

Revisiting Stateful Partial-Order Reduction

Frédéric Herbreteau, Sarah Larroze-Jardiné, Gérald Point and Igor Walukiewicz
Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, Bordeaux INP, LaBRI, UMR 5800, 33400, Talence, France

November 27, 2024

Abstract:

The goal of partial-order methods is to accelerate the exploration of concurrent systems by examining only a representative subset of all possible runs. The stateful approach builds a transition system with representative runs, while the stateless method simply enumerates them. The stateless approach may be preferable if the transition system is tree-like; otherwise, the stateful method is more effective.

We focus on a stateful method for systems with blocking operations, like locks. First, we show a simple algorithm with an oracle that is trace-optimal if used as a stateless algorithm. The algorithm is not practical, though, as the oracle uses an NP-hard test. Next, we present a significant negative result showing that in stateful exploration with blocking, a polynomially close to optimal partial-order algorithm cannot exist unless $P=NP$. This lower bound result justifies looking for heuristics for our simple algorithm with an oracle. As the third contribution, we present a practical algorithm going beyond the standard stubborn/persistent/ample set approach. We report on the implementation and evaluation of the algorithm.

1 Introduction

The goal of partial-order methods is to speed up explicit state exploration of concurrent systems. The state space of such systems grows exponentially with the number of processes. Fortunately, many runs of a concurrent system can usually be considered equivalent, so it is enough to explore only one run in each equivalence class. For example, if one process assigns $x := 2$ and another $y := 3$ then the order of execution of these two operations is usually irrelevant; the two sequences are equivalent, and it is enough to explore only one of the two. This reduces the number of visited states as well as the time of exploration. In some cases, the reductions are very substantial.

In recent years, we have seen novel applications of partial-order methods. One is proving the properties of concurrent programs [11], where equivalence between runs is not only used to reduce the number of proof objectives, but also to simplify proof objectives by choosing particular linearizations. Similarly, in symbolic executions [10], or testing [30] partial-order can be used to limit the exploration space while still being exhaustive. Another application is verification of timed systems using recently developed local-time zones [17]. All these applications, rely on explicit state enumeration, as opposed to symbolic methods such as SAT or BDDs.

The first partial-order methods were proposed about 35 years ago under the names of stubborn sets, persistent sets, or ample sets [37, 15, 22]. The distinctions between the three [40] are

not important for our discussion, so we will focus on persistent sets. Since this initial works, there has been a continuous stream of research on the topic. In 2005, Flanagan and Godefroid introduced *stateless* dynamic reductions [14], making stateless methods a focal point of subsequent research. In 2014, Abdulla et al. proposed a notion of trace-optimality [1], and a race reversal technique, initiating a new cycle of work on stateless partial-order methods [7, 5, 20, 24, 25, 3, 23].

In this paper, we focus on *stateful* partial-order reduction methods, which have seen relatively less progress over the last two decades [31, 43, 9, 8]. A partial-order algorithm produces a *reduced transition system* containing a representative for every equivalence class of runs of the system. A *stateless* approach produces a tree of runs, but saves memory by storing only one run at a time. In contrast, a *stateful* approach keeps all visited states in memory so that an exploration can be stopped if a state is revisited. Each of the two approaches has its advantages. If the transition system of all the runs is a finite tree, then stateless exploration is preferable. But when it is not, and this can happen even if the code of each individual process is a tree, the number of runs may be several orders of magnitude bigger than the number of states, rendering the stateless approach infeasible. For applications other than reachability testing, as the ones mentioned in the paragraph above, the stateful approach is usually preferable.

The concept of trace-optimality has significantly influenced developments in stateless model-checking. An algorithm is *trace-optimal* if it explores exactly one representative from each equivalence class of runs of the system. This notion was introduced in [1] where it is simply called optimal. Recent advances include the design of purely stateless, trace-optimal partial-order algorithms with polynomial memory usage relative to system size [24, 3]. In comparison, in the stateful approach, a natural goal is to minimize the size of the reduced transition system. It is not difficult to see that getting exactly the minimal size is NP-hard. One of our main results says something much stronger: even approximating the minimal size within a polynomial factor remains NP-hard.

Blocking is also an important and challenging parameter of modern partial-order methods. A system is non-blocking if every permutation of a run preserving the local order of actions of each process remains a valid run. Systems with only read and write operations generally meet this non-blocking criterion. However, the introduction of synchronization or locking mechanisms typically invalidates it. Trace-optimal stateless algorithms are known for non-blocking settings. The exploration of blocking in the context of stateless algorithms has only started to be addressed recently [27, 20, 25].

The existing stateful partial-order methods identify some persistent sets and often use them together with sleep sets [15] to prevent redundant trace exploration. While there are many presentations of persistent sets, there are few places describing algorithms to actually compute them [15, 38, 12]. Another interesting technique is to use lexicographic ordering on runs [21]. The idea is that if we want to explore only one run from an equivalence class, we can as well explore the lexicographically smallest run from each equivalence class. Actually, as we observe here, the sleep set mechanism is perfectly suited for doing precisely this.

In this work, we consider a quite general model of concurrent systems consisting of servers and clients, both modeled as labeled transition systems. Every action is a synchronization between a client and a server. We chose this model because servers can model practically any kind of communication or synchronization mechanisms like variables, locks, or bounded communication channels. Importantly, our model does not impose a non-blocking assumption, and all our methods apply to systems with arbitrary blocking situations. We differentiate




Figure 1: An example of a client/server system (left) with clients P_b and P_{ce} , and servers S_{ab} , S_e and S_c . Processes synchronize on common actions. Its semantics is defined by the transition system to the right.

between servers and clients to ensure systems are *acyclic*. Infinite runs are cumbersome to handle with partial-order techniques, so most recent research on the subject makes the acyclicity assumption.

Our three principal contributions are:

- A simple trace-optimal algorithm based on concepts existing in the literature: lexicographical ordering and sleep sets. This algorithm isolates a concept of “includes first set” oracle, *IFS*, that we consider a conceptual contribution of this work (Listing 2).
- A strong lower bound showing that assuming $P \neq NP$ no deterministic algorithm can construct a reduced transition system for a client/server system \mathbb{P} , of polynomial size relative to the *minimal size* of a reduced system for \mathbb{P} , while working in time polynomial in the size of its input and its output (Theorem 26).
- A new partial-order algorithm based on heuristics to compute *IFS* oracle (Listing 6). We show that existing methods in the literature, like computing persistent sets and the race reversal technique, can also be viewed as heuristics for solving the *IFS* problem.

We have implemented the algorithm and evaluated its performance.

2 Overview of the paper

Rather than using a programming language syntax, we opt for transition systems. Each process is modeled as a finite transition system, with synchronization occurring on shared actions between processes. We distinguish between two types of processes: clients and servers. Clients must be acyclic, whereas servers have no such restriction. The acyclicity of clients ensures that all the runs are finite. Each action involves synchronization between one client and one server.

Figure 1 presents an example of a client/server system. We have two clients P_b and P_{ce} , and three servers S_{ab} , S_e , and S_c . Action b synchronizes P_b and S_{ab} , while action a synchronizes S_{ab} with P_{ce} . We write this as $dom(b) = \{P_b, S_{ab}\}$ and $dom(a) = \{P_{ce}, S_{ab}\}$. The system has runs eab , eb , be , bc and cb .

We begin by giving a quite abstract view of partial-order reductions. This allows us to emphasize the key concepts while keeping the notation relatively light. The initial concept is a [por-equivalence](#) relation between runs of a [client/server system](#). This induces the fundamental notion of the [first set](#) of a [run](#): $first(u)$ is the set of first actions of runs equivalent to u . Then a [covering source set](#) in a state s is simply a set that intersects $first(u)$ for every [maximal run](#) u from s , with maximal run being one that cannot be extended. The core idea is that in

order to explore all maximal runs from the initial state modulo por-equivalence, it suffices to follow the actions from covering source sets (Proposition 7).

Coming back to our example. In this paper we will consider Mazurkiewicz **trace equivalence**: two adjacent actions can be permuted if their domains are disjoint. In our example bc and cb are equivalent as $\text{dom}(b) = \{P_b, S_{ab}\}$ and $\text{dom}(c) = \{P_{ec}, S_e\}$. We have $\text{first}(bc) = \{b, c\}$. In contrast, the run eab is not equivalent to any other run, so $\text{first}(eab) = \{e\}$. This shows that $\{b, e\}$ is a covering source set in the initial state of the system. In other words, it is not necessary to start an exploration with action c even though it is enabled in the initial state.

In Section 6, we present a very simple trace-optimal partial-order reduction algorithm (Listing 1). It uses two known ingredients: **lexicographic** ordering on sequences, and **sleep sets**. The later are used to stop exploring some actions that are known to have been explored already. When using sleep sets, it could happen that an exploration of a run is blocked because all enabled actions are in the sleep-set; we call this situation a **sleep-blocked** run. To circumvent such a situation, the algorithm employs an oracle that we call “includes first set” oracle. An oracle test $IFS(s, B)$ asks if there is a maximal run u from s whose first set is included in B , namely $\text{first}(u) \subseteq B$. The algorithm produces a tree of runs and can be considered stateless. Subsequently, we modify this algorithm to produce reduced transition systems and not trees, by using a straightforward **subsumption relation** (Listing 2).

In Section 7, we show that the IFS test is NP-complete (Proposition 23). This bears some similarities to the hardness result in [9] where it is also shown that some different approach to partial-order reduction hits a computationally difficult problem. It turns out though that there is a linear time algorithm for IFS when systems do not use synchronization mechanisms (Remark 24). Thus, we have a very simple trace-optimal stateless algorithm in this case. While this case is often considered in the literature, this restriction is too strong for us to adopt.

The hardness result for IFS leaves open whether there is some other, more clever, partial-order reduction algorithm that is polynomial. We answer this question negatively in Section 8. We say that a partial-order algorithm is **excellent** if it works in a time polynomial in the sum of the sizes of its input and output, producing a reduced transition system of size only polynomially bigger than the size of the *minimal* reduced transition system. Theorem 26 shows that an excellent partial-order algorithm cannot exist if $P \neq NP$. This is the first result of this kind for partial-order methods.

The hardness result justifies our choice of considering the IFS based algorithm from Listing 2 as a reference solution. In Section 9, we set out to find some heuristics for IFS . Our claim is that we have made some progress in Section 6 even though technically we have proposed an algorithm solving an NP-problem with an NP-oracle. The progress is that IFS is a clearly defined problem for which we may have good intuition on how to approximate it. We start by giving a characterization of IFS by the existence of some run pattern. The heuristics for IFS come from a very simple idea: approximate the existence of a global run by local runs of individual processes. We propose two heuristic tests, $PIFS$, and $rPIFS$, with $PIFS$ being stronger but requiring more pre-computation.

These heuristic tests are used in Section 10, where we propose a new partial-order reduction algorithm (Listing 6). Our starting point is the idealized algorithm from Listing 2. We then use $PIFS$ test instead of IFS . Since $PIFS$ test is only a heuristic, we complete it with a method of computing **covering source sets** inspired by $rPIFS$ heuristic. The method does not necessarily compute persistent sets, and it is strictly better than the methods of computing

persistent sets we have found in the literature.

In Section 11, we discuss the results obtained with our implementation of the algorithm from Listing 6.

3 Related work

The literature on partial-order methods has expanded rapidly in the last decade. In this brief discussion, we focus only on results that are closely related to our work, primarily citing more recent papers.

Partial-order methods have been introduced around 1990-ties [37, 16, 22]. The basic principles from these works are still a preferred choice for applications requiring stateful partial-order methods [12]. Another significant concept for us is the use of lexicographic ordering to identify representative runs [42, 21, 41]. We also highlight a Petri-net unfolding-based approach [34, 9] that distinguishes itself by using prime event structures instead of transition systems.

Stateless partial-order reduction, initiated by [14], gained momentum thanks to [1]. This approach has been the focus of extensive research in recent years, culminating in truly stateless algorithms using only polynomial-sized memory [24, 3]. Extensions of stateless techniques to systems admitting blocking, like some synchronization mechanisms, have been proposed very recently [20, 25].

The race reversal technique introduced in [1] has been partially adapted for use in stateful methods [43, 8]. Additionally, the unfolding based partial-order methods have seen developments like the k -partial alternatives [9]. On the application front, stateful partial-order methods have been notably used to prove the correctness of concurrent programs [12, 11], as well as for symbolic executions and testing [10, 30].

The true strength of partial-order methods is revealed when using coarser equivalence relations than Mazurkiewicz traces equivalence [28, 7, 5, 12, 23, 13, 6]. Another very fruitful direction has been adapting these methods to weak memory models [4, 26, 24]. We leave these extensions for further work.

Our choice of computational model deviates from recent trends. Apart from typical programs with variables, partial-order methods have been adapted to various frameworks, including actor programs [35], event driven programs [2, 19, 28], and MPI programs [33]. Our choice of a more abstract model aims to simplify the application of our methods to other models.

4 Client/Server systems

In this section, we formalize our models. All transition systems in this paper are finite. They have a unique initial state but no final states. The edges of a transition system are labeled with actions. We require action determinism: there is no state with two outgoing transitions labeled with the same action.

Definition 1 A *transition system* is a tuple $\langle S, \Sigma, s^0, \{\xrightarrow{a}\}_{a \in \Sigma} \rangle$, where S is a set of states, Σ is the set of actions, s^0 is an initial state, and \xrightarrow{a} is the set of transitions between states labeled with actions. Transition systems are *action deterministic*, for every $s \in S$ and $a \in \Sigma$ there is at most one t with $s \xrightarrow{a} t$.

A transition system is *acyclic* if the underlying directed graph (i.e. when edge labels are ignored) is acyclic. A *terminal state* is a state without outgoing transitions. A *run* is a path in the transition system, not necessarily from the initial state. We write $s \xrightarrow{v} t$ if there is a run labeled with a sequence of actions v from s to t . Sometimes we write just $s \xrightarrow{v}$ when t is not relevant. A *maximal run* is a run reaching a terminal state. A *full run* is a maximal run starting in the initial state.

A client/server system is a finite collection of finite transition systems synchronizing on common actions. Each action is a synchronization between one client and one server. We require that clients are acyclic.

Definition 2 (Client/Server system) Let $Proc$ be a finite set of *processes* partitioned into a set of *clients* and *servers*: $Proc = Clients \cup Servers$ with $Clients \cap Servers = \emptyset$. A *client/server system*, \mathbb{P} , is a collection of *transition systems* $\{TS_p\}_{p \in Proc}$, one for each process. Each transition system TS_p has its proper set of actions Σ_p . Transition systems for client processes should be *acyclic*. For every action $a \in \Sigma = \bigcup_{p \in Proc} \Sigma_p$ its *domain* is a set of processes $dom(a) = \{p : a \in \Sigma_p\}$. We require that the *domain* of every action in Σ consists of one client and one server: $dom(a) = \{p_c, p_s\}$ with $p_c \in Clients$ and $p_s \in Servers$. We write $s_p \xrightarrow{b}_p$ if there is an outgoing b -transition from s_p in TS_p , for some process p , and action b . For a sequence of actions v we write $dom(v)$ for $\bigcup\{dom(a) : a \text{ appears in } v\}$, and $s_p \xrightarrow{v}_p$ if there is a path labeled v from s_p in TS_p .

Observe that since every TS_p in \mathbb{P} is action deterministic, and since every action a appears in exactly one client and one server, then $TS(\mathbb{P})$ is also action-deterministic.

Definition 3 Semantics of a client/server system \mathbb{P} is a transition system $TS(\mathbb{P})$ whose states are tuples of states of process transition systems, $S = \prod_{p \in Proc} S_p$; the initial state is the tuple consisting of initial states of each process, $s^0 = \{s_p^0\}_{p \in Proc}$; every action a synchronizes processes involved in it: $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$ if $s_p \xrightarrow{a}_p s'_p$ for $p \in dom(a)$, and $s'_p = s_p$ for $p \notin dom(a)$. We write $enabled(s)$ for the set of labels of transitions outgoing from the global state s of $TS(\mathbb{P})$.

We have seen an example of a client/server system \mathbb{P} in Figure 1. The transition system $TS(\mathbb{P})$ is shown on the right of the figure.

Remark 4 Because clients are acyclic, and every action involves a client, $TS(\mathbb{P})$ is acyclic. This is actually the only reason to introduce division into clients and servers. We need cycles in servers to model read/write operations, but we also want all the runs to be finite.

5 Partial-order reduction

We begin by abstractly describing the partial-order method, highlighting the fundamental concepts as we see them. Subsequently, we revisit the standard independence relation from Mazurkiewicz trace theory and instantiate this abstract formulation. The remainder of this paper will focus exclusively on Mazurkiewicz traces. Exploring more coarse equivalence relations is outside the scope of this work.

The results in this section are not new. We see them as different formulation of a discussion from [1] where the source sets have been introduced.

Let us fix a **transition system** TS . Intuitively it is $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$ for some client/server system \mathbb{P} , but we do not need this for our definitions. An equivalence relation between sequences of actions $u \approx v$ is called *por-equivalence* for TS if $u \approx v$ implies that:

- u and v have the same length,
- if u is a **maximal run** from a state s of TS then so is v ,
- if $u \approx v$ then $au \approx av$ for every action a .

The requirement on equivalent sequences having the same length simplifies the argument. Anyway, most equivalences considered in the literature satisfy it. Relation \approx may depend on the transition system we examine, but we do not make it explicit in the definition.

The simplest example of por-equivalence is the identity. On the other extreme, we can consider relating $u \approx v$ if they have the same length and from every state either both u and v are maximal runs ending in the same state or none of them is a maximal run. This is a very powerful equivalence if we are interested in reachability, but it is very difficult to compute too. Finding good approximations of this equivalence, is an intriguing research subject. Another example is **Mazurkiewicz trace equivalence** that we will introduce later in this section.

The goal of partial-order reduction is to construct for a given client/server system \mathbb{P} , a reduced transition system representing all **full runs** in $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$ (recall that these are **maximal runs** from the initial state).

Definition 5 We say that TS_r is a *reduced transition system* for TS if it is:

- *sound*: every **full run** of TS_r is a full run in TS , and
- *complete*: for every full run u in TS there is a full run v in TS_r with $v \approx u$.

Thus, we put an accent on preserving paths up to equivalence as opposed to just being interested in reachability. Historically, partial-order reduction has always been interested in verification of path properties. Recent applications, such as proving program correctness, also require path preservation. Moreover, all the existing approaches that are focused on reachability actually also preserve some kind of por-equivalence.

A general approach to constructing a reduced transition system is to determine for each state s of TS a covering source set: a subset of enabled actions that is sufficient to explore. For example, if every sequence starting from b is equivalent to a sequence starting from c then we may choose to include only b in the source set (cf. our discussion on page 4). The notion of the first action modulo \approx is central for partial-order reduction.

$$\text{first}(u) = \{b : \exists v. bv \approx u\}$$

We want a source set in a state to be big enough to contain at least one representative from every equivalence class of **maximal runs** from the state. Using the above definition this can be formulated as: a source set in s should intersect every $\text{first}(u)$ for u a **maximal run** from s . We formalize this as follows.

Definition 6 For a *por-equivalence* relation \approx on paths, and a state s of TS we define $\text{First}(s)$ as the set of first sets of all maximal runs from s :

$$\text{First}(s) = \{\text{first}(u) : u \text{ is a maximal run from } s\}$$

A set of actions B is a *covering source set* in s if $B \cap F \neq \emptyset$ for every $F \in \text{First}(s)$.




Figure 2: A counterexample to Proposition 7 in presence of infinite runs

In particular, if B contains all enabled actions from s then B is a covering source set at s . Intuitively, smaller covering source sets should give smaller reduced transition systems. This is not always true. A bigger but incomparable w.r.t. set inclusion covering source set may give a better reduction.

Observe that the notion of a covering source set depends on the [por-equivalence](#) relation \approx , as the definition of *first* depends on it.

Suppose we have an assignment of a set of actions $source(s)$ for every state s of TS. We can use it to restrict the transition relation to transitions allowed by source sets: define $s \xrightarrow{a} t$ when $s \xrightarrow{a} t$ and $a \in source(s)$. If every $source(s)$ is a [covering source set](#) in s then this restricted transition relation is enough.

Proposition 7 Let TS be a finite acyclic transition system with a transition relation \longrightarrow . Suppose \Longrightarrow is the restricted transition relation derived from a [covering source set](#) assignment. For every state s of TS, and every [maximal run](#) $s \xrightarrow{u}$ there is a run $v \approx u$ with $s \xrightarrow{v}$.

Proof

The proof is on the length of u . Suppose $s \xrightarrow{u}$ is a [maximal run](#) from s . Consider $source(s)$ that is covering by assumption of the lemma. This means $first(u) \cap source(s) \neq \emptyset$. Say b is in the intersection. By definition of $first(u)$, there is $bu' \approx u$. By \approx being [por-equivalence](#) for TS, bu' is also a maximal run from s . We have $s \xrightarrow{b} s'$ by definition of \Longrightarrow . If u' is empty we are done. Otherwise, $s' \xrightarrow{u'}$ with u' being a maximal run from s' . Since bu' has the same length as u , induction hypothesis applies to u' . So there is $v' \approx u'$ with $s' \xrightarrow{v'}$. This gives $s \xrightarrow{b} s' \xrightarrow{v'}$ and $bv' \approx bu' \approx u$. So $bv' \approx u$ is the sequence required by the proposition. \square

This proposition allows us to construct a reduced transition system that is [sound](#) and [complete](#), by keeping only \Longrightarrow transitions and states reachable from the initial state by these transitions.

Remark 8 We can also consider a more general setting when instead of one \approx relation we have a family of relations \approx_s for each state s . This corresponds to an idea of dynamic partial-order reduction. For example, an assignment $x := 5$ and a test $x > 3$ do not commute in general, but they do in a state where the value of x is 7. Since we do not consider such contextual independence in this work, we refrain from presenting this generalization.

Remark 9 The above proposition does not hold for transition systems with cycles. Consider the system to the left of Figure 2. There are two independent actions a and b . Client C_b has a cycle on b . Since every maximal run from the initial state has b on it (see middle picture in Figure 2), $\{b\}$ is a covering source set in the initial state. But this source set does not allow taking a transition labelled a . So we will never see the run ab , as depicted in the picture to the right of Figure 2. This is why we require that clients are acyclic.

In this paper we use only the classical Mazurkiewicz [trace equivalence](#) [29] based on an independence relation induced by domains of actions.

Definition 10 Fix a client/server system \mathbb{P} with a set of actions Σ . Two actions $a, b \in \Sigma$ are [independent](#) if they have disjoint domains: aIb if $\text{dom}(a) \cap \text{dom}(b) = \emptyset$. Two sequences are [trace equivalent](#), denoted $u \sim w$ if w can be obtained from u by repeatedly permuting pairs of adjacent independent actions. Two actions are [dependent](#), written aDb , if they are not independent, namely $\text{dom}(a) \cap \text{dom}(b) \neq \emptyset$. These notions are extended to sequences: aIv means that a is independent of all actions in v , and aDv that a is dependent on some action from v . We write Da for the set of actions dependent on a .

Directly from definitions we obtain.

Proposition 11 ([29]) For every [client/server system](#) \mathbb{P} , [trace equivalence](#) is a [por-equivalence](#) for $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$.

5.1 Source sets vs. persistent sets

The first works on partial-order reduction were built on notions of stubborn/ample/persistent sets. For the sake of concreteness let us consider persistent sets from [15], but the remarks below apply to all three definitions.

Let us fix some transition system TS . Recall that persistent set reduction assigns a persistent set of actions to every state, denoted $\text{persist}(s)$, and explores only actions in the persistent set in the same way as described above for source sets. A set of actions $\text{persist}(s)$ is [persistent](#) in s when:

$$(A2) \quad \text{For every run } s \xrightarrow{b_1 \dots b_n} t \text{ in TS: if } \forall i. b_i \notin \text{persist}(s) \text{ then } \forall i. b_i I \text{persist}(s).$$

Here, $b_i I \text{persist}(s)$ means that b_i is [independent](#) from all actions in $\text{persist}(s)$. The property (A2) is the only one we need for our discussion. Observe that the definition of persistent sets does not give an efficient way of computing them, since it refers to runs in TS .

Lemma 12 For every state s , a [persistent](#) set in s is a [covering source set](#) in s .

Proof

Take a [maximal run](#) w from s . There must be an action $b \in \text{persist}(s)$ that appears on w , as otherwise $w I \text{persist}(s)$ by (A2), and wb is a [run](#) by [independence](#). This contradicts the fact that w is [maximal](#). So $w = w_1 b w_2$ with $w_1 \cap \text{persist}(s) = \emptyset$, and $b \in \text{persist}(s)$. By (A2) $w_1 I b$, so $b \in \text{first}(w)$, which means $\text{persist}(s) \cap \text{first}(w) \neq \emptyset$. \square

In the light of this lemma one may ask if the opposite is true: whether every [covering source set](#) assignment is a [persistent set](#) assignment? This is not the case as the following example shows.

Consider the [client/server system](#) to the left of Figure 3. It has two clients (C_a and C_{bc}) and two servers (S_{ab} and S_c). Possible runs are ac , ca , and b as shown by the transition system to the right of Figure 3. Moreover, aIc . Hence, $\{a, b\}$ is a covering source set in the initial state. A persistent set containing $\{a, b\}$ needs to include c because of the run c : action c is not in $\{a, b\}$, but it is [dependent](#) on b , so by (A2) c should be in the persistent set.




Figure 3: A covering source set may not be a persistent set.

6 Lex-first exploration and *IFS* oracle

As we have seen, the goal of partial-order reduction is to construct a [reduced transition system](#) containing at least one [full run](#) from each equivalence class of a [por-equivalence](#) relation. We call a reduced transition system [trace-optimal](#) if no two full runs are equivalent. This notion was proposed in [1], where it was simply called optimal. Since, we aim to construct as small reduced systems as possible, trace-optimality looks like a desired postulate, but it does not guarantee the minimality of the size of a reduced system.

In this section we will present a simple algorithm for constructing [trace-optimal](#) systems. It uses three ingredients that we describe later in this section:

- Lexicographic order on sequences allowing to determine a representative run for each class of the trace-equivalence relation \sim .
- Sleep sets giving enough information about exploration context.
- An oracle “includes first sets”, denoted *IFS*, permitting to avoid sleep-blocked runs.

Lexicographic ordering has been already used in the context of partial-order reduction [21]. Sleep sets are one of the classical concepts for partial-order methods [15]. *IFS* oracle is a direct way of avoiding sleep-blocked executions, a well known challenge in partial-order reduction [1]. Yet, making *IFS* explicit will allow us later to develop new heuristics for partial-order reduction.

Let us fix a [client/server system](#) \mathbb{P} as in Definition 2. Let us also assume that we have some linear ordering on actions of \mathbb{P} . This determines a lexicographic ordering on sequences of actions. Since we also have our Mazurkiewicz independence relation \sim on sequences, and since it is an equivalence relation, we can use the lexicographic order to define representatives for equivalence classes of \sim relation.

Definition 13 We say that w is a [lex-sequence](#) if w is the smallest lexicographically among sequences equivalent to it: that is the smallest sequence in $\{v : v \sim w\}$. A [lex-run](#) of $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$ is a lex-sequence that is a [run](#) of $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$.

We are going to present an algorithm enumerating [full lex-runs](#) of $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$. For this we will use the “includes first set (IFS)” oracle. The idea is as follows. Suppose the algorithm has reached a state s and produced a [sleep set](#) $\text{sleep}(s)$ containing actions that need not be explored from s . We would like to check if there is something left to be explored. We need to check if the exploration is not [sleep-blocked](#), namely there is a [maximal run](#) u from s , with $\text{first}(u) \cap \text{sleep}(s) = \emptyset$. If there is such run, we need to explore one of $\text{first}(u)$ from s .

Definition 14 Let s be a state of $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$ and B a subset of actions. We say that B [includes a first-set in](#) s if there is a [maximal run](#) u from s with $\text{first}(u) \subseteq B$. We write $\text{IFS}(s, B)$ when there exists such a maximal run u .

As we will later see, $IFS(s, B)$ test is NP-hard. Eventually we will study approximations of it, but for now we assume it is given as an oracle.

Listing 1 presents a very simple algorithm enumerating all **full lex-runs** of $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$. The algorithm gives us also an opportunity to introduce sleep sets. Each node n of the tree constructed by the algorithm is a pair consisting of a state of $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$, denoted $s(n)$, and a set of actions $\text{sleep}(n)$. For readability, we write $\text{enabled}(n)$ instead of $\text{enabled}(s(n))$, for the set of outgoing actions from $s(n)$.

Listing 1: Lex exploration with sleep sets, constructs a tree of maximal runs

```

1 procedure main( $\mathbb{P}$ ):
2   create node  $n^0$  with  $s(n^0) = s^0$  and  $\text{sleep}(n^0) = \emptyset$ 
3    $\text{TreeExplore}(n^0)$ 
4
5 procedure  $\text{TreeExplore}(n)$ :
6    $Sl := \text{sleep}(n)$  // invariant:  $Sl = \text{sleep}(n) \cup \{\text{labels of transitions outgoing from } n\}$ 
7   while  $\text{enabled}(n) - Sl \neq \emptyset$ 
8     choose smallest  $e \in (\text{enabled}(n) - Sl)$  w.r.t. linear ordering on actions
9     let  $s'$  such that  $s(n) \xrightarrow{e} s'$  in  $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$ 
10    if  $IFS(s', \text{enabled}(s') - (Sl - De))$ 
11      create node  $n'$  with  $s(n') = s'$  and  $\text{sleep}(n') = Sl - De$ 
12      add edge  $n \xrightarrow{e} n'$ 
13       $\text{TreeExplore}(n')$ 
14     $Sl := Sl \cup \{e\}$ 

```

Sleep sets are a very elegant mechanism to gather some information about exploration context. They can be computed top-down when constructing an exploration graph. At the root, the sleep set is empty. For a node n and a transition $n \xrightarrow{e} n_e$ we have $\text{sleep}(n_e) = (\text{sleep}(n) \cup \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}) - De$, where a_1, \dots, a_k are labels of transitions from n created before the e -transition; and the final $-De$ term means that we remove all the actions dependent on e . The intuition behind this formula is as follows. Assume that we keep an invariant:

(*sleep-invariant*): after exploration of a node n for every **maximal run** u from $s(n)$ in TS such that $\text{first}(u) \cap \text{sleep}(n) = \emptyset$ we have a path v from n with $u \sim v$.

Then the formula for $\text{sleep}(n_e)$ says that we need not explore from n_e a run starting, say, with a_1 if $a_1 Ie$. This is because when looking from n these runs have a_1 in their first set, and they have already been explored from a_1 successor of n .

The algorithm from Listing 1 examines all enabled transitions in a node n in our fixed order on actions. For every enabled transition $s(n) \xrightarrow{e} s'$ it uses *IFS* oracle in Line 10 to decide if it is necessary to explore it. If the answer is positive, then it creates node n' with an appropriate **sleep set**. If not, then it skips the transition. This guarantees that the algorithm is **trace-optimal**.

Lemma 15 The algorithm in Listing 1 constructs a tree such that: (i) every **full run** in the tree is a full **lex-run** of $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$, and (ii) for every full run u of $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$ there is a unique full run v in the tree with $v \sim u$.

Proof

The first step is to show that thanks to **sleep sets** there are no two \sim -equivalent full runs in the tree. Suppose to the contrary that we have $u \sim v$, both full runs in the constructed tree. Consider the first position where the two sequences differ: $u = wau'$ and $v = wbv'$. Observe that a and b are **independent**, since $u \sim v$. Let n be the node reached by the exploration algorithm after reading the common prefix w . We have $n \xrightarrow{a} n_a$ and $n \xrightarrow{b} n_b$ in the constructed tree. So both a and b are enabled in n . Assume $a < b$ in our fixed linear ordering on actions. Since we choose the actions according to our fixed order, we have $a \in \text{sleep}(n_b)$. As $wau' \sim wbv'$, action a must appear in v' ; say $v' = v_1av_2$. Moreover, $a \in \text{first}(v')$ because $av' \sim bv'$. Hence, aIv_1 meaning that the algorithm constructed $n_b \xrightarrow{v_1} n_1$ with $a \in \text{sleep}(n_1)$, since $a \in \text{sleep}(n_b)$. But then a is **sleep-blocked** and cannot be taken from n_1 contrary to the assumption that there is a path wbv_1a in the constructed tree.

To finish the proof we show that every **full lex-run** is present in the tree. For this, it suffices to show that the property **sleep-invariant** above holds. We do this by induction on the post-fix DFS order. Namely, we take a node n and suppose that the invariant is true for all successors of n , and all siblings to the left of n . We show that it holds for n . So let us take a **maximal** run u from $s(n)$ such that $\text{first}(u) \cap \text{sleep}(n) = \emptyset$. Consider the smallest $e \in \text{first}(u)$, and the transition $s(n) \xrightarrow{e} s'$. We have $u \sim eu'$ and $\text{first}(u') \subseteq \text{first}(u) \cup De$, where De is the set of actions dependent on e . Let a_1, \dots, a_k be the actions smaller than e for which there are successors of n . We claim that e successor must be explored, or in other words the test in line 10 holds. Indeed, $\text{first}(u') \cap (\text{sleep}(n) \cup \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}) - De = \emptyset$, so u' is a witness that $IFS(s', \text{enabled}(s') - ((\text{sleep}(n) \cup \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}) - De))$ test holds. Thus, a transition $n \xrightarrow{e} n'$ is created. By induction assumption, we have a path v' from n' with $v' \sim u'$. This gives $ev' \sim eu'$, and we are done. \square

We could use this algorithm in stateless model-checking if we had an implementation of $IFS(s, B)$. In a stateful version the algorithm is not very interesting as trees produced by this algorithm can be, and often are, orders of magnitude bigger than $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$. But we can modify the algorithm to produce a graph instead of a tree. For this we need to introduce a subsumption relation between nodes.

Definition 16 We say that n **subsumes** n' , in symbols $n \triangleleft n'$ if the states in n and n' are the same, and $\text{sleep}(n) \subseteq \text{sleep}(n')$.

Observe that if n subsumes n' , all runs that are not sleep blocked from n' are also not sleep blocked from n . Thus replacing n' by n still yields a **sound** and **complete** reduced transition system.

In the new algorithm, Listing 2, we test if a node to be created is subsumed by an already existing node. If it is, then, instead of creating a new node, we add an edge to the subsuming node in line 12. The new algorithm does not satisfy a statement as in Lemma 15 because edges added due to the subsumption relation may create paths that are not **lex-runs**. We can get a variant of this optimality property when looking at states. Let us call a state **lex-useful** if it appears on a **full lex-run**.

Lemma 17 The algorithm in Listing 2 constructs a transition system TS_r such that: (i) every **full run** in TS_r is a full **lex-run** of $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$, and (ii) for every full run u of $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$ there is a full run v in TS_r with $v \sim u$. Moreover, for every node n , the state $s(n)$ in this node is **lex-useful**.

Listing 2: Lex exploration with sleep sets, constructs a graph

```

1  procedure main( $\mathbb{P}$ ):
2      create node  $n^0$  with  $s(n^0) = s^0$  and  $sleep(n^0) = \emptyset$ 
3       $Explored := \emptyset$ 
4       $Explore(n^0)$ 
5
6  procedure  $Explore(n)$ :
7       $Sl := sleep(n)$  // invariant:  $Sl = sleep(n) \cup \{\text{labels of transitions outgoing from } n\}$ 
8      while  $enabled(n) - Sl \neq \emptyset$ 
9          choose smallest  $e \in (enabled(n) - Sl)$  w.r.t. linear ordering on actions
10         let  $s'$  such that  $s(n) \xrightarrow{e} s'$  in  $TS(\mathbb{P})$ 
11         if  $\exists n'' \in Explored$  such that  $n'' \triangleleft (s', Sl - De)$ 
12             add edge  $n \xrightarrow{e} n''$ 
13         else if  $IFS(s', enabled(s') - (Sl - De))$ 
14             create node  $n'$  with  $s(n') = s'$  and  $sleep(n') = Sl - De$ 
15             add edge  $n \xrightarrow{e} n'$ 
16              $Explore(n')$ 
17              $Sl := Sl \cup \{e\}$ 
18         add  $n$  to  $Explored$ 

```

Proof

The first statement is direct from the algorithm.

For the second statement, we verify that the [sleep-invariant](#) still holds. The argument is the same as before with an additional case of edges added in line 12. For this case we note that if u is a run from s' with $first(u) \cap (Sl - De) = \emptyset$ then by the [sleep-invariant](#), since $sleep(n'') \subseteq Sl - De$, there is a path from n'' equivalent to u .

For the third statement, observe that every node n in TS_r is accessible by a path constructed with edges due to line 15, or in other words without edges due to line 12. Such a path is a path in the tree constructed by the algorithm from Listing 1. So $s(n)$ appears in this tree, implying that it is lex-useful by Lemma 15. \square

Remark 18 In the above algorithms it is not necessary to consider all actions from $enabled(n)$. Namely, the “while” test in line 8 can be $source(n) - Sl \neq \emptyset$ for some $source(n) \subseteq enabled(n)$ provided $source(n)$ is a [covering source set](#) for $s(n)$. Indeed, this is all we need to preserve the [sleep-invariant](#). In other words, our algorithm does not need source sets, or persistent sets, but can profit from them to reduce the number of *IFS* tests, or compensate for eventual imprecision in an approximation of the *IFS* test.

Remark 19 Sleep sets are needed for the optimality result, in a sense that some information about exploration context is needed. Consider the example presented in Figure 4 (left) that consists in two clients P_{ac} and P_b , and two servers S_{ac} and S_b . The runs are depicted on the right of Figure 4. The algorithm first explores the run ab , and then in the root state asks if there is a run where a is not a first action. The answer is positive because of the run bc . The algorithm then decides to explore b as it is the smallest enabled action. At this point it arrives at n_b . Without a [sleep set](#) it has no choice but to explore both a and c from n_b . But




Figure 4: Sleep sets are needed for optimality




Figure 5: A client/server system with two optimal [transition systems](#), one of linear size and one of exponential size

$ba \sim ab$ so this is not [trace-optimal](#). Observe that with sleep sets we get $a \in \text{sleep}(n_b)$ which is exactly what is needed to block unnecessary exploration. So our idealized view suggested by Section 5 that we just need to look at a current state and be smart enough to find a good [covering source set](#) is not the whole story. On the positive side, the information required about the context is quite limited, and easy to compute.

Remark 20 The ordering on actions can strongly influence the size of the result of the above algorithm. Consider the system in Figure 5 where a pair of actions with different indexes is [independent](#). If we choose to order actions of process P_i before actions of process P_j , for $i < j$, the algorithm produces a [reduced transition system](#) of size linear in the number of processes. If we choose the alphabetic order, $a_i < b_j < c_k < d_l$ for all i, j, k, l , the algorithm produces a [reduced transition system](#) of an exponential size. Dependence of partial-order methods on the ordering of exploration is a well-known issue [39].

Remark 21 We have used lexicographic order to be able to formulate Lemma 17. Actually the algorithm from Listing 1 would still be optimal if we choose actions in line 9 arbitrarily, and not in some fixed order. Without ordering the algorithm from Listing 2 would still behave like the one from Listing 1 without ordering, but the notion of a useful state would be less clean.

Remark 22 The disadvantage of an exploration with [sleep sets](#) like in the algorithm from Listing 2 is that some states may be duplicated: they may appear several times in the exploration graph with different sleep sets. Hence, the reduced transition system produced by the algorithm is not guaranteed to be smaller than $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$ which is unsettling. It is then interesting to consider a variant of Algorithm 2 without sleep sets (but still keeping an order on considered successors). Unfortunately, Lemma 17 is no longer true in this case. We consider the two variants in our experiments (Section 11). Mostly it pays to use sleep sets.

7 $IFS(s, B)$ test is NP-hard

In the previous section, we have seen a simple and relatively interesting algorithm for partial-order reduction using [IFS](#) oracle. Unfortunately, there is a serious obstacle to implementing




Figure 6: A client/server system \mathbb{P}_φ encoding $\text{SAT}(\varphi)$ for a 3CNF formula φ

this algorithm because, as we show in this section, the $IFS(s, B)$ test is NP-hard. This leads us to study approximations of this test in Section 9. In the NP-hardness proof, we construct client/server systems where every process has at most one outgoing transition from every state; this points out that NP-hardness is solely due to blocking.

Proposition 23 The following problem is NP-hard: given a client/server system \mathbb{P} , its global state s , and a set of actions B , does $IFS(s, B)$ hold?

Proof

Suppose we are given a 3SAT formula φ consisting of m clauses over variables x_1, \dots, x_n . Say the j -th clause is of the form $(\alpha_j^1 \vee \alpha_j^2 \vee \alpha_j^3)$ where each α is either some variable x_i or its negation \bar{x}_i . We will construct a client/server system \mathbb{P}_φ such that φ is satisfiable if and only if $IFS(s, B)$ holds for s being the initial state and B some set of actions we make precise below.

All actions in \mathbb{P}_φ will implement taking or releasing a lock. There is one lock per variable and its negation, $\{x_1, \dots, x_n, \bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}$; one per clause, $\{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$; one additional lock for every variable, $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$; and a special lock f . For every lock ℓ in one of these sets we have an action of taking a lock and an action releasing it, denoted respectively $\ell \uparrow$ and $\ell \downarrow$.

System \mathbb{P}_φ is presented in Figure 6. For each lock ℓ there is a server S_ℓ with two states $\{a, t\}$; standing for *available* and *taken* respectively. Action $\ell \uparrow$ leads to t and action $\ell \downarrow$ leads to a . For every variable x_i there are two client processes P_i^0 and P_i^1 . For every clause $(\alpha_j^1 \vee \alpha_j^2 \vee \alpha_j^3)$ there are client processes C_j^1, C_j^2, C_j^3 . Additionally, there are two client processes D and F .

Consider the state s where every client processes is in its initial state, and where the locks $\{x_1, \dots, x_n, \bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n, c_1, \dots, c_m\}$ are taken (they are in state t) whereas the other locks are available (they are in state a). At this point the only clients enabled are F , and clients corresponding to propositional variables, namely $P_1^0, P_1^1, \dots, P_n^0, P_n^1$. Client F can take lock f . For each i , either client P_i^0 or client P_i^1 takes the lock e_i which amounts to choosing a value for variable x_i , as either the lock x_i or the lock \bar{x}_i is released, respectively. This may allow some client corresponding to a clause to move. For example, suppose x_i was released, and α_j^1 , the first literal of the j -th clause, is x_i . Then process C_j^1 can take x_i and release x_i thus testing if x_i was available. If it was then it can release c_j . Releasing c_j intuitively means that the j -th clause is satisfied. Thus, all locks c_1, \dots, c_m can be released if and only if the formula φ is satisfied by the valuation determined by locks from $\{x_1, \dots, x_n, \bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}$ that have been released. If all c_1, \dots, c_m are released then client D can take all these locks and then take f . So if φ is satisfiable then there is a maximal run of the system without $f \uparrow$ in the **first** set. If φ is not satisfiable then there is no way to release all the locks c_1, \dots, c_m , so D cannot take f . In this case $f \uparrow$ is in the first set of every maximal run because process F can always take f . This shows that $IFS(s, \Sigma - \{f \uparrow\})$ holds iff φ is satisfiable (where Σ is the set of all actions in \mathbb{P}_φ). \square

Remark 24 There is one case where the *IFS* test can be done in linear time, but our formalism is not convenient to describe it. We mention it here informally anyway, as it is the case most studied in the context of stateless POR. In this case, we have threads that can read and write to global variables, but there are no locks or other synchronization primitives. Moreover, programs are straight-line sequences of instructions. In this setup, we have the *non-blocking* property: if u is a full run, then every permutation of u respecting the thread ordering is also a run. Clearly, respecting thread ordering is a minimal consistency requirement on permuting actions, as we want that the instructions of each thread execute in the order specified by the code of the thread. Observe that this does not mean that every such permutation of u is equivalent to u . Consider, for example, $u = r_1(x), w_2(x, 3)$: thread 1 reading the value of x , and thread 2 writing 3 to x . The sequence $w_2(x, 3)r_1(x)$ is a permutation of u , but it is not equivalent to u , unless the initial value of x is 3. In our formalism, we do not have simply $r_1(x)$ action, but need to have $r_1(x, i)$ actions for all possible values i of x . So the permutation of $r_1(x, 0)w_2(x, 3)$ becomes $w_2(x, 3)r_1(x, 3)$; namely, the read action changes as it carries the read value. This is why formalizing the situation of threads with only reads and writes is rather inconvenient in our setting. The *non-blocking* property implies that the *IFS*(s, B) test can be done by a greedy algorithm: at each step, take the first action of the smallest thread such that the action is either in B or is dependent on some already taken action. In short, take the action of the smallest thread that is not *sleep-blocked* when started with $sleep(s) = enabled(s) - B$.

8 Partial-order reduction is NP-hard

Trace-optimality discussed in Section 6 is an interesting concept, and even a guiding principle for stateless algorithms, but it is just an approximation of what we want if we are interested in constructing *reduced transition systems*. Indeed, the example from Figure 5 shows two trace-optimal transition systems, one of a linear size and the other of an exponential size.

We have seen that *IFS* test is NP-hard, so we cannot hope to implement the algorithm from Listing 2. Yet this lower-bound on *IFS* does not imply that there does not exist some other method that is guaranteed to construct small *reduced transition systems*. In this section, we formalize what this can mean and show that this is impossible assuming $P \neq NP$.

Recall that the goal of partial-order reduction is to construct for a given system \mathbb{P} , a *reduced system* that is *sound* and *complete*. Among such systems, we would ideally like to construct one with the smallest number of states. We write $minTS(\mathbb{P})$ for the smallest number of states of a *sound* and *complete reduced transition system* for \mathbb{P} . There may be several non-isomorphic *transition systems* with a minimal number of states.

In this section, we show that there is no polynomial-time algorithm for constructing a reduced transition system that is polynomially close to optimal, even when the size of the output is taken into account when counting the complexity.

Definition 25 We say that Alg is an *excellent POR algorithm* if there are polynomials $q(x)$ and $r(x)$ such that given a *client/server system* \mathbb{P} , the algorithm constructs a *sound* and *complete transition system* for \mathbb{P} of size bounded by $q(|minTS(\mathbb{P})|)$ in time $r(|\mathbb{P}| + |minTS(\mathbb{P})|)$.

The main result is:

Theorem 26 *If $P \neq NP$ then there is no excellent POR algorithm.*




Figure 7: Program \mathbb{P}_φ for the lower bound argument.




Figure 8: A sound a complete transition system for \mathbb{P}_φ when φ is not SAT

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of this theorem.

We provide a reduction from 3-SAT problem. Consider a formula over literals $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \cup \{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}$ and with k clauses:

$$\varphi = (\alpha_1^1 \vee \alpha_2^1 \vee \alpha_3^1) \wedge \dots \wedge (\alpha_1^k \vee \alpha_2^k \vee \alpha_3^k)$$

where each α_j^i is a literal.

Client/server system \mathbb{P}_φ is presented in Figure 7. It has several clients and two servers S_l and S_r . For every $i = 1, \dots, n$ we have a client C_i corresponding to variable x_i . Client C_i has two states: top and bottom. There are two transitions from top to bottom state, the θ_i transition intuitively says that x_i should be true, and λ_i that it should be false. This choice is not encoded in the reached state though, as the two transitions go to the same bottom state where a transition on x_i is possible. Similarly, for client \bar{C}_i but now we have $\bar{\theta}_i$, $\bar{\lambda}_i$, and \bar{x}_i actions. There are also two special clients C^* and \bar{C}^* . The first does e that is enabled in the initial state. The second can do \bar{e} , but only after doing b , and this in turn can happen only when server S_r terminates.

Among the two servers, only S_r depends on formula φ . Server S_l synchronizes on λ_i actions, and S_r on θ_i actions. Server S_l starts with a choice between e and \bar{e} , while the second part of S_r corresponds to the clauses of the formula φ , and finishes with b action.

Lemma 27 If φ is not SAT then all runs of \mathbb{P}_φ start with e . In other words, $e \in \text{first}(w)$ for every full run w of \mathbb{P}_φ .

Proof

Suppose w is a full run without e in $\text{first}(w)$. Since e is always possible until \bar{e} is executed, we must have \bar{e} on w . This must be preceded by b . So the first part, call it u , of w consists of synchronizations of clients with S_r , without S_l moving until S_r completes its run, that is until it does b . From the form of S_r it follows that the first part of u is a sequence $u_1 \dots u_n$ where each u_i is either θ_i or $\bar{\theta}_i$. This defines a valuation v . At this stage, the clients corresponding to literals true in v are in their bottom states where the actions on these literals are possible. The other clients are in their top states where the action on the corresponding literals are impossible. So under our assumption that S_l does not move: S_r can get to action b iff v is a satisfying valuation. As φ is not SAT this is impossible. Hence, such w cannot exist. \square

Lemma 28 If φ is not SAT then the transition system from Figure 8 is a **sound** and **complete** transition system for \mathbb{P}_φ .

Proof

First we check that it is **sound**, namely that every **full** path of this transition system is a run of \mathbb{P}_φ . For this observe that in the state just before α 's all clients are in their bottom states, so all the literals are available. This implies that all local paths of S_r on α 's are possible. Then action b is possible, but \bar{e} is not possible since S_l is in its bottom state.

It remains to verify that the transition system is **complete**. By Lemma 27, e is a **first** action of all full runs of \mathbb{P}_φ . Take such a run ew . Looking at \mathbb{P}_φ we see that after e there are four possible actions: $\lambda_1, \bar{\lambda}_1, \theta_1, \bar{\theta}_1$. We will consider only the case when the next action is θ_1 as the argument for the other possibilities is analogous. So $w = \theta_1 u_1 \bar{\lambda}_1 u'_1$ for some sequences u_1 and u'_1 ; observe that $\bar{\lambda}_1$ must appear on the run, as after $e\theta_1$ there is no action that can disable it. Since the only action on which S_l can synchronize is $\bar{\lambda}_1$, all actions in u_1 are synchronizations with S_r . Clearly they do not involve \bar{C}_1 , as there is no way to execute $\bar{\theta}_1$ at this stage. Hence, u_1 is independent of $\bar{\lambda}_1$ giving us that w is **trace equivalent** to $\theta_1 \bar{\lambda}_1 u_1 u'_1$. Repeating this reasoning we obtain that w is trace equivalent to a run in the transition system from Figure 8. \square

Lemma 29 If φ is SAT then there are runs containing \bar{e} . In every sound and complete reduced transition system for \mathbb{P}_φ there are at least as many states as there are satisfying valuations for φ .

Proof

For a valuation v we consider a run w_v taking θ_i if $v(x_i) = \text{true}$ and taking $\bar{\theta}_i$ if $v(x_i) = \text{false}$. For example, if x_1, x_n hold and x_2 does not hold in v then this run would look something like:

$$\theta_1 \bar{\theta}_2 \dots \theta_n \alpha_{i_1}^1 \dots \alpha_{i_k}^k b \bar{e} \bar{\lambda}_1 \lambda_2 \dots \bar{\lambda}_n$$

Here $\alpha_{i_j}^j$ is a literal that holds in the clause j . Since v is a satisfying valuation server S_r can get till b .

Observe that there is no concurrency in the run w_v . All θ and $\bar{\theta}$ actions synchronize with server S_r . Then b and \bar{e} are also dependent on each other as they happen on the same client. Action \bar{e} is the first action of S_l . It is followed by a sequence of actions of S_l .

Consider two different satisfying valuations v_1 and v_2 . Let s_1 be the state of program \mathbb{P}_φ reached after \bar{e} on the run w_{v_1} . Similarly, for s_2 ad w_{v_2} . In state s_1 , the clients that are in the bottom states are those corresponding to literals that are true in v_1 and similarly for v_2 . Since v_1 and v_2 are distinct valuations, the states s_1 and s_2 are distinct. So any sound and complete transition system for \mathbb{P}_φ must have at least as many states as there are satisfying valuations of φ . \square

We write $|\varphi|$ for the length of φ . Observe that this is an upper bound on the number of variables as well as on the number of clauses in φ , namely, $n, k < |\varphi|$.

Corollary 30 If φ is not SAT then $\text{minTS}(\mathbb{P}_\varphi) \leq 6|\varphi|$ states. If φ is SAT then $\text{minTS}(\mathbb{P}_\varphi)$ is bigger than the number of satisfying valuations for φ .

Proof of Theorem 26 Suppose to the contrary that *Alg* is an excellent POR algorithm. We use it to solve SAT in deterministic polynomial time.

Let $q(x)$ and $r(x)$ be the polynomials associated to *Alg*. Namely, *Alg* working in time $r(|\mathbb{P}| + |\text{minTS}(\mathbb{P})|)$ produces a sound and complete reduced transition system of size at most $q(|\text{minTS}(\mathbb{P})|)$.

Given a formula ψ , consider an integer m and a formula

$$\varphi \equiv \psi \wedge (z_1 \vee z_2) \cdots \wedge (z_{2m-1} \vee z_{2m})$$

where z_1, \dots, z_{2m} are new variables. Clearly φ is satisfiable iff ψ is. If ψ is satisfiable then φ has at least 2^m satisfying valuations.

Now we construct our program \mathbb{P}_φ and run *Alg* on it for $r(12|\varphi|)$ time. If φ is not SAT then, by Corollary 30, the algorithm stops and produces a sound and complete transition system. If φ is SAT then by Corollary 30 the algorithm cannot stop in this time as the smallest sound and complete transition system for \mathbb{P}_φ has at least 2^m states, and we can choose m big enough so that $2^m > r(6|\varphi|)$.

9 Approximating *IFS* test

In Listing 2, we have seen a simple and relatively promising algorithm for partial-order reduction based on an *IFS* oracle. We have also seen that the oracle test is NP-complete (Proposition 23). This was followed by a much stronger negative result, stating that we cannot hope for a polynomial-time algorithm guaranteeing to produce close to optimal size reduced transition systems (Theorem 26). We interpret the later result as an indication that *IFS* based algorithm is worth serious reconsideration, particularly because it uses clear concepts. The main challenge is how to approximate *IFS* test.

Here we develop heuristics for *IFS*(s, B) test. For our algorithms to be correct, we need to ensure one-sided error, namely, a heuristic must say 'yes', if *IFS*(s, B) holds. So the heuristic of always answering 'yes' is a possibility, just not a very attractive one.

We start with a characterization of when *IFS*(s, B) holds. This characterization is, unavoidably, computationally difficult. We get heuristics for *IFS* by weakening the conditions in the characterization.

Let us fix in this section a client/server system \mathbb{P} over a set of processes $Proc = Clients \cup Servers$. For every process $p \in Proc$ we have a transition system $TS_p = \langle S_p, \Sigma_p, s_p^0, \{ \xrightarrow{a} \}_{a \in \Sigma_p} \rangle$. These determine the transition system $TS(\mathbb{P})$ whose states s are tuples of states $\{s_p\}_{p \in Proc}$ and actions are the actions of the individual processes $\Sigma = \bigcup_{p \in Proc} \Sigma_p$. Recall that we write $s_p \xrightarrow{a}_p$ for local transitions in TS_p , for process p . We write $s \xrightarrow{a}$ for global transitions in $TS(\mathbb{P})$. Moreover, we use $enabled(s)$ for the set of labels of transitions outgoing from the global state s of $TS(\mathbb{P})$. Recall that $dom(b)$ is the set of processes in \mathbb{P} using action b . We extend this notation to sequences and sets of actions: $dom(v)$ and $dom(B)$ denote the unions of domains of the involved actions.

A characterization of *IFS*(s, B)

The conditions from the characterization lemma below are schematically represented in Figure 9. We want a pattern "proving" that there is a run u from a state s with $first(u) \subseteq B$. Observe that all actions in $first(u)$ are enabled in s . In order to get $first(u) \subseteq B$, we are thus




Figure 9: Conditions of Lemma 32

looking for a run u where every action a enabled in s which is not in B , is preceded by an action b such that $\text{dom}(a) \cap \text{dom}(b) \neq \emptyset$. As shown in Figure 9, we are looking for a “staircase” of **sticking actions** b_i that block all **enabled** actions in s . Thus the run u should start with a prefix v_1 which has its domain included in B . Then b_1 is an action which involves a process appearing on v_1 but also using a new process q_1 not in $\text{dom}(B)$. Observe that thanks to b_1 , no action involving process q_1 is in $\text{first}(u)$. After b_1 , u contains a sequence of actions v_2 with their domain in $\text{dom}(B) \cup \{q_1\}$, followed by an action b_2 that involves a process in $\text{dom}(B) \cup \{q_1\}$ and a new process q_2 , and so on. The pattern $v_1 b_1 v_2 b_2 \dots v_k b_k$ from Figure 9 and Lemma 32 below may not be by itself a **maximal run**, but every maximal run prolonging it will have its **first-set** included in B . Observe that the conditions guarantee v_1 being not empty.

Definition 31 Let s be a global state, and let R be a set of processes. We say that an action c **sticks** from R in s if $\text{dom}(c) = \{p, q\}$ for some $p \in R$, $q \notin R$, and moreover $s_q \xrightarrow{c} q$.

We say that R **wraps enabled**(s) if for every $e \in \text{enabled}(s)$, $\text{dom}(e) \cap R \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 32 There is a **maximal run** u from s with $\text{first}(u) \subseteq B$, if and only if, there is a **run** from s of the form $v_1 b_1 v_2 b_2 \dots v_k b_k$, such that for $i = 1, \dots, k$ we have:

- $\text{dom}(v_1) \subseteq \text{dom}(B)$;
- b_i sticks from $\text{dom}(v_1 b_1 \dots v_{i-1} b_{i-1} v_i)$;
- $\text{dom}(v_1 b_1 \dots v_i b_i v_{i+1}) = \text{dom}(v_1 b_1 \dots v_i b_i)$;
- $\text{dom}(v_1 b_1 \dots v_k b_k)$ **wraps enabled**(s).

Proof

For the right-to-left implication, consider a run $u = v_1 b_1 \dots v_k b_k$ from s as in the statement of the lemma. Observe that $\text{first}(u) = \text{first}(v_1) \subseteq B$ and for every $e \in \text{enabled}(s)$, $\text{dom}(e) \cap \text{dom}(u) \neq \emptyset$. This is because $\text{dom}(b_i) \cap \text{dom}(v_1 b_1 \dots v_{i-1} b_{i-1} v_i) \neq \emptyset$. Let w be a complete run prolonging u . As necessarily $\text{first}(w) \subseteq \text{enabled}(s)$, we have $\text{first}(w) = \text{first}(u)$.

For the left-to-right direction take a **maximal run** w with $\text{first}(w) \subseteq B$. Consider a **trace equivalent run** $v_1 b_1 w_2 \sim w$ where v_1 is the longest trace prefix of w such that $\text{dom}(v_1) \subseteq \text{dom}(B)$. Considering b_1 , we must have $b_1 D v_1$, so there is $p_1 \in \text{dom}(b_1) \cap \text{dom}(v_1)$. On the other hand $\text{dom}(b_1) \not\subseteq B$ so there is $q_1 \in \text{dom}(b_1) - \text{dom}(v_1)$. This means that $s_{q_1} \xrightarrow{b_1} q_1$. So b_1 is sticking out from $\text{dom}(v_1)$.

For the remaining part of the run w_2 , we have $\text{first}(w_2) \subseteq \text{dom}(v_1) = \text{dom}(v_1 b_1)$. We consider a **trace equivalent run** $w_2 \sim v_2 b_2 w_3$ with v_2 the longest trace prefix with $\text{dom}(v_2) \subseteq \text{dom}(v_1 b_1)$. A similar reasoning as for b_1 , gives us that b_2 sticks from $\text{dom}(v_1 b_1 v_2)$. Continuing like this we exhaust all the run w . If for the final $R = \text{dom}(v_1 b_1 \dots v_k b_k)$ there would still be $a \in \text{enabled}(s)$ with $\text{dom}(a) \cap R = \emptyset$ then wa would also be a run from s , that is impossible since we assumed w to be maximal. \square

9.1 Approximating IFS with PIFS

The condition of Lemma 32 is difficult to check algorithmically because it involves checking the existence of global runs v_1, \dots, v_k . As a heuristic we propose a weakening of this condition by approximating the existence of such runs by local runs, namely runs in transition systems of respective processes.

Definition 33 A set of actions B *potentially includes a first set* in s , denoted $\text{PIFS}(s, B)$, if there is a sequence of sets of actions $B = B_0 \subseteq B_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq B_k$ such that:

- $B_{i+1} = B_i \cup C_i$, where C_i is the set of actions c for which there is a process p and an action $b \in B_i$, with c sticking out from $\{p\}$ in s , and a local path $s_p \xrightarrow{b} \rightarrow_p \xrightarrow{x} \rightarrow_p \xrightarrow{c} \rightarrow_p$, for some x such that $\text{dom}(x) \subseteq \text{dom}(B_i)$;
- $\text{dom}(B_k)$ wraps $\text{enabled}(s)$.

A set of actions B *remotely potentially includes first set* in s , denoted $\text{rPIFS}(s, B)$, if there is a sequence $B = B_0 \subseteq B_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq B_k$ satisfying the same two conditions without the clause $\text{dom}(x) \subseteq \text{dom}(B_i)$.

Lemma 34 For every s and B : $\text{IFS}(s, B)$ implies $\text{PIFS}(s, B)$ that in turn implies $\text{rPIFS}(s, B)$.

Proof

Consider a run $v_1 b_1 \dots v_k b_k$ from the characterization of $\text{IFS}(s, B)$ in Lemma 32. We show that every b_i belongs to some B_j from the definition of PIFS . Consider b_1 that sticks from $\text{dom}(v_1)$ in s . This means $\text{dom}(b_1) = \{p_1, q_1\}$ with $p_1 \in \text{dom}(v_1)$, $q_1 \notin \text{dom}(v_1)$ and $s_{q_1} \xrightarrow{b_1} \rightarrow_{q_1}$. Consider the first action a_1 of p_1 on $v_1 = v'_1 a_1 v''_1$. We have $s_{p_1} \xrightarrow{a_1} \rightarrow_{p_1} \xrightarrow{x} \rightarrow_{p_1} \xrightarrow{b_1} \rightarrow_{p_1}$ for some x with $\text{dom}(x) \subseteq B_1$. If $a_1 \in \text{first}(v_1)$ then $b_1 \in B_1$. Otherwise, $\text{dom}(a_1) = \{p_1, r_1\}$, and we repeat the reasoning for r_1 instead of p_1 . An induction gives us $a_1 \in B_l$ for some l ; and in consequence $b_1 \in B_{l+1}$. The argument for all other b_i 's is similar.

Now, consider some $e \in \text{enabled}(s)$. By definition of $\text{IFS}(s, B)$ we have $\text{dom}(e) \cap \text{dom}(v_1 b_1 \dots v_k b_k) \neq \emptyset$. But $\text{dom}(v_1 b_1 \dots v_k b_k) = \text{dom}(v_1) \cup \{q_1, \dots, q_k\} \subseteq \text{dom}(B) \cup \text{dom}(\{b_1, \dots, b_k\}) \subseteq \text{dom}(B_k)$. So the condition of $\text{dom}(B_k)$ wrapping $\text{enabled}(s)$ is satisfied. \square

The algorithm for $\text{PIFS}(s, B)$ is presented in Listing 3. It follows rather directly the formula from Definition 33. In each iteration of while-loop, B is extended with C_i computed by the two for-loops.

Listing 3: Computing PIFS

```

1 procedure PIFS( $s, B$ ):
2    $D := \emptyset$ 

```

```

3  while  $B - D \neq \emptyset$  and not( $\text{dom}(B)$  wraps  $\text{enabled}(s)$ )
4     $D := B$ 
5    forall  $q, b$  such that  $s_q \xrightarrow{b}$ 
6      let  $p \in \text{dom}(b), p \neq q$ 
7      if  $\exists d \in D. s_p \xrightarrow{d} \xrightarrow{x} \xrightarrow{b}$  with  $x \in \text{dom}(B)$ 
8        add  $b$  to  $B$ 
9  return( $\text{dom}(B)$  wraps  $\text{enabled}(s)$ )

```

The test in line 7 asks if there is a local **run** from s_p in the transition system TS_p of process p of the form $dx b$ where x is a sequence of actions such that $\text{dom}(x) \subseteq \text{dom}(B)$. In order to compute $rPIFS$ instead of $PIFS$ it is enough to remove the requirement $x \in \text{dom}(B)$, that is the requirement on actions over which b is reachable.

The reason to introduce a less precise $rPIFS$ is that the test of “ $s_p \xrightarrow{b} \xrightarrow{x} \xrightarrow{c}$, for some x such that $\text{dom}(x) \subseteq \text{dom}(B_i)$ ” in the definition of $PIFS$ may be expensive in some situations. If this test were implemented by a procedure computing reachability each time, then indeed the resulting exploration algorithm would spend most of its running time doing this test. Our preferred solution is to precompute, for every process p , all triples (s_p, R, b) such that $s_p \xrightarrow{x} \xrightarrow{b}$ for some x with $\text{dom}(x) \subseteq R$. With this set of triples the test becomes very fast. It is of course not difficult to come up with a transition system for which the set of such triples is exponential in the size of the transition system. Yet, if the transition system of a process is a tree then the number of these triples is linear in the size of the transition system. In our examples, even if processes are relatively big DAGs, the number of triples is never a problem. Similarly, for servers that are not even DAGs. For servers implementing variables, locks, or communication channels, the number of these triples is linear in the size of the server.

Remark 35 Of course, the above approximation of IFS is not the only one possible. A possible idea is to approximate the existence of a global run by runs of k -processes instead of a single process, similarly to k -Cartesian abstraction [18]. Another option is the race reversal technique introduced in [1]. Let us briefly sketch it below.

Suppose we do not look for the existence of the whole pattern from Figure 9 but only for the first part $v_1 b_1$. If we cannot find $v_1 b_1$ part, then clearly we cannot find the whole pattern either. Assume that we use an exploration algorithm like the one from Listing 2. Consider an execution that comes back to node n , after finishing exploring n_a with $n \xrightarrow{a} n_a$. At this point, we may ask if a is a first action of every run from the state $s(n)$; if so then we can stop exploring from n . In other words, we would like to know whether $IFS(s, \text{enabled}(n) - \{a\})$ holds. To approximate this, we may ask if there is a path $u_1 b_1$ from n_a such that $u_1 \sim v_1 b_1 w_1$ with $\text{dom}(v_1) \cap \text{dom}(a) = \emptyset$ and $b_1 D a$. This is exactly to say that there is a race between a and b_1 . But this is also exactly the criterion for the first part $v_1 b_1$ in the IFS pattern from the characterization in Lemma 32. Thus, the race reversal technique can be seen as another way of approximating IFS test.

There are two complications with implementing this technique in our setting. First, because we allow blocking, the **sleep-invariant** is not strong enough. An exploration algorithm must guarantee that every “sleep-maximal” run is explored:

after exploration of a node n : for every run u from $s(n)$ such that there is no longer run ub with $\text{first}(ub) \cap \text{sleep}(n) = \emptyset$ we have a path v from n with $u \sim v$.

This implies that the algorithm may potentially explore more. The other, more serious, problem is how to find a race pattern. In stateless exploration, it is simple, as it is enough to go up the exploration path. In our case, this requires going up the exploration DAG. But the number of paths may be exponential in the size of a DAG. Theoretically, this race test becomes NP-complete, but we may still hope to have efficient heuristics.

10 A new partial-order reduction algorithm

Our starting point is the algorithm from Listing 2 employing *IFS* oracle to avoid exploration of branches leading to **sleep-blocked** states. We intend to use *PIFS* approximation instead. Since this is only an approximation, we will add two ingredients to improve the performance. The first is a heuristic to compute some **covering source set**. Interestingly, we derive it as some kind of dual to *rPIFS* test. The second ingredient is a function for choosing the most promising action to explore among those in the computed source set. The idea is to choose actions in such a way that the *PIFS* test becomes false as soon as possible.

10.1 A *rPIFS* based *closure* operation

We come back to the notion of **covering source set** from Section 5. Until now, we have not given any algorithm to compute such sets. We will derive one now from *rPIFS* test (Definition 33). We will then compare it to a method of computing **persistent** sets, and show that *rPIFS*-based source sets can be smaller than persistent sets.

Definition 36 For a state s and an action b , $\mathit{closure}(s, b)$ is the smallest set of actions C such that

- C contains $\{a : \exists p \in \mathit{dom}(b). s_p \xrightarrow{a} p\}$;
- for every $b \in C$, if $\mathit{dom}(b) = \{p, q\}$, $s_p \xrightarrow{b} p$, and $s_q \xrightarrow{c} q \xrightarrow{q}^* \xrightarrow{b} q$ then $c \in C$.

Observe that the second condition in this definition is exactly the same as in *rPIFS* test, but it is used “in the other direction”. (The condition for *rPIFS* requires that if c is in the set then b should be in the set.) While there is a direct proof of the following lemma, we prefer to give here an argument relying on this connection.

Lemma 37 If $b \in \mathit{enabled}(s)$ then $\mathit{closure}(s, b) \cap \mathit{enabled}(s)$ is a **covering source set**.

Proof

Consider a **maximal** run $s \xrightarrow{u}$ from s . Suppose for the contradiction that $\mathit{first}(u) \cap \mathit{closure}(s, b) = \emptyset$. By Lemmas 32 and 34, this means *rPIFS*($s, \mathit{first}(u)$) holds. Recalling its definition, this means that there is a sequence of sets of actions B_0, B_1, \dots, B_k such that $B_0 = \mathit{first}(u)$ and B_k **wraps** $\mathit{enabled}(s)$. In particular, $B_k \cap \mathit{dom}(b) \neq \emptyset$. By the first condition on *closure*, $B_k \cap \mathit{closure}(s, b) \neq \emptyset$. Say d_k is in this intersection. But then by the second condition on *closure* and the definition of *rPIFS*, there must be some d_{k-1} in $B_{k-1} \cap \mathit{closure}(s, b)$. Repeating this argument, we get some $d_0 \in B_0 \cap \mathit{closure}(s, b)$. But $B_0 = \mathit{first}(u)$, a contradiction. \square

Let us compare *closure* to some standard method for computing a persistent set. We take the one from [12] that is the best we could find in the literature, at least for our model of distributed systems.

Definition 38 For an action b and state s , a p -closure(s, b) is the smallest set of processes R such that

- $dom(b) \subseteq R$;
- if $p \in R$ and $s_p \xrightarrow{*}_p \xrightarrow{c}_p$ then $dom(c) \subseteq R$.

Now, we define p -set(s, b) = $\{a \in enabled(s) : dom(a) \subseteq p$ -closure(s, b) $\}$.

Remark 39 Comparing the two definitions we get $closure(s, b) \subseteq p$ -set(s, b). This is because p -closure(s, b) is at least as big as $dom(closure(s, b))$, and p -set(s, b) contains all the actions whose domain is included in p -closure(s, b).

Lemma 40 If $b \in enabled(s)$ then p -set(s, b) is a persistent set.

Proof

For a contradiction, suppose there is a run $s \xrightarrow{a_1 \dots a_k c}$ such that for all $i = 1, \dots, k$ $a_i \in p$ -set(s, b), and $c \notin p$ -set(s, b), but $c \in Dp$ -set(s, b). So there is $d \in p$ -set(s, b) with dDc . Let us take $p \in dom(d) \cap dom(c)$. Since $d \in p$ -set(s, b), we have $p \in p$ -closure(s, b). Observe that $s_p \xrightarrow{x}_p \xrightarrow{c}_p$ for x some subsequence of $a_1 \dots a_k$. Hence, $dom(c) \subseteq p$ -closure(s, b), and in consequence $c \in p$ -set(s, b). A contradiction. \square

Remark 41 It is not the case that $closure(s, b) \cap enabled(s)$ is always a persistent set in s . Consider the example in Figure 1 again. Action b is enabled in the initial state s_0 . We have $closure(s_0, b) = \{b, a, e\}$. But because of $s_0 \xrightarrow{c}$, the set $closure(s_0, b) \cap enabled(s_0)$ set is not persistent since $c \in Dclosure(s_0, b)$ because of e , but $c \notin closure(s_0, b)$.

From this discussion it follows that $closure(s, b)$ is preferable to p -set(s, b), because it is always a covering source set, and smaller than p -set(s, b). The remaining question is how to choose b . We see two interesting options: (i) lex -closure is to take the smallest b , in our fixed ordering on actions, among those enabled in s ; or (ii) min -closure is to take b giving the smallest covering source set in s . The first option may be interesting when not using sleep sets, the second seems preferable overall. Simple algorithms for the two options are presented in Listing 4.

Listing 4: Two possibilities for computing a closure

```

1  function MinClosure( $n$ ) // returns a covering source set
2       $C := enabled(n) - sleep(n)$ 
3      forall  $b \in enabled(n) - sleep(n)$ 
4           $B := closure(s(n), b) \cap (enabled(n) - Sleep(n))$ 
5          if  $|B| < |C|$ 
6               $C := B$ 
7      return  $C$ 
8
9  function LexClosure( $n$ ) // returns a covering source set
10     if  $enabled(n) = \emptyset$ 
11         return  $\emptyset$ 
12     else
13         choose minimal  $b \in enabled(n)$  w.r.t. linear ordering on actions
14         return  $closure(s(n), b) \cap (enabled(n) - sleep(n))$ 

```

10.2 Choose an action from a closure

The goal of $ChooseAction(s, A)$ is to pick the most promising action from a set A . One simple implementation is to choose the smallest action in A according to our fixed ordering. Another option is to use information given by $PIFS$; we describe it now.

As we have seen, $closure$ corresponds to $rPIFS$. Since $PIFS$ is stronger than $rPIFS$, the question arises if we can compute some variant of a closure operation corresponding to $PIFS$. The challenge here is that while $closure$ and $rPIFS$ refer to simple reachability, $PIFS$ refers to reachability over a particular set of actions, and this set of actions is calculated dynamically in $PIFS$. We will use this calculated set to decide which action to explore next. So instead of aiming at a closure corresponding to $PIFS$, we aim at choosing an action to explore that is most promising to make the $PIFS$ test false and stop exploration.

The idea of $ChooseAction(s, A)$ is to compute $PIFS(s, \{b\})$ for each action $b \in A$, and look at the obtained set B . If B wraps all actions enabled in s then $PIFS$ indicates that there may be a run from s with $\{b\}$ as the only first action. In this case it is certain that we should explore b from s . If B does not wrap all enabled actions then we take b giving the biggest B . The intuition is that this b will be present in *first* sets of a big portion of runs from s . To implement this idea we slightly modify $PIFS$ function, so that it returns the computed set B . The algorithms for the two options are presented in Listing 5.

Listing 5: Choose action

```

1  function ChooseAction( $s, A$ )
2     $max := 0$ 
3    forall  $b \in A$ 
4       $(res, B) := aPIFS(s, \{b\})$ 
5      if  $res$  then return  $b$ 
6      if  $|B| > max$ 
7         $max := |B|$ 
8         $bmax := b$ 
9    return  $bmax$ 
10
11 function  $aPIFS(s, B)$ :
12    $D := \emptyset$ 
13   while  $B - D \neq \emptyset$  and not ( $dom(B)$  wraps  $enabled(s)$ )
14      $D := B$ 
15     forall  $q, b$  such that  $s_q \xrightarrow{b}$ 
16       let  $p \in dom(b), p \neq q$ 
17       if  $\exists d \in D. s_p \xrightarrow{d}_p \xrightarrow{x}_p \xrightarrow{b}_p$  with  $dom(x) \subseteq dom(B)$ 
18         add  $b$  to  $B$ 
19   if  $dom(B)$  wraps  $enabled(s)$ 
20     return ( $true, B$ )
21   else
22     return ( $false, B$ )

```

10.3 A $PIFS$ based algorithm

As we have seen, $closure$ gives a covering source set, so it can be used to compute what to explore, while IFS can be used to test when to stop exploring. We have also seen that if

we had a perfect *IFS* oracle then we would not need *closure*. Of course, dually, if we had a perfect variant of closure operator giving us a minimal covering *source set* then we would not need *IFS*. We have seen in Section 7 that perfect *IFS* test is NP-hard. For the same reason a perfect closure operator is also NP-hard.

The idea of the algorithm presented in Listing 6 is to use the best we have. For deciding when to stop we use *PIFS* that is the best approximation of *IFS* we have. For limiting the number of actions to consider, we use *ChooseClosure* as described in Section 10.1. Finally, we use *ChooseAction* to take the most promising action to explore as discussed in Section 10.2.

The algorithm from Listing 6 builds a *reduced transition system* where each node n is associated a state $s(n)$ of $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$ and a *sleep set* $sleep(n)$. At this point we have all the tools

Listing 6: Explore using *PIFS*, *ChooseClosure* and *ChooseAction*

```

1  main( $\mathbb{P}$ ):
2  create node  $n^0$  with  $s(n^0) = s^0$  and  $sleep(n^0) = \emptyset$ 
3   $Explored := \emptyset$ 
4   $Explore(n^0)$ 
5
6  procedure  $Explore(n)$ :
7     $Sl := sleep(n)$ 
8     $C := ChooseClosure(n)$  //  $C$  is a "covering source set",  $C \subseteq enabled(n)$ 
9    while  $C - Sl \neq \emptyset$ 
10      $a := ChooseAction(s(n), C - Sl)$ 
11     let  $s'$  such that  $s(n) \xrightarrow{a} s'$ 
12     if  $\exists n'' \in Explored$  s.t.  $n'' \triangleleft (s', Sl - Da)$ 
13       add edge  $n \xrightarrow{a} n''$  to the exploration graph
14     else if  $PIFS(s', enabled(s') - (Sl - Da))$ 
15       create node  $n' = (s', Sl - Da)$ 
16       add edge  $n \xrightarrow{a} n'$ 
17        $Explore(n')$ 
18      $Sl := Sl \cup \{a\}$ 
19     add  $n$  to  $Explored$ 

```

to prove its correctness. The algorithm is a modification of the one from Listing 2 that is correct by Lemma 17. Changing *IFS* to *PIFS* preserves correctness by Lemma 34. Function *ChooseAction* does not influence correctness. Finally, the restriction to C in the condition of the while-loop preserves correctness thanks to Remark 18 and Lemma 37 stating that *closure* gives a *covering source set*.

Theorem 42 *Given a client/server system \mathbb{P} , the algorithm from Listing 6 constructs a sound and complete transition system for $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$.*

11 Implementation and experimental results

We report on the implementation of the algorithm from Listing 6. We have compared it with what we consider the state-of-the art persistent set method, namely *p-set* from Definition 38.

The correctness of an implementation as well as of the reported results is probably the first question that comes to mind. Our implementation is in C++. It is based on a system developed for different purposes adapted to the exploration of “simple transition systems” we consider in this work. This tool includes several features, such as custom memory management and optimized [subsumption](#) checking. Even if we verified the abstract algorithm from Listing 6 in Coq, that we are not capable of, this would still leave a large margin for coding errors. Instead, we use Proposition 7 to check that the computed [reduced transition system](#) is [complete](#). To that purpose, we compute the transition system $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$ and for every state s of it, we compute the *first* sets of all [maximal](#) runs from s . Since our systems are acyclic, this can be done bottom-up relatively efficiently. Then, we take a reduced transition system and check for all its states that the set of outgoing transitions is a [covering source set](#) as in Definition 6. According to Proposition 7, this test guarantees that the reduced transition system is [complete](#). We have run this test on a large number of randomly generated systems as well as on all the reported examples, up to a size when generating the full transition system $\text{TS}(\mathbb{P})$ is still feasible. This gives us some confidence in the reported results.

We have compared 6 algorithms, all of them using depth-first exploration. The first one is the standard reachability algorithm without partial-order reduction ([reach](#)). The others differ in the use of [sleep sets](#), [PIFS](#), and a choice between [min-closure](#) or simple [lex-closure](#). We consider one algorithm without sleep sets, but with all other improvements, namely with [PIFS](#) and [min-closure](#) ([full-sleep](#)). Then we consider four algorithms using sleep sets, together with: persistent sets ([pset+sleep](#)), [min-closure](#) without [PIFS](#) ([minclosure+sleep](#)), [PIFS](#) without [min-closure](#) ([apifs+sleep](#)) and, finally, with both [PIFS](#) and [min-closure](#) ([full+sleep](#)). The last option is precisely the algorithm from Listing 6 implemented using a stack instead of recursion. We have experimented with breadth-first and some priority queue exploration ordering, but the results were roughly the same or even worse in the case of BFS.

We report experimental results on 8 models from the literature and 2 new benchmarks, one of which are randomly generated models with locks. The models from the literature are: “Dinning philosophers” ([dp](#)), “Dispatcher” ([disp](#)) [9], “MPat” ([mpat](#)) [9] and the program in Figure 1 ([qo](#)) from [9], then “Token ring” ([tk](#)) [36], next a model of Peterson’s mutual exclusion algorithm ([pet](#)) [32, 39], and finally “filesystem” ([fs](#)) and “lastzero” ([lz](#)) from [14]. The new benchmarks are described below. Model ([qo](#)), is an example where race reversal from [1] is exponential [9]. Models “filesystem” and “lastzero” are the classical examples for dynamic partial-order reduction.

Figure 10 compares the persistent set algorithm [pset+sleep](#) and our algorithm [full+sleep](#) on the classical “Dining Philosophers” example. Each Philosopher is a client process that takes both forks, eats, and then releases both forks, whereas forks are server processes that behave as locks. The picture on the left shows that on this model, the state-of-the-art persistent set approach (i.e. [pset+sleep](#)) is slightly better than reachability. Our algorithm [full+sleep](#) produces reduced graphs which are several orders of magnitude smaller than the persistent sets approach, and can explore much larger models within a span of 15 minutes (up to 15 Philosophers instead of only 10). The picture on the right of Figure 10 compares the same algorithms on a similar model, but where the Philosophers eat twice. This induces much more races in the model, making it harder to explore. Our algorithm [full+sleep](#) still significantly outperforms the persistent set algorithm.

Figure 11 reports a comparison between the persistent sets approach ([pset+sleep](#)) and our approach ([full+sleep](#)) on randomly generated “Multi locks” models. They consist of a




Figure 10: Comparison of algorithms `reach`, `pset+sleep` and `full+sleep` on the “Dining Philosophers” model, with the main loop unfolded once (left), and twice (right). Experiments have been ran on a MacBook Air M2 with 16Gb of memory, and with a timeout of 15min.




Figure 11: Comparison of algorithms `pset+sleep` and `full+sleep` on the “Multi locks” model (full results on the left, focus on the smaller models on the right). Experiments have been ran on a MacBook Air M2 with 16Gb of memory, and with a timeout of 2min.

set of processes (clients) and a set of locks (servers). Processes are randomly generated. Each process first acquires a fixed number of randomly chosen locks, and then releases the locks. We have generated 765 models using 51 random seeds, with either 4, 6, 8, 10 or 12 clients, 10 locks, and where each client acquires the same number of locks, which is set to either 1, 2 or 3. Algorithm `pset+sleep` could not terminate within 2 minutes on 37 models. The picture on the left of Figure 11 compares the size of the reduced graphs for the remaining 728 models. The picture on the right focuses on the smaller models with graph of at most 1000 nodes. Both pictures clearly show a superior performance of `full+sleep` over `pset+sleep`, with gains around an order of magnitude on a significant share of the models.

In Table 1, we compare the 6 algorithms on 9 models. We have considered several instances of each model with increasing number of processes as indicated along with the model name. The loops contained in the models have been unfolded once. The first model in the table, “boolean gates” (`bg`) is a new model representing an idealized tree architecture. It consists of a set of gates (clients) that are connected by wires (servers). The gates are set up in a complete binary tree. The size of the model corresponds to the height of the tree. Hence, the number of processes increases exponentially with the height. Each gate reads its two input wires, then writes its output wire. There are races between connected gates, while gates on distinct branches are fully concurrent.

Models			reach	pset+sleep	full+sleep		full-sleep	minclosure+sleep	apifs+sleep
#C	#S	N	N	N	N	Paths	N	N	N
bg 3	15	14	163217	95991	131	256	131	131	329
bg 4	31	30	timeout	timeout	401	65536	401	401	5945
bg 5	63	62			1211	$> 4.2 \cdot 10^9$	1211	1211	timeout
bg 8	511	510			32801	$> 1.7 \cdot 10^{19}$	32801	32801	
bg 9	1023	1022			timeout		timeout	timeout	
qo 15	17	17	6995968	3489810	407	32	407	407	422
qo 50	52	52	timeout	timeout	3977	102	3977	3977	4027
qo 100	102	102			15452	202	15452	15452	15552
qo 200	202	202			timeout		timeout	timeout	timeout
mpat 5	10	7	59616	11264	672	3840	672	672	3202
mpat 10	20	12	timeout	timeout	41984	$> 3.7 \cdot 10^9$	41984	41984	1446066
mpat 15	30	17			1998848	$> 4.2 \cdot 10^{16}$	1998848	1998848	timeout
mpat 20	40	22			timeout		timeout	timeout	
disp 5	7	18	95744	75786	176	12	176	176	224
disp 10	12	33	timeout	timeout	526	22	526	526	769
disp 50	52	153			9626	102	9626	9626	16829
disp 100	102	303			36751	202	36751	36751	66154
disp 200	202	603			timeout		timeout	timeout	timeout
tk 7	14	14	2892644	2990790	167743	$> 1.9 \cdot 10^7$	494259	167743	167743
tk 8	16	16	timeout	timeout	683829	$> 5.9 \cdot 10^8$	2405450	683829	683829
tk 9	18	18			2726258	$> 1.9 \cdot 10^{10}$	timeout	2726258	2726258
tk 10	20	20			timeout		timeout	10702780	timeout
tk 11	22	22			timeout		timeout	timeout	timeout
pet 4	4	7	19029	23824	19584	$> 5.7 \cdot 10^{10}$	17648	21209	20009
pet 5	5	9	932573	1435970	1174715	$> 1.6 \cdot 10^{19}$	877567	1295320	1201401
pet 6	6	11	timeout	timeout	timeout		timeout	timeout	timeout
fs 6	6	64	531441	274374	481	32	106	605	132
fs 7	7	66	timeout	timeout	1107	64	177	1359	234
fs 13	13	15			131103	4096	8283	147483	12366
fs 14	14	16			311339	8192	86174	364574	69770
fs 15	15	82			timeout		timeout	timeout	timeout
lz 12	12	14	16054352	11990059	1113570	190459	2030705	2654133	1113570
lz 13	13	15	timeout	timeout	timeout		timeout	8319765	timeout
lz 14	14	16			timeout		timeout	timeout	timeout
dp 10	10	10	9765624	5706432	145494	$> 4.5 \cdot 10^8$	734806	2165172	792072
dp 11	11	11	timeout	timeout	344511	$> 3.5 \cdot 10^9$	2122108	7370149	2695491
dp 12	12	12			799032	$> 2.8 \cdot 10^{10}$	5936405	timeout	timeout
dp 13	13	13			1822134	$> 2.2 \cdot 10^{11}$	timeout	timeout	timeout
dp 14	14	14			4097822	$> 1.8 \cdot 10^{12}$	timeout	timeout	timeout
dp 15	15	15			timeout		timeout	timeout	timeout

Table 1: Comparison of algorithms `reach`, `pset+sleep`, `full+sleep`, `full-sleep`, `minclosure+sleep` and `apifs+sleep` on various instances of selected models. For each instance we indicate the number of clients (`#C`) and the number of servers (`#S`). For each algorithm, we report the number of nodes in the computed graphs (`N`). For algorithm `full+sleep` we also give the number of paths (`Paths`) in the reduced model. Experiments were performed on MacBook Air M2 with 16Gb of memory, and a timeout of 5min.

For each algorithm and each model, we report the number N of nodes in the (reduced) graphs. We first observe that our algorithm `full+sleep` which includes all the features presented in this paper clearly outperforms the standard reachability algorithm (`reach`) and the persistent sets based partial-order reduction (`pset+sleep`), on all the examples. The other columns allow us to compare the impact of each technique used in `full+sleep`.

Comparing `full+sleep` and `full-sleep`, we first observe that using `sleep sets` is beneficial for all models, except `fs` and `pet`. Indeed, in these models, it appears that sleep sets lead to a huge number of state duplications (nodes with the same program state but different sleep sets).

From columns `full+sleep`, `minclosure+sleep` and `apifs+sleep`, we see that `PIFS` does not provide additional benefit over `min-closure` on the first five models. Conversely, `min-closure` alone does not improve over `PIFS` on models `lz`, `tk`, `pet` and `fs`. This last model is particular since most races appear from size 14. Then `apifs+sleep` performs significantly better than `minclosure+sleep` and even `full+sleep`. Finally, the advantages of combining our techniques are clearly visible on the `dp` model.

While our techniques scale up significantly better than standard persistent set based reduction, they are unable to explore bigger instances of models `pet` and `lz`. These models are indeed out of reach for static partial-order approaches. A combination of dynamic race detection (which can be seen as one possible heuristic for *IFS*), as well as coarser *por-equivalences*, in place of Mazurkiewicz *trace equivalence* used here, will permit handling larger instances of these models.

Finally, the column *Paths* in Table 1 shows the number of paths in the reduced graphs produced by our best algorithm `full+sleep`. We can observe that it grows sharply on many examples: `bg`, `mpat`, `tk`, `pet` and `dp`. While our models are probably not optimal in the number of paths these numbers indicate that a stateless approach might be impractical on these examples.

12 Conclusions

The first main contribution of this paper is a strong lower bound, indicating that stateful partial-order methods should not aim at some strict concept of optimality like *trace-optimality* from [1]. However, we use *trace-optimality* as a guiding principle for the idealized algorithm from Listing 2. The second contribution is the notion of *IFS* oracle and its approximations going beyond the persistent set approach so dominant in stateful partial-order reduction literature since its beginnings. This *IFS* approach shifts the focus from deciding which actions to take to determining when to stop. While it might seem less intuitive to ask when to stop, it is more intuitive to develop heuristics for the *IFS* question.

We believe that our results transfer to other models of concurrent systems. The proof of the lower bound (Theorem 26) is intricate, but as far as we can see, it does not depend on specific features of our model. Our new partial-order algorithm (Listing 6) utilizes the robust and versatile framework of asynchronous automata capable of encoding various synchronization constructs directly. However, no formalism universally fits all concurrent systems, and certain mismatches, like those discussed in Remark 24 on non-blocking, are inevitable. Our current work is limited to binary synchronizations, but we anticipate that extending our approach to multi-party synchronizations would be feasible, albeit with more complex notation.

It is uncertain whether similar lower bounds to ours apply to stateless partial-order reduction. Any lower bound in this scenario would have to consider algorithms operating in polynomial space. Since existing *trace-optimal* reductions assume some form of *non-blocking*, there is no direct conflict between our lower bound and algorithms from [24, 3]. We conjecture that an analogous lower bound might exist for a stateless partial-order reductions in the presence of blocking. It is also important to explore lower bounds for the unfolding approach [34]. Here, thanks to [9] we know a NP lower bound for computing, so called, alternatives. This result is similar to our result on the NP-hardness of *IFS*. Prime event structures represent runs differently than transition systems, and sometimes they can be more compact. For this reason, our general lower bound does not immediately translate to unfolding-based partial-order methods.

Regarding practical algorithms for stateful partial-order reductions, a crucial next step is to explore other *por-equivalence* relations. One of the greatest forces behind modern partial-order methods comes from their ability to work with more refined equivalences, such as allowing permutations of two reads of the same variable and much more [28, 7, 5, 12, 23, 13, 6]. We believe that our client/server formalism may offer an elegant way to define such equivalences,

and that the methodology presented here would apply. An extension to weak memory models would also be interesting, as they have a potential to give even bigger reductions.

One technical objective is to integrate the race reversal method. As discussed in Remark 35, it can be seen as another heuristic for *IFS*, and may even be combined with the heuristic we have proposed here. A straightforward implementation of race reversals is linear with respect to the number of paths in the reduced transition system. While suitable for stateless methods, this approach is not viable in our context, where the number of paths is often orders of magnitude bigger than the size of the reduced system. Developing a more efficient yet elegant algorithm is an interesting challenge.

A more general challenge is to find other heuristics for *IFS*. The *PIFS* heuristic introduced here is relatively straightforward, but it is certainly not the only approach. An intriguing possibility could involve leveraging SAT solvers to find approximations of *IFS*. Even without SAT there are many possibilities. For instance, employing k -Cartesian abstractions [18] instead of focusing solely on local runs could offer new insights. Additionally, in the context of verifying timed systems, methods abstracting the time component could provide novel ways to approximate *IFS*.

Handling systems with infinite runs is another important issue, particularly for the stateful approach. We have pointed out the source of the problem in Remark 9. At present, we do not have an elegant solution for this case.

References

- [1] Parosh Aziz Abdulla, Stavros Aronis, Bengt Jonsson, and Konstantinos Sagonas. Source Sets: A Foundation for Optimal Dynamic Partial Order Reduction. *Journal of the ACM*, 64(4):1–49, 2017.
- [2] Parosh Aziz Abdulla, Mohamed Faouzi Atig, Frederik Meyer Bønneland, Sarbojit Das, Bengt Jonsson, Magnus Lang, and Konstantinos Sagonas. Tailoring Stateless Model Checking for Event-Driven Multi-threaded Programs. In Étienne André and Jun Sun, editors, *Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis*, pages 176–198. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023.
- [3] Parosh Aziz Abdulla, Mohamed Faouzi Atig, Sarbojit Das, Bengt Jonsson, and Konstantinos Sagonas. Parsimonious Optimal Dynamic Partial Order Reduction.
- [4] Parosh Aziz Abdulla, Mohamed Faouzi Atig, Bengt Jonsson, Magnus Lang, Tuan Phong Ngo, and Konstantinos Sagonas. Optimal stateless model checking for reads-from equivalence under sequential consistency. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 3(OOPSLA):1–29, 2019.
- [5] Pratyush Agarwal, Krishnendu Chatterjee, Shreya Pathak, Andreas Pavlogiannis, and Viktor Toman. Stateless Model Checking Under a Reads-Value-From Equivalence. In Alexandra Silva and K. Rustan M. Leino, editors, *Computer Aided Verification*, volume 12759, pages 341–366. Springer International Publishing, 2021.
- [6] Elvira Albert, Maria Garcia de la Banda, Miguel Gómez-Zamalloa, Miguel Isabel, and Peter Stuckey. Optimal dynamic partial order reduction with context-sensitive independence and observers. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 202:111730, 2023.

- [7] Marek Chalupa, Krishnendu Chatterjee, Andreas Pavlogiannis, Nishant Sinha, and Kapil Vaidya. Data-centric dynamic partial order reduction. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 2(POPL):1–30, 2018.
- [8] Berk Cirisci, Constantin Enea, Azadeh Farzan, and Suha Orhun Mutluergil. A Pragmatic Approach to Stateful Partial Order Reduction. In Cezara Dragoi, Michael Emmi, and Jingbo Wang, editors, *Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation*, volume 13881, pages 129–154. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023.
- [9] Camille Coti, Laure Petrucci, César Rodríguez, and Marcelo Sousa. Quasi-optimal partial order reduction. *Formal Methods in System Design*, 57(1):3–33, 2021.
- [10] Frank S. De Boer, Marcello Bonsangue, Einar Broch Johnsen, Violet Ka I Pun, S. Lizeth Tapia Tarifa, and Lars Tveito. SymPaths: Symbolic Execution Meets Partial Order Reduction. In Wolfgang Ahrendt, Bernhard Beckert, Richard Bubel, Reiner Hähnle, and Mattias Ulbrich, editors, *Deductive Software Verification: Future Perspectives*, volume 12345, pages 313–338. Springer International Publishing, 2020.
- [11] Azadeh Farzan. Commutativity in Automated Verification. In *2023 38th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2023.
- [12] Azadeh Farzan, Dominik Klumpp, and Andreas Podelski. Sound sequentialization for concurrent program verification. In *Proceedings of the 43rd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, pages 506–521. ACM, 2022.
- [13] Azadeh Farzan, Dominik Klumpp, and Andreas Podelski. Stratified Commutativity in Verification Algorithms for Concurrent Programs. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 7(POPL):1426–1453, 2023.
- [14] Cormac Flanagan and Patrice Godefroid. Dynamic Partial-Order Reduction for Model Checking Software. In *POPL’05*, 2005.
- [15] Patrice Godefroid. *Partial-Order Methods for the Verification of Concurrent Systems An Approach to the State-Explosion Problem*. PhD thesis.
- [16] Patrice Godefroid. Using partial orders to improve automatic verification methods. In Edmund M. Clarke and Robert P. Kurshan, editors, *Computer-Aided Verification*, pages 176–185. Springer, 1991.
- [17] R. Govind, Frédéric Herbretreau, Srivathsan, and Igor Walukiewicz. Abstractions for the local-time semantics of timed automata: A foundation for partial-order methods. In *Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 1–14. ACM, 2022.
- [18] Jochen Hoenicke, Rupak Majumdar, and Andreas Podelski. Thread modularity at many levels: A pearl in compositional verification. In *Proceedings of the 44th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, pages 473–485. ACM, 2017.
- [19] Casper S. Jensen, Anders Moller, Veselin Raychev, Dimitar Dimitrov, and Martin Vechev. Stateless model checking of event-driven applications. In *Proceedings of the 2015*

- ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, Systems, Languages, and Applications*, OOPSLA 2015, pages 57–73. Association for Computing Machinery, 2015.
- [20] Bengt Jonsson, Magnus Lang, and Konstantinos Sagonas. Awaiting for Godot Stateless Model Checking that Avoids Executions where Nothing Happens. In *{22nd Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design, {FMCAD} 2022}*. IEEE, 2022.
- [21] Vineet Kahlon, Chao Wang, and Aarti Gupta. Monotonic Partial Order Reduction: An Optimal Symbolic Partial Order Reduction Technique. In Ahmed Bouajjani and Oded Maler, editors, *Computer Aided Verification*, volume 5643, pages 398–413. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.
- [22] Shmuel Katz and Doron Peled. Verification of distributed programs using representative interleaving sequences. *Distributed Computing*, 6(2):107–120, 1992.
- [23] Michalis Kokologiannakis, Rupak Majumdar, and Viktor Vafeiadis. Enhancing GenMC’s Usability and Performance. In Bernd Finkbeiner and Laura Kovács, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, pages 66–84. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024.
- [24] Michalis Kokologiannakis, Iason Marmanis, Vladimir Gladstein, and Viktor Vafeiadis. Truly stateless, optimal dynamic partial order reduction. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 6(POPL):1–28, 2022.
- [25] Michalis Kokologiannakis, Iason Marmanis, and Viktor Vafeiadis. Unblocking Dynamic Partial Order Reduction. In Constantin Enea and Akash Lal, editors, *Computer Aided Verification*, volume 13964, pages 230–250. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023.
- [26] Michalis Kokologiannakis, Azalea Raad, and Viktor Vafeiadis. Model checking for weakly consistent libraries. In Kathryn S. McKinley and Kathleen Fisher, editors, *Proceedings of the 40th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2019, Phoenix, AZ, USA, June 22-26, 2019*, pages 96–110. ACM, 2019.
- [27] Michalis Kokologiannakis and Viktor Vafeiadis. BAM: Efficient Model Checking for Barriers. In Karima Echihabi and Roland Meyer, editors, *Networked Systems*, volume 12754, pages 223–239. Springer International Publishing, 2021.
- [28] Pallavi Maiya, Rahul Gupta, Aditya Kanade, and Rupak Majumdar. Partial Order Reduction for Event-Driven Multi-threaded Programs. In Marsha Chechik and Jean-François Raskin, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, pages 680–697. Springer, 2016.
- [29] Antoni W. Mazurkiewicz. Introduction to trace theory. In Volker Diekert and Grzegorz Rozenberg, editors, *The Book of Traces*, pages 3–41. World Scientific, 1995.
- [30] Burcu Kulahcioglu Ozkan, Rupak Majumdar, and Simin Oraee. Trace aware random testing for distributed systems. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 3(OOPSLA):1–29, 2019.

- [31] Doron Peled. Partial-order reduction. In Edmund M. Clarke, Thomas A. Henzinger, Helmut Veith, and Roderick Bloem, editors, *Handbook of Model Checking*, pages 173–190. Springer, 2018.
- [32] Gary L. Peterson. Myths about the mutual exclusion problem. 12(3):115–116, 1981.
- [33] The Anh Pham. *Efficient State-Space Exploration for Asynchronous Distributed Programs: Adapting Unfolding-Based Dynamic Partial Order Reduction to MPI Programs*. These de doctorat, Rennes, Ecole normale superieure, 2019.
- [34] César Rodríguez, Marcelo Sousa, Subodh Sharma, and Daniel Kroening. Unfolding-based Partial Order Reduction. *LIPICs, Volume 42, CONCUR 2015*, 42:456–469, 2015.
- [35] Samira Tasharofi, Rajesh K. Karmani, Steven Lauterburg, Axel Legay, Darko Marinov, and Gul Agha. TransDPOR: A Novel Dynamic Partial-Order Reduction Technique for Testing Actor Programs. In Holger Giese and Grigore Rosu, editors, *Formal Techniques for Distributed Systems*, pages 219–234. Springer, 2012.
- [36] Antti Valmari. A State Space Tool for Concurrent System Models Expressed In C++.
- [37] Antti Valmari. Stubborn sets for reduced state space generation. In G. Goos, J. Hartmanis, D. Barstow, W. Brauer, P. Brinch Hansen, D. Gries, D. Luckham, C. Moler, A. Pnueli, G. Seegmüller, J. Stoer, N. Wirth, and Grzegorz Rozenberg, editors, *Advances in Petri Nets 1990*, volume 483, pages 491–515. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1991.
- [38] Antti Valmari. The state explosion problem. In Gerhard Goos, Juris Hartmanis, Jan Leeuwen, Wolfgang Reisig, and Grzegorz Rozenberg, editors, *Lectures on Petri Nets I: Basic Models*, volume 1491, pages 429–528. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1998.
- [39] Antti Valmari. Stop It, and Be Stubborn! *ACM Transactions on Embedded Computing Systems*, 16(2):1–26, 2017.
- [40] Antti Valmari and Henri Hansen. Stubborn Set Intuition Explained. In Maciej Koutny, Jetty Kleijn, and Wojciech Penczek, editors, *Transactions on Petri Nets and Other Models of Concurrency XII*, volume 10470, pages 140–165. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2017.
- [41] Bjorn Wachter, Daniel Kroening, and Joel Ouaknine. Verifying multi-threaded software with impact. In *2013 Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design*, pages 210–217. IEEE, 2013.
- [42] Chao Wang, Zijiang Yang, Vineet Kahlon, and Aarti Gupta. Peephole Partial Order Reduction. In C. R. Ramakrishnan and Jakob Rehof, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, volume 4963, pages 382–396. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008.
- [43] Yu Yang, Xiaofang Chen, Ganesh Gopalakrishnan, and Robert M. Kirby. Efficient Stateful Dynamic Partial Order Reduction. In Klaus Havelund, Rupak Majumdar, and Jens Palsberg, editors, *Model Checking Software*, pages 288–305. Springer, 2008.