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Paradigm


- The Dijkstra's language is a parallel extension of ALGOL60 with
  P (lock/take), V (unlock/release), and `parbegin` ... `parend`
- Shared memory (e.g. Parallel RAM - Concurrent Read Exclusive Write)
- e.g. POSIX\(^1\) Threads
- Parallel compound can occur anywhere in a program e.g.

\[
x := 0 ; y := 0 ; (x := 1 || y := 1)
\]

- The Carson and Reynolds language is a restriction of Dijkstra's language:
  - Operator `||` in outermost position: only sequential processes are executed in parallel
  - Neither branchings nor loops

\(^1\)Portable Operating Systems Interface, X is a reference to Unix
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Declarations

- \texttt{sem} \langle \texttt{int} \rangle \langle \texttt{set of identifiers} \rangle
e.g. \texttt{sem 3 a b c d}
- \texttt{sync} \langle \texttt{int} \rangle \langle \texttt{set of identifiers} \rangle
e.g. \texttt{sync 3 a b c d}
- \texttt{mtx} \langle \texttt{set of identifiers} \rangle
e.g. \texttt{mtx a b c d}
- \texttt{var} \langle \texttt{identifier} \rangle = \langle \texttt{constant} \rangle
e.g. \texttt{var x = 0}
- \texttt{proc} \langle \texttt{identifier} \rangle = \langle \texttt{basic block} \rangle
- \texttt{init} \langle \texttt{multiset of identifiers} \rangle
e.g. \texttt{init a 2b 3c}
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Expressions and values

The set of expressions is inductively built on the set of identifiers and the following set of operators:

- $\text{identifiers}$
- $V$
- $x \in \mathbb{R}$
- $\land$, $\lor$
- $+$, $-$, $\ast$, $/$
- $\leq$, $\geq$
- $<$, $>$
- $=$, $\neq$
- $\neg$
- $\%$
- $\bot$
Expressions and values

The set of expressions is inductively built on the set of identifiers and the following set of operators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ν</th>
<th>content of ν ∈ V</th>
<th>x ∈ R</th>
<th>constant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>∧</td>
<td>minimum</td>
<td>∨</td>
<td>maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>addition</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>subtraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>multiplication</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤</td>
<td>less or equal</td>
<td>≥</td>
<td>greater of equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>strictly less</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>strictly greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>equal</td>
<td>≠</td>
<td>not equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¬</td>
<td>complement</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>modulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⊥</td>
<td>nullary</td>
<td></td>
<td>unary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_nullary_:
- ⊥, x ∈ R, ν ∈ V

_unary_:
- ¬

_binary_:
- ∧, ∨, +, −, *, /, <, >, ≤, ≥, =, ≠, %
Non branching instructions

- identifier := expression
  the expression is evaluated then the result is stored in the identifier

- P(identifier)
  takes an occurrence of the resource identifier (there are arity available tokens), stops the process otherwise

- V(identifier)
  release an occurrence of the resource identifier (if such an occurrence is held by the process), ignored otherwise

- W(identifier)
  stops the execution of the process until arity + 1 of them are stopped by the barrier

- J(identifier)
  the execution of the process is stopped and the one of a copy of identifier starts. There is no return mechanism.

- (L enclose a list of instructions between parenthesis to make it a single instruction
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- identifier:=expression the expression is evaluated then the result is stored in the identifier
- P(identifier) takes an occurrence of the resource identifier (there are arity available tokens), stops the process otherwise
- V(identifier) release an occurrence of the resource identifier (if such an occurrence is held by the process), ignored otherwise
- W(identifier) stops the execution of the process until arity + 1 of them are stopped by the barrier identifier
- J(identifier) the execution of the process is stopped and the one of a copy of identifier starts. There is no return mechanism.
- (L) enclose a list of instructions between parenthesis to make it a single instruction
Branching

The branching is provided by a kind of "match case like" instruction 
\[(L_1)^+ [e_1] + (L_2)^+ [e_2] + \cdots + (L_n)^+ [e_n] + (L_{n+1})\]

- Each \(L_k\) is a basic block
- Each \(e_k\) is an expression
- The triggered branch is \(L_k\) with \(k\) being the first index such that \(e_k\) evaluate to some nonzero value
- If all the expressions evaluate to zero, then \(L_{n+1}\) is triggered.
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Describing a process

The body of a process is just a (possibly empty) sequence of instructions, i.e., a basic block, separated by semicolons. For example, the Hasse/Syracuse algorithm with input value 7:

```plaintext
proc p = x:=7;J(q)
proc q = J(r)+[x<>1]+()
proc r = (x:=x/2)+[x%2=0]+(x:=3*x+1); J(q)
```

Due to the branchings, basic blocks are actually trees.
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The body of a process is just a (possibly empty) sequence of instructions, i.e. a basic block, separated by semicolons. e.g. the Hasse/Syracuse algorithm with input value 7

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{proc } p &= x:=7; J(q) \\
\text{proc } q &= J(r) + [x \neq 1] + () \\
\text{proc } r &= (x:=x/2) + [x \mod 2 = 0] + (x:=3x+1) ; J(q) \\
\text{init } p
\end{align*}
\]
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```
proc p = x:=7; J(q)
proc q = J(r)+[x<>1]+()
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```

Due to the branchings, basic blocks are actually trees.
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Control flow graphs and flowcharts

Control flow analysis, *F. E. Allen*, 1970
Assigning meanings to programs, *R. W. Floyd*, 1967

- Compilers and static analyzers internal representation of programs.
- No theoretical definition yet control flow graphs must be finite for practical reasons.
- At the core of many softwares dealing with source code
  e.g. GCC (cf. “basic blocks”), LLVM, Frama-C.
- No such structure exist for parallel programs.
Generators

\[ x := f \]

\[ a_1 \]

\[ b_1 \]

\[ \phi? \]

Yes

\[ b_1 \]

No

\[ b_2 \]

\[ a_1 \]

\[ a_2 \]

\[ b_1 \]

\[ a_1 \]

\[ \text{START} \]

\[ b_1 \]

\[ \text{HALT} \]
The Hasse-Syracuse algorithm in PAML

```paml
var x = 7

proc p = ()+[x=1]+J(q)

proc q = (x:=x/2) + [x%2=0] + (x:=3*x+1) ; J(p)

init p
```
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Building the control flow graph
of the Hasse-Syracuse algorithm

\[
\begin{align*}
x &= 1 \\
x &= 3x + 1 \\
\text{entry point of the basic block of } p \\
x &= x/2 \\
\text{entry point of the basic block of } q \\
x &\% 2 = 0 \\
x &= 3x + 1 \\
\end{align*}
\]
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The current value of \( x \) is 7

\begin{align*}
  x &= x/2 \\
  x &= 3 \times x + 1 \\
  x &\equiv 0 \mod 2 \\
  x &= 1
\end{align*}
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- Entry point
- $x := x/2$
- $x := 3x + 1$
- $x \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$
- $x = 1$
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- $x := x/2$
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- Any execution trace induces a path
- Some paths do not come from an execution trace
- Therefore the collection of path provides a (strict) overapproximation of the collection of execution traces
- The (infinite) collection of paths is entirely determined by the (finite) control flow graph
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Any model of a program should contain a finite representation of an overapproximation of the collection of all its execution traces.

One of the goal of the course it to provide such a structure for a large class of PAML programs.
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By construction the PAML language enforces the following restrictions

- There is neither birth nor death of processes at runtime
- The arity of resources cannot be changed at runtime
- There is no pointer arithmetics
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- The set of expressions occurring in the program is denoted by $\mathcal{E}$. 
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The sets of semaphores, and barriers of a program are respectively $S$ and $B$.
- An assignment is an element of $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{E}$ yet we write $x := \varepsilon$ instead of $(x, \varepsilon)$. By extension $\mathcal{F}(x := \varepsilon) = \mathcal{F}(\varepsilon)$.
- Given a graph
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Abstract instructions

The sets of semaphores, and barriers of a program are respectively $S$ and $B$.

- An assignment is an element of $X \times E$ yet we write $x := \varepsilon$ instead of $(x, \varepsilon)$. By extension $F(x := \varepsilon) = F(\varepsilon)$.

- Given a graph

$$G : A \xrightarrow{\partial^{-}} V \xleftarrow{\partial^{+}}$$

a conditional branching at vertex $v \in V$ is a mapping

$$\beta : \{\text{valuations}\} \rightarrow \{a \in A \mid \partial a = v\}$$

together with a subset $F(\beta) \subseteq X$ such that if the valuations $\nu$ and $\nu'$ match on $F(\beta)$ then $\beta(\nu) = \beta(\nu')$.

- The synchronisation primitives $P(s)$, $V(s)$, and $W(b)$ for $s \in S$ and $b \in B$
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\[ G : A \xrightarrow{\partial} V \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda : V \rightarrow \{\text{instructions}\} \]

- An entry point \( v_0 \in V \) such that \( \lambda(v_0) = \text{Skip} \).
- If \( \lambda(v) \neq \text{Skip} \), then \( v \) has at least one outgoing arrow.
- If \( \lambda(v) \) is not a branching, then \( v \) has at most one outgoing arrow.

The arrows are interpreted as intermediate positions of the instruction pointer so a point on a control flow graph is either a vertex or an arrow.
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- The initial valuation $\nu : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which provides the values of the variables at the beginning of each execution of the program.
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Points and multi-instructions

*Higher Dimensional Transition Systems*, G. L. Cattani and V. Sassone, 1996
Points and multi-instructions

*Higher Dimensional Transition Systems*, G. L. Cattani and V. Sassone, 1996

- A point of \((G_1, \ldots, G_n)\) is an \(n\)-tuple \(p\) whose \(i^{th}\) component, namely \(p_i\), is a point of \(G_i\).
Points and multi-instructions

*Higher Dimensional Transition Systems*, G. L. Cattani and V. Sassone, 1996

- A point of $(G_1, \ldots, G_n)$ is an $n$-tuple $p$ whose $i^{th}$ component, namely $p_i$, is a point of $G_i$.
- A multi-instruction is a partial map $\mu : \{1, \ldots, n\} \rightarrow \{\text{instructions}\}$. 
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Admissible multi-instructions

The possible conflicts are:
- write-write: \( x := \varepsilon \) vs \( x := \varepsilon' \)
- read-write: \( x := \varepsilon \) vs an instruction in which \( x \) is free

A multi-instruction \( \mu \) is said to be admissible at state \( \sigma \) when:
- for \( i, j \in \text{dom}(\mu) \) with \( i \neq j \), \( \mu(i) \) and \( \mu(j) \) do not conflict,
- for all \( s \in S \), \( 0 \leq \phi(s) \leq \alpha(s) \) where \( \phi(s) = |\sigma(s)| + \text{card }\left\{ i \in \text{dom}(\mu) \mid \mu(i) = P(s) \right\} - \text{card }\left\{ i \in \text{dom}(\mu) \mid \mu(i) = V(s) \right\} \)
- for all \( b \in B \), \( \text{card }\left\{ i \in \text{dom}(\mu) \mid \mu(i) = W(b) \right\} \notin \{1, \ldots, \alpha(b)\} \)
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Action of a multi-instruction on a state

Assuming that \( \mu \) is admissible at \( \sigma \)

The state \( \sigma \cdot \mu \) is defined as follows.

- For every \( x \in X \), if there exists \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) s.t. \( \mu(i) = x \) := \( \varepsilon \), then one has \( (\sigma \cdot \mu)(x) = \varepsilon (\sigma | X) \).

Otherwise one has \( (\sigma \cdot \mu)(x) = \sigma(x) \).

- For all \( s \in S \) the multiset \( (\sigma \cdot \mu)(s) \), seen as a mapping from \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \) to \( \mathbb{N} \), is given by

\[
\begin{cases}
  \sigma(s)(i) + 1 & \text{if } i \in \text{dom}(\mu) \text{ and } \mu(i) = P(s) \\
  \sigma(s)(i) - 1 & \text{if } i \in \text{dom}(\mu) \text{ and } \mu(i) = V(s) \\
  \sigma(s)(i) & \text{in all other cases}
\end{cases}
\]

A sequence \( \mu_0, \ldots, \mu_{q-1} \) of multi-instructions is said to be admissible at state \( \sigma \) when for all \( k \in \{0, \ldots, q-1\} \) the multi-instruction \( \mu_k \) is admissible at state \( \sigma \cdot \mu_0 \cdots \mu_{k-1} \).
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The state $\sigma \cdot \mu$ is defined as follows.

- For every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, if there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ s.t. $\mu(i)$ is $x := \epsilon$, then one has
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The state $\sigma \cdot \mu$ is defined as follows.
- For every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, if there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ s.t. $\mu(i)$ is $x := \varepsilon$, then one has
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\]

Otherwise one has $(\sigma \cdot \mu)(x) = \sigma(x)$. 
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- $\gamma_i(k) = \gamma_i(k + 1)$ or $\partial^+ \gamma_i(k) = \gamma_i(k + 1)$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

Then $\gamma$ is associated with a sequence of multi-instructions $(\mu_k)_{k \in \{0, \ldots, q-1\}}$ defined for $k \in \{0, \ldots, q-1\}$ by

- $\text{dom}(\mu_k) = \{i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} | \gamma_i(k + 1) = \partial^+ \gamma_i(k) \text{ or } \lambda_i(\gamma_i(k + 1)) = W(\_)[i] \}$
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- $\gamma_i(k) = \gamma_i(k+1)$ or $\partial^+ \gamma_i(k) = \gamma_i(k+1)$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

Then $\gamma$ is associated with a sequence of multi-instructions $(\mu_k)_{k \in \{0, \ldots, q-1\}}$ defined for $k \in \{0, \ldots, q-1\}$ by

- $\text{dom}(\mu_k) = \{i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \mid \gamma_i(k+1) = \partial^+ \gamma_i(k) \text{ or } \lambda_i(\gamma_i(k+1)) = W(\_)}$
- $\mu_k(i) = \lambda_i(\gamma_i(k+1))$ for all $k \in \{0, \ldots, q-1\}$ and all $i \in \text{dom}(\mu_k)$
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Given $\sigma$ a state of the program, a directed path is said to be admissible at $\sigma$ when so is its associated sequence of multi-instructions at state $\sigma$. In this case we define the action of $\gamma$ on the right of $\sigma$ as follows.

$$\sigma \cdot \gamma = \sigma \cdot \mu_0 \cdot \mu_{q-1}$$
Admissible paths and execution traces

Given $\sigma$ a state of the program, a directed path is said to be admissible at $\sigma$ when so is its associated sequence of multi-instructions at state $\sigma$. In this case we define the action of $\gamma$ on the right of $\sigma$ as follows.

$$\sigma \cdot \gamma = \sigma \cdot \mu_0 \cdots \mu_{q-1}$$

An admissible path is an execution trace when all the conditional branchings met along the way are respected: for all $k \in \{0, \ldots, q - 2\}$ and all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $\mu_k(i)$, which is by definition $\lambda_i(\gamma_i(k + 1))$, is a branching, we have

$$(\mu_k(i))(\sigma \cdot \mu_0 \cdots \mu_{k-1}) = \gamma_i(k + 2)$$
Concurrent access

\begin{align*}
\text{var } x &= 0 \\
\text{proc } p &= x := 1 \\
\text{proc } q &= x := 2 \\
\text{init } p &\quad q
\end{align*}
Admissible execution trace

The value of $x$ is 0
Admissible execution trace

the value of $x$ is 0
Admissible execution trace

the value of $x$ is 0
Admissible execution trace

The value of $x$ is 1
Admissible execution trace

the value of $x$ is $2$
Admissible execution trace

The value of $x$ is 2
Admissible execution trace

the value of \( x \) is 2
Admissible execution trace

The value of $x$ is 2
Not admissible execution trace

x := 1
x := 2

the value of x is 0
Not admissible execution trace

the value of x is 0
Not admissible execution trace

the value of $x$ is 0
Not admissible execution trace

the value of $x$ is $?$. 

$x := 1$

$x := 2$
Lack of resources

sem 1 a

proc p = P(a);V(a)

init 2p
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Synchronisation

\[ \text{sync 1 b} \]

\[ \text{proc p = W(b)} \]

\[ \text{init 2p} \]
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Next goal

Encode admissibility into a model.
CONSERVATIVE PROGRAMS
Potential Functions
The potential functions of processes and programs

A program $\Pi = (G_1, \ldots, G_n)$ is conservative when for all directed paths starting at the origin, the amount of semaphores held by the program at the end of the path only depends on its arrival point.

For all initial states $\sigma$, for all directed paths $\gamma, \gamma'$ starting at the origin,

$$\partial^+ \gamma = \partial^+ \gamma' \Rightarrow \sigma \cdot \gamma|_S = \sigma \cdot \gamma'|_S$$

In particular, the program $\Pi$ comes with a potential function $F_\Pi$: \{semaphores\} $\times$ \{points\} $\rightarrow$ $\mathbb{N}$. \{points\} $\rightarrow$ \{multisets over $S$\}

Proposition: The program $\Pi$ is conservative if and only if so are its processes $G_1, \ldots, G_n$ and its potential function is given by

$$F_\Pi(p_1, \ldots, p_n) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} F_{G_k}(p_k)$$
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Conservativity is decidable

We inductively define a sequence of partial functions $\pi_n : \{ \text{points} \} \to \mathbb{N}$. 

- The first term $\pi_0$ is only defined at the origin and $\pi_0(\text{origin})$ is the empty.

- Assuming that $\pi_n$ is defined, for all pairs of points $(p, p')$ such that:
  
  - $\pi_n(p)$ is defined but not $\pi_n(p')$,
  - $\partial^- p' = p$ or $p' = \partial^+ p$,

  we define a strict extension of $\pi_n$, by setting:
  
  $p' \mapsto \pi_n(p)$ if $\partial^- p' = p$,
  $\lambda(p')$ if $p' = \partial^+ p$.

- If all these extensions are compatible, then $\pi_{n+1}$ is their union.

Otherwise the induction stops and the graph is not conservative.

- If all the points have been "visited" we have a finite chain of strict extensions $\pi_0 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \pi_n \subseteq \pi_{n+1} = \pi$ whose last element is denoted by $\pi$.

- If the following holds for all ordered pairs of points $(p, p')$ such that $\partial^- p' = p$ or $p' = \partial^+ p$, then $G$ is conservative, otherwise it is not.

$\pi(p') = \pi(p)$ if $\partial^- p' = p$,
$\lambda(p')$ if $p' = \partial^+ p$. 
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We inductively define a sequence of partial functions $\pi_n : \text{points} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^S$. 

- The first term $\pi_0$ is only defined at the origin and $\pi_0(\text{origin})$ is the empty.
- Assuming that $\pi_n$ is defined, for all pairs of points $(p, p')$ such that:
  - $\pi_n(p)$ is defined but not $\pi_n(p')$,
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We inductively define a sequence of partial functions $\pi_n : \{\text{points}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^S$.
- The first term $\pi_0$ is only defined at the origin and $\pi_0(\text{origin})$ is the empty set.
- Assuming that $\pi_n$ is defined, for all pairs of points $(p, p')$ such that:
  - $\pi_n(p)$ is defined but not $\pi_n(p')$,
  - $\partial^- p' = p$ or $p' = \partial^+ p$,
we define a strict extension of $\pi_n$, by setting:
  - $p' \rightarrow \pi_n(p)$ if $\partial^- p' = p$,
  - $\lambda(p')$ if $p' = \partial^+ p$.
- If all these extensions are compatible, then $\pi_n + 1$ is their union.
- Otherwise the induction stops and the graph is not conservative.
- If all the points have been “visited” we have a finite chain of strict extensions $\pi_0 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \pi_n \subseteq \pi_n + 1 = \pi$ whose last element is denoted by $\pi$.
- If the following holds for all ordered pairs of points $(p, p')$ such that $\partial^- p' = p$ or $p' = \partial^+ p$, then $G$ is conservative, otherwise it is not.
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We inductively define a sequence of partial functions $\pi_n : \{\text{points}\} \to \mathbb{N}^S$.

- The first term $\pi_0$ is only defined at the origin and $\pi_0(\text{origin})$ is the empty

- Assuming that $\pi_n$ is defined, for all pairs of points $(p, p')$ such that:
  - $\pi_n(p)$ is defined but not $\pi_n(p')$, 
  - $\pi_n(p)$ is defined but not $\pi_n(p')$, 
  - $\partial_-p' = p$ or $p' = \partial_+p$, 

If all these extensions are compatible, then $\pi_{n+1}$ is their union. Otherwise the induction stops and the graph is not conservative.

If all the points have been "visited" we have a finite chain of strict extensions $\pi_0 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \pi_n \subseteq \pi_{n+1} = \pi_n$ whose last element is denoted by $\pi_n$.

If the following holds for all ordered pairs of points $(p, p')$ such that $\partial_-p' = p$ or $p' = \partial_+p$, then $G$ is conservative, otherwise it is not.

\[ \pi_n(p') = \pi_n(p) \text{ if } \partial_-p' = p \]
\[ \lambda(p') \text{ if } p' = \partial_+p \]
Conservativity is decidable

We inductively define a sequence of partial functions \( \pi_n : \{\text{points}\} \to \mathbb{N}^S \).

- The first term \( \pi_0 \) is only defined at the origin and \( \pi_0(\text{origin}) \) is the empty set.
- Assuming that \( \pi_n \) is defined, for all pairs of points \((p, p')\) such that:
  - \( \pi_n(p) \) is defined but not \( \pi_n(p') \), and
  - \( \partial \cdot p' = p \) or \( p' = \partial \cdot p \),

we define a strict extension of \( \pi_n \), by setting:

\[
\begin{align*}
\pi_n'(p') &= \pi_n(p) \\
&= \pi_n(p') \\
&= \lambda(p')
\end{align*}
\]

- If all these extensions are compatible, then \( \pi_n + 1 \) is their union.
- If all the points have been "visited" we have a finite chain of strict extensions \( \pi_0 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \pi_n \subseteq \pi_{n+1} = \pi \) whose last element is denoted by \( \pi \).
- If the following holds for all ordered pairs of points \((p, p')\) such that \( \partial \cdot p' = p \) or \( p' = \partial \cdot p \), then \( G \) is conservative, otherwise it is not.
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We inductively define a sequence of partial functions $\pi_n : \{\text{points}\} \to \mathbb{N}^S$.

- The first term $\pi_0$ is only defined at the origin and $\pi_0(\text{origin})$ is the empty
- Assuming that $\pi_n$ is defined, for all pairs of points $(p, p')$ such that:
  - $\pi_n(p)$ is defined but not $\pi_n(p')$, and
  - $\partial p' = p$ or $p' = \partial^+ p$,
we define a strict extension of $\pi_n$, by setting:

$$
p' \mapsto \begin{cases} 
\pi_n(p) & \text{if } \partial p' = p \\
\pi_n(p) \cdot \lambda(p') & \text{if } p' = \partial^+ p 
\end{cases}
$$
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- If all these extensions are compatible, then $\pi_{n+1}$ is their union.
  Otherwise the induction stops and the graph is not conservative.

- If all the points have been “visited” we have a finite chain of strict extensions

  $$
  \pi_0 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \pi_n \subseteq \pi_{n+1} = \pi
  $$

  whose last element is denoted by $\pi$.

- If the following holds for all ordered pairs of points $(p, p')$ such that $\partial p' = p$ or $p' = \partial^+ p$, then $G$ is conservative, otherwise it is not.

  $$
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Discrete Models
The discrete model of a conservative program

A point $p = (p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ of the conservative program is said to be:
- conflicting when $\lambda_i(p_i)$ and $\lambda_j(p_j)$ conflict for some $i \neq j$,
- exhausting when there is some semaphore $s \in S$ such that $F(p_1, \ldots, p_n, s) \notin \{0, \ldots, \text{arity}(s)\}$,
- desynchronizing when there is some synchronization barrier $b \in B$ such that $0 < \text{card} \{i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} | \lambda_i(p_i) = W(b) \leq \text{arity}(b)\}$.

The forbidden set gathers all the conflicting, exhausting, and desynchronizing points.

${\text{forbidden}} = \{\text{conflicting}\} \cup \{\text{exhausting}\} \cup \{\text{desynchronizing}\}$

The discrete model is the complement of its forbidden set.

$\{\text{points of the program}\} \setminus \{\text{forbidden points}\}$
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- **conflicting** when \( \lambda_i(p_i) \) and \( \lambda_j(p_j) \) conflict for some \( i \neq j \),
- **exhausting** when there is some semaphore \( s \in S \) such that
  \[
  F(p_1, \ldots, p_n, s) \notin \{0, \ldots, \text{arity}(s)\},
  \]
- **desynchronizing** when there is some synchronization barrier \( b \in B \) such that
  \[
  0 < \text{card}\{i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \mid \lambda_i(p_i) = W(b)\} \leq \text{arity}(b),
  \]

The **forbidden** set gathers all the conflicting, exhausting, and desynchronizing points.

\[
\{\text{fobidden}\} = \{\text{conflicting}\} \cup \{\text{exhausting}\} \cup \{\text{desynchronizing}\}
\]

The **discrete model** is the complement of its forbidden set.

\[
\{\text{points of the program}\} \setminus \{\text{forbidden points}\}
\]
Discrete model

\[ \text{sem 1 a} \]
Discrete model

\texttt{sem 1 a}
Discrete model

sem 1 a
Discrete model

\[\text{sem} \ 1 \ a\]
Discrete model
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Discrete Model

\[ \text{sync 1 b} \]
Discrete Model
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Discrete Model

\[ \text{sync } 1 \ b \]
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\[ \text{sync } 1 \ b \]
Discrete Model

sync 1 b
Discrete Model

sync 1 b
Main theorem of discrete models

- Soundness: any directed path on a discrete model (i.e., which does not meet any forbidden point) is admissible.
- Completeness: for each admissible path which meets a forbidden point there exists a directed path which avoids them and such that both directed paths induce the same sequence of multi-instructions.
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- **Soundness**: any directed path on a discrete model (i.e. which does not meet any forbidden point) is admissible.

- **Completeness**: for each admissible path which meets a forbidden point there exists a directed path which avoids them and such that both directed paths induce the same sequence of multi-instructions.
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The value of \( x \) is \( 2 \).
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\[ x := 2 \]
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\[ x := 1 \]
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Replacement

\[ x := 2, \quad x := 1, \quad x := x \]

\[ x := x \]

\[ x := x \]