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Process interleavings are one of the main sources of state-space explosion for explicit model checkers

## Partial Order Reductions (POR)

- Build a reduced state space
- For each state only consider a reduced subset of actions

State Space


Possible Reduced State Space


POR work only iff the property to check belongs to LTL $\backslash X$
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## Requires an extra condition: the proviso

A proviso ${ }^{a}$ ensures that every cycle in the reduced graph contains at least one expanded state, i.e, a state where all actions are considered.

[^0]
## Model Checking LTL\X with POR

Use classical DFS-based emptiness checks
During DFS:

- how to detect cycles without expanded states?
- which state to expand in a cycle?

Objectives:

- Choose states to expand states in order to have the smallest reduced state space


## Variations on SPIN's proviso
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Expands the source of backedge iff destination is not expanded

Expanded state $\widehat{\natural}$ Not expanded state $\bullet \quad$ Already visited edge $\rightarrow$

## Evaluation

- 38 models from the BEEM benchmark
- reduced implements the stubborn-set method from Valmari
- Each model is run 100 times with different transition order

|  | states $\left(10^{6}\right)$ |  | transitions $\left(10^{6}\right)$ |  | st/ms |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Full | 784.45 | $100.00 \%$ | $2,677.73$ | $100.00 \%$ | 17.90 |
| SoURCE [Peled, 1994] | 303.21 | $38.65 \%$ | 679.16 | $25.36 \%$ | 12.33 |
| CondSource | 252.83 | $32.23 \%$ | 518.80 | $19.37 \%$ | 11.85 |
| None | 57.58 | $7.34 \%$ | 97.65 | $3.65 \%$ | 22.65 |
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## Deconstructing Evangelista and Pajault [2010] proviso

- Based on CondSource
- Try to reduce useless expansions:
- Must consider all closing-edges:

- Colors: safe, dangerous, on-dfs \& not expanded

| WEIGHTED | SCAN | KNOWN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $c$ |  |  |

## Evaluation of each optimization

|  | states $\left(10^{6}\right)$ |  |  | transitions $\left(10^{6}\right)$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| st/ms |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full | 784.45 | $100.00 \%$ | $2,677.73$ | $100.00 \%$ | 17.90 |
| Source [Peled, 1994] | 303.21 | $38.65 \%$ | 679.16 | $25.36 \%$ | 12.33 |
| WeightedSource | 263.43 | $33.58 \%$ | 537.56 | $20.08 \%$ | 11.68 |
| WeightedSourceKnown |  |  |  |  |  |
| CondSource | 262.63 | $33.48 \%$ | 534.35 | $19.96 \%$ | 11.77 |
| CondSourceKnown | 252.83 | $32.23 \%$ | 518.80 | $19.37 \%$ | 11.85 |
| WeightedSourceScan | 251.05 | $32.00 \%$ | 510.91 | $19.08 \%$ | 11.89 |
| WeightedSourceKnownScan | 10 | 250.49 | $31.93 \%$ | 505.98 | $18.90 \%$ |
| 11.67 |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 248.11 | $31.63 \%$ | 498.68 | $18.62 \%$ | 11.70 |
|  | 57.58 | $7.34 \%$ | 97.65 | $3.65 \%$ | 22.65 |

- Source have the best throughput
- Most of the improvement comes from Cond
- Evangelista's provisos outperforms Source
${ }^{1}$ [Evangelista and Pajault, 2010]
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## Optimizations for these new provisos

- Compatible with: Cond, Weighted, Known
Colored Unknown Deepest


Reuse colors
Mark for expansion
Expand iff necessary

Prioritizing unknown
successsors

DEEPEST


Only mark the deepest dest. for expansion

Mark for expansion $\square \quad$ Already visited edge $\rightarrow \quad$ Not yet visited edge $\rightarrow$

## Evaluation

|  | states $\left(10^{6}\right)$ |  |  | transitions $\left(10^{6}\right)$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | st/ms |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DeepestDestUnknown | 276.51 | $35.25 \%$ | 570.52 | $21.31 \%$ |
| 11.81 |  |  |  |  |
| DeepestDest | 275.31 | $35.10 \%$ | 566.63 | $21.16 \%$ |
| WeightedDestUnknown | 273.94 | $34.92 \%$ | 563.61 | $21.05 \%$ |
| 11.87 |  |  |  |  |
| Dest | 272.79 | $34.77 \%$ | 508.17 | $18.98 \%$ |
| WeightedDest | 272.68 | $34.76 \%$ | 559.73 | $20.90 \%$ |
| 11.48 |  |  |  |  |
| WeightedSourceKnownScan | 248.11 | $31.63 \%$ | 498.68 | $18.62 \%$ |
| 11.70 |  |  |  |  |
| CondDest | 213.98 | $27.28 \%$ | 413.15 | $15.43 \%$ |
| 12.57 |  |  |  |  |
| CondDestUnknown | 213.92 | $27.27 \%$ | 412.75 | $15.41 \%$ |
| ColoredDest | 213.92 | $27.27 \%$ | 412.93 | $15.42 \%$ |
| ColoredDestUnknown | 213.83 | $27.26 \%$ | 412.27 | $15.40 \%$ |

- CondDest outperforms state-of-the-art provisos
- Weighted and Deepest variants are disappointing
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## Improving Provisos With SCCs information

- When destination is red, an expansion is required:
- Until now, the source was expanded

> DEAD

Avoid expansions when dest. is dead, i.e. in a fully visited SCC

Highlinks


Adaptation of Deepest when dest. is not on the DFS and not dead

Dead and Highlinks are compatibles with both source and destination expansion-based provisos.

## Evaluation 1/2

|  | states $\left(10^{6}\right)$ |  | transitions $\left(10^{6}\right)$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DeepestDest | 275.31 | $35.10 \%$ | 566.63 | $21.16 \%$ |
| DeadDeepestDest | 269.10 | $34.30 \%$ | 543.64 | $20.30 \%$ |
| WeightedDest | 272.68 | $34.76 \%$ | 559.73 | $20.90 \%$ |
| DeadWeightedDest | 270.62 | $34.50 \%$ | 554.91 | $20.72 \%$ |
| DeadWeightedSourceKnownScan | 247.68 | $31.57 \%$ | 497.79 | $18.59 \%$ |
| ColoredDest | 213.92 | $27.27 \%$ | 412.93 | $15.42 \%$ |
| DeadColoredDest | 213.87 | $27.26 \%$ | 412.80 | $15.42 \%$ |
| HighlinkWeightedDest | 207.41 | $26.44 \%$ | 393.22 | $14.68 \%$ |
| HighlinkWeightedDestScan | 206.23 | $26.29 \%$ | 391.05 | $14.60 \%$ |
| HighlinkWeightedSourceKnown | 203.20 | $25.90 \%$ | 386.84 | $14.45 \%$ |
| HighlinkWeightedSourceKnownScan | 203.08 | $25.89 \%$ | 386.60 | $14.44 \%$ |
| HighlinkDeepestDest | 192.84 | $24.58 \%$ | 349.89 | $13.07 \%$ |
| HighlinkDeepestDestScan | 191.78 | $24.45 \%$ | 347.95 | $12.99 \%$ |

## Evaluation 2/2

- Standard score for selected provisos
- take the set of 1600 runs generated
- compute a mean number $\mu_{M}$ for each model M
- compute a standard deviation $\sigma_{M}$ for each model M
- standard score for a run $r$ is then $\frac{\operatorname{states}(r)-\mu_{M}}{\sigma_{M}}$
- Boxplot standard score



## Conclusion

- Overview of state-of-the-art provisos for checking liveness properties
- New heuristics: Colored, Deepest, Dead, Highlink
- Combination with existing heuristics
- Intensive evaluation
- Independant of the reduction technique: ample set, sttuborn set, etc. (see [Laarman et al., 2014] for survey)


## Our recommended provisos:

- CondDest in NDFS-based emptiness-checks
- HighlinkWeightedSourceKnown in SCC-based emptiness checks (no scan required)
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[^0]:    ${ }^{a}$ More simpler provisos can be applied for safety properties Evangelista and Pajault [2010]

