

## Exercise 9

**Problem 1.**

Consider the atomic *commit-adopt* object, which has the following specification. Every process  $p$  proposes an input value  $v$  to such an object and obtains an output, which consists of a pair  $(\text{dec}, \text{val})$ ;  $\text{dec}$  can be either *commit* or *adopt*. The following properties are satisfied:

- **Validity:** If a process obtains output  $(\text{commit}, v)$  or  $(\text{adopt}, v)$ , then  $v$  was proposed by some process.
- **Commitment:** If every process proposes the same value, then no process may output  $(\text{adopt}, v)$  for any value  $v$ .
- **Agreement:** If a process  $p$  outputs  $(\text{commit}, v)$  and a process  $q$  outputs  $(\text{commit}, v')$  or  $(\text{adopt}, v')$ , then  $v = v'$ .
- **Termination:** Every correct process eventually obtains an output.

Consider the following implementation of an atomic *commit-adopt* object from atomic wait-free snapshot objects and atomic MRMW registers:

- Using two shared snapshot objects:  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  of size  $n$ , initialized to  $(\perp, \perp, \dots, \perp)$ ;
- Using two local arrays of registers:  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  of size  $n$ .

The implementation is as follows:

```

propose(v)
  S_1.update(i, v);

  a_i := S_1.snapshot();
  if every non- $\perp$  value in a_i is v then
    x := (true, v);
  else
    v := max(a_i); // max(arr) returns the greatest non- $\perp$  element in array arr
    x := (false, v);

  S_2.update(i, x);

  b_i := S_2.snapshot();
  if every non- $\perp$  value in b_i is equal to (true, v) then
    return (commit, v);
  if some value in b_i is equal to (true, val) for some val then
    return (adopt, val);
  return (adopt, v);

```

Is the above implementation correct (does it satisfy the *commit-adopt* properties)? Justify your answer.