Heuristics for Checking Liveness Properties with Partial Order Reductions

A. Duret-Lutz, F. Kordon, D. Poitrenaud, E. Renault

Tuesday, October 18th





State Space Explosion

- Two concurrent processes
- β independent of α_1 , α_2 , and α_3

Process 1 Process 2



State Space Explosion

- Two concurrent processes
- β independent of α_1 , α_2 , and α_3



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



POR work only iff the property to check belongs to LTL $\backslash X$

The Ignoring Problem for Liveness Properties

• If the same actions are consistently ignored along a cycle, they may never be executed (below β is never executed)



The Ignoring Problem for Liveness Properties

• If the same actions are consistently ignored along a cycle, they may never be executed (below β is never executed)



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.

^aMore simpler provisos can be applied for safety properties Evangelista and Pajault [2010]

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







Systematically expands the source of a backedge





Systematically expands the source of a backedge





Systematically expands the source of a backedge

Expands the source of backedge iff destination is not expanded



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 (10 ⁶) | | transiti | 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 |

7 / 17

• Based on CONDSOURCE

- Based on CONDSOURCE
- Try to reduce useless expansions:



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



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



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



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



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

| WEIGHTED | SCAN | Known |
|----------|------|-------|
| | | |

weight: 0

Keep track of exp--anded states on DFS

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



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



Keep track of exp--anded states on DFS

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



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



Keep track of exp--anded states on DFS

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



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



Keep track of exp--anded states on DFS

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



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



Keep track of exp--anded states on DFS "safe" states

E. Renault

Deconstructing Evangelista's proviso

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



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



Keep track of exp--anded states on DFS "safe" states

E. Renault

Deconstructing Evangelista's provise

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





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





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





Evaluation of each optimization

| | states (10 ⁶) | | transitions (10 ⁶) | | 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 ¹ | 262.63 | 33.48% | 534.35 | 19.96% | 11.77 |
| CondSource | 252.83 | 32.23% | 518.80 | 19.37% | 11.85 |
| CondSourceKnown | 251.05 | 32.00% | 510.91 | 19.08% | 11.89 |
| WeightedSourceScan | 250.49 | 31.93% | 505.98 | 18.90% | 11.67 |
| ${\sf W} {\sf eighted} {\sf S} {\sf ource} {\sf K} {\sf n} {\sf own} {\sf S} {\sf can}^1$ | 248.11 | 31.63% | 498.68 | 18.62% | 11.70 |
| None | 57.58 | 7.34% | 97.65 | 3.65% | 22.65 |

- $\bullet~\mathrm{SOURCE}$ have the best throughput
- $\bullet\,$ Most of the improvement comes from ${\rm COND}\,$
- Evangelista's provisos outperforms SOURCE
- ¹ [Evangelista and Pajault, 2010]

-

Proposed by Nalumasu and Gopalakrishnan [2002] in a narrower context



Systematically expands the source of a backegde















• Compatible with: COND, WEIGHTED, KNOWN

 Mark for expansion ■
 Already visited edge →
 Not yet visited edge →

 E. Renault
 Destination Expansion Based Provisos
 Tuesday, October 18th
 11 / 17

• Compatible with: COND, WEIGHTED, KNOWN

Colored Unknown Deepest

 Mark for expansion ■
 Already visited edge →
 Not yet visited edge →

 E. Renault
 Destination Expansion Based Provisos
 Tuesday, October 18th
 11 / 17

• Compatible with: COND, WEIGHTED, KNOWN



 Mark for expansion
 Already visited edge ->
 Not yet visited edge ->

 E. Renault
 Destination Expansion Based Provisos
 Tuesday, October 18th
 11 / 17

• Compatible with: COND, WEIGHTED, KNOWN



Reuse colors Mark for expansion Expand iff necessary

 Mark for expansion I
 Already visited edge ->
 Not yet visited edge ->

 E. Renault
 Destination Expansion Based Provisos
 Tuesday, October 18th
 11 / 17

• Compatible with: COND, WEIGHTED, KNOWN



E. Renault

Destination Expansion Based Provisos

Tuesday, October 18th

11 / 17

• Compatible with: COND, WEIGHTED, KNOWN



 Mark for expansion ■
 Already visited edge →
 Not yet visited edge →

 E. Renault
 Destination Expansion Based Provisos
 Tuesday, October 18th
 11 / 17

• Compatible with: COND, WEIGHTED, KNOWN



 Mark for expansion ■
 Already visited edge →
 Not yet visited edge - →

 E. Renault
 Destination Expansion Based Provisos
 Tuesday, October 18th
 11 / 17

Evaluation

| | states (10 ⁶) | | transitions (10 ⁶) | | st/ms |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|-------|
| DeepestDestUnknown | 276.51 | 35.25% | 570.52 | 21.31% | 11.81 |
| DeepestDest | 275.31 | 35.10% | 566.63 | 21.16% | 11.87 |
| WeightedDestUnknown | 273.94 | 34.92% | 563.61 | 21.05% | 11.83 |
| Dest | 272.79 | 34.77% | 508.17 | 18.98% | 14.48 |
| WeightedDest | 272.68 | 34.76% | 559.73 | 20.90% | 11.80 |
| 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% | 12.52 |
| ColoredDest | 213.92 | 27.27% | 412.93 | 15.42% | 12.54 |
| ColoredDestUnknown | 213.83 | 27.26% | 412.27 | 15.40% | 12.46 |

- CONDDEST outperforms state-of-the-art provisos
- $\bullet~{\rm WEIGHTED}$ and ${\rm DEEPEST}$ variants are disappointing

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

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

Dead

HIGHLINKS

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



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

Dead

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



Avoid expansions when dest. is dead, i.e. in a fully visited SCC Adaptation of Deepest when dest. is not on the DFS and not dead

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



Avoid expansions when dest. Adaptation is dead, i.e. in a fully visited SCC is not on the second sec

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

 $\rm DEAD$ and $\rm HIGHLINKS$ are compatibles with both source and destination expansion-based provisos.

Evaluation 1/2

| | states (10 ⁶) | | transitions (10 ⁶) | |
|---|---------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|
| 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% |
| ${\sf DeadWeightedSourceKnownScan}$ | 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% |
| ${\sf HighlinkWeightedSourceKnownScan}$ | 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 μ_M for each model M
 - compute a standard deviation σ_M for each model M
 - ▶ standard score for a run *r* is then $\frac{states(r) \mu_M}{\sigma_M}$
- 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:

- $\bullet \ \mathrm{CONDDEST}$ in NDFS-based emptiness-checks
- HIGHLINKWEIGHTEDSOURCEKNOWN in SCC-based emptiness checks (no scan required)

- Evangelista, S. and Pajault, C. (2010). Solving the ignoring problem for partial order reduction. <u>STTT</u>, 12(2):155–170.
- Laarman, A., Pater, E., Pol, J., and Hansen, H. (2014). Guard-based partial-order reduction. STTT, pages 1–22.
- Nalumasu, R. and Gopalakrishnan, G. (2002). An efficient partial order reduction algorithm with an alternative proviso implementation. FMSD, 20(1):231–247.
- Peled, D. (1994). Combining partial order reductions with on-the-fly model-checking. In <u>Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV'94)</u>, volume 818 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 377–390. Springer-Verlag.