Abstract
Concurrency in the Linux kernel can be a contentious topic. The Linux kernel mailing list features numerous discussions related to consistency models, including those of the more than 30 CPU architectures supported by the kernel and that of the kernel itself. How are Linux programs supposed to behave? Do they behave correctly on exotic hardware?

A formal model can help address such questions. Better yet, an executable model allows programmers to experiment with the model to develop their intuition. Thus we offer a model written in the cat language, making it not only formal, but also executable by the herd simulator. We tested our model against hardware and refined it in consultation with maintainers. Finally, we formalised the fundamental law of the Read-Copy-Update synchronisation mechanism, and proved that one of its implementations satisfies this law.

1. Introduction
Concurrency in Linux may frighten small children [35]; it also appears to be disconcerting to grown-ups.

1.1 “Still confusion situation all round” [sic] [89]

The Linux kernel (LK) targets more than 30 CPU architectures, amongst which Alpha [18], ARM [14], IBM Power [38], Intel [40], Itanium [40] and MIPS [39] implement weak consistency models. Consistency models determine what values a read can take; weak models allow more behaviours than Sequential Consistency (SC) [45].

These architectures implement distinct models and thus disagree on the values that a read can return. This leads to a plethora of discussions on the Linux Kernel mailing list (LKML), some of which are listed in Table 1; their frequency has increased as multicore systems have gone mainstream.

Table 1: Selection of LKML discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPARC</td>
<td>[51] [76]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>[84]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>[56] [4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>[19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>[73]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>[36]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK/Itanium</td>
<td>[16] [70]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>[20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itanium</td>
<td>[57] [48] [49] [88]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intel</td>
<td>[53] [41]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK/C11</td>
<td>[22] [23]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>[21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>[79]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>[31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARM64</td>
<td>[26]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>[27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIPS</td>
<td>[85] [86] [87] [81]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>[52] [53] [30]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARM64</td>
<td>[28]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK/C11</td>
<td>[23]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>[72]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LK developers must understand not only the kernel’s concurrency primitives, but also those of the underlying hardware. Several documents make laudable efforts in this direction: [37] lists what orderings are guaranteed; [69] summarises semantics of read-modify-write operations, and [55] documents ways of avoiding counterproductive optimisations. Sadly these documents are in prose, subject to ambiguities and misinterpretations. As a candid disclaimer puts it [37]:

*This document is not a specification; it is intentionally (for the sake of brevity) and unintentionally (due to being human) incomplete. [...] in case of any doubt (and there are many) please ask.*
This quote suggests that a specification might dispel all doubts. However, as Linus Torvalds writes [78]:

"With specs, there really *are* people who spend years discussing what the meaning of the word "access" is or similar [the authors of this paper plead guilty]. Combine that with a big spec that is 500+ pages in size and then try to apply that all to a project that is 15 million lines of code and sometimes *knowingly* has to do things that it simply knows are outside the spec [...]"

This highlights the need for an object beyond a prose specification: unambiguous, concise, amenable to vast code projects, and complete. We offer a *formal executable model* for the LK, written in the cat language [12].

Writing a memory consistency model in cat gives it a formal meaning, since cat has a formal semantics [3]. Moreover, a cat model can be executed within the herd tool [5], allowing users to experiment with the model to develop their intuition.

1.2 “[I]t is your kernel, so what is your preference?” [54]

Architects and standard committees are often seen as ultimate authorities on consistency matters. In our case, we rely on Linus Torvalds’s and his maintainers’ posts to LKML and the gcc mailing list. We cite and discuss these posts below.

A common denominator of hardware models seems to align with Torvalds’ view [80]:

*Weak memory ordering is [...] hard to think about [...] So the memory ordering rules should [...] absolutely be as tight as at all humanly possible, given real hardware constraints.*

To this end, we axiomatised models of IBM Power [75 74] in cat. We modified this formalisation to handle Alpha [18] and incorporate ideas from academic ARM models [34]. ARM then released their official memory model [47 Chap. B2.3] (including a cat file distributed within the diy+herd tool suite [5]), making those models obsolete; we thus modified our LK model accordingly. This experience shows that our model will change over time as existing hardware evolves, or new hardware arises.

Yet the LK cannot simply be an envelope for the architectures it supports. As Ingo Molnar writes [71]:

"it's not true that Linux has to offer a barrier and locking model that panders to the weakest (and craziest!) memory ordering model amongst all the possible Linux platforms—theoretical or real metal. Instead what we want to do is to consciously, intelligently pick a sane, maintainable memory model and offer primitives for that—at least as far as generic code is concerned. Each architecture can map those primitives to the best of its abilities.*

This seems much like defining a language-level model: it might appear that the C11 model could be used as the LK model. Indeed, converging with C11 is the topic of several LKML discussions [22 24]. Unfortunately the C11 model is an imperfect fit [78]:

*I do not believe for a second that we can actually use the C11 memory model in the kernel [...] We will continue to have to do things that are “outside the specs” [...] with models that C11 simply doesn’t cover.*

In short, the LK should have a model of its own.

1.3 “[P]ick a sane, maintainable memory model” [71]

Our LK model is a first attempt at fulfilling this wish. Of course, concerns like sanity or maintainability are to an extent in the eye of the beholder. But we believe that the LK community will help achieve these goals. Indeed, our work is based on interactions with the community, along with documentation and posts to mailing lists. This has been necessary for understanding the semantics of certain pieces of code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LK issue</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>locking on ARM64</td>
<td>[26]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambiguities in</td>
<td>[57]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambiguities in RCU</td>
<td>[58]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documentation</td>
<td>[59]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPU hotplug</td>
<td>[90]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumption about lock-unlock</td>
<td>[64]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semantics of spin_lock</td>
<td>[83]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 2: LK issues that our work helped address |

Moreover, our model has already resolved ambiguities and helped fix bugs (see Table 2). The RCU documentation now uses our definitions [58] and memory-barriers.txt [37] was updated to distinguish between transitivity and cumulativity [59]. Our work informed fixes to code incorrectly relying on fully ordered lock-unlock pairs [64], code where ARM64 needed stronger ordering from combinations of locking and fences [26], and discussions about the semantics of locking primitives [83]. Finally, our model was directly used by a maintainer to justify his patch [90]; this highlights the practical applicability of our model.

Seven maintainers agreed to sponsor our model, which has received positive feedback on LKML [60].

1.4 Correctness of concurrent code

Our model is also a stepping stone towards assessing the correctness of LK code. We focus here on Read-Copy-Update (RCU) [52].

CBMC [17] has been used to verify LK Tree RCU over SC, TSO, and PSO [46]; others used Nidhugg over SC and TSO [42]. Userspace RCU has been examined with respect to C11 [77 43]. These works provided valuable insights, but only relative to the models available to them. We examine RCU in the light of our LK model, the first to provide a formal semantics for RCU. Moreover, our results provide two alternative ways to integrate a semantics of RCU in a software analysis tool.

1.5 Overview of the paper and contributions

Section 2 introduces LK programs and their executions, and the cat language. Section 3 describes and illustrates our model. Section 4 formalises RCU. Section 5 gives our experimental results. Section 6 examines the correctness of an RCU implementation. In summary, this paper presents:
1. a formal core LK memory model, in the form of a specification of the model in cat (Figure 8) and precise constraints under which executions are allowed or forbidden by the LK model (Figure 3);
2. examples illustrating how forbidden executions violate the constraints (Figures 4 and 5);
3. a formalisation of RCU as an axiom (Figure 12);
4. a formalisation of the fundamental law of RCU equivalent to the axiom (Theorem 1);
5. experiments showing that our model is sound with respect to hardware, and a comparison with C11 (Table 5);
6. the correctness of an RCU implementation (Theorem 2);
7. a discussion of required future work (Section 7).

The cat model, test results and proofs are online [7].

2. Programs and Candidate Executions

LK programs communicate via shared locations (e.g., x, y, z), use private locations (e.g., r1, r2) for logic or arithmetic, and control their execution flow with conditionals and loops. Use of shared accesses may result in weak behaviours.

Figure 1 shows an LK program where two threads communicate via shared locations x and y, initialised to 0. T0 updates x, calls smp_wmb, and sets y to 1. T1 reads y, calls smp_rmb, and reads x. This is a message passing idiom: with enough synchronisation, after T1 sees that the flag y is set, it must see the updated data. Here smp_wmb and smp_rmb are enough.

Below we partially describe the LK primitives in Table 3. Table 4 details RCU primitives.

**ONCE primitives** are special reads and writes which restrict compiler optimisations (vide infra).

**Acquire and release primitives** are synchronising: a release read by an acquire ensures that writes before the release are seen by the acquire’s thread.

**Fences** prevent reorderings: smp_rmb for reads, smp_wmb for writes, smp_mb for all accesses, and smp_read_barrier_depd for dependent reads on architectures that do not respect such dependencies, viz. Alpha.

**Read-modify-writes** (xchg and siblings) consist of a read paired with a write. Depending on the primitive, these reads and writes can be ONCE (for xchg_relaxed), acquire, release, or surrounded by full fences (for xchg).

**LK coding conventions** restrict compiler optimisations, e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LK/C primitive</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>READ_ONCE()</td>
<td>R[once]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITE_ONCE()</td>
<td>W[once]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smp_load_acquire()</td>
<td>R[acquire]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smp_store_release()</td>
<td>W[release]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smp_rmb()</td>
<td>F[rmb]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smp_wmb()</td>
<td>F[wmb]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smp_mb()</td>
<td>F[mb]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smp_read_barrier_depd()</td>
<td>F[rb-dep]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xchg_relaxed()</td>
<td>R[once], W[once]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xchg_acquire()</td>
<td>R[acquire], W[once]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xchg_release()</td>
<td>R[once], W[release]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xchg()</td>
<td>F[mb], R[once], W[once], F[mb]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: LK primitives and corresponding events

- ONCE primitives prevent tearing (compiling a large access as a group of smaller accesses), fusing (compiling a series of accesses to a single location as just one access), and splitting (compiling a single access as multiple full-sized accesses, e.g., repeating a load to avoid a register spill);
- dependencies are crafted to prevent the compiler from breaking them [37, 55];
- the LK relies on inline assembly: for example, architectures with write memory barriers can implement smp_wmb, despite lack of C11 support for this notion.

In addition, we only model architectures that the LK actually supports. Thus we need not consider (for example) difficulties such as 8-bit architectures with 16-bit pointers. All in all, our LK model specifies the cumulative effect of a language-level model (the subset of C specific to the LK) and the hardware models targeted by the LK.

A consistency model determines which values can be returned by read primitives. An axiomatic model—the style we chose here—does so by determining whether candidate executions of a program are allowed. Candidate executions are graphs: nodes are events modeling instructions, and edges form relations over events, representing, e.g., the program order in which instructions appear on a thread, or where a read takes its value from. Figure 2 shows a candidate execution (with initial writes and thread labels omitted).

![Diagram](image)

Figure 2: Forbidden execution for the program in Figure 1

**Events** model primitives. Reads (R) from a shared location place the value read in a private location, writes (W) to a shared location update said location with a given value,
and fences (F) may prevent undesirable behaviors. Read-modify-writes give rise to a read and a write for the same shared location. Events bear annotations reflecting the corresponding primitives: once or acquire (for reads); once or release (for writes); and rmb, wmb, mb or rb-dep (for fences). For example, smp_load_acquire is represented by a read annotated acquire, WRITE_ONCE by a write annotated once, and smp_wmb by a fence annotated wmb. Table 3 lists the events for each primitive, omitting locations for brevity.

**Candidate executions** consist of abstract executions, representing the semantics of each thread, and execution witnesses, representing communications between threads. Abstract executions (E, po, addr, data, ctrl, rmw) contain:

- **E**, the set of events;
- **po**, the program order, specifies instruction order in a thread after evaluating conditionals and unrolling loops;
- **addr**, data, and ctrl are the **address**, **data**, and **control dependency** relations in po, always starting from a read.
- **rmw** links the read of a read-modify-write to its write.

Execution witnesses (rf, co) contain:

- the **reads-from** relation rf, which determines where reads take their value from. For each read r there is a unique write w to the same location s.t. r takes its value from w.
- the **coherence order** relation co, representing the history of writes to each location. It is a total order over writes to the same location, starting with the initialising write.

**The cat language** [3] formalises consistency models as sets of constraints over candidate executions. We wrote our model in cat so that it can be executed by the herd simulator [12]. The language provides the user with predefined sets of events (W contains all write events, R all reads, and _ all events) and the relations forming candidate executions (po, addr, data, ctrl, rmw, rf, and co), as well as the identity relation id, the loc relation, which contains all pairs of events that access the same shared location, and the int relation, which contains all pairs of events that belong to the same thread.

Users can build new relations via union (∪), intersection (∩), difference (\), complement (~ r), inverse (r⁻¹), reflexive closure (r²), transitive closure (r⁺), reflexive transitive closure (r*(4)), sequence (r₁; r₂, defined as \{(x, z) | \exists y[(x, y) ∈ r₁ ∧ (y, z) ∈ r₂] \}), and direct product of sets of events (X × Y). One can thus build the following relations, which often appear in cat models (and in our LK model):

- the **from-reads** relation consists of one step of reads-from backwards, then one step of coherence: fr := rf⁻¹; co;
- the **communication** relation gathers reads-from, coherence and from-reads: com := rf ∪ co ∪ fr;
- the **dependency** relation gathers address and data (but not control) dependencies: dep := addr ∪ data;
- the program order relation restricted to accesses of the same location: po-loc := po ∩ loc;
- the **internal reads-from** relation, i.e., the reads-from which take place within a thread: rfi := rf ∩ int;
- the **external** relation ext, containing pairs of events that belong to different threads: ext := ~ int;
- the **external reads-from, coherence and from-reads** relation, containing pairs of events that belong to different threads: rfe := rf ∩ ext, coe := co ∩ ext, and fre := fr ∩ ext.

A cat model can constrain a relation r to be irreflexive, acyclic, or empty.

In Figure 2, read c takes its value from write b, hence the reads-from (rf) arrow between them. Read d takes the initial value, which is overwritten by write a, hence the from-reads (fr) arrow between them. This candidate execution is forbidden by our LK model: the synchronisation ensures that the updated data x is visible to T₁ when it reads the flag y.

### 3. The LK model’s core

A candidate execution is **allowed by the core LK model** if it satisfies the constraints of Figure 3; it is **forbidden** otherwise.

**acyclcic(po-loc ∪ com)** (Scpv)

**empty(rmw ∩ (fre ∩ coe))** (At)

**acyclic(hb)** (Hb)

**acyclic(pb)** (Pb)

**Figure 3:** Core of our LK model

Scpv (satisfies the constraints of Figure 3; it is **forbidden** otherwise.

**Acyclic** (po-loc ∪ com) (Scpv)

**Empty** (rmw ∩ (fre ∩ coe)) (At)

**Acyclic** (hb) (Hb)

**Acyclic** (pb) (Pb)

**Figure 3:** Core of our LK model

Scpv (sequential consistency per variable) forces the values of a single variable to be the same as it would have in SC: weak consistency arises from interactions among variables. At (atomicity) ensures that there cannot be an intervening write to the same location between the read and the write of a read-modify-write. Hb (happens-before) provides the intuitive causality notion. Pb (propagates-before) constrains the propagation of writes and fences among concurrent threads. Both Scpv and At appear in the literature [12] Sect. 4.2. In this section, we present Hb and Pb.

These axioms constrain the hb and pb relations (defined later) to be partial orders, because they require the relations to be acyclic. Below we illustrate these orders using examples from the LK 4.12 source code [82].

**Auxiliary relations** in the figures include the following: The acq-po relation contains pairs of events in program order such that the first is an acquire. Similarly, po-rel pairs events where the second is a release. rfi-rel-acq is an internal reads-from communication between a release and an acquire. The rmb relation pairs reads with an smp_rmb fence between them. Similarly, wmb pairs writes with an smp_wmb fence between them, mb pairs any events with an smp_mb fence between them, and rb-dep pairs reads with a smp_read_barrier_depends between them.
3.1 Examples

**LB+ctrl+mb.** In Figure 4, appears in the ring-buffer interface from kernel to userspace (see `perf_output_put_handle()` in [82] `kernel/events/ring_buffer.c`). $T_0$ reads from $x$ (event a) and writes to $y$ (b), imposing a control dependency (depicted by the ctrl arrow) in between. Similarly, $T_1$ reads from $y$ (c) and writes to $x$ (d), with an `smp_mb` fence between them (mb arrow). If the dependency or the fence is removed, the execution is allowed by the model and observed on ARMv7 [50, Sect. 7.1].

![Figure 4: LB+ctrl+mb: Forbidden.](image)

**WRC+po-rel+mb.** In Figure 5, is a sibling of Figure 1. This pattern appears in LKML discussions [61]. $T_0$ writes to $x$ (a), and $T_1$ writes to $y$ (c) after reading $x$ (b). The release in $T_1$ (po-rel arrow) forces $a$ to happen before $c$, even though $a$ and $c$ are not in the same thread. The fence in $T_2$ (mb arrow) ensures that $d$ and $e$ stay in order.

![Figure 5: WRC+po-rel+mb: Forbidden.](image)

**SB+mb** (a store buffering idiom), in Figure 6 is used in LK wait-event/wakeup code. It is documented in `waitqueue_active()` [82] include/linux/wait.h; `wait_woken()` and `woken_wake_function()` [82] `kernel/sched/wait.c`; and `wake_q_add()`, `wake_up_q()`, and `try_to_wake_up()` [82] `kernel/sched/core.c`. Without the fences it is observed on x86.

![Figure 6: SB+mb: Forbidden.](image)

**PeterZ,** in Figure 7, is used to resolve races between performance monitoring and CPU hotplug operations [90]. As in the previous example, two strong fences forbid the pattern, which otherwise is observed on Power machines.

![Figure 7: PeterZ: Forbidden.](image)

3.2 Formal definitions

We now dive into the formal definitions of our model, given in Figure 8 which we justify in the light of the LK design.

![Figure 8: LK definitions.](image)

3.2.1 “If some [...] architecture gets its memory ordering wrong [...] [it] should pay the price” [80]

Some architectures do not provide sufficient ordering for the LK. The LK compensates in architecture-specific ways, and our LK model reflects only the ordering provided by the hardware. A notable example is Itanium, which can reorder loads from the same address. To work around this, Itanium’s gcc compiler emits special load instructions, which provide suitable ordering guarantees, for `READ_ONCE`. Accordingly, even though all other architectures’ compilers need only emit a plain load, our LK model requires memory accesses to be annotated by once or something stronger (see Table 3).

3.2.2 The preserved program order relation `ppo`

`ppo` relates events in program order as described below:

**Local orderings to writes** are modeled by `to-w` relation. The `rwdep (read-write dependency)` relation orders a read and a write with an address, data, or control dependency between them (dep `∪ ctrl`) (see [57] l. 879). In Figure 4 there is a control dependency between $a$ and $b$ (($a, b) \in ctrl$); thus ($a, b) \in ppo$.

The `overwrite` relation orders events where the second overwrites the first. Among the local orderings to writes, we consider only the instances of `overwrite` that are internal to a thread; hence the intersection with the `int` relation.

**Local orderings to reads** are modeled by the `to-r` relation. Read-read dependencies (formalised by `rrdep`) consist of `addr`, or `dep` followed by `rfi (internal reads-
from) (see [37] l. 393). Unfortunately, Alpha does not respect read-read address dependencies [18]. The LK compensates via *smp_read_barrier_depends* (modeled by *rb-dep*), which emits a memory barrier on Alpha and is a no-op on other architectures. Our model therefore respects read-dependencies only given an intervening *smp_read_barrier_depends* (see [37] l. 429, l. 550), as modeled by *strong-rddep* (*strong read-read dependency*).

An internal read from a write release and a read acquire also provides ordering.

**Local ordering due to fences** is modeled by the *fence* relation (see [37] l. 1801)). The *strong-fence* relation orders events separated by *smp_mb*; we will update it in the next section to account for RCU. The *fence* relation orders events separated by a fence (*mb* [37] l. 446), *smp_wmb* [37] l. 1801) or *smp_rmb* [37] l. 1801), or such that the first event is an acquire (*acq-po*) [37] l. 461) or the second is a release (*po-rel*) [37] l. 477]. In Figure 5, *d* and *e* are separated by an *smp_rmb* fence (i.e., *(d,e) ∈ rmb*); thus *(d,e) ∈ fence*. In Figure 7, *d* is a write release; thus *(c,d) ∈ po-rel ⊆ fence*.

ARMv7 implements *smp_load_acquire* with a full fence for lack of better means. In contrast, Power uses the lightweight *lwsync*, and ARMv8 a special load-acquire. Our model represents *smp_load_acquire* with the weaker orderings of ARMv8 [47] and Power [12], not the stronger ordering of ARMv7 [12]. The situation for *smp_store_release* is the same.

**All in all**, *ppo* pairs events linked by one of the relations above, optionally preceded by a read-dependency (in the sense of *rrdep*). The LK uses this prefix (as documented in task_rqlock [32] kernel/sched/core.c]) to forbid Figure 9: *d* is address-dependent (addr arrow) on *c*, thus *(c,d) ∈ rrdep*; and *d* is an acquire, thus *(d,e) ∈ acq-po*, which entails *(d,e) ∈ strong-rrdep ⊆ to-r*. Therefore *(c,e) ∈ ppo*.

**3.2.3 The propagation relation *prop***

This relation corresponds to the informal notion of *transitivity* presented in [37] l. 1349). It pairs events possibly in different threads ordered as follows.

**Cumulative fences** are modeled by *cumul-fence*, which pairs events in program order that are separated by an *smp_wmb* or *smp_mb* fence, or where the second is a release.

Strong fences (*smp_mb*) and releases are *A-cumulative*, as formalised by the cat function *A-cumul(r) := rfe^n : r*. The ordering provided by these fences extends to external writes that are read by an event preceding the fence. In Figure 5, *c in T_1* is a write release, thus *(b,c) ∈ po-rel*. Since *b* reads the write *a in T_0*, *(a,b) ∈ rfe* and thus *(a,c) ∈ A-cumul(po-rel); hence *(a,c) ∈ cumul-fence*.

The relation *prop generalises cumulativity*: it ensures that guarantees made by *cumul-fence* for a thread *T* spread to other threads that access the same variables as *T*. When *e_1* and *e_2* are related by a sequence of *cumul-fence* links:

- *(e_1,e_2) ∈ prop*. In Figure 2, *a* and *b* are separated by an *smp_wmb* fence; thus they are related by *prop*.
- Any external event overwritten by *e_1 links by *prop* to *e_2*. In Figure 2, *d* is overwritten by *a*; thus *(d,b) ∈ prop*.
- *(e_1 or an external event it overwrites) is related by *prop* to events that read from *e_2*. In Figure 7, *b* is overwritten by *c* and the release *d* is read by *e*; thus *(b,e) ∈ prop*.
- These facts hold when *(e_1,e_2) ∈ prop*. In Figure 6, *d* is overwritten by *a*; thus *(d,a) ∈ prop*. Idem *f* and *a* in Figure 7.

**3.2.4 The happens-before relation *hb***

*hb* is the union of the *ppo* and *rfe* relations, together with *prop* restricted to distinct events in the same thread. The *hb* axiom requires *hb* to be acyclic, ensuring that reads-from is consistent with local orderings due to *ppo* and fences.

In Figure 4, we have *(a,b) ∈ ctrl*; thus *(a,b) ∈ ppo* (as *ctrl ⊆ to-w ⊆ ppo*). We also have *(c,d) ∈ mb*; thus *(c,d) ∈ ppo* (as *mb ⊆ fence ⊆ ppo*). Overall, we have *a → b → c → d → a*, a cycle in the *hb* relation.

In Figure 5, we have *(a,c) ∈ cumul-fence*, as mentioned above. Moreover, a overwrites *e* and *d* reads from *c*. *(e,d) ∈ prop*. Since *e* and *d* are different events in the same thread, we have *(e,d) ∈ (prop \ id) ∩ int*. And since *d* and *e* are separated by an *rmb* fence, we also have *(d,e) ∈ ppo*. Thus *d → e → (prop \ id) ∩ int* → *d*, a cycle in *hb*.

**3.2.5 The propagates-before relation *pb***

*pb* contains events related by *prop* followed by a strong fence and an arbitrary number of *hb* links. The *pb* axiom requires *pb* to be acyclic, so that events are overwritten in a manner consistent with the orderings due to strong fences.

In Figure 6, *(d,a) ∈ prop*, as mentioned above. Since *a* and *b* are separated by a strong fence, we have *(d,b) ∈ pb*.

By symmetry we also have *(b,d) ∈ pb*, hence a cycle in *pb*.

In Figure 7, *(b,e) ∈ prop*, as mentioned above. Since *e* and *f* are separated by a strong fence, we have *(b,f) ∈ pb*. Similarly, since *(f,a) ∈ prop* and *(a,b) ∈ strong-fence*, we also have *(f,b) ∈ pb*, thus creating a cycle in *pb*.

**3.3 Summary**

This section presented the core of our formal LK model.

**3.3.1 Our core LK model** (Figure 5)

We exclude executions exhibiting any of following cycles:
• Sepv cycles, which involve only one shared variable, made of program order and communications edges;
• At cycles, which involve read-modify-writes;
• Hb cycles, which involve local orderings due to dependencies and fences, and reads-from communications;
• Pb cycles, which involve at least one strong fence.

3.3.2 The relations constrained by the model
These are formally defined in Figure 8. The crucial ones are:
• preserved program order ppo, which models local orderings due to dependencies (to-x and to-w) and fences;
• the propagation relation prop, which models the effect of fences (cumul-fence) on the propagation of writes to different variables with respect to one another;
• the happens-before relation hb, which models the effect of local orderings due to ppo and fences on reads-from;
• the propagates-before relation pb, modeling strong fences.

4. Modeling Read-Copy-Update
Read-copy update (RCU) is a synchronisation mechanism in which writers do not block readers: readers can be fast and scalable and writers can make forward progress concurrently with readers. Readers call the primitives rcu_read_lock and rcu_read_unlock to delimit a read-side critical section (RSCS). Updaters are writers that call the synchronize_rcu primitive: calling it starts a grace period (GP). Table 4 lists RCU primitives and their corresponding events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LK/C primitive</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rcu_dereference()</td>
<td>R[once], F[rb-dep]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rcu_assign_pointer()</td>
<td>W[release]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rcu_read_lock()</td>
<td>F[rcu-lock]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rcu_read_unlock()</td>
<td>F[rcu-unlock]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synchronize_rcu()</td>
<td>F[sync-rcu]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: RCU primitives and corresponding events
In Figure [10] $T_0$ contains an RSCS accessing variables $x$ and $y$, and $T_1$ updates the same variables.

Figure 10: RCU-MP: Forbidden.
We present here two different ways of formalising RCU: the fundamental law in Section 4.1 and the RCU axiom in Section 4.2. We show the equivalence of the law and the axiom in Theorem 1. This result has practical significance because it enables tools to embed RCU semantics in either of two ways: by determining if a critical section spans a grace period (as per the law), or by counting the number of grace periods and critical sections in a cycle (as per the axiom).

4.1 Formalising the fundamental law of RCU
In [62], “an informal, high-level specification for RCU”, the reader is warned thus:

*RCU’s specification is primarily empirical in nature*

We would like to formalise the requirement of [62], i.e., the fundamental law of RCU (aka grace period guarantee) [66]:

**Read-side critical sections cannot span grace periods.**

Intuitively, for any GP and RSCS, the law has two aspects:
• RSCS precedes GP: if any access in the RSCS precedes the GP, then no access in the RSCS can follow the GP.
• GP precedes RSCS: if any access in the RSCS follows the GP, then no access in the RSCS can precede the GP.

We illustrate each aspect below, referring to Figure [10].

**RCU precedes GP:** we take the $\rightarrow$ arrow to indicate that $b$ precedes $c$, hence $b$ precedes the synchronize_rcu event $k$. Thus an access in the RSCS precedes the GP. By the fundamental law, no access in the RSCS can follow the GP. Thus a cannot read from d, which forbids the pattern.

**GP precedes RSCS:** we take the $\leftarrow$ arrow to indicate that $a$ follows $d$, i.e., a executes after synchronize_rcu returns. The law says that no access in the RSCS can precede the GP. Thus $b$ cannot precede $c$, which again forbids the pattern.

The guarantees made by the law may seem similar to the ones made by fences. Indeed, the pattern of Figure [10] would also be forbidden with wmb in $T_1$ and wmb in $T_0$ (cf. Figure [1]). However, unlike with fences, if we swap the reads in $T_0$ (cf. Figure [1]), the pattern remains forbidden: if the read of $x$ obtains $0$ and hence executes before the GP, then the read of $y$ cannot obtain $1$.

Figure 11: RCU-deferred-free: Forbidden.
We model the law with a “precedes” function $F$ which, given a candidate execution, an RSCS, and a GP, selects which of the RSCS or the GP precedes the other:

$$F(RSCS, GP) = RSCS \quad \text{or} \quad F(RSCS, GP) = GP.$$
The \texttt{rcu-fence}(F) relation models the interaction of an RSCS and a GP. Two events, \(e_1\) and \(e_2\), are related by \texttt{rcu-fence}(F) iff there are an RSCS (delimited by \texttt{rcu-read_lock} and \texttt{rcu_read_unlock} events \(l\) and \(u\)) and a GP (given by \texttt{synchronize_rcu} event \(s\)) such that either:

- the RSCS precedes the GP, \(e_1\) precedes \(u\) in program order, and \(e_2\) is \(s\) itself or follows \(s\) in program order:
  \[F(\text{RSCS}, \text{GP}) = \text{RSCS} \land (e_1, u) \in \text{po} \land (s, e_2) \in \text{po}^2\]

- or the GP precedes the RSCS, \(e_1\) precedes \(s\) in program order, and \(e_2\) is \(l\) itself or follows \(l\) in program order:
  \[F(\text{RSCS}, \text{GP}) = \text{GP} \land (e_1, s) \in \text{po} \land (l, e_2) \in \text{po}^2\]

Let us revisit Figure\textsuperscript{10} in the light of our new definition.

- If \(F(\text{RSCS}, \text{GP}) = \text{RSCS}\) (i.e., the RSCS precedes the GP), all events preceding the unlock event \(j\) in program order are related by \texttt{rcu-fence}(F) to the GP event \(k\) and all \text{po}-subsequent events. In particular, we have \((a, d) \in \text{rcu-fence}(F)\).

- If \(F(\text{RSCS}, \text{GP}) = \text{GP}\) (i.e., the GP precedes the RSCS), all events preceding the event \(k\) are related by \texttt{rcu-fence}(F) to the lock event \(g\) and all \text{po}-subsequent events. In particular, we have \((c, b) \in \text{rcu-fence}(F)\).

The fundamental law makes guarantees similar to fences, albeit stronger. Thus we treat \texttt{rcu-fence}(F) on a pair with \texttt{strong-fence} and embed it in an enlarged \texttt{pb}(F) relation:

\[\text{pb}(F) := \text{prop; (strong-fence \cup \text{rcu-fence}(F)); hb}^*\]

A candidate execution \(X\) satisfies the fundamental law of RCU iff there is a \texttt{precedes} function \(F\) such that \(X\) satisfies the enlarged \texttt{Pb} axiom \texttt{acyclic(pb}(F)), \texttt{we see that there is no such function for the execution in Figure\textsuperscript{10}}.

- if \(F(\text{RSCS}, \text{GP}) = \text{RSCS}\) then \((a, d) \in \text{rcu-fence}(F)\). Moreover we have \((d, a) \in \text{rfe}\), thus in \text{hb}^*. This creates a cycle in \text{pb}(F).

- if \(F(\text{RSCS}, \text{GP}) = \text{GP}\) then \((c, b) \in \text{rcu-fence}(F)\). Moreover we have \((b, c) \in \text{rfe}\), thus in \text{prop}. This also creates a cycle in \text{pb}(F).

4.2 The RCU axiom

We augment our model with the relations in Figure\textsuperscript{12}.

We write \texttt{gp} for the relation between events in program order separated by a \texttt{synchronize_rcu} \(s\), or such that the second one is \(s\) itself. In Figure\textsuperscript{10} we have \((c, k)\) and \((c, d)\) in \texttt{gp}. We add \texttt{gp} to the definition of \texttt{strong-fence}, so that \texttt{synchronize_rcu} can be used instead of \texttt{smp_mb}.

We write \texttt{crit} for the relation between an RSCS’s lock \(l\) and its unlock \(u\). The LK allows \texttt{rcu_read_lock()} and \texttt{rcu_read_unlock()} to be nested arbitrarily deeply; \texttt{crit} connects each outermost \texttt{rcu_read_lock()} to its matching \texttt{rcu_read_unlock()}.

\[\text{gp} := (\text{po} \cap \langle \times \text{Sync} \rangle) \cup \text{po}^2\]

\[\text{strong-fence} := \text{mb \cup gp}\]

\[\text{rscs} := \text{po; crit}^1 \cup \text{po}^2\]

\[\text{link} := \text{hb}^* \cup \text{pb}^* \cup \text{prop}\]

\[\text{gp-link} := \text{gp; link}\]

\[\text{rscs-link} := \text{rscs; link}\]

\[\text{rec} \texttt{rcu-path} := \text{gp-link} \cup \text{rcu-path; rscs-link}; \text{rcu-path}\]

\[\text{link} := \text{hp-link} \cup \text{rcu-path; rscs-link}\]

\[\text{link} := \text{rscs-link}; \text{rcu-path}\]

\[\text{irreflexive}(\text{rcu-path})\]

Figure\textsuperscript{12}: RCU relations and axiom

The relation \texttt{rscs} pairs events \(e_1\) and \(e_2\) in the same thread s.t. \(e_1\) is \text{po}-before an unlock \(u\) and \(e_2\) is \text{po}-after the matching lock \(l\) or is \(l\) itself. In Figure\textsuperscript{10} \((g, g), (g, a), (a, b), (b, a), (b, j), (b, g)\), and many other pairs are in \texttt{rscs}.

The \texttt{link relation} embeds everything that provides order in our model. Intuitively, if an event in an RSCS appears before a GP according to our \texttt{link} relation, we model the first aspect of the fundamental law; if a GP appears before an event in an RSCS in \texttt{link}, we model the second aspect.

The \texttt{gp-link} and \texttt{rscs-link} relations are \texttt{gp} followed by \texttt{link} and \texttt{rscs} followed by \texttt{link}, respectively. Roughly speaking, they pair events where the second occurs after a GP following, or RSCS containing, the first.

The \texttt{rcu-path relation} is defined recursively, as indicated by the \texttt{cat} keyword \texttt{rec}. It merely pairs events that are connected by a non-empty sequence of \texttt{gp-link} and \texttt{rscs-link} edges in which there are at least as many GPs as RSCSes.

The \texttt{RCU axiom} requires \texttt{rcu-path} to be a path, i.e., to be irreflexive. Strikingly, our work allows us to demonstrate that this is equivalent to the fundamental law:

\textbf{Theorem 1 (RCU guarantee). An LK candidate execution satisfies the Pb and RCU axioms iff it satisfies the fundamental law.}

This theorem formalises a rather simple rule of thumb \cite{slide 42}: the fundamental law of RCU is invalid iff there is a cycle in which the number of RSCSes is less than or equal to the number of GPs.

To establish this result, we show that the irreflexivity of \texttt{rcu-path} (as per the axiom) is equivalent to the acyclicity of \texttt{pb} enlarged by \texttt{rcu-fence}(F) (as per the law). We omit the proof (available online \cite{online}) for brevity.

5. Experiments

We used the diy+herd toolsuite \cite{toolsuite} to build a vast library of \textit{litmus tests} and run them against our model and as kernel modules. We also compared our model to the C11 model of \cite{C11}.

Litmus tests are small programs that exercise specific features of consistency models. Our validation includes classic
Table 5: Simulations vs. experimental results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Power8</th>
<th>ARMv8</th>
<th>ARMv7</th>
<th>X86</th>
<th>C11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>Allow</td>
<td>0/15G</td>
<td>0/10G</td>
<td>0/3.0G</td>
<td>0/33G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB+ctrl+mb, Fig. 4</td>
<td>Forbid</td>
<td>0/17G</td>
<td>0/5.1G</td>
<td>0/4.4G</td>
<td>0/18G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRC</td>
<td>Allow</td>
<td>741K/7.7G</td>
<td>13k/5.2G</td>
<td>0/1.6G</td>
<td>0/17G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRC+wmb+acq, Fig. 14</td>
<td>Allow</td>
<td>0/7.5G</td>
<td>0/4.6G</td>
<td>0/1.6G</td>
<td>0/16G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRC+po-rel+rmb, Fig. 5</td>
<td>Forbid</td>
<td>0/7.7G</td>
<td>0/5.3G</td>
<td>0/1.6G</td>
<td>0/17G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Allow</td>
<td>4.4G/15G</td>
<td>2.4G/10G</td>
<td>429M/3.0G</td>
<td>765M/33G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB+mbs, Fig. 6</td>
<td>Forbid</td>
<td>0/15G</td>
<td>0/10G</td>
<td>0/3.0G</td>
<td>0/33G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Allow</td>
<td>57M/15G</td>
<td>104M/10G</td>
<td>3.0M/3.0G</td>
<td>0/33G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP+wmb+rmb, Fig. 2</td>
<td>Forbid</td>
<td>0/15G</td>
<td>0/9.4G</td>
<td>0/2.6G</td>
<td>0/33G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PeterZ-No-Synchro</td>
<td>Allow</td>
<td>26M/4.6G</td>
<td>3.6M/900M</td>
<td>10k/380M</td>
<td>351k/7.2G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PeterZ, Fig. 7</td>
<td>Forbid</td>
<td>0/8.7G</td>
<td>0/2.5G</td>
<td>0/2.2G</td>
<td>0/9.1G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCU-deferred-free, Fig. 11</td>
<td>Forbid</td>
<td>0/256M</td>
<td>0/576M</td>
<td>0/15M</td>
<td>0/25M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCU-MP, Fig. 10</td>
<td>Forbid</td>
<td>0/672M</td>
<td>0/336M</td>
<td>0/336M</td>
<td>0/336M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWC</td>
<td>Allow</td>
<td>88M/11G</td>
<td>94M/4.8G</td>
<td>7.5M/1.6G</td>
<td>5.6M/17G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWC+mbs, Fig. 13</td>
<td>Forbid</td>
<td>0/8.7G</td>
<td>0/2.5G</td>
<td>0/2.2G</td>
<td>0/9.1G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each test we give the number of times it was observed on hardware, over the times it was run: k stands for $10^{6}$, M for $10^{6}$ and G for $10^{9}$. E.g., we ran LB+ctrl+mb (Figure 4) 17G times on Power8, but never observed it. This is expected, as the model forbids the idiom.

Indeed, a result observed during experiments but forbidden by the model indicates a bug. One cannot make definite conclusions from the absence of observation, but the tool proved rather discriminating in previous works [10, 11, 12, 75, 74].

For reference, we include tests without synchronisation. E.g., Figure 4 shows LB+ctrl+mb with a control dependency and an mb fence; its sibling LB has no dependency and no fence.

Table 5 shows that all the hardware behaviours we observed are allowed by the model: our model is experimentally sound. Some behaviours allowed by the model have not been observed in experiments; the machines are stronger than required by our model. For instance, LB, although allowed by our model, was not observed on any of our systems. It was observed on other ARMv7 machines, however [50, Sect. 7.1].

5.2 Comparison to C11

To compare our LK model and C11, we used the cat model of [15], and the mapping from LK primitives to C11 primitives given in [68]. The complete results are available at [7]. Our experiments quantify the differences between LK and C11, using this mapping.
For example, `smp_mb` “restores SC”, but its C11 counterpart `atomic_thread_fence(memory_order_seq_cst)` does not. Thus the LK model forbids the pattern in Figure 13 (there is a cycle in pb) but C11 allows it. (In fact, no known production-quality implementation of C11 fails to forbid Figure 13 [13][14][15]. But originally, C11 allowed it so that the `seq_cst` fence could be implemented with Itanium’s `mf` instruction. Eventually relaxed loads were defined to forbid reordering of loads to the same variable, forcing Itanium to generate `ld_acq` for relaxed loads; hence `mf` is now sufficient to forbid Figure 13. The current consensus is that C11’s fence should be strengthened to restore SC (as `smp_mb` does in the LK); there are various ideas on how to accomplish this [15][14].)

In addition, the LK respects control dependencies between a read and a write (`ctrl ⊆ to_w ⊆ ppo` in Figure 3), thus forbidding the outcome of Figure 4 which C11 allows.

Table 5 summarises our results on C11. The tests forbidden by the LK but allowed by C11 highlight that the mapping of [68] cannot be used to implement the LK in C11. The test `wrc+wmb+acq` (Figure 14), which C11 forbids but the LK allows, shows that there is no ideal equivalent of `smp_wmb` in C11 [68].

![Diagram of RCU-MP with RCU implemented in Figure 15](image)

**Figure 14: RCU-MP, with RCU as implemented in Figure 15**

### 6. Verifying an RCU implementation

The RCU implementation in Figure 15, used in the Linux trace tool [11], provides code for `rcu_read_lock` (lines 8 to 18), `rcu_read_unlock` (lines 20 to 55) and `synchronize` (lines 43 to 50). We explain here why it satisfies the fundamental law of RCU at a high level, and refer the reader to [7] for details.

#### 6.1 Description of the implementation

Threads communicate via an array of variables `rc[i]` (line 4) and a grace-period control variable `gc` (line 5). The `gp_loc1` mutex (line 9) serialises grace periods. The `GP_PHASE` (line 1) bit of `gc` indicates which `phase` a grace period is in (grace periods have two phases). The low-order bits of `rc[i]` selected by `CS_MASK` (line 2) form a `16-bit counter`.

**The counter in rc[i]** records the depth of RSCS nesting for thread i: initially 0, set to 1 at line 13 in an outermost `rcu_read_lock` call, incremented at line 16 in inner calls and decremented at line 24 in `rcu_read_unlock`. If RSCSes are properly nested (no unlock without a earlier matching lock) and the depth of nesting does not overflow the 16 bit counter, the only outermost `rcu_read_unlock` sets the counter to 0, indicating that thread i is not in an RSCS.

**The GP_PHASE bit in gc** is 0 before a grace period, viz, before `synchronize_rcu` is called. That routine sets the phase to 1 and then 0 (line 36). Threads starting an RSCS copy the current phase value into their respective `rc[i]` (line 13). Thus `synchronize_rcu` knows which threads must be waited for. Indeed, after changing the phase, `update_counter_and_wait` waits for each thread i (lines 38–39) until the value computed at lines 29–30 becomes false. This happens when:

- `rc[i]`’s counter is zero (thread i is not in an RSCS), or
- `rc[i]`’s counter is nonzero and its phase bit is equal to that of `gc` (thread i is in an RSCS which started after the current GP phase).

#### 6.2 Correctness statement

Let P be an LK program, and let P’ be obtained by replacing the RCU primitives in P with the routines of Figure 13. For any execution X’ of P’ allowed by our model, let X be the corresponding execution of P. Each non-RCU event e in X corresponds directly to an event e’ in X’. (Consider, e.g., the execution X in Figure 10, corresponding to X’ in Figure 16.)

Events a, b, c, and d in X match a’, b’, c’, and d’ in X’. (For example, a’ in X’ reads from d’, not from some other write present in X’ but not in X.) More generally, the non-RCU relations of X are simply those of X restricted to the events in X.

We set up a similar correspondence for the RCU events (in Figure 16 appended to these events’ labels are the line numbers from Figure 15 for the events and their call chains):

```
g'[13]: W[once] rc[i]=1
h'[14]: F[mb]
a': R[once] y=1
b': R[once] x=0
k'[36,46]: W[once] gc=0x10001
i'[23]: F[mb]
j'[24]: W[once] rc[i]=0
c': W[once] x=1
h: W[once] rc[i]=1
fr
h
fr
fr
fr
...  
```
For each \( F[\text{rcu\_lock}] \) event \( l \) in \( X \) (\( g \) in Figure 10), let \( l' \) be the write of \( rc[i] \) at line 13 (or 16) for inner nesting levels. In Figure 16, this is \( g' \).

For each \( F[\text{rcu\_unlock}] \) event \( u \) in \( X \) (\( j \) in Figure 10), let \( u' \) be the write of \( rc[i] \) at line 24 (\( j' \) in Figure 16).

For each \( F[\text{sync-rcu}] \) event \( s \) in \( X \) (\( k \) in Figure 10), let \( s' \) be the write to \( gc \) at line 36 from the call to \( \text{update\_counter\_and\_wait} \) at line 46 (\( k' \) in Figure 16).

We can now state our correctness result:

**Theorem 2** (Correctness of RCU implementation). If \( X' \) is allowed in our LK model and has properly nested RSCSes that do not overflow the counters in \( rc[I] \), then \( X \) is allowed.

### 6.3 Proof sketch

For brevity, we only list critical points of our proof; detailed proofs are in [7].

All non-RCU relations \( R \) in \( X \) hold in \( X' \): when \( (e_1, e_2) \in R \) holds in \( X \), the corresponding fact \( (e'_1, e'_2) \in R \) holds in \( X' \). Recall that we defined \( X \) to differ from \( X' \) only for RCU events and relations. Hence this result is immediate except when \( R \) is strong-fence, which contains the RCU relation \( \text{gp} \). Fortunately it is true in this case as well.

To see why, consider \( (e_1, e_2) \in \text{gp} \) in \( X \) (e.g., the writes \( c \) and \( d \) in Figure 10). There is an \( F[\text{sync-rcu}] \) event between them in program order; hence the \( F[\text{mb}] \) event arising from line 44 lies between the corresponding events \( e'_1 \) and \( e'_2 \) in \( X' \). Thus \( (e'_1, e'_2) \in \text{mb} \), implying that \( (e'_1, e'_2) \in \text{strong-fence} \). (Between \( c' \) and \( d' \) in Figure 15 are all the events from Figure 15's implementation of \( \text{synchronize\_rcu} \); the \( F[\text{mb}] \) event for line 44 is elided.)

Since \( X' \) is allowed, \( X \) thus obeys all the core constraints of our model, leaving only the RCU constraint to consider.

**Using our RCU guarantee theorem** (Section 4.2), we show that \( X \) does obey the RCU constraint by showing that \( X \) satisfies the fundamental law of RCU. This requires finding a precedes function \( F \) for \( X \) such that \( \text{pb}(F) \) is acyclic.

**Our precedes function** \( F \) is derived from the execution \( X' \). Given a GP in \( X \) and an outermost RSCS in thread \( i \), let \( l \) and \( u \) be the lock and unlock of the RSCS. The corresponding events \( l' \) and \( u' \) in \( X' \) were defined in Section 6.2. We consider two distinguished read events, \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \), where:

- \( r_1 \) is the read of \( rc[i] \) executed by line 27 of Figure 15
- in the call to \( \text{gp\_ongoing}(i) \) from the last iteration of the \( \text{while} \) loop at line 38
- in the first call to \( \text{update\_counter\_and\_wait} \) (line 46) within the GP,

and \( r_2 \) is the equivalent read from within the second call to \( \text{update\_counter\_and\_wait} \) (line 47). In Figure 16 \( r_2 = m' \) and \( r_1 \) is not shown.

At least one of the following two facts must hold in \( X' \):

1. the RSCS's \( \text{rcu\_read\_lock} \) was not visible at the start of the GP: \( (r_1, l') \in \text{fr} \);
2. the RSCS's \( \text{rcu\_read\_unlock} \) or a later write to \( rc[i] \) was visible at the end of the GP: \( (u', r_2) \in (\text{coi} : \text{rf}) \).

```c
#define GP_PHASE 0x10000
#define CS_MASK 0x0ffff
static unsigned long rc[MAX_THREADS] = {0};
static DEFINE_MUTEX(gp_lock);
void rcu_read_lock(void) {
    unsigned int i = get_my_tid();
    unsigned long tmp = READ_ONCE(rc[i]);
    if (!(tmp & CS_MASK)) {
        WRITE_ONCE(rc[i], READ_ONCE(rc[i]) - 1);
    }
    smp_mb();
    WRITE_ONCE(rc[i], tmp + 1);
}
void rcu_read_unlock(void) {
    unsigned int i = get_my_tid();
    smp_mb();
    WRITE_ONCE(rc[i], READ_ONCE(rc[i]) - 1);
}
static void update_counter_and_wait(void) {
    msleep(10);
    for (i = 0; i < MAX_THREADS; i++) {
        if (!((tmp & CS_MASK)) {
            WRITE_ONCE(rc[i], READ_ONCE(gc));
            smp_mb();
        }
    }
    WRITE_ONCE(rc[i], READ_ONCE(gc));
    smp_mb();
}
static int gp_ongoing(unsigned int i) {
    unsigned long val = READ_ONCE(rc[i]);
    return (val & CS_MASK) && ((val - READ_ONCE(gc)) & GP_PHASE);
}
static void synchronize_rcu(void) {
    smp_mb();
    mutex_lock(&gp_lock);
    update_counter_and_wait();
    update_counter_and_wait();
    mutex_unlock(&gp_lock);
    smp_mb();
}
```
We take $F(RSCS, GP)$ to be GP if (1) holds and RSCS otherwise. In Figure 16 (2) holds since $u' = j', r_2 = m'$, and $(j', m') \in \text{rf}$. Thus $F(RSCS, GP) = \text{RSCS}$.

A cycle in pb$(F)$ for $X$ would give rise to a cycle in pb for $X'$. We omit the full demonstration (given in [7]) but illustrate it with our example. We know from Section 4.1 that $X$ in Figure 16 violates the fundamental law of RCU and every pb$(F)$ relation for $X$ contains a cycle. We are now claiming this means that $X'$ in Figure 16 has a cycle in pb. And so it does: $d' \xrightarrow{\text{rrdep}} a' \xrightarrow{\text{mb}} j'$, hence $d' \xrightarrow{\text{pb}} j'$, and similarly, $j' \xrightarrow{\text{pb}} d' \xrightarrow{\text{mb}} m'$.

Returning to the general proof of Theorem 2. The theorem assumed that $X'$ is allowed in our model and hence obeys the Pb constraint. This requires the pb relation in $X'$ to be acyclic, from which we now deduce that the pb$(F)$ relation in $X$ must also be acyclic. By our earlier remark, this suffices to conclude the proof sketch.

7. Discussion

The process that led to our LK model was iterative, and both social and technical. We reviewed [37] and wrote an initial cat file formalising our understanding. We used the litmus tests of [37] [66] [67] to refine this model, and asked questions to hardware designers and LK maintainers [8] [9] [25] [65]. Later we modified the tools of the diy+herd tool-suite [5] to generate more tests, and run them as kernel modules. We referred to published models when available, e.g., ARMv8 [47], and architectural definitions of LK primitives [37] [69].

The need to account for all the architectures that the LK targets can make the model seem complex and arbitrary. For example, \texttt{cmp\_read\_barrier\_depends} exists exclusively for the sake of Alpha. Otherwise, in the definition of ppo, the relations \texttt{strong-rrdep} and \texttt{rrdep} would be the same.

We do think that our LK model is, perhaps surprisingly, less subtle than C11 and OpenCL [32], as it is inspired by hardware: thus our model does not have out-of-thin-air values, because it respects dependencies as hardware does; and the LK’s full fence restores SC, unlike that of C11.

All in all, the model is as complex and arbitrary as the LK is. Consequently it is as stable as the LK is; we expect it to change as often as [37] does, i.e., a handful of times per year. The LK model will adapt as architectures change (or become better defined), as workloads change, and as kernel developers become more aggressive in their pursuit of performance and scalability.

To support existing non-buggy LK code, an LK model must account for the LK’s primitives, including fences, RCU, read-modify-writes, and locking. Our work models all these primitives, except for locks. This is due to the current lack of consensus on the semantics of certain locking primitives [33] within the LK community, which our preliminary work on the topic helped uncover.

Locking may, however, be emulated with the constructs that we already have [63]. For example, we model a spinlock as a shared location. The \texttt{spin\_lock} primitive behaves like \texttt{xchg\_acquire} for this location. In Table 1 this is modeled as a read with annotation acquire and a write with annotation once, governed by the At axiom of Figure 5 and the constraints on acquire in Figure 8. The \texttt{spin\_unlock} primitive behaves like a \texttt{cmp\_store\_release} for the shared location, governed by the constraints on release in Figure 8.

Other features not currently supported by our model are:

- compiler optimizations (however, the LK’s READ\_ONCE and WRITE\_ONCE rule out many optimizations [20] [21], so this limitation is less of a problem than it might seem);
- any kind of arithmetic;
- multiple access sizes and partially overlapping accesses;
- non-trivial data, including arrays and structures;
- dynamic memory allocation;
- exceptions, interrupts, self-modifying code, and I/O;
- asynchronous RCU grace period primitives, including \texttt{call\_rcu} and \texttt{rcu\_barrier}.

We do hope to address these limitations over time. But even in its current form, our model provides a reference for making decisions about concurrency in the LK, as witnessed by the issues that our work helped discuss or settle (Table 2).
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A. Model files

This appendix contains listings of the files that constitute our executable formalisation of the Linux kernel consistency model. See the companion page [7] to download the files and for directions on using them.

A.1 Basic definitions (bell file)

This first file defines some basic relations. In particular, we define the annotations corresponding to instructions, as listed in Tables 3 and 4. We also define auxiliary functions related to RCU, as presented in Section 4. In addition, the file checks for valid read-side critical section nesting—see the definition of the \texttt{match} relation and the emptiness checks at the end of file.

"Linux kernel memory model"

\begin{verbatim}
enum Accesses = 'once (*READ_ONCE,WRITE_ONCE,ACCESS_ONCE*) ||
   'release (*smp_store_release*) ||
   'acquire (*smp_load_acquire*) ||
   'noreturn (* R of non-return RMW *)
   || 'assign || 'deref || 'lderef (* Legacy *)
instructions R[\{'once,'acquire,'noreturn,'deref,'lderef\}]
instructions W[\{'once,'release,'assign\}]
instructions RMW[\{'once,'acquire,'release\}]
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
enum Barriers = 'wmb (*smp_wmb*) ||
   'rmb (*smp_rmb*) ||
   'mb (*smp_mb*) ||
   'rb_dep (*smp_read_barrier_depends*) ||
   'rcu_read_lock (*rcu_read_lock*) ||
   'rcu_read_unlock (*rcu_read_unlock*) ||
   'sync (*synchronize_rcu*) ||
   'before_atomic (*smp_mb__before_atomic*) ||
   'after_atomic (*smp_mb__after_atomic*) ||
   'after_spinlock (*smp_mb__after_spinlock*)
instructions F[Barriers]
\end{verbatim}

(* Compute matching pairs of nested Rcu_read_lock and Rcu_read_unlock *)
let matched = let rec
   unmatched-locks = Rcu_read_lock \ domain(matched)
   and unmatched-unlocks = Rcu_read_unlock \ range(matched)
   and unmatched = unmatched-locks | unmatched-unlocks
   and unmatched-po = (unmatched * unmatched) & po
   and unmatched-locks-to-unlocks = (unmatched-locks * 
      unmatched-unlocks) & po
   and matched = matched | (unmatched-locks-to-unlocks 
      \ (unmatched-po ; unmatched-po))
   in matched

(* Validate nesting *)
flag ~empty Rcu_read_lock \ domain(matched) as unbalanced-rcu-locking
flag ~empty Rcu_read_unlock \ range(matched) as unbalanced-rcu-locking

(* Outermost level of nesting only *)
let crit = matched \ (po^-1 ; matched ; po^-1)
\end{verbatim}

A.2 Formal definitions and axioms (cat files)

This second file is the cat executable model. It contains all the remaining definitions, including the derived relations of Figure 8 and the RCU relations of Figure 12 and the model's constraints.
"Linux kernel memory model"

include "cos.cat"

(*******************)
(* Basic relations *)
(*******************)

(* Fences *)
let rb-dep = [R] ; fencerel(Rb_dep) ; [R]
let rmb = [R \ Noreturn] ; fencerel(Rmb) ; [R \ Noreturn]
let wmb = [W] ; fencerel(Wmb) ; [W]
let mb = ([M] ; fencerel(Mb) ; [M]) |
      (M ; fencerel(Before_atomic) ; [RMW] ; po? ; [M]) |
      (M ; po? ; [RMW] ; fencerel(After_atomic) ; [M]) |
      (M ; po? ; [LKW] ; fencerel(After_spinlock) ; [M])
let gp = po ; [Sync] ; po?

let strong-fence = mb | gp

(* Release Acquire *)
let acq-po = [Acquire] ; po ; [M]
let po-rel = [M] ; po ; [Release]
let rfi-rel-acq = [Release] ; rfi ; [Acquire]

(*******************)
(* Fundamental coherence ordering *)
(*******************)

(* Sequential Consistency Per Variable *)
let com = rf | co | fr
acyclic po-loc | com as coherence

(* Atomic Read-Modify-Write *)
empty rmw & (fre ; coe) as atomic

(*******************)
(* Instruction execution ordering *)
(*******************)

(* Preserved Program Order *)
let dep = addr | data
let rwdep = (dep | ctrl) ; [W]
let overwrite = co | fr
let to-w = rwdep | (overwrite & int)
let rrdep = addr | (dep ; rfi)
let strong-rrdep = rrdep+ & rb-dep
let to-r = strong-rrdep | rfi-rel-acq
let fence = strong-fence | wmb | po-rel | rmb | acq-po
let ppo = rrdep* ; (to-r | to-w | fence)

(* Propagation: Ordering from release operations and strong fences. *)
let A-cumul(r) = rfe? ; r
let cumul-fence = A-cumul(strong-fence | po-rel) | wmb
let prop = (overwrite & ext)? ; cumul-fence* ; rfe?

(*
  * Happens Before: Ordering from the passage of time.
  * No fences needed here for prop because relation confined to one process.
  *)
let hb = ppo | rfe | ((prop \ id) & int)
acyclic hb as happens-before

(******************************************************************************
(* Write and fence propagation ordering *)
******************************************************************************)

(* Propagation: Each non-rf link needs a strong fence. *)
let pb = prop ; strong-fence ; hb*
acyclic pb as propagation

(******)
(* RCU *)
(******)

(*
  * Effect of read-side critical section proceeds from the rcu_read_lock()
  * onward on the one hand and from the rcu_read_unlock() backwards on the
  * other hand.
  *)
let rscs = po ; crit^-1 ; po?

(*
  * The synchronize_rcu() strong fence is special in that it can order not
  * one but two non-rf relations, but only in conjunction with an RCU
  * read-side critical section.
  *)
let link = hb* ; pb* ; prop

(* Chains that affect the RCU grace-period guarantee *)
let gp-link = gp ; link
let rscs-link = rscs ; link

(*
  * A cycle containing at least as many grace periods as RCU read-side
  * critical sections is forbidden.
  *)
let rec rcu-path =
  gp-link |
  (gp-link ; rscs-link) |
  (rscs-link ; gp-link) |
  (rcu-path ; rcu-path) |
  (gp-link ; rcu-path ; rscs-link) |
  (rscs-link ; rcu-path ; gp-link)

irreflexive rcu-path as rcu
B. Proof of RCU guarantee (Theorem 1)

We recall the statement of the RCU guarantee theorem:

An LK candidate execution satisfies the Pb and RCU constraints iff it satisfies the fundamental law of RCU.

Below, we will use the words “constraint” and “axiom” interchangeably. Thus, we aim to prove that for a given candidate execution $X$:

- the law implies the axioms (Theorem 1): if $X$ satisfies the law, i.e., there exists a precedes function $F$ for $X$ such that $\text{pb}(F)$ is acyclic, then $X$ satisfies the Pb and RCU axioms, i.e., $\text{pb}$ is acyclic and $\text{rcu-path}$ is irreflexive.

- the axioms imply the law (Theorem 1): if $X$ satisfies the Pb and RCU axioms, i.e., $\text{pb}$ is acyclic and $\text{rcu-path}$ is irreflexive, then $X$ satisfies the law, i.e., there exists a precedes function $F$ for $X$ such that $\text{pb}(F)$ is acyclic.

We begin with two lemmas.

**Lemma 1.** Let $X$ be a candidate execution and let $F$ be a precedes function for $X$. Then the following properties hold:

(i): \[ a \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} b \xrightarrow{\text{strong-fence}(F)} c \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} d \implies a \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} d; \]

(ii): \[ a \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} b \xrightarrow{\text{strong-fence}(F)} a \implies \text{the existence of a cycle in pb}(F). \]

**Proof.** These properties follow directly from the definitions of $\text{link}(F)$ and $\text{pb}(F)$. For (i), expanding out the definitions yields:

\[
(a, d) \in (\text{hb}^*; \text{pb}(F)^*; \text{prop}) \cup (\text{hb}^*; \text{pb}(F)^*; \text{prop}) \cup (\text{hb}^*; \text{pb}(F)^*; \text{prop}) \\
= \text{hb}^*; \text{pb}(F)^*; \text{prop}.
\]

We now prove Theorems 1a and 1b in turn.

**B.1 The law implies the axiom**

We begin with two lemmas.

**Lemma 1.** Let $X$ be a candidate execution and let $F$ be a precedes function for $X$. Then the following properties hold:

(i): \[ a \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} b \xrightarrow{\text{strong-fence}(F)} c \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} d \implies a \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} d; \]

(ii): \[ a \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} b \xrightarrow{\text{strong-fence}(F)} a \implies \text{the existence of a cycle in pb}(F). \]

**Proof.** These properties follow directly from the definitions of $\text{link}(F)$ and $\text{pb}(F)$. For (i), expanding out the definitions yields:

\[
(a, d) \in (\text{hb}^*; \text{pb}(F)^*; \text{prop}) \cup (\text{hb}^*; \text{pb}(F)^*; \text{prop}) \cup (\text{hb}^*; \text{pb}(F)^*; \text{prop}) \\
= \text{hb}^*; \text{pb}(F)^*; \text{prop}.
\]

We now prove Theorems 1a and 1b in turn.
For (ii), we obtain:

\[(a, a) \in (\text{hb}^*; \text{pb}(F)^*; \text{prop}; \text{strong-fence}(F)),\]

which means that for some \(x:\)

\[(x, x) \in \text{pb}(F)^*; (\text{prop}; \text{strong-fence}(F); \text{hb}^*) = \text{pb}(F)^*; \text{pb}(F),\]

which demonstrates the existence of a cycle. \(\square\)

**Lemma 2.** We have \(a \xrightarrow{\text{rcu-path}} b\) iff there are \(e_0, e_1, \ldots, e_N \in E\) (with \(N > 0\)) such that

\[a = e_0 \xrightarrow{r_0} e_1 \xrightarrow{r_1} \cdots \xrightarrow{r_{N-1}} e_N = b,\]

where each relation \(r_i\) is either \(\text{gp-link}\) or \(\text{rscs-link}\), and there are at least as many instances of \(\text{gp-link}\) as \(\text{rscs-link}\) among the \(r_i\)'s. The same is true of \(\text{rcu-path}(F), \text{gp-link}(F),\) and \(\text{rscs-link}(F)\), for any precedes function \(F\).

**Proof.** The forward implication follows immediately from the recursive definition of \(\text{rcu-path}\). For the reverse direction, assume we have \(e_0, e_1, \ldots, e_N\) and \(r_0, \ldots, r_{N-1}\) as above. The proof proceeds by induction on \(N\). If \(N = 1\) then \(r_0\) must be \(\text{gp-link}\), and so \((a, b) \in \text{rcu-path}\).

For \(N > 1\), first suppose \(r_0\) and \(r_{N-1}\) are not the same relation, i.e., one is \(\text{gp-link}\) and the other is \(\text{rscs-link}\). If \(N = 2\) then we have

\[a \xrightarrow{\text{gp-link}} e_1 \xrightarrow{\text{rscs-link}} e_2 \text{ or } a \xrightarrow{\text{rscs-link}} e_1 \xrightarrow{\text{gp-link}} b.\]

Either way, \((a, b) \in \text{rcu-path}\). If \(N > 2\) then there must be at least as many instances of \(\text{gp-link}\) as \(\text{rscs-link}\) among \(r_1, \ldots, r_{N-2}\); therefore by induction we have

\[a \xrightarrow{\text{gp-link}} e_1 \xrightarrow{\text{rcu-path}} e_{N-1} \xrightarrow{\text{rscs-link}} b \text{ or } a \xrightarrow{\text{rscs-link}} e_1 \xrightarrow{\text{rcu-path}} e_{N-1} \xrightarrow{\text{gp-link}} b.\]

Again, either way \((a, b) \in \text{rcu-path}\).

Now suppose \(r_0\) and \(r_{N-1}\) are the same relation. For each \(i = 0, \ldots, N\), let \(t_i\) be the total number of \(\text{gp-link}\) instances among \(r_0, \ldots, r_{i-1}\) minus the number of \(\text{rscs-link}\) instances. In other words, define

\[t_0 := 0,\]

\[t_{i+1} := \begin{cases} t_i + 1 & \text{if } r_i \text{ is } \text{gp-link}, \\ t_i - 1 & \text{if } r_i \text{ is } \text{rscs-link}. \end{cases}\]

By assumption, \(t_N \geq 0\).

It suffices to find some \(i\) between \(1\) and \(N - 1\) such that \(t_i = 0\); then there will be equally many \(\text{gp-link}\) and \(\text{rscs-link}\) instances among \(r_0, \ldots, r_{i-1}\) and at least as many \(\text{gp-link}\) instances as \(\text{rscs-link}\) instances among \(r_i, \ldots, r_{N-1}\). By induction we will have

\[a \xrightarrow{\text{rcu-path}} e_i \xrightarrow{\text{rcu-path}} b\]

and therefore \((a, b) \in \text{rcu-path}\).

If \(r_0\) and \(r_{N-1}\) are both \(\text{rscs-link}\) then \(t_1 = -1\) and \(t_{N-1} \geq 1\). Since each \(t_i\) and \(t_{i+1}\) differ by one, there must be an intermediate \(i\) where \(t_i = 0\). If \(r_0\) and \(r_{N-1}\) are both \(\text{gp-link}\) then \(t_1 = 1\), so if \(t_{N-1} < 0\), the same argument applies. Otherwise there are at least as many instances of \(\text{gp-link}\) as \(\text{rscs-link}\) among \(r_0, \ldots, r_{N-2}\), so by induction we have

\[a \xrightarrow{\text{rcu-path}} e_{N-1} \xrightarrow{\text{gp-link}} b\]

and once again, \((a, b) \in \text{rcu-path}\).

The analysis for \(\text{rcu-path}(F), \text{gp-link}(F),\) and \(\text{rscs-link}(F)\) is analogous. \(\square\)

We can now prove one direction of the RCU guarantee theorem from Section 4.

**Theorem 1a (The law implies the axioms).** Let \(X\) be a candidate execution, and let \(F\) be a precedes function for \(X\). Then \(\text{acyclic}(\text{pb}(F))\) implies \(\text{acyclic}(\text{pb})\) and \(\text{irreflexive(\text{rcu-path})}\).
Proof. In fact, we will prove \( \text{irreflexive(rcu-path}(F)) \). By comparing the definitions in Figures 8 and 12 with those in Figure 17, it is easy to check that \( \text{rcu-path}(F) \subseteq \text{rcu-path}(F) \). Likewise, \( \text{pb} \subseteq \text{pb}(F) \), so \( \text{acyclic(pb)} \) is immediate.

We prove the contrapositive. Assume that \( X \) has a reflexive edge \((a, a)\) in \( \text{rcu-path}(F) \). Let \( a = e_0, \ldots, e_N = a \) and \( r_0, \ldots, r_{N-1} \) form the cyclic path given by Lemma 2. The proof is by induction on \( N \).

For \( N = 1 \), we must have \( r_0 = \text{gp-link}(F) \). Then for some \( x \),

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} \xrightarrow{\text{gp}} x & \quad \text{link}(F) \\
\xrightarrow{} a,
\end{align*}
\]

which implies that \( \text{pb}(F) \) is cyclic by Lemma 2(ii).

For \( N > 1 \), first suppose that all the \( r_i \) relations are \( \text{gp-link}(F) \). Then for some \( x \) and \( y \) we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} \xrightarrow{\text{gp}} x & \quad \text{link}(F) \\
\xrightarrow{} e_1 & \quad \text{link}(F) \\
\xrightarrow{} y & \quad \text{gp} \\
\quad e_2,
\end{align*}
\]

and so by Lemma 2(i),

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} \xrightarrow{\text{gp-link}(F)} x & \quad \text{link}(F) \\
\xrightarrow{} e_2.
\end{align*}
\]

which implies \( a \xrightarrow{\text{gp-link}(F)} e_2 \). Thus we have reduced the length of the cyclic path by one, and the conclusion follows by induction.

Now suppose at least one of the \( r_i \) relations is \( \text{rscs-link}(F) \). Since there must also be at least one instance of \( \text{gp-link}(F) \) among the \( r_i \)'s, there is a place where a \( \text{gp-link}(F) \)-edge is followed by an \( \text{rscs-link}(F) \)-edge. By cyclically permuting the path, we can assume that \( r_0 = \text{gp-link}(F) \) and \( r_1 = \text{rscs-link}(F) \). Then for some \( x, y, \) and \( z \) we have

\[
\begin{align*}
x & \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} e_N = e_0 \quad \text{gp} \\
\xrightarrow{} e_1 & \quad \text{rscs} \\
\xrightarrow{} z & \quad \text{link}(F) \\
\xrightarrow{} e_2.
\end{align*}
\]

Let RSCS and GP be the read-side critical section and the grace period associated with the \( \text{rscs} \) and \( \text{gp} \) edges in this formula. We consider the two possible sub-cases:

1. \( F(\text{RSCS, GP}) = \text{RSCS} \). From the definitions of \( \text{gp} \), \( \text{rscs} \), and \( \text{strong-fence}(F) \), we have \((e_1, y) \in \text{rcu-fence}(F) \), and therefore

\[
\begin{align*}
y & \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} e_1 \\
\xrightarrow{} \text{strong-fence}(F) \\
\xrightarrow{} y,
\end{align*}
\]

which by Lemma 2(ii) implies that \( \text{pb}(F) \) is cyclic.

2. \( F(\text{RSCS, GP}) = \text{GP} \). As above, we have \((e_0, z) \in \text{rcu-fence}(F) \), and therefore

\[
\begin{align*}
x & \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} e_0 \\
\xrightarrow{} e_1 & \quad \text{strong-fence}(F) \\
\xrightarrow{} z & \quad \text{link}(F) \\
\xrightarrow{} e_2.
\end{align*}
\]

If \( N = 2 \) then \( e_0 = e_2 \), and so Lemma 2(ii) implies that \( \text{pb}(F) \) is cyclic. Otherwise, Lemma 2(ii) implies

\[
\begin{align*}
x & \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} e_2,
\end{align*}
\]

which allows us to remove the first two edges from the cyclic path. Since there are still at least as many instances of \( \text{gp-link}(F) \) as \( \text{rscs-link}(F) \) among \( r_2, \ldots, r_{N-1} \), the conclusion follows by induction. \qed

B.2 The axioms imply the law

The other half of the theorem requires a separate proof. The proof relies on the concept of partial precedes functions (i.e., ones whose domain need not contain all RSCS and GP pairs), and on the following related notion:

Definition 1. For any execution \( X \), we will say that a partial precedes function \( F \) is feasible iff \( \text{pb}(F) \) is acyclic and \( \text{rcu-path}(F) \) is irreflexive.

Our current goal (to prove that the axiom implies the law) is a consequence of the following result:

Proposition 1. Let \( X \) be a candidate execution satisfying the \( \text{Pb} \) and \( \text{RCU} \) axioms. Then there is a feasible total precedes function \( F \) for \( X \).

The proof uses the following extension lemma.

Lemma 3. Let \( F \) be a feasible partial precedes function for \( X \) such that \((C, s)\) is not in the domain of \( F \), for some RSCS \( C = (l, u) \) and GP \( s \). Let \( F_C \) and \( F_s \) be the two partial precedes functions obtained by extending \( F \) to \((C, s)\) with \( F_C(C, s) = C \) and \( F_s(C, s) = s \).
1. If $F_C$ is not feasible then there are $a, b, x \in E$ such that $(a, u) \in po$, $(s, b) \in po'$, and

$$b \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} x \xrightarrow{\text{rcu-path}(F)^\gamma} a.$$ 

2. If $F_s$ is not feasible then there are $c, d, y \in E$ such that $(c, s) \in po$, $(l, d) \in po'$, and

$$d \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} y \xrightarrow{\text{rcu-path}(F)^\gamma} c.$$ 

Proof. We begin with part (1). Suppose that $pb(F_C)$ contains a cycle. Then there are $e_0, \ldots, e_N \in E$ such that

$$e_0 \xrightarrow{pb(F_C)} e_1 \xrightarrow{pb(F_C)} \ldots \xrightarrow{pb(F_C)} e_N = e_0.$$ 

If all these $pb(F_C)$-edges were in $pb(F)$ then $pb(F)$ would be cyclic and so $F$ would not be feasible. Hence there is some $j$ such that the edge from $e_j$ to $e_{j+1}$ is in $pb(F_C) \setminus pb(F)$. This means there are events $v$ and $b$ such that

$$e_j \xrightarrow{\text{prop}} v \xrightarrow{\text{rcu-fence}(F_C)} b \xrightarrow{\text{bb}^*} e_{j+1}.$$ 

Since $(v, b)$ is not in $\text{rcu-fence}(F)$, we must have $(s, b) \in po'$. Let $e_k \xrightarrow{pb(F_C)} e_{k+1}$ be the next edge in the cycle that is not in $pb(F)$. (If there are no others then set $k = j$.) As above, there are events $a$ and $w$ such that

$$e_k \xrightarrow{\text{prop}} a \xrightarrow{\text{rcu-fence}(F_C)} w \xrightarrow{\text{bb}^*} e_{k+1}$$ 

and $(a, u) \in po$. Since we now have

$$b \xrightarrow{\text{bb}^*} e_{j+1} \xrightarrow{pb(F)'} e_k \xrightarrow{\text{prop}} a,$$

it follows that $b \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} a$. Taking $x = a$, this is the conclusion of case (1).

Now suppose that $\text{rcu-path}(F_C)$ contains a reflexive edge. By Lemma 2, there are $e_0, \ldots, e_N \in E$ such that

$$e_0 \xrightarrow{r_0} e_1 \xrightarrow{r_1} \ldots \xrightarrow{r_{N-1}} e_N = e_0,$$

where each $r_i$ is either $\text{gp-link}(F_C)$ or $\text{rscs-link}(F_C)$, and there are at least as many instances of $\text{gp-link}(F_C)$ as $\text{rscs-link}(F_C)$ among the $r_k$’s. The edge from $e_i$ to $e_{i+1}$ can be written as

$$e_i \xrightarrow{q_i} f_i \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F_C)} e_{i+1},$$

where $q_i$ is either $\text{gp}$ or $\text{rscs}$, according to the identity of $r_i$. The $\text{link}(F_C)$-edge from $f_i$ to $e_{i+1}$ can in turn be written as

$$f_i \xrightarrow{\text{bb}^*} g_{i,0} \xrightarrow{pb(F_C)} g_{i,1} \xrightarrow{pb(F_C)} \ldots \xrightarrow{pb(F_C)} g_{i,N_i} \xrightarrow{\text{prop}} e_{i+1}.$$ 

There must be at least one value of $i$ for which at least one of the $pb(F_C)$-edges between the $g_{i,j}$’s is not in $pb(F)$, as otherwise the cycle above would demonstrate that $\text{rcu-path}(F)$ contains the edge $(e_0, e_0)$, contradicting the assumption that $F$ is feasible.

If, for some fixed $i$, more than one of these $pb(F_C)$-edges was not in $pb(F)$ (say, the edges starting from $g_{i,j}$ and $g_{i,k}$, for some $j < k$) then we could use the same argument as in the first section of this proof (with $g_{i,j}$ and $g_{i,k}$ in place of $e_i$ and $e_k$ above). Therefore we may assume that for each $i$, at most one of the $pb(F_C)$-edges between the $g_{i,j}$ events does not belong to $pb(F)$. Let these edges be the ones starting from $g_{i,0}, \ldots, g_{i,M,j_M} (M \geq 0)$.

The $i_n$ values partition the cyclic indices 0, 1, ..., $N - 1$. Hence there must be a value of $n$ such that there are at least as many $\text{gp-link}(F_C)$ instances as $\text{rscs-link}(F_C)$ instances among $r_{i_{n+1}}, \ldots, r_{i_{(n+1)}}$. To avoid falling into a morass of subscripts, let us write $i, j$ for $i_n, j_n$ and $i', j'$ for $i_{n+1}, j_{n+1}$. (If $M = 0$ then we will have $i, j = i', j'$.) Each of the $r_k$-edges running from $e_{i+1}$ to $e_{i'}$ must belong to $\text{gp-link}(F)$ or $\text{rscs-link}(F)$, because all of the $pb(F_C)$-edges in between are in $pb(F)$.

By contrast, the edges starting from $g_{i,j}$ and $g_{i',j'}$ are in $pb(F_C) \setminus pb(F)$, and as before, this means there are $a, b, w,$ and $v$ such that

$$g_{i,j} \xrightarrow{\text{prop}} v \xrightarrow{\text{rcu-fence}(F_C)} b \xrightarrow{\text{bb}^*} g_{i',j'}.$$
and
\[ g_{v,j'} \xrightarrow{\text{prop}} a \xrightarrow{\text{rcu-fence}(F_C)} w \xrightarrow{\text{bb}^*} g_{v,j'+1}, \]
with \((a, u) \in \text{po}\) and \((s, b) \in \text{po}'\). From the first formula we obtain \(b \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} e_{i+1}\), and from the second we obtain \(a \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} a\) and hence \(e_v \xrightarrow{r_i'} a\), with this last edge belonging either to \(\text{gp-link}(F)\) or \(\text{rscs-link}(F)\).

Putting these together yields
\[ b \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} e_{i+1} \xrightarrow{r_{i+1}} \ldots \xrightarrow{r_{i'}} a, \]
where all of the \(r_k\)-edges belong to \(\text{gp-link}(F)\) or \(\text{rscs-link}(F)\). Furthermore, by the choice of \(i = i_n\), there are at least as many instances of \(\text{gp-link}(F)\) as \(\text{rscs-link}(F)\) among them, so by Lemma 2 we have
\[ b \xrightarrow{\text{link}(F)} e_{i+1} \xrightarrow{\text{rcu-path}(F)} a, \]
which is the conclusion of part (1) (taking \(x\) to be \(e_{i+1}\)).

Part (2) is proved in exactly the same way as part (1), simply by changing the variable names and using \(F_s\) in place of \(F_C\). \(\square\)

We can now give the proof of Proposition 1.

Proof. There is at least one feasible partial precedes function for \(X\), namely, the function \(F_0\) with empty domain. \(\text{pb}(F_0)\) is equal to \(\text{pb}\) and \(\text{rcu-path}(F_0)\) is equal to \(\text{rcu-path}\), and these are respectively acyclic and irreflexive by hypothesis.

Let \(F\) be a feasible partial precedes functions for \(X\) with maximal domain, and assume for a contradiction that \(F\) is not total. Let \(C\) and \(s\) be an RSCS and a GP such that \((C, s)\) is outside the domain of \(F\), and let \(F_C\) and \(F_s\) be the two possible extensions of \(F\) defined on \((C, s)\). Since \(F\)'s domain is maximal, neither \(F_C\) nor \(F_s\) is feasible, so let \(a, b, x, c, d, y \in E\) be as given by Lemma 2. Then we have \(a \xrightarrow{\text{rscs}} d\) and \(c \xrightarrow{\text{gp}} b\), which yield
\[ a \xrightarrow{\text{rscs}(F)} y \xrightarrow{\text{rcu-path}(F)} c \xrightarrow{\text{gp}(F)} x \xrightarrow{\text{rcu-path}(F)} a. \]

\((a, a) \in \text{rcu-path}(F)\) follows, contradicting the fact that \(F\) is feasible. Thus \(F\) must be a total precedes function for \(X\). \(\square\)

The second direction of the RCU guarantee from Section 4 is an immediate consequence.

Theorem 1b (The axioms imply the law). A candidate execution satisfies the fundamental law of RCU if it satisfies the Pb and RCU axioms.

Proof. By Proposition 1 there is a feasible precedes function \(F\) for the candidate execution. Since \(F\) is feasible, \(\text{pb}(F)\) is acyclic, which demonstrates that the execution satisfies the fundamental law of RCU. \(\square\)

C.  Proof of correctness of the RCU implementation of \([29]\) (Theorem 2)

This appendix examines the RCU implementation in Figure 15 (used, for example, in the Linux trace tool \([1]\)). For completeness, we include the description of the implementation (Section C.1) and the correctness statement (Section C.2). We then present a complete version of the correctness proof (Section C.3).

C.1  Description of the implementation

Threads communicate via an array of variables \(\text{rc}[i]\) (line 5) and a grace-period control variable \(\text{gc}\) (line 4). The \(\text{gp}\_\text{lock}\) mutex (line 6) serialises grace periods. The \(\text{GP}\_\text{PHASE}\) (line 4) bit of \(\text{gc}\) indicates which phase a grace period is in (grace periods have two phases). The low-order bits of \(\text{rc}[i]\) selected by \(\text{CS}\_\text{MASK}\) (line 2) form a 16-bit \(\text{counter}\). The low-order bits in \(\text{gc}\) similarly contain a 16-bit counter permanently equal to 1, thus allowing a single write (line 13) to set \(\text{rc}[i]\)'s counter to 1 while copying the phase-bit value from \(\text{gc}\).

The \textbf{counter} in \(\text{rc}[i]\) records the depth of RSCS nesting for thread \(i\): initially 0, set to 1 at line 13 in an outermost \(\text{rcu}\_\text{read}\_\text{lock}\) call, incremented at line 16 in inner calls, and decremented at line 24 in \(\text{rcu}\_\text{read}\_\text{unlock}\). If RSCSes are properly nested (no unlock without an earlier matching lock) and depth of nesting does not overflow the 16-bit counter, only an outermost \(\text{rcu}\_\text{read}\_\text{unlock}\) sets the counter to 0, indicating that thread \(i\) is not in an RSCS.
The `GP_PHASE` bit in `gc` is 0 before a grace period, viz, before `synchronize_rcu` is called. That routine sets the phase to 1 and then 0 again (line 36). Threads starting an outermost RSCS copy the current phase value into their respective `rc[i]` (line 15). Thus `synchronize_rcu` knows which threads must be waited for. Indeed, after changing the phase, `update_counter_and_wait` waits for each thread `i` (line 38–39) until the value computed at lines 29–30 becomes false. This happens when:

- `rc[i]`'s counter is zero (thread `i` is not in an RSCS), or
- `rc[i]`'s counter is nonzero and its phase bit is equal to that of `gc` (thread `i` is in an RSCS which started after the current GP phase).

### C.2 Correctness statement

Let $P$ be a LK program, and let $P'$ be obtained by replacing the RCU primitives in $P$ with the routines of Figure 18. For any execution $X'$ of $P'$ allowed by our model, let $X$ be the corresponding execution of $P$. Each non-RCU event $e$ in $X$ corresponds directly to an event $e'$ in $X'$. (Consider, e.g., the execution $X$ in Figure 19, corresponding to $X'$ in Figure 20.) Events $a$, $b$, $c$, and $d$ in $X$ match $a'$, $b'$, $c'$, and $d'$ in $X'$.

Furthermore, the code in Figure 18 does not access any of the shared locations in $P$, and conversely, $P$ does not access the shared locations `gc` and `rc[]`, each read in $X$ is related by `rf` in $X'$ to a write also in $X$. (For example, `$a'$ in $X'$ reads from `$d'$, not from some other write present in $X'$ but not in $X$.) More generally, the non-RCU relations of $X$ are simply those of $X'$ restricted to the events in $X$.

We set up a similar correspondence for the RCU events (in Figure 20 appended to these events’ labels are the line numbers from Figure 18 or the events and their call chains):

- For each F[rcu_lock] event $l$ in $X$ (g in Figure 19), let $l'$ be the write of `rc[i]` at line 13 (or 16 for inner nesting levels). In Figure 20, this is `g'`.
- For each F[rcu_unlock] event $u$ in $X$ (j in Figure 19), let $u'$ be the write of `rc[i]` at line 24 (j' in Figure 20).
- For each F[sync-rcu] event $s$ in $X$ (k in Figure 19), let $s'$ be the write to `gc` at line 36 from the call to `update_counter_and_wait` at line 43 (k' in Figure 20).

We can now state our correctness result: If $X'$ is allowed in our LK model and has properly nested RSCSes that do not overflow the counters in `rc[i]`, then $X$ is allowed.
C.3 Proof of correctness

All non-RCU relations \( R \) in \( X \) hold in \( X' \): when \( (e_1, e_2) \in R \) holds in \( X \), the corresponding fact \( (e'_1, e'_2) \in R \) holds in \( X' \). Recall that we defined \( X \) to differ from \( X' \) only for RCU events and relations. Hence this result is immediate except when \( R \) is strong-fence, which contains the RCU relation gp. Fortunately it is true in this case as well.

To see why, consider \( (e_1, e_2) \in \text{gp} \) in \( X \) (e.g., the writes \( c \) and \( d \) in Figure 19). There is an \( F[\text{sync-rcu}] \) event between them in program order; hence the \( F[\text{mb}] \) event arising from line 44 lies between the corresponding events \( e'_1 \) and \( e'_2 \) in \( X' \). Thus \( (e'_1, e'_2) \in \text{mb} \), implying that \( (e'_1, e'_2) \in \text{strong-fence} \). (Between \( c' \) and \( d' \) in Figure 20 are all the events from Figure 18’s implementation of synchronize_rcu; the \( F[\text{mb}] \) event for line 44 is elided.)

Since \( X' \) is allowed, \( X \) thus obeys all the core constraints of our model, leaving only the RCU constraint to consider.

Using our RCU guarantee theorem (Appendix [B]), we show that \( X \) does obey the RCU constraint by showing that \( X \) satisfies the fundamental law of RCU. This requires finding a precedes function \( F \) for \( X \) such that \( \text{pb}(F) \) is acyclic.

Our precedes function \( F \) is derived from the execution \( X' \). Given a GP in \( X \) and an outermost RSCS in thread \( i \), let \( l \) and \( u \) be the lock and unlock events of the RSCS. The corresponding events \( l' \) and \( u' \) in \( X' \) were defined in Section [C.2] We consider two distinguished read events, \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \), where:

- \( r_1 \) is the read of \( \text{rc}[i] \) executed by line 27 of Figure 18
- in the call to gp_ongoing(i) from the last iteration of the while loop at line 38
- in the first call to update_counter_and_wait (line 46) within the GP,

and \( r_2 \) is the equivalent read from within the second call to update_counter_and_wait (line 47). In Figure 20, \( r_2 = m' \) and \( r_1 \) is not shown.

We will show that at least one of the following two statements must hold in \( X' \):

1. the RSCS’s \( \text{rcu_read_lock} \) \( l' \) was not visible at the start of the GP: \( (r_1, l') \in \text{fr} \);
2. the RSCS’s \( \text{rcu_read_unlock} \) \( u' \) or a later write to \( \text{rc}[i] \) was visible at the end of the GP: \( (u', r_2) \in (\text{coi}_1 : \text{rf}) \).

To see why, we let \( w_1 \) and \( w_2 \) be the writes to \( \text{rc}[i] \) read by \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \). Since \( r_1 \) comes before \( r_2 \) in program order, it follows from the Scpv axiom that \( w_1 \) either is equal to \( w_2 \) or comes before it in the coherence order for \( \text{rc}[i] \).

Now reason by contradiction. (1) says that \( r_1 \) reads a value that is overwritten by \( l' \), so if (1) does not hold then \( r_1 \) reads from \( l' \) or from a write that comes after \( l' \) in the coherence order. In other words, either \( l' = w_1 \) or \( (l', w_1) \in \text{co} \). Similarly, (2) says that \( r_2 \) reads from \( u' \) or from a write that comes after \( u' \) in the coherence order (note that all the writes to \( \text{rc}[i] \) are made by thread \( i \)); hence two writes to that variable are related by \( \text{co} \) iff they are related by \( \text{coi} \). So if (2) does not hold then \( r_2 \) reads a value that is overwritten by \( u' \); in other words, \( (w_2, u') \in \text{co} \). And since either \( w_1 = w_2 \) or \( (w_1, w_2) \in \text{co} \), it follows that each of \( w_1 \) and \( w_2 \) is either equal to \( l' \) or comes between \( l' \) and \( u' \) in the coherence order. But the only writes to \( \text{rc}[i] \)
between \( l' \) and \( u' \) are those arising from inner nested calls of `rcu_read_lock` or `rcu_read_unlock`, and such writes neither alter the phase bit in \( rc[i] \) nor set its counter to zero. Thus \( w_1 \) and \( w_2 \) must both write the same value for the phase bit and a nonzero value for the counter.

However, the phase bit in \( gc \) has opposite values during the calls to \( gp\_ongoing(i) \) containing \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \): thanks to the mutual exclusion ensured by \( gp\_lock \), only `update_counter` and `wait` in the GP’s thread changes this bit (line 36) during that time interval, setting it to 1 before \( r_1 \) (when called from line 46) and then back to 0 before \( r_2 \) (when called from line 47).

Thus it is not possible for the calls of \( gp\_ongoing(i) \) containing \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) both to return false (recall that \( gp\_ongoing(i) \) returns false when either \( rc[i] \)’s counter is zero, or its counter is nonzero and its phase bit is equal to that of \( gc \)). This contradicts the definition of \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) as being events in the last iterations of their respective while loops. Hence (1) or (2) must hold.

We take \( F(\text{RSCS, GP}) \) to be GP if (1) holds and RSCS otherwise. In Figure 20 (2) holds, since \( u' \) is \( j' \), \( r_2 \) is \( m' \), and \((j', m') \in rf \). Thus for this example, \( F(\text{RSCS, GP}) = \text{RSCS} \).

**Claim 1.** If there is a cycle in \( pb(F) \) for \( X \) then there is a cycle in \( pb \) for \( X' \).

In our example, we know from Section 4.1 that \( X \) in Figure 19 violates the fundamental law of RCU, and hence the \( pb(F) \) relation in \( X \) contains a cycle (for every precedes function \( F \), including the one chosen above). We are now claiming this means that \( X' \) in Figure 20 has a cycle in \( pb \). And so it does: \( d' \xrightarrow{\text{rfe}} a' \xrightarrow{\text{wmb}} j' \), hence \( d' \xrightarrow{\text{pb}} j' \), and similarly, \( j' \xrightarrow{\text{pb}} d' \)

Returning to the general proof: The correctness statement assumes that \( X' \) is allowed in our model and hence obeys the \( \text{Pb} \) constraint. This requires the \( \text{pb} \) relation in \( X' \) to be acyclic, from which we now deduce (using the Claim) that the \( \text{pb}(F) \) relation in \( X \) must also be acyclic. As a result, \( X \) obeys the fundamental law and the RCU axiom.

Thus to conclude the proof, we only need to justify the Claim. Doing so requires the following interpolation lemma.

**Lemma 4.** Suppose \( b \xrightarrow{\text{link}} a \), where \( b \neq a \) and \( b \) is not a memory access, i.e., it is a fence event. Then there is an event \( x \) such that \( b \xrightarrow{\text{po}} x \xrightarrow{\text{link}} a \).

**Proof.** This follows from the form of the definition of \( \text{link} \) and the relations which make it up. We merely have to consider all the possible cases.

Start by noticing that \( \text{rfe}, \text{co}, \text{fr}, \) and \( \text{overwrite} \) edges always link two memory accesses, so no edge starting from \( b \) can be of these types. Also, notice that \( \text{ppo} \) is a subrelation of \( \text{po} \), as is \( \text{fence} \) (which includes \( \text{strong-fence} \)). Furthermore, the definition in Figure 8 of \( \text{cumul-fence}^* \) expands to

\[
(\text{rfe}^*; (\text{strong-fence} \cup \text{po-rel})) \cup \text{wmb},
\]

so any \( \text{cumul-fence}^* \) edge starting from \( b \) must be an instance of \( \text{strong-fence} \), \( \text{po-rel} \), or \( \text{wmb} \)—hence a \( \text{po} \) edge—since it can’t begin with the optional \( \text{rfe} \).

Thus, if we have a nontrivial edge \( b \xrightarrow{\text{cumul-fence}^*} y \) for some event \( y \) then there is an \( x \) with

\[
b \xrightarrow{\text{cumul-fence}} x \xrightarrow{\text{cumul-fence}^*} y,
\]

from which we conclude

\[
b \xrightarrow{\text{po}} x \xrightarrow{\text{cumul-fence}^*} y.
\]

Similarly, suppose there is a nontrivial edge \( b \xrightarrow{\text{prop}} y \), or equivalently,

\[
b \xrightarrow{\text{prop}(\text{ext})^*; \text{cumul-fence}^*; \text{rfe}^*} y.
\]

The edge cannot begin with \( \text{overwrite} \) nor with \( \text{rfe} \). Hence it must begin with \( \text{cumul-fence}^* \), so as above there is an \( x \) with

\[
b \xrightarrow{\text{po}} x \xrightarrow{\text{cumul-fence}^*; \text{rfe}^*} y.
\]

and thus \( b \xrightarrow{\text{po}} x \xrightarrow{\text{prop}} y \).

Now consider what happens with a nontrivial edge \( b \xrightarrow{\text{hb}} y \). The definition expands to

\[
b \xrightarrow{(\text{prop}(\text{id})^*; \text{int}); \text{ppo}; \text{rfe}} y.
\]
If the edge is an instance of prop then we have an \( x \) with
\[
\begin{align*}
  b &\xrightarrow{\text{po}} x \xrightarrow{\text{prop}} y.
\end{align*}
\]
x is in the same thread as \( b \), so it is in the same thread as \( y \). If \( x \) is equal to \( y \) then we have \( b \xrightarrow{\text{po}} y \) directly; otherwise the prop edge between \( x \) and \( y \) is not in the identity relation \( \text{id} \), so we have \( x \xrightarrow{\text{hb}} y \). If the edge from \( b \) to \( y \) is an instance of ppo then again we get \( b \xrightarrow{\text{po}} y \). Since the edge cannot be rfe, we conclude that
\[
\begin{align*}
  b &\xrightarrow{\text{po}} y, \quad \text{or for some } x, \quad b \xrightarrow{\text{po}} x \xrightarrow{\text{hb}} y.
\end{align*}
\]
We apply these facts to analyze the given situation where \( b \xrightarrow{\text{link}} a \). This expands to
\[
\begin{align*}
  b &\xrightarrow{\text{hb}^*;\text{pb}^*;\text{prop}} a.
\end{align*}
\]
Since \( b \neq a \), at least one of these edges must be nontrivial. Consider the possibilities for the first nontrivial edge in this sequence.

Case 1: The \( \text{hb}^* \) edge is nontrivial. Then for some \( y \) we have
\[
\begin{align*}
  b &\xrightarrow{\text{hb}} y \xrightarrow{\text{hb}^*;\text{pb}^*;\text{prop}} a.
\end{align*}
\]
As shown above, either \( b \xrightarrow{\text{po}} y \) (in which case we can take \( x \) to be \( y \)), or for some \( x \),
\[
\begin{align*}
  b &\xrightarrow{\text{po}} x \xrightarrow{\text{hb}} y \xrightarrow{\text{hb}^*;\text{pb}^*;\text{prop}} a.
\end{align*}
\]
Either way, we obtain \( b \xrightarrow{\text{po}} x \xrightarrow{\text{link}} a \).

Case 2: The \( \text{hb}^* \) edge from \( b \) is trivial, and the \( \text{pb}^* \) edge is the first nontrivial one. Then for some \( z \) we have \( b \xrightarrow{\text{pb}} z \xrightarrow{\text{pb}^*;\text{prop}} a \). The \( \text{pb} \) edge expands to
\[
\begin{align*}
  b &\xrightarrow{\text{prop};\text{strong-fence};\text{hb}^*} z,
\end{align*}
\]
and a prop edge may be trivial. We divide the possibilities into two subcases.

Case 2A: The prop edge is nontrivial, leading from \( b \) to some event \( y \). As shown above, there is \( x \) with
\[
\begin{align*}
  b &\xrightarrow{\text{po}} x \xrightarrow{\text{prop}} y \xrightarrow{\text{strong-fence};\text{hb}^*} z.
\end{align*}
\]
It follows that \( x \xrightarrow{\text{pb}} z \) and hence \( x \xrightarrow{\text{link}} a \).

Case 2B: The prop edge is trivial, so the edge starting from \( b \) is in \( \text{strong-fence} \). Since \( \text{strong-fence} \subseteq \text{po} \), for some \( x \) we have
\[
\begin{align*}
  b &\xrightarrow{\text{po}} x \xrightarrow{\text{hb}^*} z \xrightarrow{\text{pb}^*;\text{prop}} a,
\end{align*}
\]
in other words, \( b \xrightarrow{\text{po}} x \xrightarrow{\text{link}} a \).

Case 3: The \( \text{hb}^* \) and \( \text{pb}^* \) edges from \( b \) are trivial, and the prop edge is the first nontrivial one. Then we have \( b \xrightarrow{\text{prop}} a \), and as shown above, there is \( x \) with \( b \xrightarrow{\text{po}} x \xrightarrow{\text{prop}} a \). It follows that \( x \xrightarrow{\text{link}} a \), as desired. This exhausts the possibilities.

We can now give the proof of Claim 1 if there is a cycle in \( \text{pb}(F) \) for \( X \) then there is a cycle in \( \text{pb} \) for \( X' \).

**Proof.** Suppose
\[
\begin{align*}
  e_0 \xrightarrow{\text{pb}(F)} e_1 \xrightarrow{\text{pb}(F)} \ldots \xrightarrow{\text{pb}(F)} e_n = e_0
\end{align*}
\]
is a cycle in \( \text{pb}(F) \) for \( X \). By the earlier discussion, if \( e_i \xrightarrow{\text{pb}} e_{i+1} \) holds in \( X \) then \( e'_i \xrightarrow{\text{pb}} e'_{i+1} \) holds in \( X' \). Consequently, if all the edges in this cycle happen to belong to \( \text{pb} \) then the \( e'_i \) events would form a cycle in \( \text{pb} \) for \( X' \).

Otherwise, let \( j \) be an index such that the \( e_j \xrightarrow{\text{pb}(F)} e_{j+1} \) edge is not in \( \text{pb} \). Then for some events \( a_j \) and \( b_j \),
\[
\begin{align*}
  e_j &\xrightarrow{\text{prop}} a_j \xrightarrow{\text{rcu-fence}(F)} b_j \xrightarrow{\text{hb}^*} e_{j+1}.
\end{align*}
\]
By the definition of \texttt{rcu-fence} (given in Section 4.1), this means there is an outermost RSCS $C_j = (l_j, u_j)$ and a GP $s_j$, with

\begin{itemize}
  \item [(i):] $F(C_j, s_j) = s_j \land a_j \xrightarrow{po} s_j \land l_j \xrightarrow{po'} b_j$, or
  \item [(ii):] $F(C_j, s_j) = C_j \land a_j \xrightarrow{po} u_j \land s_j \xrightarrow{po'} b_j$.
\end{itemize}

Let $k$ be the next index in the cycle for which the $e_k \rightarrow e_{k+1}$ edge is not in $pb$. Then there are events $a_k$ and $b_k$ with properties like those of $a_j$ and $b_j$. Since all the edges from $e_{j+1}$ to $e_k$ are in $pb$, we have

\[
b_j \xrightarrow{hb} e_{j+1} \xrightarrow{pb} e_k \xrightarrow{prop} a_k,
\]

and therefore $b_j \xrightarrow{link} a_k$.

The optional $po'$ edges leading to $b_j$ in cases (i) and (ii) are troublesome. Fortunately we can apply Lemma 4 using the fact that $l_j$ and $s_j$, being $F[rcu-lock]$ and $F[sync-rcu]$ events respectively, are not memory accesses. In case (i), if $l_j = b_j$ but $b_j \neq a_k$ then the lemma says there is an event $x$ such that $l_j \xrightarrow{gb} x \xrightarrow{link} a_k$. Taking $b_j$ to be $x$ rather than its original value, we obtain $l_j \xrightarrow{po} b_j$; we will denote this situation as subcase (i)$\neq$. The other possibility, denoted as subcase (i)$=\neq$, is that $l_j = b_j = a_k$. Case (ii) is similarly subdivided: in subcase (ii)$\neq$ we have $s_j \xrightarrow{po} b_j \xrightarrow{link} a_k$, and in subcase (ii)$=\neq$, $s_j = b_j = a_k$.

Now consider the corresponding events in $X'$. According to the way the precedes function $F$ was defined above, in both (i) subcases we have $r_{1j} \xrightarrow{fr} l'_j$ where $r_{1j}$ is a read event within a $gb_{ongoing}$ subroutine call inside the $s_j$ grace period. For these subcases, set $v_j = r_{1j}$; then $a'_j \xrightarrow{nb} v_j$ because $a_j \xrightarrow{po} s_j$ and because of the \texttt{amp_mnb} in line 44 of Figure 18. Similarly, in both (ii) subcases we have $u'_j \xrightarrow{col.rf} r_{2j}$, where $r_{2j}$ is another read event inside the $s_j$ grace period. For these subcases, take $v_j$ to be the intermediate event for which $u'_j \xrightarrow{col} v_j \xrightarrow{rf} r_{2j}$; then because $a_j \xrightarrow{po} u_j$ and $col \subseteq po$ (since $X'$ satisfies the \texttt{Scpv} axiom) it follows that $a'_j \xrightarrow{nb} v_j$, thanks to the \texttt{amp_mnb} in line 23. Thus $a'_j \xrightarrow{nb} v_j$ in every subcase, and of course the same will be true for $a'_k$ and $v_k$.

Putting all these ingredients together, in subcase (i)$=\neq$ we have

\[
v_j \xrightarrow{fr} l'_j \xrightarrow{nb} a'_k \xrightarrow{nb} v_k.
\]

If $v_j$ and $l'_j$ are in the same thread then the $fr$ reduces to $po$ (again because of the \texttt{Scpv} axiom); otherwise the relation is $\texttt{po.e}$. Either way, this shows that $v_j \xrightarrow{pb} v_k$. In subcase (ii)$\neq$ we have $l_j \xrightarrow{po} b_j$, which implies that $l'_j \xrightarrow{nb} b'_j$ thanks to the fact that $C_j$ is an outermost critical section and to the \texttt{amp_mnb} in line 44. Thus we get

\[
v_j \xrightarrow{fr} l'_j \xrightarrow{nb} b'_j \xrightarrow{link} a'_k \xrightarrow{nb} v_k.
\]

As before, it follows that

\[
v_j \xrightarrow{pb} b'_j \xrightarrow{link} a'_k \xrightarrow{strong-fence} v_k,
\]

and hence $v_j \xrightarrow{pb} v_k$.

The analysis for the (ii), subcases is similar. In subcase (ii)$=\neq$ we have $v_j \xrightarrow{rf} r_{2j}$, and we claim that $r_{2j} \xrightarrow{nb} v_k$. This claim will follow from the \texttt{amp_mnb} in line 49 provided that $v_k$ is po-after the end of the $s_j$ GP. This is true because in case (i)$\neq$, $v_k$ lies within the $s_k$ GP which is po-after $a_k = s_j$, and in case (ii)$\neq$, $v_k$ is within or po-after the $C_k$ RSCS which is po-after $a_k = s_j$. As in the previous paragraph, the $rf$ edge from $v_j$ resolves either to po or $\texttt{rgf}$, both of which yield $v_j \xrightarrow{pb} v_k$. Lastly, in subcase (ii)$\neq$ we have $s_j \xrightarrow{po} b_j$, which implies that $r_{2j} \xrightarrow{nb} b'_j$ because of the \texttt{amp_mnb} in line 49. Thus we get

\[
v_j \xrightarrow{rf} r_{2j} \xrightarrow{nb} b'_j \xrightarrow{link} a'_k \xrightarrow{nb} v_k.
\]

As before, it follows that

\[
v_j \xrightarrow{pb} b'_j \xrightarrow{link} a'_k \xrightarrow{strong-fence} v_k,
\]

and hence $v_j \xrightarrow{pb} v_k$.

In each possible subcase we see that $v_j$ and $v_k$ are linked in $X'$ by a sequence of one or more $pb$ edges. Continuing this construction around the original $pbf(F)$ cycle generates a $pb$ cycle passing through the $v_j$ events. \qed