
- 21:                      $\mathbf{LinQ}[h] \leftarrow \perp$
- 22:                      $head(\mathbf{LinQ}) \leftarrow h + 1$
- 23:                     Linearize that dequeue operation at  $e_j$

---

easy to see that  $l < n$ . Thus, there are at most  $n - 1$  unoccupied cells between two occupied. Because of this, when the recovery function in PERIQ finds the first streak of  $n$  unoccupied cells in  $\mathcal{Q}$ , it sets **Tail** to the first cell of that streak.

To find **Head**, PERIQ (Algorithm 1) starts from **Tail** and traverses towards the beginning of  $\mathcal{Q}$  until it first sees the value  $\top$ . **Head** is set to point to the element on the right of this  $\top$  in  $\mathcal{Q}$  (or to 0 if such an element does not exist). This way, there does not exist an element with the value  $\top$  between **Head** and **Tail**.

We now discuss why PERIQ ensures durable linearizability. We denote by  $enq_j$  the enqueue operation that reads  $j$  in **Tail** (line 3) in its last iteration of the while loop (line 2) and successfully inserts an item  $x_j$  in position  $\mathcal{Q}[j]$ . A dequeue operation *matches*  $enq_j$  if it reads  $j$  in **Head** (line 9) and replaces  $x_j$  with  $\top$  in  $\mathcal{Q}[j]$  (line 10). We denote by  $deg_j$  the matching dequeue operation of  $enq_j$ . Any dequeue that reads  $j' > j$  in **Head** (line 9) and replaces a value  $\notin \{\top, \perp\}$  with  $\top$  in  $\mathcal{Q}[j']$  (line 10) is called a *following* dequeue to  $deg_j$ . An operation *belongs to* an epoch  $E_k$ , if it performs a *FAI* in  $E_k$ . A dequeue operation is *successful* if it replaces a value  $x \notin \{\top, \perp\}$  with  $\top$  in  $\mathcal{Q}$  (line 10). We say that an enqueue operation is *persisted* if it has executed the **GET&SET** (line 4), the return value is  $\perp$ , and the write-back of the new value has taken effect. A dequeue operation is *persisted*, if it has executed the **GET&SET** (line 10), read a value  $x \neq \perp$ , and the write-back of  $\top$  has taken effect. Persisted operations terminate if the system does not crash.

We linearize an enqueue  $enq$  that belongs to an epoch  $E_k$ , if either  $enq$  is persisted in  $E_k$ , or there exists a matching dequeue  $deg$  to  $enq$  which is persisted in  $E_k$ ;  $enq$  is linearized at the last *FAI* it executes. We linearize a dequeue  $deg$  of  $E_k$ , if either it is persisted in  $E_k$ , or there exist a matching enqueue to  $deg$  that has been included in the linearization and a following dequeue to  $deg$  of  $E_k$  is persisted. If a dequeue returns **EMPTY**, it is linearized when it reads **Tail** on line 14. The linearization points of successful dequeues are assigned in the same order as the linearization points of their matching enqueues, so that the FIFO property holds. Algorithm 2 assigns linearization points to PERIQ in a formal (algorithmic) way.

Roughly speaking, all enqueue and dequeue operations that have been persisted by the time of the crash are linearized. This is needed to ensure durable linearizability, as such operations may have also returned. We linearize all active non-persisted enqueue operations that have matching

---

**Algorithm 3** PERCRQ, code for thread  $p_i$ . Ignore code in blue to get the pseudocode for CRQ. Instances of  $Q$ ,  $Head$ , and  $Tail$  refer to  $crq.Q$ ,  $crq.Head$  and  $crq.Tail$ .

---

```

1: function ENQUEUE( $crq, x$ )
2:    $closedFlag$  : integer, initially 0
3:   while true do
4:      $(cb, t) \leftarrow$  FETCH&INCREMENT( $Tail$ )
5:     if  $cb == 1$  then // closed bit is set
6:       if  $closedFlag == 0$  then
7:          $pwb(Tail)$ ;  $psync()$ 
8:          $closedFlag \leftarrow 1$ 
9:         return CLOSED
10:     $e \leftarrow Q[t \bmod R]$  // get item
11:     $v \leftarrow e.val$  // get item's value
12:     $(s, i) \leftarrow (e.s, e.idx)$  // get safe bit and index
13:    if  $v == \perp$  then
14:      if  $i \leq t$  and  $(s == 1$  or  $Head \leq t)$  and
15:         $CAS2(Q[t \bmod R], (s, i, \perp), (1, t, x))$  then
16:           $pwb(Q[t \bmod R])$ ;  $psync()$ 
17:          return OK
18:       $h \leftarrow Head$  // read Head
19:      if  $t - h \geq R$  or STARVING then
20:        TEST&SET( $Tail.cb$ )
21:         $pwb(Tail)$ ;  $psync()$ 
22:         $closedFlag \leftarrow 1$ 
23:        return CLOSED
24: function DEQUEUE( $crq$ )
25:   while true do
26:      $Head_i \leftarrow$  FETCH&INCREMENT( $Head$ )
27:      $h \leftarrow Head_i$ 
28:      $e \leftarrow Q[h \bmod R]$  // read item
29:     while true do
30:        $v \leftarrow e.v$  // read item's value
31:        $(s, i) \leftarrow (e.s, e.idx)$ 
32:       if  $i > h$  then goto line 43
33:       if  $v \neq \perp$  then
34:         if  $i == h$  then
35:           if  $CAS2(Q[h \bmod R], (s, h, v), (s, h +$ 
36:              $R, \perp))$  then // dequeue transition
37:              $pwb(Head_i)$ ;  $psync()$ 
38:             return  $v$ 
39:           else
40:             if  $CAS2(Q[h \bmod R], (s, i, v), (0, i, v))$ 
41:               then // unsafe transition
42:                 goto line 43
43:           else
44:             if  $CAS2(Q[h \bmod R], (s, i, \perp), (s, h +$ 
45:                $R, \perp))$  then // empty transition
46:                 goto line 43
47:             goto line 43
48:   function FIXSTATE( $crq$ )
49:   while True do
50:      $h \leftarrow$  FETCH&ADD( $crq.head, 0$ )
51:      $t \leftarrow$  FETCH&ADD( $crq.tail, 0$ )
52:     if  $crq.tail \neq t$  then
53:       continue
54:     if  $h \leq t$  then
55:       return
56:     if  $CAS(crq.tail, t, h)$  then
57:       return
58: function RECOVERY
59:    $R$ : size of circular array
60:    $Head \leftarrow \max_{i=1 \dots n} Head_i$ 
61:    $(cb, t) \leftarrow Tail$ 
62:    $Tail \leftarrow (cb, 0)$ 
63:   for  $i \leftarrow 0$ ;  $i < R$ ;  $i++$  do
64:     if  $Q[i].val \neq \perp$  and  $Tail < Q[i].idx + 1$  then
65:        $Tail \leftarrow Q[i].idx + 1$ 
66:     else if  $Q[i].val == \perp$  and  $Q[i].idx \geq R$  then
67:       if  $Tail < Q[i].idx - R + 1$  then
68:          $Tail \leftarrow Q[i].idx - R + 1$ 
69:   if  $Head > Tail$  then  $Tail \leftarrow Head$  // Empty queue
70:   else //  $Head \leq Tail$ 
71:      $max \leftarrow Head$ 
72:     for  $i \leftarrow Head$ ;  $i \bmod R \neq Tail \bmod R$ ;  $i++$  do
73:       if  $Q[i \bmod R].val == \perp$  and
74:          $Q[i \bmod R].idx - R > max$  then
75:          $max \leftarrow Q[i \bmod R].idx - R + 1$ 
76:    $Head \leftarrow max$ 
77:    $min \leftarrow Tail$ 
78:   for  $i \leftarrow Head$ ;  $i \bmod R \neq Tail \bmod R$ ;  $i++$  do
79:     if  $Q[i \bmod R].val \neq \perp$  and  $Q[i \bmod R].idx <$ 
80:        $min$  and  $Q[i \bmod R].idx \geq Head$  then
81:        $min \leftarrow Q[i \bmod R].idx$ 
82:   if  $min < Tail$  then  $Head \leftarrow min$ 
83:   for  $i = Head - 1$ ;  $i \bmod R \neq Tail \bmod R$ ;  $i-$  do
84:      $Q[i \bmod R] \leftarrow (1, i + R, \perp)$ 
85:   for  $i = 0$ ;  $i < R$ ;  $i \leftarrow i + 1$  do  $Q[i].s \leftarrow 1$ 

```

---

dequeue operations which are persisted. Since all persisted dequeue operations are linearized, linearizing also their matching enqueues (even if they are not persisted) is necessary for correctness. We linearize an active non-persisted dequeue  $deg$  only if there is a matching enqueue operation  $enq$  that has been included in the linearization and a following dequeue  $deg'$  to  $deg$  that is persisted in  $E_k$  (and thus it is linearized). This is necessary because in the absence of the linearization of  $deg$ , the linearization of  $deg'$  would violate the FIFO property of the queue (given that  $enq$  has been linearized). Note that if we do not assign a linearization point to an enqueue and its matching dequeue, the FIFO property of the rest operations is not violated. So, we do not linearize  $deg$ , if there is no following dequeue that is linearized in  $E_k$ .

## 4.2 Persistent CRQ

PERCRQ (Algorithm 3) builds upon CRQ, so we focus on how to support persistence on top of CRQ. As in PERIQ, our goal is to execute a single  $pwb$  instruction in each operation. An



enqueue operation, *enq*, either returns `CLOSED` (line 9 or 22), or it returns `OK` (line 16). As shown in Algorithm 3, we managed to insert a single pair of `pwb-psync` instructions in each of these cases. Apparently, the new value written by *enq* has to be written back to NVM before it completes, to ensure durable linearizability. So, the pair of `pwb-psync` in line 15 is necessary. In order to respect the semantics of a tantrum queue, if *enq* returns `CLOSED`, all other enqueues on this instance of CRQ that will be linearized after *enq* should also return `CLOSED`. Thus, PERCRQ has to ensure that the state of `Tail` is `CLOSED` after recovery. This means that we need to persist the `CLOSED` value in `Tail`, as soon as it is written there. This justifies the `pwb-psync` pair of line 20. However, a pair of `pwb-psync` is also needed in line 7, to avoid the following bad scenario: Assume that a thread performs the *TAS* of line 19 and becomes slow before executing the `pwb` instruction of line 20. Afterwards, another thread reads in `Tail` the value 1 for the closed bit and returns `CLOSED` in line 9 without persisting the closed bit. Then, if a crash occurs, at recovery time, `Tail` will not be closed anymore. So, it may happen that a subsequent enqueue operation returns `OK`, violating the semantics of a tantrum queue.

To reduce the persistence cost, we use a known technique [1,9], which uses a flag (*closedFlag*) to indicate whether executing the persistence instructions can be avoided.

Consider now a dequeue operation, *deq*. Assume first that *deq* has executed the *CAS* of line 34 (dequeue transition), successfully, and thus, at the absence of a crash, it will return in line 36. Our first effort was to follow the same approach as in PERIQ, and persist the triplet written by *deq* into  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Scenario 1 explains why persisting just this triplet is not enough.

**Scenario 1** *Consider a circular array  $\mathcal{Q}$  of size  $R = 5$  and let its state consist of the following triplets:  $\{(1, x_0, 0), (1, x_1, 1), (1, x_2, 2), (1, x_8, 8), (1, \perp, 4)\}$  (see Fig. 1a for a graphical illustration). Assume that the values of these triplets are stored in NVM. If a crash occurs, at recovery time, Algorithm 3 cannot distinguish between the following two cases: (a) the enqueue with index 8 (*enq*<sub>8</sub>) occurs after the enqueue with index 3 (*enq*<sub>3</sub>) and its matching dequeue (*deq*<sub>3</sub>) have been completed. (b) *enq*<sub>8</sub> stores its item in  $\mathcal{Q}[3]$  before *enq*<sub>3</sub> stores its own item there and no dequeue operations (at all) have been executed. In both cases we linearize enqueues *enq*<sub>0</sub>, *enq*<sub>1</sub>, *enq*<sub>2</sub> and *enq*<sub>8</sub> (as they are persisted operations). However, in the first case, we have to also linearize *enq*<sub>3</sub> and dequeues *deq*<sub>0</sub>, *deq*<sub>1</sub>, *deq*<sub>2</sub>, and *deq*<sub>3</sub>, to ensure the FIFO property. Thus, at recovery time `Head` should have a value at least 4. Note that in the second case, only enqueue operations are executed, hence at recovery time `Head` should be equal to 0. Since these two cases are indistinguishable to PERCRQ, RECOVERY cannot choose a correct value for `Head`.*

From the above, we figured out that the value of `Head` should be written back to NVM. However, we made the following observation: as long as the value of `Head` is written back to NVM, writing the triplet of line 34 back is unnecessary. If *deq* reads *h* in `Head`, then by writing `Head` back, no dequeue after the crash gets index *h* or less, and *deq* is considered to be persisted.

Writing `Head` back to NVM only in a successful dequeue is not enough. To argue that the pair of `pwb-psync` of line 45 is needed, assume it is omitted from the code. Then, there is an execution which results in a state where before the crash the last linearized operation is a dequeue which returns `EMPTY`, whereas after the crash we can have a dequeue operation that returns some item without any enqueue operation to be linearized between these two dequeues. This violates the FIFO property. Note that after any `pwb-psync` instruction pair, an operation will return in the absence of a crash. This gives us the optimal one `pwb-psync` instruction pair for each operation.

We now describe the recovery function for PERCRQ. To find `Tail`, we traverse the entire array (line 63) and search for an index that is at least as large as the maximum index recorded in each occupied cell of  $\mathcal{Q}$  (lines 64-65). This is needed to ensure that all items that have been written back before the crash will be dequeued. We have to also consider unoccupied elements of  $\mathcal{Q}$ , because they can result from pairs of enqueues-dequeues which are linearized<sup>3</sup>. Hence `Tail`

<sup>3</sup> As we explain later, this may occur in two cases. Either because the system, through a system cache invalidation, writes back the triplet, or because an obsolete enqueue operation executes a `pwb` instruction writing it back.




Fig. 1: Circular array states. On top of the array are the array indexes. Each cell has a value; the subscript corresponds to the index field value.

should get a bigger index. To achieve this, **Tail** gets the maximum index of unoccupied elements (minus  $R$ ), which is greater than its current value (lines 66-68).

We next focus on **Head**, which, at recovery time, gets a value at least as large as the value of **Head** that is written back in NVM by the time of the crash. This is ensured by lines 71-80. To find the recovered value of **Head**, we need to examine the indexes in the unoccupied cells between current **Head** and **Tail**. We do so because **RECOVERY** cannot distinguish if these elements are the result of a *CAS* of line 34 or 41. In the former case, by the way linearization points are assigned, there will be a linearized *deq*, that we have to consider in order to ensure durable linearizability. Scenario 2 provides the details.

**Scenario 2** Let  $R = 4$  be the size of the circular array  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Consider an enqueue,  $enq_0(x_0)$ , which executes its *CAS* of line 14 successfully and then becomes slow. Now, a dequeue,  $deq_0()$ , becomes active, executes its *CAS* of line 34 successfully removing  $x_0$ , and then becomes slow. Next,  $enq_0(x_0)$  finishes its execution and returns *OK*. Because of the pair of *pub-psync* in line 15,  $\mathcal{Q}[0]$  (which contains the triplet  $(s, 4, \perp)$ ) is written back to NVM. The state of  $\mathcal{Q}$  at this point is illustrated in Fig. 1b. Then, a system-wide failure occurs. At crash time, the value of **Head** is equal to 1, but it has not been written back.

Since  $enq_0(x_0)$  has been completed by the time of the crash, durable linearizability requires that it is linearized. The question is whether we will linearize  $deq_0()$ . Since the triplet  $(s, 4, \perp)$  has been written back, no dequeue can return  $x_0$  after recovery. Thus, if we do not linearize  $deq_0()$ , durable linearizability will be violated. If we linearize  $deq_0()$ , the value of **Head** must be set to 1 at recovery time. By considering only occupied cells of the array this will not be the case. Thus, **RECOVERY** cannot ignore triplets containing the value  $\perp$ .  $\square$

In **PERCRQ**, **RECOVERY** traverses all elements from **Head** to **Tail** (line 72) to find the largest index (minus  $R$ ),  $max$ , stored into an unoccupied cell, that is larger than the current value of **Head**. We check if the maximum of these values is larger than or equal to  $max$ , where  $max$  is initialized to the written back value of **Head** (line 71). If it is, we update  $max$  to store the maximum such value (line 74).

**RECOVERY** also examines the occupied elements between **Head** and **Tail**. We follow a similar approach (as for  $max$ ) for now finding the minimum index among these elements (lines 76-80). Scenario 3 explains why doing this is necessary.

**Scenario 3** Let  $R = 4$  be the size of the circular array  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Assume that four enqueue operations,  $enq_0, \dots, enq_3$  are executed successfully returning *OK*. Next,  $deq_0$  executes its *FAI* (line 25) and then becomes slow. There are three more dequeue operations  $deq_1, \dots, deq_3$  that execute successfully. These dequeues return items  $x_1, \dots, x_3$ , respectively, and write  $\perp_5, \dots, \perp_7$  to their respective

cells,  $Q[1], \dots, Q[3]$ . Next, three more enqueue operations  $enq_4, \dots, enq_6$  begin their execution. Enqueue  $enq_4$  executes its *FAI* (line 4) and then becomes slow. The other two,  $enq_5$  and  $enq_6$  insert successfully their items,  $x_5$  and  $x_6$ , and return *OK*. Now a crash occurs. Fig. 1c illustrates the state of  $Q$  at crash time.

After the execution of lines 61-68 of *RECOVERY*, *Tail*'s recovered value is 7. Moreover, because of  $deq_3$ , the value stored in NVM for *Head* is 4 at crash time. After executing lines 71-74, *Head*'s value does not change. Thus, *Head* points to  $Q[0]$ , which contains element  $x_0$  whose index 0 is less than 4. Since  $enq_0$  and  $deq_1, \dots, deq_3$  have terminated, they have to be linearized. To ensure the FIFO property,  $deq_0$  should be linearized as well. Thus, the value of *Head* must be higher than 0 at recovery time. To address this problem, *PERCRQ* sets *Head* to the smallest index of an occupied cell between the current *Head* and *Tail*. Hence, after lines 69-80 are executed *Head* = 5 and *Tail* = 7.  $\square$

*RECOVERY* also initiates all elements of  $Q$  outside the range *Head*...*Tail* with the appropriate value for serving subsequent enqueue operations (lines 81-83).

**Local Persistence.** Experiments show (Figure 2 of Section 5) that having each successful dequeue executing a *pw*b instruction on *Head* is quite costly. The reason for this is that *Head* is a heavily contended variable.

*PERCRQ* introduces the following technique to reduce the cost of persisting a variable *var* that is highly contended. Every thread  $p_i$  maintains a local copy,  $var_i$ , of *var*. Thus, there exists an array of  $n$  elements, one for each thread, where the thread stores its local copy of the variable. This array is maintained in NVM. Every time the thread performs an operation on *var*, it also updates its local copy with the value read. Then,  $p_i$  persists  $var_i$  rather than *var*. Since  $var_i$  is a single-reader, single-writer variable, persisting it is very cheap [1].

For instance, in *PERCRQ*, every thread  $p_i$  maintains a local copy, *Head<sub>i</sub>*, of *Head*, and persists *Head<sub>i</sub>* rather than *Head*. This happens every time *Head* is to be persisted by *PERCRQ* (lines 35 and 45). The recovery function begins by setting the initial value of *Head* to be the maximum value found in every element of the array of local copies of the *Head* values in NVM.

We believe that this technique, which we call *local persistence*, is of general interest, and can be applied to reduce the persistence cost of many other algorithms.

**Durable Linearizability.** We now discuss how to assign linearization points to ensure durable linearizability. We say that an enqueue (dequeue) operation *has index i* if it reads  $i$  into *Tail* (*Head*) at its last iteration of the while loop of line 3 (line 24). We use  $enq_i$  to denote the enqueue with index  $i$  that successfully inserts the triplet  $(1, i, x_i)$  in cell  $Q[i \bmod R]$ . A dequeue operation *matches*  $enq_i$ , if it reads  $i$  in *Head* (line 25); let  $deq_i$  be this dequeue.

An enqueue operation is *persisted* in some epoch  $E_k$ , if it has executed successfully the *CAS* of line 14 and the write-back of the new value has taken effect by  $c_k$ . A persisted enqueue will terminate successfully if the system does not crash. Consider now a dequeue operation  $deq$  that has read the value  $i$  into *Head* the last time it read it. We say that  $deq$  is *persisted* in  $E_k$ , if either some value of  $Head \geq i$  has been written back by  $c_k$  or a value  $idx \geq i + R$  stored in some element of  $Q$  (by a *CAS* of lines 34, 41) has been written back by  $c_k$ .

We assign linearization points to enqueue and dequeue operations of  $E_k$  according to the following rules:

**Enqueue operations:** Consider an enqueue operation,  $enq$ , for which the *FAI* of the last iteration of the while loop (line 3) before  $c_k$  reads  $i$  from *Tail*. We linearize  $enq$  in the following cases:

- (1) If  $enq$  has been persisted by  $c_k$ .
- (2) If there exists a dequeue operation,  $deq$ , that reads  $i$  into *Head* at its last iteration of the while loop, and  $deq$  has been persisted by  $c_k$ .

---

**Algorithm 4** PERCRQ linearization procedure

---

Execution  $\alpha$  and set of epochs  $\mathcal{E} := \{E_1, E_2, \dots\}$  in  $\alpha$

- 1: **LinQ**: auxiliary infinite array
- 2:  $head(\text{LinQ})$ : head index of **LinQ**
- 3:  $tail(\text{LinQ})$ : tail index of **LinQ**
  
- 4: **for** each epoch  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  **do**
- 5:   **for** each event  $j = 1, 2, \dots$  in epoch  $E_k$  **do**
- 6:     **if**  $e_j$  is a *TAS* of line 19 by  $enq(x)$  and its change has been persisted by  $c_k$  **then**
- 7:       Linearize  $enq(x)$  at  $e_j$
- 8:     **else if**  $e_j$  is a *FAI* of line 4 by  $enq(x)$  that reads 1 in the closed bit of **Tail** **and** the closed bit is persisted by  $c_k$  **then**
- 9:       Linearize  $enq(x)$  at  $e_j$
- 10:    **else if**  $e_j$  is a *FAI* of  $enq(x)$  in  $E_k$  **then**
- 11:     **if**  $e_j$  is the last *FAI* of  $enq(x)$  and  $enq(x)$  is persisted  
      **or** there exists a  $deq$  such that:  
      a)  $deq$  has executed successfully the *CAS* of line 34,  
      b)  $deq$  reads  $i$  into **Head** at its last iteration of the while loop  
      (line 24), and  $deq$  has persisted in  $E_k$  **then**
- 12:         $\text{LinQ}[t] \leftarrow x$
- 13:         $tail(\text{LinQ}) \leftarrow t + 1$
- 14:        Linearize  $enq(x)$  at  $e_j$
- 15:     **else if**  $e_j$  is a **Tail** read of line 43 by  $deq$  that gives an empty queue **and**  $deq$  has been persisted in  $E_k$  **then**
- 16:       Linearize that dequeue operation at  $e_j$
- 17:     **while**  $head(\text{LinQ}) < tail(\text{LinQ})$  **do**
- 18:        $h \leftarrow \min\{i : \text{LinQ}[i] \neq \perp\}$
- 19:       Let  $deq$  be the dequeue whose *FAI* at its last iteration returns  $h$
- 20:       **if**  $deq$  not active in  $e_1, \dots, e_j$  of  $E_k$  **then**
- 21:         **break**
- 22:       **if**  $deq$  has executed successfully the *CAS* of line 34,  
       $deq$  reads  $h$  into **Head** at its last iteration of the while loop  
      (line 24), and  $deq$  has persisted in  $E_k$  **then**
- 23:          $x \leftarrow \text{LinQ}[h]$
- 24:          $\text{LinQ}[h] \leftarrow \perp$
- 25:          $head(\text{LinQ}) \leftarrow h + 1$
- 26:         Linearize that dequeue operation at  $e_j$

---

(3) If  $enq$  has read 1 in the closed bit of **Tail** and this value has been written back by  $c_k$ .

(4) If  $enq$  has executed successfully the *TAS* of line 19 and the new value of **Tail.cb** has been written back by  $c_k$ .

In the first three cases,  $enq$  is linearized at the point that it executed its last *FAI* operation. In the fourth case,  $enq$  is linearized at the time it executes the *TAS* of line 19.

**Dequeue operations:** Consider a dequeue operation,  $deq$ , for which the *FAI* of the last iteration of the while loop (line 24) before  $c_k$  reads  $i$  in **Head**. We linearize  $deq$  if it has been persisted by  $c_k$  and one of the following two conditions hold:

(1) The matching enqueue operation to  $deq$  has successfully executed the *CAS* of line 14.

(2)  $deq$  has read a value  $t \leq i + 1$  into **Tail** (line 43).

In the first case,  $deq$  is assigned a linearization point either exactly after the linearization point of the enqueue operation  $enq$  that read  $i$  in **Tail**, if  $deq$  is active at that point, or at the first point in which it is active and all dequeues that have smaller indices than  $deq$  have been linearized. In the second case,  $deq$  is assigned a linearization point at the read of **Tail** in line 43.

Algorithm 4 assigns linearization points to PERCRQ in a formal (algorithmic) way. We continue to argue that PERCRQ is durably linearizable. We start with the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *Assume that a dequeue  $deq$  reads a value  $i$  into **Head** and assume that  $deq$  writes back **Head** to NVM by a failure  $c_k$ . Then, at recovery time, the following hold: (a) **Head** will have a value greater than  $i$ , and (b) **Tail** will have a value greater than  $i$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $deq$  is persisted, either a value of **Head** greater than  $i$  has been written back by  $c_k$ , or an index with value at least  $i + R$  has been written into **Q** and into NVM by  $c_k$ .

In case (a), **Head** has a value greater than  $i$  at the beginning of the execution of the recovery code. By inspection of the code, **Head** is not assigned a value smaller than this initial value. In

the second case, let  $m$  be the index, which is greater than or equal to  $i + R$ . That index has been written by a *CAS* of line 34 or 41 into  $\mathcal{Q}$ , and it has been written back by  $c_k$ . We argue that a greater value than  $m - R$  will be written into **Head** during the execution of lines 71-75. By inspection of the recovery code, **Tail** gets a value greater than the maximum index in elements of  $\mathcal{Q}$  at recovery time. Thus, **Tail** has a value greater than  $m - R$ , because of lines 66-68. Due to lines 71-75, **Head** will be initialized to a value greater than  $m - R$ . After recovery, **Head** has a value greater than  $i$ . This proves case (a).

In case (b), because *deq* is persisted, either some value of **Head**  $> i$  has been written back by  $c_k$  or a value  $idx \geq i$  has been written in some element of  $\mathcal{Q}$  and in NVM by  $c_k$ . Assume first that a value of **Head**  $> i$  has been written back by  $c_k$ . It is apparent from lines 69-80, that **Tail**  $\geq$  **Head**, at recovery time. Thus, **Tail** has a value at least  $i$  at recovery time. The other case is also simple. By inspection of Algorithm 3, if at some point in time, an element of  $\mathcal{Q}$  stores an index  $idx$ , then it will store an index at least as large as  $idx$  at all later times. At recovery time, **Tail** gets the maximum among all indices written in  $\mathcal{Q}$ , and by assumption, a value greater than or equal to  $i$  has been written in some element of  $\mathcal{Q}$  and persisted by  $c_k$ .  $\square$

We consider different cases regarding the execution of the algorithm at crash time.

### A. Enqueue Operations

We first study enqueues that return closed and then successful enqueues.

**I. Closed enqueue:** Consider an enqueue  $enq(x)$  that executes the *TAS* of line 19 setting the value of *Tail.cb* to 1. If the closed bit is written back by  $c_k$ , then after the crash any new enqueue operation on this instance of *crq* will return **CLOSED**, as needed by the semantics of a tantrum queue. Suppose the closed bit is not written back by  $c_k$ . By inspection of the code (lines 7 and 20), this implies that neither  $enq(x)$ , nor any other enqueue that has read the closed bit to be 1 (at its *FAI* in **Tail** of line 4) have returned. Specifically, if one such enqueue operation had returned, then because of the *pwb-psync* pairs of lines 7 and 20, the closed bit would have been written back. According to Algorithm 4 and the linearization rules described above, these enqueue operations are not linearized. Thus, at recovery time, the closed bit equals 0 and no enqueue operation that returns **CLOSED** has been linearized in this epoch.

**II. Successful enqueue:** We now focus on a successful enqueue  $enq_i(x_i)$  with index  $i$  and item  $x_i$ . We proceed by case analysis. In each case, we argue about the following, at recovery time:

- If  $enq_i$  and its matching *deq* are linearized, then **Head** and **Tail** get a value greater than  $i$ .
- If only  $enq_i$  is linearized, then **Head**  $\leq i <$  **Tail**, and  $x_i$  exists in  $\mathcal{Q}$ , at recovery time.
- If *deq* that read  $i$  in **Head** is linearized,  $enq_i$  is also linearized.
- If neither  $enq_i$ , nor its matching *deq* are linearized, then  $x_i$  does not exist in  $\mathcal{Q}$  after  $c_k$ .

(i) **Assume first that the triplet  $(s, x_i, i)$  stored into  $\mathcal{Q}[i \bmod R]$  by  $enq_i(x_i)$  is written back by  $c_k$ .** Then, according to Algorithm 4,  $enq_i(x_i)$  is linearized at its last *FAI*.

We argue that **Tail** will have a value greater than  $i$  at recovery time. By inspection of the recovery code (lines 61-69), **Tail** gets a value greater than the maximum index seen in every occupied element of  $\mathcal{Q}$ . By inspection of Algorithm 3, if an element of  $\mathcal{Q}$  has an index  $idx$ , then at all later times it will get an index at least that large. Since  $i$  has been written back by  $c_k$ , **Tail** will get a value greater than  $i$ . To argue about **Head**, we consider the following cases.

(a) If no matching *deq* for  $enq_i$  is linearized in  $E_k$ , then we argue that  $x_i$  resides between **Head** and **Tail** at recovery time. Thus,  $x_i$  can be dequeued on a subsequent epoch. This is true if **Head**  $\leq i <$  **Tail**. If there is no matching *deq*, then no dequeue operation has read an index greater than or equal to  $i$ , so no such dequeue has been linearized. Assume now that there exists a matching *deq* to  $enq_i$ . Since  $enq_i$  has been persisted by  $c_k$  and *deq* is not linearized, by the way we assign linearization points, *deq* is not persisted. Thus, no value of **Head** greater than or equal to  $i$ , nor an  $idx$  (in some element of  $\mathcal{Q}$ ) greater than or equal to  $i$ , have been written back by  $c_k$ . Thus, *max* is initialized to a value less than  $i$  (line 71). After the execution of lines 72-75, **Head** continues to have a value smaller than  $i$ . Then, lines 76-80 of recovery are executed. Since

$\text{Head} < i < \text{Tail}$ , it follows that the minimum value will be  $i$  or smaller. Thus, the value of  $\text{Head}$  after recovery is less than or equal to  $i$ .

(b) If  $\text{enq}_i$ 's matching  $\text{deq}$  is linearized in  $E_k$ , we argue that at recovery,  $\text{Head}$  will get a value greater than  $i$ . By the way we assign linearization points,  $\text{deq}$  is persisted, and by Lemma 1 it follows that at recovery time,  $\text{Head}$  gets a value greater than  $i$ .

(ii) **Assume next that the triplet written in  $\mathcal{Q}[i \bmod R]$  is not written back by  $c_k$ .** We consider the following cases.

(a) If  $\text{enq}_i$  is linearized in  $E_k$ , then there exists a  $\text{deq}$  which reads  $i$  in  $\text{Head}$  and has been persisted by  $c_k$ . By the way linearization points are assigned,  $\text{deq}$  is linearized. By Lemma 1,  $\text{Head}$  and  $\text{Tail}$  are assigned, at recovery time, a value greater than  $i$ .

(b) If  $\text{enq}_i$  is not linearized in  $E_k$ , then by the way linearization points are assigned,  $\text{enq}_i$  cannot be persisted. Moreover, no  $\text{deq}$  that reads  $i$  in  $\text{Head}$  by  $c_k$  is persisted. Since  $\text{enq}_i$  is not persisted,  $x_i$  does not exist in  $\mathcal{Q}$  after  $c_k$ . Since no  $\text{deq}$  reads  $i$  into  $\text{Head}$ , there is no matching  $\text{deq}$  to  $\text{enq}_i$  and thus, no such  $\text{deq}$  is linearized. Otherwise,  $\text{deq}$  exists but has not been persisted. By the way we assign linearization points,  $\text{deq}$  is not linearized.

## B. Dequeue operations

We now focus on a dequeue operation,  $\text{deq}_i$  with index  $i$ . Recall that  $\text{deq}_i$  will succeed to dequeue an item from  $Q$  only if the index associated with this item is equal to  $i$ . We proceed by case analysis. In each case, we argue about the following, in whatever regards the recovery time:

- If  $\text{deq}_i$  is linearized and would return  $x_i \neq \text{EMPTY}$  (if no crash occurs), then its matching enqueue operation,  $\text{enq}_i(x_i)$ , is also linearized. Moreover, the recovered values of  $\text{Head}$  and  $\text{Tail}$  are greater than  $i$ .
- If  $\text{deq}_i$  is linearized and would return  $\text{EMPTY}$  (if no crash occurs), then the recovered value of  $\text{Head}$  is greater than  $i$ . Moreover, if an enqueue reads  $i$  in  $\text{Tail}$ , it does not store its item in  $Q[i]$ . It repeats the while loop of line 3 and stores its item in  $Q[i']$ , where  $i' > i$ .
- If  $\text{deq}_i$  is not linearized, whereas  $\text{enq}_i$  is linearized, then no dequeue operation with index  $i' > i$  is linearized, and the recovered value of  $\text{Head}$  is smaller than  $i$  whereas the recovered value of  $\text{Tail}$  is greater than  $i$ .
- If neither  $\text{deq}_i$  nor  $\text{enq}_i$  are linearized, then  $x_i$  does not exist in  $Q$  after  $c_k$ .

**A. Dequeue that (would) return  $\text{EMPTY}$ :** Assume that  $\text{deq}_i$  evaluates the condition of the `if` statement of line 44 to `true`. We consider two cases.

(i)  $\text{deq}_i$  is persisted. Then, by Lemma 1, we get that  $\text{Head}$  has a value greater than  $i$  at recovery time. Since  $\text{deq}_i$  is persisted, all dequeues whose index is smaller than  $i$  are also persisted (by definition). By the way linearization points are assigned, no operation that has index smaller than  $i$  will be linearized after the linearization point of  $\text{deq}_i$ ; moreover, all dequeues with indexes smaller than  $i$  have been linearized before  $\text{deq}_i$  (as was the case in `crq`). Since  $\text{deq}_i$  reads a value less than  $i$  in  $\text{Tail}$  and it is linearized at the point that it performed this read, it follows that all enqueue operations with indexes greater than  $i$  cannot have been linearized before  $\text{deq}_i$  (since they perform their `FAI` on  $\text{Tail}$  at some later point than  $\text{deq}_i$ 's read of  $\text{Tail}$ ). Since `crq` is a correct algorithm, it follows that the queue is indeed  $\text{EMPTY}$  at the linearization point of  $\text{deq}_i$ .

Moreover, we argue that if the system crashes before any other enqueue operation is linearized between the time that  $\text{deq}_i$  reads  $\text{Tail}$  and the time that the crash occurs, then the value of  $\text{Tail} \leq \text{Head}$  at recovery time. By Lemma 1,  $\text{Tail}$  is at least  $i$  at recovery time. Assume, by the way of contradiction, that the recovered value of  $\text{Tail}$  is greater than  $i$ . Since there are no enqueue operations that are linearized between the time that  $\text{deq}_i$  reads  $\text{Tail}$  and the time that the crash occurs, by the way linearization points are assigned, it follows that there does not exist any persisted enqueue with index greater than  $i$ . since  $\text{deq}_i$  returns  $\text{EMPTY}$ , it has not executed a successful dequeue transition. These imply that there does not exist any occupied cell in  $Q$  with index greater than or equal to  $i$ . By inspection of the code (lines 66-68), it follows that if the recovered value of  $\text{Tail}$  is  $i' > i$ , it is because there exists an index equal to  $i' + R$  in an unoccupied cell. By inspection of the code (lines 72-74), `PERCRQ` will examine this cell in order

to find the recovered value of **Head**. It follows that **Head** will get a value equal to **Tail** in this case.

(ii)  $deq_i$  is not persisted. Then, neither a value of **Head**  $\geq i$  has been written back by  $c_k$ , nor a value  $idx \geq i + R$  written in some element of  $\mathcal{Q}$  has been written back by  $c_k$ . Since  $deq_i$  is not persisted, by inspection of the code, it follows that  $deq_i$  does not cause any change to the state of  $Q$ . By the way linearization points are assigned,  $deq_i$  is not linearized. Note also that no enqueue will be persisted with index  $i$ . (Thus, none of the required claims is violated.)

**B. Dequeues that (would) return a value other than EMPTY.** Assume that  $deq_i$  performs a dequeue transition (by successfully executing the *CAS* of line 34) replacing the triplet  $(s, i, x_i)$  with the triplet  $(s, i + R, \perp)$  in  $\mathcal{Q}[i \bmod R]$ . We proceed by case analysis.

(i) **Assume first that  $deq_i$  is persisted by  $c_k$ .** By the way we assign linearization points, both operations,  $deq_i$  and its matching enqueue  $enq_i$  are linearized (in  $E_k$ ). By Lemma 1, **Head** and **Tail** have a value greater than  $i$  at recovery time.

(ii) **Assume next that  $deq_i$  is not persisted by  $c_k$ .** By definition, neither a value of **Head**  $\geq i$  has been written back by  $c_k$ , nor a value  $idx \geq i + R$ , stored in  $\mathcal{Q}$ , has been written back by  $c_k$ . By the way linearization points are assigned, it follows that neither  $deq$ , nor any dequeue operation with index  $i' > i$ , is linearized. We consider the following cases.

(a)  $enq_i$  is linearized. Since  $deq_i$  is not persisted by  $c_k$ , by the way linearization points are assigned it follows that  $enq_i$  must be persisted by  $c_k$ . By inspection of the pseudocode, it follows that  $x_i$  can only be removed from  $Q$  by a dequeue transition. Moreover, such a transition can only be executed by  $deq_i$ . Since  $deq_i$  is not persisted,  $x_i$  appears in  $\mathcal{Q}$  at recovery time.

We argue that the value of **Tail** after recovery is greater than  $i$ . By inspection of **RECOVERY** (lines 63-69), we have that the value of **Tail** is (at least) the maximum index (plus one) of the occupied cells of  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Since  $x_i$  appears in  $\mathcal{Q}$  at recovery time, **Tail** will be assigned a value that is greater than  $i$  (lines 61-65).

We now argue that **Head** will have a value less than or equal to  $i$  at recovery time. Recall that there is no persisted value of **Head** greater than  $i$ , hence  $max$  is initialized to a value less than or equal to  $i$  (line 71). Moreover, there is no index value  $idx$  greater than or equal to  $i + R$  written in some (unoccupied) element of  $\mathcal{Q}$  (by a *CAS* of line 34 or 41) that has been written back by  $c_k$ . Thus, after the execution of lines 71-75, the value of **Head** still has a value less than or equal to  $i$ . We now examine lines 76-80, where **Head** gets the minimum index of the occupied array elements (in range). Since  $enq_i$  is persisted, **Head** is less than or equal to  $i$  and **Tail** is greater than  $i$ , it follows that the recovered value of **Head** is less than or equal to  $i$ .

(b) Assume that  $enq_i$  is not linearized (so, neither  $deq_i$  nor  $enq_i$  are linearized). By the way linearization points are assigned,  $enq_i$  is not persisted. It follows that  $x_i$  does not appear in  $\mathcal{Q}$  at recovery time.

### C. Empty and Unsafe transitions.

We now focus on the cases where a dequeue  $deq$  performs an empty or an unsafe transition (after reading index  $h$  in **Head**), and does not evaluate the condition of the **if** statement of line 44 to **true**. Since  $deq$  reads  $t$  in **Tail** (line 43) such that  $t > h + 1$ , by inspection of the code, it follows that  $deq$  neither changes the value of **Head**, nor performs any persistence instruction. If no crash occurs,  $deq$  will execute another iteration of the while loop of line 24, getting the next available index. Thus, no dequeue with index  $h$  will be included in the linearization. By the way linearization points are assigned, this is so even if a crash occurs by the time that  $deq$  reads **Head** again. Note that no persisted enqueue will have index  $h$ .

**Empty transition:** By inspection of the code, the enqueue  $enq$  (if it exists) that has read  $h$  into **Tail** has not yet executed successfully its *CAS* of line 14, and  $deq_i$  has executed successfully its *CAS* of line 41. If the triplet  $(s, h + R, \perp)$  stored into  $\mathcal{Q}[h \bmod R]$ , when  $deq$  executes the *CAS* of line 41, is not written back in NVM by  $c_k$ , no change on the state of the queue has occurred, thus none of the dequeue claims are violated.)

Assume that  $(s, h+R, \perp)$  is persisted by  $c_k$ . This may cause the linearization of some dequeue operations with indexes less than  $h$ . By the way linearization points are assigned, there should be matching enqueues of all these dequeues which will be also linearized. By Lemma 1, both **Head** and **Tail** have values greater than the maximum index of any of these pairs at recovery time. It follows that none of the claims mentioned above (bullets for dequeues) is violated.

**Unsafe transition:** By inspection of the code, the node  $Q[h \bmod R]$  is occupied with an index value  $j < h$ , and *deq* reads  $h$  into **Head** and successfully executes the *CAS* of line 38. Then, according to Algorithm 3, we have an unsafe transition which sets the safe bit  $s$  to zero. Note that the change of the safe bit is to ensure that the enqueue operation that would read  $h$  in **Tail** would not enqueue its item in  $Q[h \bmod R]$ . The unsafe transition does not cause any change to the indexes of cells, and it does not cause the linearization of any operation. Moreover, at recovery time, all safe bits are set to 1 (line 83). It follows that none of the claims mentioned above (bullets for dequeues) is violated.

### 4.3 Persistent LCRQ

In this section, we describe the persistent version of LCRQ, called PERLCRQ. PERLCRQ implements a lock-free linked list of nodes, each of which represents an instance of PERCRQ. Each PERCRQ instance has its own **Head** and **Tail** shared variables that encapsulate the head and the tail of a durably linearizable tantrum queue of finite size, as discussed in Section 4.2. PERLCRQ eliminates the disadvantage that the PERCRQ queue is of finite size and transforms it from a tantrum to a FIFO queue. Specifically, when the currently active instance of PERCRQ becomes **CLOSED**, a new instance is appended in the linked list. Moreover, when the queue of a PERCRQ instance becomes **EMPTY**, a dequeuer dequeues this instance from the linked list and searches for the item to dequeue in the next element of the linked list. Two pointers, **First** and **Last** point to the first and the last element of the linked list, which operates as a queue. These pointers are stored in the NVM.

The pseudocode of PERLCRQ (Algorithm 5 in Appendix) closely follows that of the lock-free queue implementation by Michael and Scott [19]. An **ENQUEUE**( $x$ ) operation starts by reading **Last** (line 20), to get a reference to an instance, **crq**, of PERCRQ (of Algorithm 3). If it manages to read the last element of the list (i.e., the next pointer of the node **crq** pointed by **Last** is equal to **NULL**), the enqueue operation calls **ENQUEUE**(**crq**,  $x$ ) method (line 26) to insert  $x$  into the queue of **crq**. If this method returns **OK** then **ENQUEUE**( $x$ ) is complete and returns also **OK**. If **ENQUEUE**(**crq**,  $x$ ) returns **CLOSED** (line 26), then **ENQUEUE**( $x$ ) creates a new node (i.e., a new instance of PERCRQ), containing  $x$  (line 17), and tries to append that to the list by executing the *CAS* of line 28. If the *CAS* succeeds, it tries to also change **Last** to point to the new PERCRQ node (line 30). If the *CAS* fails, another PERCRQ node was inserted. Then, **ENQUEUE**( $x$ ) retries by executing one more loop of its while statement (line 19).

**ENQUEUE**( $x$ ) does not attempt to append its node if **Last** does not point to the last element of the list (line 22). It rather tries (line 24) to update **Last** to point to the last element, and starts one more loop (line 19). This scenario might happen if after appending a new node and before updating **Last**, a thread becomes slow (or fails). Then, **Last** is *falling behind* (i.e., it does not point to the last element of the list), and other threads will have to help by setting **Last** to point to the last element of the list, before they try to append their nodes.

A **DEQUEUE**() reads **First** to get a pointer to the instance, **crq**, of PERCRQ that is first in the linked list, and calls **DEQUEUE**(**crq**) (lines 8-10) in an effort to dequeue an element from that instance. If **DEQUEUE**(**crq**) returns some value, then **DEQUEUE** is complete and returns also that value (lines 11 and 12). If **DEQUEUE**(**crq**) returns **EMPTY**, then **DEQUEUE** checks if there is no next PERCRQ node in the list (line 13), and if that is true, then it returns also **EMPTY**. If there is another PERCRQ node it tries to move the **First** pointer (line 15) to that node and starts a new loop (line 7).



---

**Algorithm 5** Persistent LCRQ (PERLCRQ)

---

```
1: struct Node {
2:   Node *next;
3:   PERCRQ Object crq;
4: };

5: Node *First, *Last // both initially point to a Node
   with next being NULL and crq in initial state

6: function DEQUEUE
7:   while true do
8:     f ← First
9:     crq ← f→crq
10:    v ← DEQUEUE(crq)
11:    if v ≠ EMPTY then
12:      return v
13:    if f→next = NULL then
14:      return EMPTY
15:    CAS(First, f, f→next)

16: function ENQUEUE(x)
17:   Create a new Node nd with next equal to NULL,
   x stored in nd.crq.Q[0], nd.crq.Tail = 1, and
   nd.crq.Head = 0

18:   pwb(nd.next, nd.crq.Q[0], nd.crq.Tail); psync();
19:   while true do
20:     ℓ ← Last
21:     crq ← ℓ→crq
22:     if ℓ→next ≠ NULL then
23:       pwb(ℓ→next); psync();
24:       CAS(Last, ℓ, ℓ→next)
25:       continue
26:     if ENQUEUE(crq, x) ≠ CLOSED then
27:       return OK
28:     if CAS(ℓ→next, NULL, nd) then
29:       pwb(ℓ→next); psync();
30:       CAS(Last, ℓ, nd)
31:       return OK

32: function PERLCRQ RECOVERY
33:   while Last→next ≠ NULL do
34:     RECOVERY(Last→crq) // From Algorithm 3
35:     Last ← Last→next
36:     RECOVERY(Last→crq) // From Algorithm 3
```

We now discuss the persistence instructions that we added in LCRQ to make it persistent. We were able to achieve persistence without adding any persistence instruction to the dequeue code. Thus, we focus on enqueue. The `pwb-psync` pair of line 18 is necessary just in case the enqueue returns on line 31. However, the persistence of `nd.next` should be performed before the `CAS` of line 28 for the following reason. Assume that it occurs after the `CAS` of line 28. Then, if the system evicts the cache line where the next field of the node on which the `CAS` has been executed resides (i.e.,  $\ell \rightarrow \text{next}$ ), and before the next field of the appended node, `nd`, is persisted, then at recovery time, this field may not be `NULL`, whereas `nd` is the last node of the recovered list. This jeopardizes the correctness of the algorithm (for instance the condition of the `if` statement of line 22 may succeed, although `nd` is the last node in the list). Note that `nd.crq.Tail` and `nd.crq.Q[0]` can be persisted after the execution of the `CAS` of line 28. However, since these are fields of a struct of type `Node`, we place them so that they all reside in the same cache line and can be persisted all together with a single `pwb`. Therefore, we persist them all together to save on the number of `pwb`s the algorithm performs.

We now explain why the `pwb-psync` pair of line 29 is necessary. Assume that this pair is omitted. Consider an enqueue that returns on line 31. If a crash occurs right after the completion of the enqueue, at recovery time, the node appended by the enqueue and its enqueued item will not be included in the state of the linked list. This violates durable linearizability (as the enqueue has been completed, and this it should be linearized).

We next explain why the `pwb-psync` pair of line 23 is necessary. Assume that these persistent instructions are omitted. Assume that an enqueue,  $enq_1$  executes up until line 28 and then becomes slow. Now assume that another enqueue,  $enq_2$  starts its execution, evaluates the condition of the `if` statement of line 22 to `true`, executes lines 24-25, and starts a new loop which makes it return on line 27. If a crash occurs at this point, the node appended by  $enq_1$ , and the items enqueued by both enqueue operations will not appear in the recovered state of the linked list. This violates durable linearizability (as  $enq_2$  has been completed, and thus it should be linearized).

We now focus on the recovery function. Assume that a crash occurs and the system recovers by calling the recovery function once. Since `First` and `Last` are non-volatile variables, at recovery time, they may have any value they had obtained by the crash (as the system may have evicted the cache line they reside and written it back to NVM).

At recovery time, **First** and **Last** point either to the first node of the list (if the cache line in which they reside has never been evicted by the system and written back to NVM) or to nodes that has been appended in the linked list by the crash otherwise. In the second case, note that the appended nodes may have been dequeued, by the crash, but they are still connected to the linked list, i.e., if we start from the initial node in the list and follow next pointers we will traverse these nodes).

To recover **Last**, we start from the value stored for it in NVM (which can be its initial value) and we traverse the list following next pointers of its Nodes, until we reach the last node. **Last** will be set to point to this Node. On the way, we call **RECOVERY** on the **crq** object of each Node we traverse. **First** pointer never changes at recovery. This has a cost in the performance of dequeues that will be executed after the crash, as they will have to traverse all Nodes until they reach the first such Node whose **crq** instance contains items to be dequeued.

**Durable Linearizability.** PERLCRQ is durably linearizable. We next discuss how to assign linearization points to operations.

**Dequeue operations:** Consider a dequeue operation *deg*. Let **crq** be the last instance of PERCRQ on which *deg* calls **DEQUEUE(crq)**. *deg* is linearized in the following cases: a) **DEQUEUE(crq)** is linearized in **crq** and its response is not **EMPTY** in the linearization of the corresponding execution of **crq**. b) **DEQUEUE(crq)** is linearized in **crq**, its response is **EMPTY** in the linearization of the corresponding execution of **crq**, and *deg* returns **EMPTY**.

**Enqueue operations:** Consider an enqueue operation *enq*. Let **crq** be the last instance of PERCRQ on which *enq* calls **ENQUEUE(crq)**. We linearize an enqueue operation of PERLCRQ if the following three conditions hold

1. If **ENQUEUE(crq, x)** returns **EMPTY** (line 26), we assign a linearization point at the point of the corresponding **ENQUEUE(crq, x)** linearization point.
2. If the change to the next pointer **crq.next** (line 28) is written back to NVM and the new item that was enqueued is also written back by  $c_k$ . We assign a linearization point at the time the **CAS** operation has taken effect.

## 5 Performance Evaluation

For the evaluation, we used a 48-core machine (96 logical cores) consisting of 2 Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 5318Y processors with 24 cores each. Each core executes two threads concurrently. Our machine is equipped with a 128GB Intel Optane 200 Series Persistent Memory (DCPMM) and the system is configured in AppDirect mode. We use the 1.9.2 version of the *Persistent Memory Development Kit* [21], which provides the **pwb** and **psync** persistency instructions. The operating system is Ubuntu 20.04.6 LTS (kernel Linux 6.6.3-custom x86\_64) and we use *gcc* v9.4.0. Threads were bound in all experiments following a scheduling policy which distributes the running threads evenly across the machine’s NUMA nodes [6,7].

In the experiments, each run simulates  $10^7$  atomic operations in total; each thread simulates  $10^7/n$  operations (where  $n$  is the number of threads). We follow a kind of standard approach [5,6,7,12,24,25], where each thread performs pairs of **ENQUEUE** and **DEQUEUE** starting from an empty queue; this kind of experiment avoids performing unsuccessful (and thus cheap) operations. Experiments where each thread executed random operations (50% of each type) did not illustrate significantly different performance trends.

We compare PERLCRQ with the state-of-the-art persistent queue implementations, namely **PBQUEUE** and **PWFQUEUE** [9]. The experimental analysis in [9] compares **PBQUEUE** and **PWFQUEUE** with the specialized persistent queue implementation in [12] (FHMP), and those recently published in [25], as well as the persistent queue implementations based on the following general techniques and transformations: a) **CAPSULES-NORMAL** [2], b) **ROMULUS** [3] c) **ONE-FILE** [22], d) **CX-PUC** [4] and **CX-PTM** [4], and e) **REDOPT** [4]. Experiments in [9] showed




Fig. 2: Performance comparison of PERLCRQ with PBQUEUE and PWFQUEUE.




Fig. 3: Cost of persisting Head and Tail in PERLCRQ.

that PBQUEUE is at least 2x faster than all these algorithms. For this reason, we compare the performance of PERLCRQ only with the performance of PBQUEUE and PWFQUEUE [9].

**Results.** Figure 2 shows the performance of PERLCRQ against PBQUEUE and PWFQUEUE. We measure throughput, i.e. number of operations executed per time unit (thus, larger is better), as the number of threads increases. We see that PERLCRQ (purple line) is 2x faster than PBQUEUE, which is the best competitor.

Figure 2 shows also the cost of persisting different instructions. Interestingly, although PERLCRQ executes only one `pwb` per operation, persisting shared variable `Head` is too expensive. As we see, the version of PERLCRQ that persists a shared version of `Head` (PERLCRQ-PHead) instead of local copies of `Head` maintained by each thread, incurs high performance overhead. The throughput of PERLCRQ-PHead is much lower than that of PERLCRQ, as the number of threads increases, and eventually its performance gets surpassed by PBQUEUE and PWFQUEUE. Figure 3 provides additional evidence that the drop in performance observed in PERLCRQ-PHead, is due to how expensive persisting highly contended shared variables, such as `Head` is. We denote PERLCRQ in which all `pwb` instructions on `Head` have been removed, as PERLCRQ (*no head*) and the PERLCRQ in which all `pwb` instructions on `Tail` have been removed, PERLCRQ (*no tail*). From Figure 3, we see that the persistence cost of persisting `Tail` is negligible. This shows that PERLCRQ persists `Tail` rarely (only when it closes the current instance of CRQ). Additionally, it provides evidence that the optimization of using the `closedFlag` to avoid persisting `Tail` more than once in the case a CRQ instance needs to close, works well. By comparing the throughput of PERLCRQ (from Figure 2) with that of PERLCRQ (*no head*) in Figure 3, we see the cost of persisting `Head` even when the algorithm uses a local copy of `Head` for each thread.

**Evaluation of the recovery cost.** We have developed a custom failure framework to evaluate the recovery cost of algorithms. The framework provides a shared variable called “`recovery_steps`”. All threads “monitor” this variable and each operation periodically (or randomly) lowers the value by 1 step. When it reaches 0, any thread running will cease, effectively simulating a crash of all threads. Afterwards, the recovery function is launched by some thread; this simulates the system running the recovery function.

The above procedure - a standard run where recovery steps are being decreased, a random crash that occurs when these steps become 0, and the recovery function run - is called a *cycle*. Each evaluation test has 10 cycles and we measure only the third part of each cycle, which corresponds to the recovery cost. The average of the 10 cycles is the result shown on the graphs in Figures 4 and 5.

PERIQ can be designed to illustrate a tradeoff between the persistence cost at normal execution time (where no failures occur) and the recovery cost. The idea is that each thread, periodically, persists `Head` and `Tail`, in addition to the values it writes in `Q`. This may hap-






Fig. 4: Recovery time of PERIQ as the number of operations increases. Fig. 5: Recovery time of PERIQ as the queue size increases. Fig. 6: Throughput of PERIQ and PERIQ (no Tail).

---

**Algorithm 6** Variant of ENQUEUE of PERIQ, used to illustrate the tradeoff between the persistence and the recovery cost.

---

$nOps_i$ : counter of thread  $p_i$ , initially. It counts the the number of enqueue operations  $p_i$  has performed.

```

function ENQUEUE( $x$ : Item)
  while true do
     $t \leftarrow$  FETCH&INCREMENT(Tail)
    if  $nOps_i ==$  Threshold then
      pwb(Tail)
      psync()
       $nOps_i = 0$ 
      /* If Threshold =  $\infty$ , then persisting Tail is disabled */
    if GET&SET( $Q[t], x$ ) ==  $\perp$  then
      pwb( $Q[t]$ )
      psync()
       $nOps \leftarrow nOps + 1$ 
      return OK

```

---

pen e.g. every time the thread has completed the execution of a specific number of operations. Algorithm 6 presents the enhanced pseudocode of PERIQ to accommodate this variant.

Figure 4 compares the time needed to recover the queue after a crash that takes place when a predetermined number of operations have been executed. Figure 5 compares the time (lower is better) needed to recover the queue based on its size. Figure 6 shows the throughput (lower is worse) of the PERIQ compared to the variation of persisting the tail index on each operation. We can see that there is a clear tradeoff between the throughput of the persistence of the tail index and how quick the algorithm’s recovery function is. As shown in Figures 4 to 6, if we do not persist Tail, the recovery function is slower as the queue gets larger, but the throughput of the PERIQ is high. On the other hand, if we persist Tail, the recovery function is very fast, while the throughput of PERIQ is lower.

## References

1. Attiya, H., Ben-Baruch, O., Fatourou, P., Hendler, D., Kosmas, E.: Detectable recovery of lock-free data structures. In: Lee, J., Agrawal, K., Spear, M.F. (eds.) PPOPP ’22: 27th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming, Seoul, Republic of Korea, April 2 - 6, 2022. pp. 262–277. ACM (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3503221.3508444>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3503221.3508444>
2. Ben-David, N., Blleloch, G.E., Friedman, M., Wei, Y.: Delay-free concurrency on faulty persistent memory. In: The 31st ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures. pp. 253–264. SPAA ’19, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3323165.3323187>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3323165.3323187>
3. Correia, A., Felber, P., Ramalhete, P.: Romulus: Efficient algorithms for persistent transactional memory. In: Proceedings of the 30th on Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures. pp. 271–282.

- SPAA '18, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3210377.3210392>
4. Correia, A., Felber, P., Ramalhete, P.: Persistent memory and the rise of universal constructions. In: Proceedings of the Fifteenth European Conference on Computer Systems. EuroSys '20, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3342195.3387515>
  5. Fatourou, P., Kallimanis, N.D.: A highly-efficient wait-free universal construction. In: Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures. pp. 325–334. SPAA '11, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2011), <https://doi.org/10.1145/1989493.1989549>
  6. Fatourou, P., Kallimanis, N.D.: Revisiting the combining synchronization technique. In: Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming. pp. 257–626. PPOPP '12, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2012), <https://doi.org/10.1145/2145816.2145849>
  7. Fatourou, P., Kallimanis, N.D.: Highly-efficient wait-free synchronization. *Theory of Computing Systems* **55**(3), 475–520 (2014)
  8. Fatourou, P., Kallimanis, N.D.: Lock oscillation: Boosting the performance of concurrent data structures. In: Aspnes, J., Bessani, A., Felber, P., Leitão, J. (eds.) 21st International Conference on Principles of Distributed Systems, OPODIS 2017, Lisbon, Portugal, December 18-20, 2017. LIPIcs, vol. 95, pp. 8:1–8:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2017). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.OPODIS.2017.8>
  9. Fatourou, P., Kallimanis, N.D., Kosmas, E.: The performance power of software combining in persistence. In: Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming. p. 337–352. PPOPP '22, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3503221.3508426>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3503221.3508426>
  10. Fatourou, P., Kallimanis, N.D., Ropars, T.: An efficient wait-free resizable hash table. In: Proceedings of the 30th on Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures. pp. 111–120. SPAA '18, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3210377.3210408>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3210377.3210408>
  11. Friedman, M., Herlihy, M., Marathe, V., Petrank, E.: A persistent lock-free queue for non-volatile memory. *SIGPLAN Not.* **53**(1), 28–40 (feb 2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3200691.3178490>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3200691.3178490>
  12. Friedman, M., Herlihy, M., Marathe, V., Petrank, E.: A persistent lock-free queue for non-volatile memory. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices* **53**(1), 28–40 (2018)
  13. Hendler, D., Incze, I., Shavit, N., Tzafrir, M.: Flat combining and the synchronization-parallelism tradeoff. In: Proceedings of the twenty-second annual ACM symposium on Parallelism in algorithms and architectures. pp. 355–364 (2010)
  14. Herlihy, M.P., Wing, J.M.: Linearizability: A correctness condition for concurrent objects. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* **12**(3), 463–492 (jul 1990). <https://doi.org/10.1145/78969.78972>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/78969.78972>
  15. Izraelevitz, J., Mendes, H., Scott, M.L.: Linearizability of persistent memory objects under a full-system-crash failure model. In: Distributed Computing - 30th International Symposium, DISC 2016, Paris, France, September 27-29, 2016. Proceedings. pp. 313–327 (2016). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-53426-7\\_23](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-53426-7_23), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-53426-7\\_23](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-53426-7_23)
  16. Izraelevitz, J., Mendes, H., Scott, M.L.: Linearizability of persistent memory objects under a full-system-crash failure model. In: Proceedings of the 30th International Symposium of Distributed Computing. DISC '16, vol. LNCS 9888, pp. 313–327. Springer (2016)
  17. Izraelevitz, J., Mendes, H., Scott, M.L.: Linearizability of persistent memory objects under a full-system-crash failure model. In: Distributed Computing: 30th International Symposium, DISC 2016, Paris, France, September 27-29, 2016. Proceedings 30. pp. 313–327. Springer (2016)
  18. Klaftenegger, D., Sagonas, K., Winblad, K.: Queue delegation locking. *IEEE Trans. Parallel Distributed Syst.* **29**(3), 687–704 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPDS.2017.2767046>, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPDS.2017.2767046>
  19. Michael, M.M., Scott, M.L.: Simple, fast, and practical non-blocking and blocking concurrent queue algorithms. In: Proceedings of the fifteenth annual ACM symposium on Principles of distributed computing. pp. 267–275 (1996)
  20. Morrison, A., Afek, Y.: Fast concurrent queues for x86 processors. In: Proceedings of the 18th ACM SIGPLAN symposium on Principles and practice of parallel programming. pp. 103–112 (2013)
  21. PMDK: The persistent memory development kit. <https://github.com/pmem/pmdk/>, <https://github.com/pmem/pmdk/>
  22. Ramalhete, P., Correia, A., Felber, P., Cohen, N.: Onefile: A wait-free persistent transactional memory. In: 2019 49th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN). pp. 151–163. IEEE (2019)
  23. Rusanovsky, M., Attiya, H., Ben-Baruch, O., Gerby, T., Hendler, D., Ramalhete, P.: Flat-combining-based persistent data structures for non-volatile memory. In: Stabilization, Safety, and Security of Distributed

- Systems: 23rd International Symposium, SSS 2021, Virtual Event, November 17–20, 2021, Proceedings. pp. 505–509. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg (2021)
24. Rusanovsky, M., Ben-Baruch, O., Hendler, D., Ramalhete, P.: A flat-combining-based persistent stack for non-volatile memory. CoRR **abs/2012.12868** (2020 (version submitted at 23 December, 2020)), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.12868>
  25. Sela, G., Petrank, E.: Durable queues: The second amendment. In: Proceedings of the 33rd ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures. pp. 385–397. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3409964.3461791>