# Finding Deadlocks and Data Races with Frama-C

Tomáš Dacík*<sup>∗</sup>*

Tomáš Vojnar

Brno University of Technology, Faculty of Information Technology

*∗* Supported by Brno Ph.D. Talent scholarship

#### Introduction

- Two plugins of Frama-C for detection of concurrency bugs developed in my BSc thesis:
	- DEADLOCKF deadlock detection
	- RACERE data race detection
- Both plugins can use the value analysis of EVA to improve their precision (but can also run without it)
- Inspired by the tool RACERX<sup>1</sup>:
	- Quite scalable (successfully evaluated on the Linux kernel)
	- The tool is not available for experiments

<sup>1</sup>Dawson Engler and Ken Ashcraft. RacerX: Effective, Static Detection of Race Conditions and Deadlocks. Symposium on Operating Systems Principles 2003.

• Lightweight static analysis  $\rightarrow$  focus on detection of likely bugs (no soundness/completeness guarantees)

• Both plugins are based on custom CFG traversals algorithm, assuming that branching is always nondeterministic

- Focus on multi-threaded C code with mutexes (binary locks):
	- The main focus is on the *Pthreads* library
	- Custom locking/threading functions can be provided by the user

• Deadlocks caused by incorrect usage of mutexes:



• Data Races caused by missing (mutex) synchronisation between two memory accesses:

```
void *thread1(...)
void *thread2(...)
   counter++;
```

```
counter--;
```
## Common Architecture of Both Plugins

#### Thread analysis

- Identify all thread entry points; for each, run EVA to compute an (under-approximated) value analysis:
	- Parameters of (un)lock operations
	- Thread-create/join operations

#### Lockset analysis

• Compute which locks are held at which program points

#### Concurrency checking

• Determine whether two events may happen in parallel (mostly for data races)

- Start with a thread-create graph containing only the *main* function
- Run EVA for each entry point in the graph with an initial state given as the join of states of its create statement
- If new thread-create statements are found to be reachable, update the thread-create graph
- Repeat until a fixpoint is reached (possibly accelerated using widening) – usually fast since thread-create graphs are usually acyclic

```
void thread1(...) {
    i--;
    create(thread1);
}
void thread2(...) {
    i++;
}
```

```
void thread1(...) {
    i--;
    create(thread1);
}
void thread2(...) {
    i++;
}
```

```
main
```

```
void thread1(...) {
    i--;
    create(thread1);
}
void thread2(...) {
    i++;
}
```

```
main
```

```
void thread1(...) {
    i--;
    create(thread1);
}
```

```
void thread2(...) {
    i++;
}
```


```
void thread1(...) {
    i--;
    create(thread1);
}
```

```
void thread2(...) {
    i++;
}
```


```
void thread1(...) {
    i--;
    create(thread1);
}
```

```
void thread2(...) {
    i++;
}
```


```
void thread1(...) {
    i--;
    create(thread1);
}
```

```
void thread2(...) {
    i++;
}
```


int *i = 0;* int *main(...) { i = 1; create(thread1); i = 2; create(thread2); }* void *thread1(...) { i--; create(thread1); }* void *thread2(...) { i++; } main i* ∈ {1} *<del>/</del></sup> <i>thread1 thread2*  $i \in \{1\} \sqcup \{2\} = \{1, 2\}$ *i ∈ {*2*} i ∈ {*1*} i ∈ {*1*}*

- Lockset the set of mutexes locked at the current program point
- For each line, we compute the set of possible locksets
- For each function, we compute its summary as a mapping from input locksets to output sets of locksets

#### Lockset Analysis

- Lockset the set of mutexes locked at the current program point
- For each line, we compute the set of possible locksets
- For each function, we compute its summary as a mapping from input locksets to output sets of locksets

```
int f(...) {
    lock(E);
     ...
    unlock(E);
}
                  ◀
```
*{∅}*

- Lockset the set of mutexes locked at the current program point
- For each line, we compute the set of possible locksets
- For each function, we compute its summary as a mapping from input locksets to output sets of locksets

```
int f(...) {
     lock(E); \longrightarrow [E] = \{A\}...
     unlock(E);
}
                                                      {∅}
                                                      {{A}}
```
- Lockset the set of mutexes locked at the current program point
- For each line, we compute the set of possible locksets
- For each function, we compute its summary as a mapping from input locksets to output sets of locksets

```
int f(...) {
    lock(E);
     ...
    unlock(E);
}
                   ◀
                                               {∅}
                                               {{A}}
                                               {{A}}
```
- Lockset the set of mutexes locked at the current program point
- For each line, we compute the set of possible locksets
- For each function, we compute its summary as a mapping from input locksets to output sets of locksets

```
int f(...) {
       lock(E);
       ...
       unlock(E); \Leftrightarrow \llbracket E \rrbracket = \{A, B\}}
                                                                      {∅}
                                                                      {{A}}
                                                                      {{A}}
                                                                      {{A}, ∅}
```
• Summary: *f* : *∅ 7→ {{A}, ∅}*

```
int f(...) {
     lock(E);
     ...
     unlock(E);
}
                         ◀ [[E]] = {A, B}
                                                    {∅}
                                                    {{A}}
                                                    {{A}}
                                                    {{A}, ∅}
```
- The state at the last line can be interpreted in two ways:
	- May-lockset: *{A}* (generally union of all locksets)
	- Must-lockset: *∅* (generally intersection of all locksets)
- Duality of deadlock and data-race detection:
	- Must-locksets for conservative deadlock detection
	- May-locksets for conservative data race detection

During the lockset analysis, a lock-dependency graph (lockgraph for short) is created:

- Whenever a lock *ℓ* is added to a lockset *X*, an edge *x → ℓ* is created for each  $x \in X$
- Created edges are added as another component of function summaries
- The graph is then checked for cycles representing possibility of deadlocks

• The proposed form of summaries does not work well for locking wrappers (either direct or indirect):

*}*

```
void thread(...) {
   wrapper(m1);
   wrapper(m2);
}
```

```
void wrapper(m) {
    lock(m);
    ...
```
• The proposed form of summaries does not work well for locking wrappers (either direct or indirect):

```
void thread(...) {
    wrapper(m1);
    wrapper(m2);
}
                         void wrapper(m) {
                              lock(m);
                              ...
                          }
```
• A heuristic solution: extend summaries with the value of parameters (when they are precisely determined at the call site):

$$
\text{wrapper} : (\emptyset, m = m_1) \mapsto \{\{m_1\}\},\
$$

$$
(\{m_1\}, m = m_2) \mapsto \{\{m_1, m_2\}\}\
$$

• Very heuristic, a lot of space for future improvements

- Running EVA automatically without manually setting its parameters is not always possible
- Locking expressions are often just direct accesses to global variables

 $\rightarrow$  A modified version of the algorithm that does not use EVA and relies on syntactic information only

## Experimental Evaluation

- Benchmark of 997 multi-threaded programs
	- Used for evaluation of a deadlock detector implemented in the CPROVER framework
	- Heavily preprocessed  $\rightarrow$  not all can be parsed by Frama-C
	- Not all of them contain reachable parallelism (those are ignored in our evaluation)
	- 8 deadlocks manually created by the authors (deadlocks caused solely by locks seem to be hard to find in wild)
		- DEADLOCK can detect all of them with value analysis, and 7 of them without it
- Comparison with:
	- CPROVER deadlock detection (implemented in a fork of CBMC)
	- L2D2 (a plugin of Facebook/Meta INFER, also developed at BUT FIT) – based on a bottom-up lockset analysis







The number of LoC is increased by heavy preprocessing done by CPROVER. 13/23

#### Data Race Detection

- Track memory accesses (in a similar way as locksets) and detect pairs satisfying conditions of a data race:
	- At least one is a write access
	- Can happen in parallel
	- Not-protected (empty intersection of may-locksets)
- $\cdot$  Tracking of **all accesses** and checking **all pairs** for races is potentially expensive:
	- $\rightarrow$  Track only indistinguishable accesses (related mostly to their traces and quite technical)
	- $\rightarrow$  Process accesses more systematically (inspired by dynamic race detectors)

Change of a memory location state by access (read/write) of thread *t*:



#### Data Race Detection - Details

Only memory locations in Shared & Modified and Exclusive (if the entry point is spawned multiple times) states are searched for races



## Concurrency Checking

• Both plugins record traces of the form

```
<entry point><function call>
∗<event>,
```
where *<*event*>* is either a memory access or creation of a lock dependency

• Traces are useful for reporting (but complicate summaries)

## Concurrency Checking

• Both plugins record traces of the form

```
<entry point><function call>
∗<event>,
```
where *<*event*>* is either a memory access or creation of a lock dependency

- Traces are useful for reporting (but complicate summaries)
- Lightweight checking whether events of two traces cannot happen in parallel:
	- One surely happens before the thread of the other is created (often corresponds to data initialisation)
	- One happens after the thread of the other is surely joined (often corresponds to data postprocessing/deleting)

## Experimental Evaluation

- A benchmark of 116 student programs implementing a ticket synchronisation algorithm
	- Smaller programs (200-300 LoC) but heavily concurrent and parametric in the number of threads
	- 23 confirmed data races found by the ANaConDA dynamic analyser

- A comparison with:
	- GOBLINT  $2$  over-approximating abstract interpreter
	- $\cdot$  O<sub>2</sub><sup>3</sup> detection focused on low false positive ratio

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Saan, S. et al. Static race detection for device drivers: the Goblint approach. ASE '16. <sup>3</sup>Bozhen Liu et al. When threads meet events: efficient and precise static race detection with origins. PLDI 2021.





- RACER reports false positive races on thread arguments (each thread uses as an argument a different element of an array)
- All tools missed an intricate race caused by re-initialisation of mutexes
- Plugins are compatible with Frama-C 23.1 (Vanadium)
- DEADLOCK is available as an *opam* package and via github
- Both plugins are available via docker image



DEADLOCK on github Deadlock & Racer in docker image

# <span id="page-35-0"></span>[Small Demonstration](#page-35-0)

```
[deadlock] == Lockgraph: ==[ deadlock] lock2 -> lock1 (1 times)
[ deadlock ] lock1 -> lock2 (3 times)
[deadlock] == = = Results : == =[deadlock] Deadlock between threads thread1 and thread2:
   Trace of dependency (lock1 -> lock2):
        In thread thread1:
            Call of f (deadlock.c:6)
                Lock of lock1 (deadlock.c:2)
            Lock of lock2 (deadlock.c:7)
   Trace of dependency (lock2 -> lock1):
        In thread thread2 \cdotCall of g (deadlock.c:15)
                Lock of lock2 (deadlock.c:10)
                Call of f ( deadlock . c : 11)
                    Lock of lock1 (deadlock.c:2)
```
## GUI example I



#### GUI example II



- Frama-C plugins for lightweight detection of deadlocks and data races
- Successfully evaluated on small/medium-size programs (especially nice: low false positive rate)
- Possible future work:
	- Updating to the latest version of Frama-C
	- More systematic implementation of the lockset analysis
	- A focus on data races seems to be a more interesting direction
	- Evaluation on new benchmarks (a new data race category in SV-COMP)
	- Combination with dynamic analysers (e.g., guiding noise insertion)