

# Recoverable Lock-Free Locks

Hagit Attiya ✉ 


Technion – Israel Institute of Technology, Israel

Panagiota Fatourou ✉ 

FORTH ICS, Greece and University of Crete, Computer Science Department

Eleftherios Kosmas ✉ 

Hellenic Mediterranean University, Greece

Yuanhao Wei ✉ 

University of British Columbia, Canada

---

## Abstract

This paper presents the first transformation that introduces both lock-freedom and recoverability. Our transformation starts with a lock-based implementation, and provides a recoverable, lock-free substitution to lock acquire and lock release operations. The transformation supports nested locks for generality and ensures recoverability without jeopardising the correctness of the lock-based implementation it is applied on.

**2012 ACM Subject Classification** Theory of computation → Concurrent algorithms; Software and its engineering → Synchronization

**Keywords and phrases** recoverable computing, NVM, lock, lock-freedom

**Funding** *Hagit Attiya*: Supported by the Israel Science Foundation (22/1425 and 25/1849)

*Panagiota Fatourou*: Supported by the Hellenic Foundation for Research and Innovation (HFRI) under the “Second Call for HFRI Research Projects to support Faculty Members and Researchers” (Project: PERSIST, number: 3684), and by the Greek Ministry of Education, Religious Affairs and Sports call SUB 1.1 – Research Excellence Partnerships (Project: HARSH, code: YII 3TA-0560901), implemented through the National Recovery and Resilience Plan Greece 2.0 and funded by the European Union – NextGenerationEU.

*Eleftherios Kosmas*: Supported by the Hellenic Foundation for Research and Innovation (HFRI) under the “Second Call for HFRI Research Projects to support Faculty Members and Researchers” (project number: 3684).

## 1 Introduction

Novel *non-volatile memory* (NVM) devices is an emerging memory technology, currently co-existing with DRAM in some machines. NVM persists during transient failures and opens the possibility of designing data structures and applications that can recover their original state after such failures and continue their execution. Despite intensive research, *efficient recoverability* remains a challenge, due to the intricate persistence behavior of cached information, and it requires costly synchronization instructions. To address this challenge, many hand-crafted algorithms were proposed (e.g., [9, 12, 20, 14, 32, 33, 18, 37]), and even general techniques to turn existing applications into recoverable ones (e.g., [27, 7, 19, 21, 1]).

In the context of multi-processing and concurrent programs, an even older trend is to strive for *lock-freedom* [23], in order to tolerate delays and (non-transient) failure of threads. Lock-freedom has been the gold standard for concurrency, and is provided by numerous algorithms and implementations. More importantly, there have been several proposals to automatically derive lock-free implementations. The classical idea for making algorithms lock-free, dating back to [5, 35], relies on having a thread that takes a lock on an object, assign an *operation descriptor* to that object. This descriptor is then used to help the

operation complete in case the object is needed for another operation. (See more details in Section 6.)

Interestingly, neither of these two types of transformations, adding recoverability or adding lock-freedom, achieves both goals. This is unfortunate since recoverability is particularly attractive when combined with lock-freedom. This is also curious since similar techniques are used in many of these transformations, albeit for different purposes. For example, carefully *tracking* the execution of operations in order to support *helping* in the case of lock-free transformations, or to support re-execution of operations in the case of recoverability. Another aspect is relying on *idempotent* code that can be run multiple times but appears to have run once [15], either due to helping (in lock-free transformations) or due to recovery (in recoverability).

This paper presents the first direct transformation that introduces both lock-freedom and recoverability. Our transformation starts with a lock-based implementation, and produces recoverable, lock-free substitutions to *lock acquire* and *lock release* operations. This includes *nested* calls to acquire locks while holding other locks. The recoverable, lock-free substitutions ensure the same properties in the resulting implementation.

Lock replacement is a particularly attractive avenue for deriving recoverable lock-free applications, due to their wide applicability. Our transformation builds on FLOCK [8], a recent highly-optimized implementation of lock-free locks. Their main departure from the classical approach of [5, 35] is in the way idempotence is ensured. Instead of tracking the progress of code through object descriptors, they use a *read log* shared by all threads helping the same code. The log tracks all reads from shared mutable locations, and is modified with CAS. This ensures that all threads executing the same code use the same values read, which in turn, mean they execute the same writes. To increase the applicability of their transformation, they support nesting of locks, by making the locking code itself be idempotent.

Our transformation, called RFLOCK, starts with FLOCK, since it has an explicit handling of idempotence and comes with an efficient implementation. However, several key changes are needed in order to introduce recoverability. The most important one is to maintain *update logs*, in addition to read logs. Before applying any update on shared memory, the update is first recorded in the log. The log is persisted before the updates are applied.

Another important aspect is that RFLOCK avoids in-place updates, since this would require to log and persist each update, at a significant persistence cost [3]. Instead, RFLOCK defers the persistence and the application of updates to the end of a critical section.

Summarizing, the contributions of this paper are:

- We present a general transformation of lock-based implementations to their recoverable lock-free analogs.
- We extend FLOCK to get a new approach that provides recoverability in addition to lock-free try-locks.
- The proposed approach supports nested locks for generality and wide applicability.
- The transformation preserves the correctness of the lock-based data structure and ensures recoverability on top.

## 2 Definitions

We consider a system of asynchronous crash-prone *threads* which communicate through *base objects* supporting atomic read, write, and Compare&Swap (CAS) *primitive* operations.

We assume that the main memory is non-volatile, whereas the data in the cache or registers are volatile. Thus, writes are persisted to the non-volatile memory using explicit

```

1:   TRYLOCK( $L_1$ , [=] {
2:       SOME CODE
3:       TRYLOCK( $L_2$ , [=] {
4:           SOME CODE })
5:   })

```

■ **Figure 1** Typical code with TRYLOCK.

flush instructions, or when a cache line is evicted. Under *explicit epoch persistence* [27], a write-back to persistent storage is triggered by a *persistent write-back* (**pwb**) instruction; a **pwb** flushes all fields fitting in a cache line. The order of **pwb**s is not necessarily preserved. A **pfence** instruction orders preceding **pwb**s before all subsequent **pwb**s. A **psync** instruction waits until all previous **pwb**s complete the write backs. For each location, persistent write-backs preserve program order. We assume the *Total Store Order* (*TSO*) model, supported by the x86 and SPARC architectures, where writes become visible in program order.

The concurrent program implements a collection of *methods*. A thread  $q$  *invokes* a method to start its execution; the method *completes* by returning a *response value*, which is stored to a local variable of  $q$  (and thus it is lost if a crash occurs before  $q$  persists it).

At any point during the execution of a method, a system-wide *crash-failure* (or simply a *crash*) resets all volatile variables to their initial values. Failed threads are recovered by the system asynchronously, independently of each other; the system may recover only a subset of these threads before another crash occurs.

We assume methods synchronize through locks. The code section protected by a lock is called a *thunk* [26], and it is a function that takes no arguments, and returns a boolean value, indicating whether the thunk was successful. To synchronize, threads call TRYLOCK, with the corresponding Lock and thunk as parameters. A typical code would look as in Figure 1.

In this code, Lines 2–4 are the thunk of the TRYLOCK in Line 1, while Line 4 is the thunk of the TRYLOCK in Line 3. Note that lock acquire and release are implicit in this programming style. Also, this style also implies *pure* nesting, i.e., the scope of locks is properly nested within each other. As in [8], we borrow the notation [=] for lambdas in C++ to denote a thunk; a lambda allows the programmer to define an anonymous function object right at the location where it is invoked or passed as an argument to a function.

An execution is *durably linearizable* [28], if the effects of all methods that have completed before a crash are reflected in the object’s state upon recovery. A recoverable implementation is *lock-free*, if in every infinite execution produced by the implementation, which contains a finite number of system crashes, an infinite number of methods complete.

### 3 Overview and Interface of RFlock

**Overview.** Our transformation utilizes FLOCK [8], which transforms a lock-based implementation into a lock-free one, by enabling threads to help other threads to execute their critical sections. In case a thread  $p$  wants to acquire a lock that is currently held by another thread  $p'$ , then instead of blocking,  $p$  helps  $p'$  by executing the entire critical section of  $p'$ . Then,  $p$  unlocks the lock and can compete for the lock again in order to continue with the execution of its critical section.

We first describe the key elements of FLOCK. A lock is implemented as a pointer to a descriptor where all necessary information is stored to allow helping. To ensure *idempotent* execution of a critical section (by multiple threads), FLOCK maintains a *read log* of the

values read during each read access within a critical section. The first thread to perform such a read records the read value in the log. Subsequent threads will read these values by accessing the read log and thus, they will follow the same execution path within the critical section. Therefore, they will all perform the same updates of memory locations; the latter are atomically applied in place using *CAS*. A pointer to the log is stored in the descriptor associated with the lock at each point in time. A boolean variable is also stored in the lock to indicate whether the lock is acquired. Thus, the *value* of a lock is a vector containing the pointer to the lock descriptor and the value of the boolean variable.

Recall that a *thunk* is a function that contains the code of the critical section, takes no arguments, and returns a boolean value. The use of thunks supports helping, as a helper of a critical section can simply invoke the thunk.

To support *nesting* of critical sections, FLOCK logs also the values of locks. Consider a critical section  $CS'$ , nested within a critical section  $CS$ , and let  $L$  be the lock protecting  $CS'$ . Every thread that wants to acquire  $L$ , it attempts to log  $L$ 's value in the read log of  $CS$ . Only one of them succeeds. Then, all threads use the logged value to acquire  $L$ . After acquiring  $L$ , a thread continues with the execution of  $CS'$  (using the read log of  $CS'$  which is different than that of  $CS$ ). In case a helper thread attempts to acquire  $L$  after it has already been taken, then its acquisition effort will fail, but it may continue with the execution of  $CS'$  (in case it is not already completed).

RFLOCK builds upon the main idea of FLOCK to support the idempotent execution of critical sections by maintaining read logs. However, the design of RFLOCK departs from FLOCK by avoiding in-place updates. In-place updates would require to log and persist each update individually, which would result in significant persistence cost [3]. To enhance its performance, RFLOCK defers the persistence and the application of updates to the end of the thunk.

RFLOCK maintains an *update log* per lock, in addition to its read log to support recoverability. Before applying any update on shared memory, the update is first recorded in the update log. The update log is persisted before the updates are applied.

Deferring updates to the end of a critical section, can result in executions where reads following a write in a critical section may have different responses than in the original code  $\mathcal{C}$ , on which RFLOCK is applied. Whether this will happen depends on the memory consistency model of the programming language  $\mathcal{L}$ , in which  $\mathcal{C}$  has been written, and the level of consistency chosen by the programmer. In cases where the memory consistency model of  $\mathcal{L}$  provides consistency guarantees as strong as sequential consistency, then RFLOCK requires the following assumption to ensure correctness. *For each thunk, no read on a shared location occurs after the first write into such a location.* This assumption is needed to avoid the following bad scenario. Consider two shared variables  $A$  and  $B$  and assume that the critical section of a thread  $p_1$  first writes  $A$  and then reads  $B$ , whereas the critical section of a thread  $p_2$  first writes  $B$  and then reads  $A$ . If the consistency memory model of  $\mathcal{L}$  ensures sequential consistency, one of the two reads will return the new written value in  $\mathcal{C}$ . This is the case, for instance, when the writes to  $A$  and  $B$  are protected by locks and the memory consistency model ensures that acquiring or releasing a lock causes all writes to be flushed. Since RFLOCK defers updates, in the absence of the assumption above, in RFLOCK, these reads could return the old values for both  $A$  and  $B$ .

RFLOCK is correct even when the assumption does not hold in cases where the same lock protects the two writes to  $A$  and  $B$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Moreover, if no locks protect these two writes in  $\mathcal{C}$ , then the scenario described above can appear even when running  $\mathcal{C}$ , thus the behavior of RFLOCK is then correct. In cases where the two writes are protected by different locks,

the memory consistency model of many programming languages, including C++, allows this scenario to occur even in executions of the original code  $\mathcal{C}$ . Thus, RFLOCK is also correct then. Summarizing, whether the assumption is needed for proving RFLOCK correct depends on the level of consistency the programmer chooses for  $\mathcal{C}$  from the levels supported by the programming language (through its memory consistency model), and has to be checked separately in each case. RFLOCK can also support in-place updates at a higher persistence cost; the *persistence cost* is the cost that RFLOCK pays (at executions with no crashes) to execute the necessary persistence instructions in order to provide recoverability in case of crashes. Then, RFLOCK would be correct without requiring that the assumption holds.

RFLOCK does not support I/O within a critical section. In order for lock-free locks [8] to ensure lock-freedom, the code inside a critical section needs to complete within a finite number of steps, so condition variables (or any form of waiting) cannot be used inside critical sections. The same holds for RFLOCK.

**Interface.** RFLOCK uses the same application interface as FLOCK. We illustrate this interface with an example of a simple lock-based implementation of a concurrent queue [29], whose code is provided in Algorithm 1. The implementation uses two locks, a lock called TailLock, to synchronize the enqueueers, and another called HeadLock, to synchronize the dequeuers. The queue is implemented by a linked list whose first element is a dummy node. Variables Head and Tail are shared, as well as the fields of the nodes of the list that implements the queue. Only next fields of nodes are updated, whereas the rest of the fields are immutable.

Algorithm 2 shows how this code is written using the interface of FLOCK. The calls to Lock() on lines 2 and 8 are substituted by TryLocks (lines 18 and 26), which call the appropriate thunks. In the thunks, whenever variables Head and Tail are read or written, this is done by calling LOAD and STORE, respectively. The same is true with the next fields of the nodes of the linked list. Allocation of memory should happen in the thunk (line 19).

In FLOCK, the assignment operator has been overloaded, so that calling STORE in the application code is not needed. The same can be done in RFLOCK to simplify the task of incorporating the appropriate interface in the application.

Our transformation works on top of any lock-based implementation. A programmer needs to simply rewrite those parts of its code that use locks utilizing the RFLOCK interface described here. After ensuring that the original code has been rewritten using the RFLOCK interface appropriately, the obtained implementation provides similar correctness guarantees as the original lock-based implementation, in addition to being durable linearizable and lock-free. Debugging needs to be performed solely on the original lock-based code.

## 4 Detailed Description of RFlock

### 4.1 Logs and Mutable Objects

Algorithm 3 presents different types of objects utilized by RFLOCK. Code in red is required to support nesting and is discussed in Section 5.

Each thread  $q$  maintains three *private* variables, namely  $\log_q[\text{READ}]$ ,  $\log_q[\text{UPDATE}]$ ,  $\log_q[\text{LOCK}]$ , which store pointers to the read, update and lock logs of the lock that  $q$  is interested in at the current point in time (i.e., it either competes for it or it has acquired it). We will call them *read*, *update* and *lock log pointers* of  $q$ . When  $q$  executes a thunk to help another thread finishing a critical section with lock  $L$ , it will run the code of  $L$ 's thunk from scratch using  $L$ 's logs. To do this,  $q$ 's log pointers will be set to point to  $L$ 's logs. Then,  $q$  will traverse these logs starting from their first position, using its  $\text{pos}_q$  variables. If any of

■ **Algorithm 1** Simple Lock-based Concurrent Queue Implementation from [29].

---

```

type Node {
  Int key
  Node *next
}
Lock HeadLock, TailLock           initially, released
Node *Head, *Tail                 initially, pointing to a dummy node

Procedure void Enqueue(Int key)
1  Node *nd := new<Node>(key, NULL)
2  Lock(TailLock)
3  Tail → next := nd
4  Tail := nd
5  Unlock(TailLock)

6 Procedure Int Dequeue(void)
7  Int result
8  Lock(HeadLock)
9  if Head → next = NULL then
10 |   result := EMPTYQUEUE
11 else
12 |   result := Head → next → key
13 |   Node *oldHead = Head
14 |   Head := Head → next
15 |   Retire(oldHead);
16 Unlock(HeadLock)
17 return result

```

---

the  $\log_q$  pointers is NULL at some point in time,  $q$  is not executing a critical section. Type *Log* indicates an array of *logSize* elements implementing a log. In  $\log_q[\text{LOCK}]$ ,  $q$  records the locks that acquires during the execution of a thunk and is needed to support nesting.

Each shared memory location that is accessed within a thunk (and it is protected by a lock) should be an object of type *mutable* (Algorithm 3). A mutable object  $O$  stores a value (*val*) of type  $V$  and supports the functions: a) **LOAD**() that returns  $O$ 's current value, b) **STORE**(*newV*) that writes the value *newV* into  $O$ , and c) **CAM**(*oldV*, *newV*) that atomically compare  $O$ 's current value with *oldV* and if they are the same modifies  $O$ 's value to *newV*. For generality, in **RFLOCK**, a mutable object may also be accessed by a thread  $q$  outside a critical section. Then, the  $\log_q$  pointers are NULL.

Briefly, **LOAD** first discovers the current value of  $O$  by calling function **FETCHVALUE** and then commits the value read in the appropriate log by calling function **COMMITVALUE**; **STORE** behaves similarly. **FETCHVALUE** takes as an argument a pointer to the *val* field of  $O$  and returns the current value of  $O$ . Its argument is needed to identify whether  $O$  has been written in previous steps of the executed thunk, which means that its value is recorded in the corresponding update log and should be taken from there, or whether it should be taken directly from the *val* field of the object. **COMMITVALUE** takes as an argument the value *val* to commit in the appropriate log and a boolean *Type* that identifies in which of the three logs the value should be committed. It returns the value that is actually recorded for the operation that called **COMMITVALUE** in the log. It also returns a boolean value which is used only for the purpose of properly deallocating objects. Allocation and deallocation of objects is performed using **CREATE** and **RETIRE**. We next provide the details of the implementation.

**LOAD.** Consider a thunk  $th$  protected by a lock  $L$  and assume that a thread  $q$  calls an instance  $ld$  of **LOAD** for the  $k$ th time during the execution of  $th$ . Suppose that  $q$  has performed  $m$  accesses to shared memory (including allocations of shared variables) by the invocation of  $ld$ . Assume that **LOAD** is invoked to read the value of object  $O$ . **LOAD** reads the value of  $O$  by calling **FETCHVALUE**, and attempts to record this value in the  $k$ th position of the read

■ **Algorithm 2** Example of using FLOCK on the implementation of Algorithm 1.

---

```

type Node {
  Int key
  mutable Node * next
}
Lock HeadLock, TailLock          initially, released
mutable Node *Head, *Tail        initially, pointing to a dummy node

Procedure void Enqueue(Int key)
18   TRYLOCK(TailLock, [=] {
19     Node *nd := CREATE<Node>(key, NULL)
20     Node *tail := Tail.LOAD()
21     tail → next.STORE(nd)
22     Tail.STORE(nd)
23   return true
  })

24 Procedure Int Dequeue(void)
25   Int result
26   TRYLOCK(HeadLock, [=] {
27     Node *head := Head.LOAD()
28     Node *headNext := (head → next).LOAD()
29     if headNext = NULL then
30       result := EMPTYQUEUE
31     else
32       result := headNext → key
33       Head.STORE(headNext)
34       Retire<Node>(head)
35   return true
  })
36 return result

```

---

log of  $L$  by calling COMMITVALUE.

FETCHVALUE copes with the following cases. Either  $q$  has already invoked STORE for  $O$  (lines 52-54), in which case the value of  $O$  is the value parameter of the last STORE performed by  $q$  on  $O$  thus far, or it is the current value recorded into  $O$  (line 55).

After FETCHVALUE,  $q$  calls COMMITVALUE attempting to record the value it gets as a parameter in the  $k$ th position of the log (line 60). Its attempt may fail since helper threads may have recorded a value in this position already. In this case,  $q$  returns the value that is already recorded there (lines 61 and 63).

RFLOCK copes also with the case that an instance of LOAD or STORE is called outside a critical section (for generality reasons). COMMITVALUE addresses such calls to LOAD and STORE with lines 56-58. Specifically, COMMITVALUE discovers that its pointer to the corresponding log is NULL in this case and returns either  $\perp$  in case of a STORE or the current value of  $O$  in case of a LOAD.

Recall that  $q$  runs the code of  $th$  from scratch using its log pointers (which point to  $L$ 's logs) and its local variables  $pos_q$ , as reflected in the codes of FETCHVALUE and COMMITVALUE.

We next describe the code of COMMITVALUE in more detail. When a thread  $q$  invokes COMMITVALUE() with parameters  $val$  and  $Type$ ,  $q$  attempts to record the value  $val$  into the next available position of the log pointed to by  $log_q[Type]$ , using a CAS (line 60). This position is identified by  $pos_q[Type]$  (line 59). Other threads may concurrently try to record values at the same position of the log. COMMITVALUE returns the value of the winner thread (lines 61, 63), i.e., the value written by the single successful CAS on this position of the log. **STORE.** A store logs a pointer to  $O$  in the update log, together with the value returned for  $O$  by LOAD (line 45) and the new value to be stored in it. It does so by calling COMMITVALUE



■ **Algorithm 3** Mutable object. Code for thread  $q$ .

---

```

type Log is shared<entry>[logSize]
type Thunk is function with no arguments returning bool
▷ Private local variables of process  $q$ :
Log*  $log_q$ [READ,UPDATE,LOCK], initially all NULL // current logs
//  $log_q$ [READ] maintains  $\langle V \rangle$  entries
//  $log_q$ [UPDATE] maintains  $\langle shared(V)*, V, V \rangle$  entries
//  $log_q$ [LOCK] maintains  $\langle Lock*, descriptor* \rangle$  entries
int  $pos_q$ [READ,UPDATE,LOCK], initially all 0 // current positions in logs
37 Set<V*> *retSet $_q$ , initially pointing to an empty set

38 type mutable<V> {
39   shared<V> val
40   Procedure V LOAD()
41   |   V  $v :=$  FETCHVALUE(&val)
42   |    $\langle retVal, - \rangle :=$  COMMITVALUE( $v$ , READ)
43   |   return retVal
44   Procedure void STORE(V newV)
45   |   V oldV := FETCHVALUE(&val)
46   |   COMMITVALUE( $\langle \&val, oldV, newV \rangle$ , UPDATE)
47   Procedure void CAM(V oldV, V newV)
48   |   V check := this.LOAD()
49   |   if check  $\neq$  oldV then return
50   |   val.CAS(oldV, newV)
51 } // end of type mutable<V>

Procedure V FETCHVALUE(V *pv)
| if  $log_q$ [UPDATE]  $\neq$  NULL and  $pv \in log_q$ [UPDATE] then
52 |   int  $lpos =$  last entry containing  $pv \in log_q$ [UPDATE]
53 |   if  $lpos \leq pos_q$ [UPDATE] then
54 |     return newVal of  $log_q$ [UPDATE][ $lpos$ ]
55 |   return *pv

Procedure  $\langle V, boolean \rangle$  COMMITVALUE(V val, {READ,UPDATE,LOCK} Type)
| V cval
56 | if Type = READ then cval := val
57 | else cval :=  $\perp$ 
58 | if  $log_q$ [Type] = NULL then return  $\langle cval, true \rangle$ 
59 | int pos =  $pos_q$ [Type]
60 | boolean isFirst :=  $log_q$ [Type][pos].CAS( $\perp$ , val)
61 | V returnVal :=  $log_q$ [Type][pos]
62 |  $pos_q$ [Type] := pos + 1
63 | return  $\langle returnVal, isFirst \rangle$ 

Procedure V* CREATE<V>(args)
64 | V* newV = AllocateInNVM<V>(args)
65 |  $\langle obj, isFirst \rangle :=$  COMMITVALUE(newV, READ)
66 | if not isFirst then sysFree<V>(newV)
67 | return obj

Procedure RETIRE<V>(V* obj)
68 |  $\langle -, isFirst \rangle :=$  COMMITVALUE(1, READ)
69 | if isFirst then add obj to *retSet $_q$ 

```

---

(line 46) with parameter *Type* equal to UPDATE.

**CAM.** CAM is only needed to appropriately implement the acquisition of a nested lock. Recall that the lock value may need to be recorded in the read log (to support nested locks), so the lock is implemented as a mutable object. Different threads may try to acquire the lock at the same time by storing into it the descriptor they have created locally. CAM provides the necessary functionality for ensuring that only one of them succeeds. The rest of the threads use the descriptor recorded in the log. Specifically, a  $CAM(old, new)$  atomically updates the value of  $O$  from  $old$  to  $new$  using a *CAS* instruction (line 50). To enhance its



performance, the value of  $O$  is loaded and compared against *old* (lines 48-49) and only if they are the same, the *CAS* is executed. If the *CAS* of line 50 of CAM is executed successfully, we say that the CAM is *successful*.

**CREATE.** A thread that calls CREATE allocates a new object of type  $V$  in NVM (line 64). It then calls COMMITVALUE to attempt to record the pointer to the new object in the read log pointed to by its read log pointer. Note that it might be that many threads may attempt to also allocate the same object and record a pointer to its local copies in the read log. Only one of them will succeed, which takes back the value **true** for *isFirst*. The rest see **false** in *isFirst*, use the logged pointer as the pointer to the new object (lines 65, 67) and deallocate the object they allocated themselves (line 66). To avoid leaks after a crash, a persistent allocator, such as ralloc [11], can be used.

**RETIRE.** RETIRE attempts to record a value other than  $\perp$  (in our case 1) in the read log of lock  $L$ . Only one of the threads will succeed. COMMITVALUE will return the value **true** for *isFirst* to this thread. This thread undertakes the task to actually declare as retired the object *obj* on which RETIRE is invoked. Idempotence ensures that all other threads that call RETIRE for *obj* attempt to write in the same position of this log (and thus they fail). The actual garbage collection needs to be performed by the original code (i.e., RETIRE should be appropriately invoked in the thunks and a garbage collection algorithm should be employed by the original application for memory reclamation). The garbage collector presented in [11] allows to trace and recycle unreachable blocks upon recovery from a crash.

RFLOCK supports the use of randomization in critical sections, but the random bits need to be logged and persisted in a way similar to how CREATE handles memory allocation.

Note that CREATE, RETIRE, FETCHVALUE and COMMITVALUE are routines that are not necessarily called on a mutable object. On the contrary, LOAD, STORE and CAM are part of the interface of a mutable object.

## 4.2 Descriptor Objects and Critical Sections

For each critical section, there is a *descriptor* object (Algorithm 4), which stores pointers to the critical section's logs, as well as to its thunk. A descriptor object also contains a boolean variable *done*, initialized to **false**, which indicates whether this critical section has been executed; *done* is updated to **true** at the end of the critical section's execution. Algorithms 4 and 5 provide pseudocode for the descriptor object. Code in red copes with nested locks and is discussed in Section 5.

**CreateDescriptor.** The creator of a descriptor object (lines 71-82) calls CREATE to create the logs of the object. Then, it calls CREATE one more time to create a new descriptor object, which stores pointers to the allocated logs and to the thunk. CREATE ensures that the created values will be saved in the read log pointed to by  $q$ 's read log pointer. This is necessary for supporting nested locks (and specifically, idempotence in assigning the same descriptor to a nested lock).

**RetireDescriptor.** RETIREDESCR calls RETIRE< $V$ > for the logs and the descriptor.

**Run.** When RUNDESCR is invoked by a thread  $q$  with parameter some descriptor *descr*, it executes the thunk (line 95) of the descriptor. Before doing so,  $q$  initializes its local pointers  $log_q[READ]$ ,  $log_q[UPDATE]$  and  $log_q[LOCK]$  to point to the logs of the descriptor (lines 92-93). While executing a thunk, RUNDESCR accesses mutable memory locations by invoking the LOAD and STORE operations that have been incorporated into the code of the thunk. The execution of a thunk may end up to be unsuccessful due to contention, in which

■ **Algorithm 4** Descriptor object. Code for thread  $q$ .

---

```

type descriptor {
  Log* log[READ,UPDATE,LOCK]
  Thunk* thunk
  mutable<boolean> done
  int owner
  descriptor* topdescr
  Lock* toplock
}
Log* RD[0..N - 1], initially [NULL, ..., NULL] // stored in NVM
int wth, initially q // currently executing thread
descriptor topD[0..N - 1], initially [NULL, ..., NULL]
Lock topL[0..N - 1], initially [NULL, ..., NULL]

Procedure descriptor* CREATEDESC(Thunk  $f$ , Lock * $lock$ )

70 descriptor* descr
71 Log* log[READ, UPDATE,LOCK]

72 if  $wth = q$  and  $topD[q] = NULL$  then
73    $log[READ] := CREATEVolatile<Log>()$ 
74    $log[UPDATE] := CREATE<Log>()$ 
75    $log[LOCK] := CREATE<Log>()$ 
76 else
77    $log[READ,UPDATE,LOCK] := topD[wth] \rightarrow log[READ,UPDATE,LOCK]$ 
78    $descr := CREATE<descriptor>(log, f, false, wth, topD[wth], topL[wth])$ 
79   if  $wth = q$  and  $topD[q] = NULL$  then
80      $topD[q] := descr$ 
81      $topL[q] := lock$ 
82   return descr

Procedure boolean RUNDESC(descriptor* descr)

83 boolean returnVal
84 Log* prevlog[READ,UPDATE,LOCK]
85 int prevpos[READ,UPDATE,LOCK]
86 Set<V*> *prevretSet
87 int prevwth :=  $\perp$ 
88 if  $descr \rightarrow owner \neq wth$  then
89    $prevwth := wth$ 
90    $wth := descr \rightarrow owner$ 
91   SAVELOGS( $prevlog$ ,  $prevpos$ ,  $prevretSet$ )
92    $log_q[READ,UPDATE,LOCK] := descr \rightarrow log[READ,UPDATE,LOCK]$ 
93    $pos_q[READ,UPDATE,LOCK] := \{0, 0, 0\}$ 
94    $descr := descr \rightarrow topdescr$ 
95    $returnVal := descr \rightarrow thunk()$  // run thunk
96   if  $descr \rightarrow topdescr = NULL$  then
97     if  $returnVal = true$  then
101        $pwb(contents of log_q[UPDATE]);$  pfence()
103        $RD[wth] := log_q[UPDATE]$ 
105        $pwb(\&RD[wth]);$  psync()
107       foreach  $\langle pv, oldV, newV \rangle$  in  $log_q[UPDATE]$  do
109         if  $descr \rightarrow done.LOAD() = true$  then break
111          $pv \rightarrow CAS(oldV, newV)$ 
113          $pwb(pv)$ 
115        $psync()$ 
117        $descr \rightarrow done.STORE(true)$ 
118       foreach  $obj$  in  $retSet_q$  do
120          $sysRetire(obj)$ 
121          $remove\ obj\ from\ *retSet_q$ 
122       if  $returnVal = true$  then
124          $RD[wth] := NULL;$   $pwb(\&RD[wth]);$  pfence()
125   if  $prevwth \neq \perp$  then
127     RESTORELOGS( $prevlog$ ,  $prevpos$ )
129      $wth := prevwth$ 
131   return returnVal

```

---

■ **Algorithm 5** Descriptor object. Code for thread  $q$ .

---

```

Procedure RETIREDESCR(descriptor* descr)
133   RETIRE<Log>(descr → log[READ])
135   RETIRE<Log>(descr → log[UPDATE])
137   RETIRE<Log>(descr → log[LOCK])
139   RETIRE<descriptor>(descr)

140 Procedure SAVELOGS(Log *prevlog[], Log *prevpos[], Set<V*> *prevretSet)
142   prevlog[READ, UPDATE, LOCK] := logq[READ, UPDATE, LOCK]
144   prevpos[READ, UPDATE, LOCK] := posq[READ, UPDATE, LOCK]
146   *prevretSet := retSetq

147 Procedure RESTORELOGS(Log *prevlog[], Log *prevpos[], Set<V*> *prevretSet)
149   logq[READ, UPDATE, LOCK] := prevlog[READ, UPDATE, LOCK]
151   posq[READ, UPDATE, LOCK] := prevpos[READ, UPDATE, LOCK]
153   retSetq := *prevretSet

```

---

case it has to be repeated<sup>1</sup>. Recall that RFLOCK executes all updates after the execution of the thunk. Before doing so, it has a) to persist the contents of the update log of the descriptor (line 101), and b) to persist a pointer to the update log by storing its value in a shared variable  $RD[q]$  (line 103) and by persisting  $RD[q]$  (line 105). These actions are needed to ensure durable linearizability. Then, RUNDESCR continues to apply the updates on shared memory and persist them, one by one (lines 107-113)<sup>2</sup>. Next, it sets the *done* field of the descriptor to **true** to indicate that the execution of its thunk has been completed (line 117). Finally,  $q$  resets its local pointers  $log_q[READ]$ ,  $log_q[UPDATE]$ , and  $log_q[LOCK]$  (line 127), as well as resets and persists the value stored in  $RD[q]$  (line 124).

Recall that to help another thread finishing a critical section with lock  $L$ ,  $q$  sets its log pointers to point to  $L$ 's logs. To be able to continue its own critical section after helping,  $q$  invokes SAVELOGS before doing so to get a backup of its log pointers (line 91). It also calls RESTORELOGS to recover these values as soon as it has finished helping (line 127).

### 4.3 Flat Locks in RFlock

A lock is implemented as a mutable *LockDescr* object (Algorithm 6), which contains a pointer to the descriptor of the critical section it protects and a boolean variable (*isLocked*) that indicates whether the lock is acquired or not.

Recall that while executing a critical section, a thread  $q$ 's log pointers point to the logs, respectively, of the Lock of the critical section; moreover,  $q$ 's private variables  $pos_q[]$  store the next available position in the corresponding logs of the critical section, where a new entry should be added. These variables are stored in volatile memory.

**TryLock.** Each thread that wants to execute a critical section  $CS$ , calls the TRYLOCK function with two parameters: a pointer *lock* to the corresponding Lock and a pointer *thunk* to the thunk. TRYLOCK attempts to acquire *lock* and then it executes the *thunk*. It returns **true** if the *lock* is acquired and the  $CS$  is executed; otherwise, it returns **false**.

In more detail, when a thread  $q$  invokes TRYLOCK, first loads the current value of *lock* (line 154). In case no thread currently owns *lock* (line 155),  $q$  initializes a new descriptor

<sup>1</sup> This is, for instance, the case, in an optimistic implementation of a linked list [34][Chapter 9], where a thread repeatedly executes attempts to insert or delete an element until it succeeds; the execution of an attempt corresponds to a single execution of the thunk. Another example of a doubly-linked list is provided in [8]. In our simpler example (Algorithm 2) all thunks complete successfully.

<sup>2</sup> RFLOCK assumes that the original lock-based code is ABA-free. To make a program ABA-free a counter can be attached to any shared variable that may suffer from the ABA problem. The counter should be incremented every time the value of the variable is updated.

■ **Algorithm 6** Locks in RFLOCK. Code for thread  $q$ .

---

```

type LockDescr {
    descriptor *descr
    Boolean isLocked
}
type Lock is mutable(LockDescr)

Procedure boolean TRYLOCK(Lock *lock, Thunk *thunk)
154   LockDescr CLDescr := lock → LOAD()
155   if not CLDescr.isLocked or CLDescr.descr → owner = with then
156       descriptor *descr := CREATEDESCR(thunk, lock)
157       LockDescr NLDescr := ⟨descr, true⟩
158       lock → CAM(CLDescr, NLDescr)
159       CLDescr := lock → LOAD()
160       if NLDescr.descr → done.LOAD() = true or CLDescr = NLDescr then
161           Boolean result := RUNDESCR(NLDescr.descr)
162           UNLOCK(lock, NLDescr)
163           RETIREDESCR(descr)
164           return result
165       RETIREDESCR(descr)
166   RUNDESCR(CLDescr)
167   UNLOCK(lock, CLDescr)
168   return false

169 Procedure boolean UNLOCK(Lock *lock, LockDescr lockDescr)
170   descriptor *descr := lockDescr.descr → topdescr
171   if descr = NULL then descr := lockDescr.descr
172   if descr → done = true then
173       LockDescr NLDescr
174       foreach ⟨l, d⟩ in descr → log[LOCK] do
175           LockDescr LDescr := ⟨d, true⟩
176           NLDescr := ⟨d, false⟩
177           l → CAM(LDescr, NLDescr)
178       if lockDescr.descr → topdescr = NULL then
179           NLDescr := ⟨lockDescr.descr, false⟩
180           lock → CAM(lockDescr, NLDescr)
181           if descr → owner = q then
182               topD[q] := NULL
183               topL[q] := NULL
184       else
185           LockDescr LDescr := ⟨descr, true⟩
186           NLDescr := ⟨descr, false⟩
187           descr → toplock → CAM(LDescr, NLDescr)
188       else COMMITVALUE(⟨lock, lockDescr.descr⟩, LOCK)

Procedure RECOVER()
186   foreach p ∈ {0, 1, ..., N - 1} do
187       Log *updatesLog := RD[p]
188       if updatesLog ≠ NULL then
189           foreach ⟨val, oldV, newV⟩ in updatesLog do
190               val.CAS(oldV, newV)
191               pwb(&val)
192       psync()
193   RD[q] := NULL

```

---

for  $CS$  (line 156) and then it executes a CAM, using this descriptor, to attempt to acquire the  $lock$  (line 158). The CAM, in addition to serve the purpose of synchronizing between threads that attempt to execute  $CS$  concurrently (as it contains a  $CAS$ ), it is also necessary for supporting nested locks. In case  $lock$  has been acquired (second condition of line 160), the  $thunk$  is executed by calling  $RUNDESCR$ . Then, the  $lock$  is unlocked by calling  $UNLOCK$  (line 162) and the value returned by the  $thunk$  is returned (line 164). The same happens in

case the execution of  $CS$  has been completed and its *lock* has been released by some helper thread (first condition of line 160).

In case some other thread owns *lock*, either because the if statement of line 167 was evaluated to **false**, or because the conditions of the if statement of line 160 are evaluated to **false**, then TRYLOCK continues by helping the thread that has acquired the *lock* to complete its critical section. This is done by calling RUNDESCR and UNLOCK with this thread's descriptor *CLDescr*. In this case, **false** is returned (line 168).

**Unlock.** UNLOCK (lines 170-185) unlocks the lock by attempting to update the Lock's descriptor using CAM (line 180), so that it contains the value **false** in the *isLocked* field.

**Recover.** At recovery time, each thread  $q$  calls RECOVER. In RECOVER,  $q$  has to apply all the updates recorded in the update logs of all threads. This is necessary to ensure durable linearizability in situations, where e.g., we have a (partially applied) critical section  $CS$  for which a crash occurs after at least one of its updates has been applied and persisted, and before some other update has been persisted. If  $q$  does not ensure that all the updates of  $CS$  are applied and persisted, it may end up to access, in the subsequent thunks it will execute, some of the memory locations that have already been persisted and others that have not (with obsolete values), thus possibly violating durable linearizability.

In the full version, we argue that those updates that have not yet been persisted by the time of the failure, will be applied and persisted before the end of (any instance of) RECOVER. Recall that for each thread  $p$ ,  $RD[p]$  stores a pointer to the update log of the critical section that  $p$  was executing at the time of the failure. Because updates are not in-place in RFLOCK, a crash that occurs before any of the updates have taken place does not jeopardise durable linearizability. Moreover, a crash that occurs after  $RD[p]$  has been persisted will also not jeopardise durable linearizability, as all updates performed by  $p$  during the execution of its last thunk are persisted before persisting  $RD[p]$ .

#### 4.4 Sketch of Proof

We briefly discuss correctness for RFLOCK. Many of our arguments (and our definitions) follow that in [8]. We first argue that RFLOCK ensures idempotent execution of thunks. Consider any execution  $\alpha$  and let  $th$  be any instance of a thunk executed in  $\alpha$ . Due to helping, the code of the thunk may have been executed by many different threads. We argue that all these threads follow the same execution flow while executing  $th$ , thus they all execute the same code lines of  $th$ . We also argue that all the threads read the same value when they read a lock-protected variable and attempt to store the same value when they write such a variable. For each store, only one of the threads succeeds to record the new value in the update log. Roughly speaking, if we start from any configuration  $C$  at which no invocation of the thunk is active, we let any number of inactive threads invoke the thunk starting from  $C$ , and consider all possible executions in which at least one thread completes the execution of the thunk, at the first configuration at which the execution of the thunk completes in all of these executions, the values of the shared variables protected by the lock of the thunk will have the same values. If this property holds for every execution produced by RFLOCK and every thunk invoked in each execution, we say that RFLOCK ensures idempotence. We prove the following:

► **Lemma 1.** *RFLOCK ensures idempotence.*

We also argue that RFLOCK does not over-allocate memory or retire the same allocated chunk of memory multiple times. Roughly speaking, we show that for each chunk of memory that the threads attempt to allocate, only one thread records a pointer to its allocated chunk

in the read log and the rest use that version (quitting from using the versions they allocated). Similarly, at most one thread retires each allocated chunk of memory.

Consider an execution  $\alpha$ . An instance  $I$  of TRYLOCK executed in  $\alpha$  is successful if it returns TRUE and unsuccessful if it returns FALSE. (A nested lock succeeds if the outer lock and all locks nested in it succeed.) Intuitively,  $I$  is correct if the following holds: if  $I$  is unsuccessful, none of the updates performed in the thunk(s) it executes has effect, whereas if it is successful, then all the updates performed in the thunk(s) it executes must have effect. We say that RFLOCK is correct if in every execution it produces, all instances of TRYLOCK that are invoked in the execution, are correct. We argue the following:

► **Lemma 2.** *RFLOCK is a correct algorithm.*

For studying progress, we make similar assumptions as in [8]. We first assume that all locks have a partial order and that the acquisition of nested locks respects this order. We also assume that the number of locks is bounded and that the time a thread holds a lock is bounded [8]. We argue that RFLOCK is lock-free.

► **Lemma 3.** *In every infinite execution produced by RFLOCK, which contains a finite number of system crashes, an infinite number of invocations to TRYLOCK completes.*

## 5 Nested Locks in RFlock

We now briefly describe how RFLOCK handles nested critical sections. In Algorithms 3-6, we highlight in red the part of the pseudocode which copes with nesting.

RFLOCK implements updates in a deferred way for achieving good performance. To respect this design decision, nested locking is implemented so that all updates performed in nested critical sections occur at the end of the outermost critical section and all nested locks are released together with the outermost lock, i.e., nesting requires that the original program follows two-phase locking. RFLOCK could easily support in-place updates, and thus it can also support nested locking without making this assumption. However, this would violate well-known persistence principles [2, 17], increasing the number of persistence instructions that are needed, which would result in higher persistence cost.

The above design decision of RFLOCK for nested locks requires that when a thread  $q$  wants to reserve an acquired nested lock  $L'$ , it has to help  $L'$ 's owner thread  $p$  to finish the outermost critical section  $L$  that contains  $L'$ , as well as all critical sections that are nested in  $L$ . This requires mechanisms that allow  $q$  to figure out that  $L'$  is nested and discover  $p$  and  $L$ . Moreover, to avoid circular helping,  $q$  must remember that it helps  $p$ , so that it does not restart the helping process (starting from the outermost critical section) each time it acquires one of  $L$ 's nested locks. RFLOCK maintains the lock log and many variables per thread to handle these issues. For instance, while  $q$  executes a thunk, variable  $wth$ , which is initially  $q$ , is updated to  $p$  each time  $q$  helps a thread  $p$  (lines 87-91 of RUNDESCR).

To execute nested critical sections, we re-use the logs of the Lock protecting the outermost critical section. CREATEDESCR has been updated to accommodate this change. Moreover, we now use an extra log, namely the lock log, where all locks are recorded. This is also needed for releasing all locks at the end of the outermost critical section. RFLOCK maintains also two variables,  $topD[q]$  and  $topL[q]$ , for each thread  $q$ , where  $q$  records pointers to the descriptor and the lockDescr of the outermost lock of its current critical section at each point in time. If  $q$  does not execute any critical section at  $t$ , then these pointers are NULL.

**Recording Nested-Lock Descriptors in Read-Logs.** Consider a critical section  $CS$  that is not nested and let  $CS'$  be a critical section that is nested under  $CS$ . Then, RFLOCK

ensures that the read log of  $CS$  contains the `LockDescr`,  $ld$ , used to acquire the lock for  $CS'$ . This is needed for the following reason. Assume that several threads are concurrently trying to acquire the lock for  $CS'$  while executing  $CS$ . They will all invoke `TRYLOCK` for  $CS'$ , but only one of them will execute the CAM of line 158 successfully. By the code, this thread will next invoke `LOAD` on the acquired Lock (for  $CS'$ ) on line 159. Thus, the value of the Lock will be logged in the read log for  $CS$ . A helper thread, executing  $CS$ , will retrieve  $ld$  from the read log, and replay the code for  $CS'$  in an idempotent way.

**Manipulation of  $\log_q$ .** To support nested locks, before executing a (possibly nested) thunk (line 95), a thread  $q$  halts and records the currently executing critical section (if any) by calling `SAVELOGS` (line 91). `SAVELOGS` stores  $q$ 's log pointers, and their corresponding active positions to appropriate private variables (lines 142-144). After the thunk of the (nested) critical section is executed,  $q$  resumes the execution of the (outer) critical section (if any) by re-setting these variables to their previous values. This is done by calling `RESTORELOGS` (line 127).

## 6 Related Work

Designing lock-free concurrent algorithms, especially for data structures, have been a vibrant research field. Shortly after defining the concept of lock-free algorithms, Herlihy [24] proposed a methodology for deriving concurrent lock-free implementations of objects, from their *sequential* implementation. Since they are derived from implementations that do not expose concurrency, the resulting concurrent data structures tend to be overly synchronized.

Barnes [5] present the *cooperative* method for implementing lock-free data structures based on a sequential implementation of the data structure. Each implemented operation is associated with an *operation descriptor*, that tracks the progress of an operation. When an operation  $op_1$  needs to gain control of a memory object, it tries to install its descriptor in this object; if this succeeds, in a sense, the operation holds a *soft* lock on the object. This lock is considered *soft*, since another operation  $op_2$  needing the same object will help  $op_1$  to complete (using information in its descriptor).

A similar method is *locking without blocking* suggested by Turek, Shasha and Prakash [35]. Their transformation is applied to algorithms that synchronize solely by using locks, and avoid deadlock. The base lock-based algorithms expose situations where processes can proceed concurrently—when they do not compete for the same locks.

Ten years later, Rajwar and Goodman [31] proposed *Transactional Lock Removal* as a way to transparently execute lock-based synchronization in a lock-free manner. The idea, inspired by transactional memory [25] and speculative lock elision [30], is as follows: (1) speculatively execute the code sequence protected by a lock, without trying to acquire this lock, and then (2) use a conflict resolution mechanism to arbitrate between conflicting code sequences, and commit the successful one.

A large number of follow-up papers have applied similar ideas to specific data structures, rather than as general transformations.

The idea of soft, lock-free locks has resurfaced recently [8], in work that elegantly combines a generic interface with an efficient implementation. Their algorithmic ideas have been described in Section 3.

The advent of persistent memory has lead to an interest in lock-free algorithms that support recovery from failure. In addition to many specific recoverable and lock-free data structures, several transformations were suggested to make lock-free algorithms recoverable.

The *tracking* approach [3] is perhaps the most related to the research thread described



earlier. It incorporates recoverability to lock-free algorithms, as it assumes that algorithms incorporate *info-objects*, similar in functionality to the object descriptors used, e.g., in [5]. The info-objects are used to track the progress of an operation, which in turn, is used to recover its state and effects during recovery.

*Mirror* [22] is a transformation that automatically adds durability to lock-free data structures. The main idea underlying Mirror is to have two copies of the data. Only the write to the first copy is persisted, while reads are done from the second copy, which is placed in volatile memory. Mirror demonstrates good performance in read-dominated workloads.

*FliT* [36] is a library that makes any linearizable data structure durable, through the use of a persistent programming interface. It builds on the generic transformation of Izraelevits et al. [27], but uses a sophisticated tagging mechanism to reduce the number of flush instructions and achieves good performance. Lock-freedom is preserved, if the original program was lock-free. (See a formal verification of FliT in [10].)

The *Capsules* approach [6] transforms a concurrent program with reads, writes and CASs into a persistent one, with a constant overhead. (See also the implementation of persistent operations in [4].) Like FliT, this approach preserves the lock-freedom properties of the program, but a blocking implementation will remain so.

*Memento* [13] is a general programming framework for detectably recoverable concurrent data structures, which preserves lock-freedom. It provides timestamp-based checkpoint and compare-and-swap operations. Similarly, *Mangosteen* [16] is a programming framework that translates a linearizable application to be a durably linearizable. It employs binary instrumentation and redo logging, and it batches memory accesses to reduce the cost of persistence.

None of the above transformations introduces both lock-freedom and durability starting from a lock-based implementation.

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed RFLOCK, the first transformation that can be applied directly on a lock-based programme to introduce both lock-freedom and recoverability. RFLOCK is general enough to be widely applicable (supporting also nested locks). The transformation ensures recoverability without jeopardising the correctness of the lock-based implementation it is applied on. We have performed a preliminary set of experiment to study the efficiency of our approach in practice. The results are promising but a complete experimental analysis is yet to be performed.

---

## References

- 1 Hagit Attiya, Ohad Ben-Baruch, Panagiota Fatourou, Danny Hendler, and Eleftherios Kosmas. Tracking in order to recover - detectable recovery of lock-free data structures. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures (SPAA)*, SPAA '20', pages 503–505, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.
- 2 Hagit Attiya, Ohad Ben-Baruch, Panagiota Fatourou, Danny Hendler, and Eleftherios Kosmas. Detectable recovery of lock-free data structures. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming, PPOPP '22*, page 262–277, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery.
- 3 Hagit Attiya, Ohad Ben-Baruch, Panagiota Fatourou, Danny Hendler, and Eleftherios Kosmas. Tracking in order to recover: Detectable recovery of lock-free data structures, 2022.
- 4 Hagit Attiya, Ohad Ben-Baruch, and Danny Hendler. Nesting-safe recoverable linearizability: Modular constructions for non-volatile memory. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Symposium*

- on *Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2018, Egham, United Kingdom, July 23-27, 2018*, pages 7–16, 2018.
- 5 Greg Barnes. A method for implementing lock-free shared-data structures. In *Proceedings of the 5th Annual ACM Symposium on Parallel Algorithms and Architectures, SPAA '93, Velen, Germany, June 30 - July 2, 1993*, pages 261–270, 1993.
  - 6 Naama Ben-David, Guy E Blelloch, Michal Friedman, and Yuanhao Wei. Delay-free concurrency on faulty persistent memory. In *The 31st ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures*, pages 253–264, 2019.
  - 7 Naama Ben-David, Guy E. Blelloch, and Yuanhao Wei. Making concurrent algorithms detectable. *CoRR*, abs/1806.04780, 2018. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1806.04780>.
  - 8 Naama Ben-David, Guy E Blelloch, and Yuanhao Wei. Lock-free locks revisited. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming*, pages 278–293, 2022.
  - 9 Ryan Berryhill, Wojciech M. Golab, and Mahesh Tripunitara. Robust shared objects for non-volatile main memory. In *19th International Conference on Principles of Distributed Systems, OPODIS 2015, December 14-17, 2015, Rennes, France*, pages 20:1–20:17, 2015. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.OPODIS.2015.20>.
  - 10 Stefan Bodenmüller, John Derrick, Brijesh Dongol, Gerhard Schellhorn, and Heike Wehrheim. A fully verified persistency library. In *Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation (VMCAI)*, pages 26–47, 2024.
  - 11 Wentao Cai, Haosen Wen, H. Alan Beadle, Chris Kjellqvist, Mohammad Hedayati, and Michael L. Scott. Understanding and optimizing persistent memory allocation. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on Memory Management, ISMM 2020*, pages 60–73, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.
  - 12 Shimin Chen and Qin Jin. Persistent b+-trees in non-volatile main memory. *PVLDB*, 8(7):786–797, 2015. URL: <http://www.vldb.org/pvldb/vol8/p786-chen.pdf>.
  - 13 Kyeongmin Cho, Seungmin Jeon, Azalea Raad, and Jeehoon Kang. Memento: A framework for detectable recoverability in persistent memory. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, PLDI:292–317, 2023.
  - 14 Joel Coburn, Adrian M. Caulfield, Ameen Akel, Laura M. Grupp, Rajesh K. Gupta, Ranjit Jhala, and Steven Swanson. Nv-heaps: making persistent objects fast and safe with next-generation, non-volatile memories. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, ASPLOS 2011, Newport Beach, CA, USA, March 5-11, 2011*, pages 105–118, 2011. URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1950365.1950380>.
  - 15 Marc A De Kruijf, Karthikeyan Sankaralingam, and Somesh Jha. Static analysis and compiler design for idempotent processing. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, pages 475–486, 2012.
  - 16 Sergey Egorov, Gregory Chockler, Brijesh Dongol, Dan O’Keeffe, and Sadegh Keshavarzi. Mangosteen: Fast transparent durability for linearizable applications using NVM. In *USENIX Annual Technical Conference (ATC)*, 2024.
  - 17 Panagiota Fatourou, Nikolaos D. Kallimanis, and Eleftherios Kosmas. The performance power of software combining in persistence. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming, PPoPP '22*, page 337–352, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3503221.3508426>.
  - 18 Panagiota Fatourou, Elias Papavasileiou, and Eric Ruppert. Persistent non-blocking binary search trees supporting wait-free range queries. In *Proc. 31st ACM on Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures*, pages 275–286, 2019.
  - 19 Michal Friedman, Naama Ben-David, Yuanhao Wei, Guy E. Blelloch, and Erez Petrank. Nvtraverse: In nvram data structures, the destination is more important than the journey. In *Proceedings of the 41st ACM Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*,

- PLDI 2020, page 377–392, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3385412.3386031>.
- 20 Michal Friedman, Maurice Herlihy, Virendra J. Marathe, and Erez Petrank. A persistent lock-free queue for non-volatile memory. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming, PPOPP 2018, Vienna, Austria, February 24–28, 2018*, pages 28–40, 2018. URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3178487.3178490>.
  - 21 Michal Friedman, Erez Petrank, and Pedro Ramalhete. Mirror: Making lock-free data structures persistent. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2021*, page 1218–1232, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3453483.3454105>.
  - 22 Michal Friedman, Erez Petrank, and Pedro Ramalhete. Mirror: making lock-free data structures persistent. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, pages 1218–1232, 2021.
  - 23 Maurice Herlihy. Wait-free synchronization. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS)*, 13(1):124–149, 1991.
  - 24 Maurice Herlihy. A methodology for implementing highly concurrent data objects. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS)*, 15(5):745–770, 1993.
  - 25 Maurice Herlihy and J. Eliot B. Moss. Transactional memory: Architectural support for lock-free data structures. *SIGARCH Comput. Archit. News*, 21(2):289–300, may 1993.
  - 26 Peter Zilahy Ingerman. Thunks: a way of compiling procedure statements with some comments on procedure declarations. *Communications of the ACM*, 4(1):55–58, 1961.
  - 27 Joseph Izraelevitz, Hammurabi Mendes, and Michael L. Scott. Linearizability of persistent memory objects under a full-system-crash failure model. In *Distributed Computing - 30th International Symposium, DISC 2016, Paris, France, September 27–29, 2016. Proceedings*, pages 313–327, 2016. URL: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-53426-7\\_23](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-53426-7_23).
  - 28 Joseph Izraelevitz, Hammurabi Mendes, and Michael L. Scott. Linearizability of persistent memory objects under a full-system-crash failure model. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Symposium of Distributed Computing*, volume LNCS 9888, pages 313–327. Springer, 2016.
  - 29 Maged M. Michael and Michael L. Scott. Simple, fast, and practical non-blocking and blocking concurrent queue algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, May 23–26, 1996*, pages 267–275, 1996. URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/248052.248106>.
  - 30 Ravi Rajwar and James R Goodman. Speculative lock elision: Enabling highly concurrent multithreaded execution. In *Proceedings. 34th ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Microarchitecture. MICRO-34*, pages 294–305. IEEE, 2001.
  - 31 Ravi Rajwar and James R Goodman. Transactional lock-free execution of lock-based programs. *ACM SIGOPS Operating Systems Review*, 36(5):5–17, 2002.
  - 32 Pedro Ramalhete, Andreia Correia, Pascal Felber, and Nachshon Cohen. Onefile: A wait-free persistent transactional memory. In *49th Annual IEEE/IFIP Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks, DSN 2019, Portland, OR, USA, June 24–27, 2019*, pages 151–163. IEEE, 2019. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/DSN.2019.00028>.
  - 33 Gal Sela and Erez Petrank. *Durable Queues: The Second Amendment*, page 385–397. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2021. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3409964.3461791>.
  - 34 Maurice Herlihy & Nir Shavit. *The art of multiprocessor programming*. Morgan Kaufmann, 2008.
  - 35 John Turek, Dennis Shasha, and Sundeep Prakash. Locking without blocking: making lock based concurrent data structure algorithms nonblocking. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Symposium on Principles of database systems*, pages 212–222, 1992.
  - 36 Yuanhao Wei, Naama Ben-David, Michal Friedman, Guy E Blelloch, and Erez Petrank. FliT: a library for simple and efficient persistent algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming*, pages 309–321, 2022.

- 37 Yoav Zuriel, Michal Friedman, Gali Sheffi, Nachshon Cohen, and Erez Petrank. Efficient lock-free durable sets. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 3(OOPSLA), oct 2019.