

Parameterized Dynamic Logic — Towards A Cyclic Logical Framework for Program Verification via Operational Semantics

Yuanrui Zhang¹[0000–0002–0685–6905]

Collage of Software, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, China
yuanruizhang@nuaa.edu.cn, zhangyrmath@126.com

Abstract. Dynamic logic and its variations, because of their good expressive forms capturing program specifications clearly by isolating programs from logical formulas, have been used as a formalism in program reasoning for decades and have many applications in different areas. The program models of traditional dynamic logics are in explicit forms. With a clearly-defined syntactic structure, compositional verification is made possible, in which a deduction step transfers proving a program into proving its sub-programs. This structure-based reasoning forms the basis of many dynamic logics and popular Hoare-style logics. However, structural rules induce a major drawback that for different target programs, different rules have to be proposed to adapt different program structures. Moreover, there exist programs that does not support (or not entirely support) a structure-based reasoning. In this paper, we propose a parameterized ‘dynamic-logic-like’ logic called DL_p with general forms of program models and formulas, and propose a cyclic proof system for this logic. Program reasoning in DL_p is directly based on symbolic executions of programs according to their operational semantics. This reduces the burden of designing a large set of rules when specializing a logic theory to a specific domain, and facilitates verifying programs without a suitable structure for direct reasoning. Without reasoning by dissolving program structures, DL_p can cause an infinite proof structure. To solve this, we build a cyclic preproof structure for the proof system of DL_p and prove its soundness. Case studies are analyzed to show how DL_p works for reasoning about different types of programs.

Keywords: Logical Framework · Dynamic Logic · Program Verification · Operational Semantics · Cyclic Proof · Theorem Proving

1 Introduction

Dynamic logic is an extension of modal logic by enriching modal formulas with explicit program models. It is one of popular formal languages for specifying and reasoning about different types of programs or systems, such as process algebras [6], programming languages [5], synchronous systems [43,42], hybrid systems [31,33] and probabilistic systems [30,32,24,14]. Like a Hoare-style logic, dynamic logic consists of two parts: program models and formulas. A *dynamic formula* is of the form: $[\alpha]\psi$, expressing that after all executions of program α , formula ψ holds. Formula $\phi \rightarrow [\alpha]\psi$ exactly captures partial correctness of programs expressed by triple $\{\phi\}\alpha\{\psi\}$ in Hoare logic [21]. This separation of program structures (α) and logical formulas (ϕ) by the modal operator $[\cdot]$ allows a clear observation of program behaviours throughout the whole deduction processes. Compared to Hoare-style logics, one advantage of dynamic logics is that with $[\alpha]\phi$ itself a logical formula, it is able to also express the negation $\neg[\alpha]\phi$ of $[\alpha]\phi$, or in its dual form: $\langle\alpha\rangle\neg\phi$, meaning that there exists an execution of α after which ϕ is not satisfied. Operator $\langle\cdot\rangle$ is helpful to express “incorrectness properties”, which are crucial for nowadays program analysis and verification, and which has been addressed recently with the new development of incorrectness Hoare logic [29,44].

In dynamic logics, program models α are usually regular programs with tests (e.g. in propositional dynamic logic [15]), programs tailored from regular programs with tests (e.g. in differential dynamic logic [31]), or actual computer programs from reality (e.g. in Java dynamic logic [5]). Deductions of dynamic logics are based on the syntactic structure of a program. This makes *compositional*

verification possible, in which a deduction step transfers proving a property of a program into proving a property of its sub-programs. For example, in propositional dynamic logic [15], proving $[\alpha \cup \beta]\phi$ relies on proving both $[\alpha]\phi$ and $[\beta]\phi$, where α and β are sub-programs of program $\alpha \cup \beta$. This also-called ‘divide-and-conquer’ way of verifying have brought many benefits, among which the most is avoiding state-explosion problem, as opposed to other verification technologies such as traditional model checking [2].

However, as the development of programs and computer systems nowadays, especially as the emergence of real-time systems and AI systems [38], this traditional structure-based reasoning supported by dynamic logics and many Hoare-style logics is challenged, because of the two main drawbacks:

Firstly, structure-based reasoning requires explicit program syntactic structures. So, for a new type of programs, one needs to define a new program model (α) and carefully design a set of particular structural rules to adapt their semantics. This often demands a large amount of work. For example, Verifiable C [1], a famous program verifier for C programming language based on Hoare logic, used nearly 40,000 lines of Coq code to define the logic theory. Secondly, and importantly as well, some (parts of) programs or system models do not directly support structural rules. These programs either do not have a syntactic structure, like neural networks [18] for example, or have semantics that do not support independent executions based on their syntax. In the latter case, usually, additional processes are required to re-formalize their program structures so that structure-based reasoning is possible. A typical example is the synchronous programming language Esterel [7], where in a sequential program $\alpha; \beta$, as fully illustrated in [17], the executions in α cannot be analyzed independently from β unless α and β are executed at different instances.

In this paper, we present an abstract dynamic-logic-like formalism, which aims at compensating for the above two shortcomings in traditional dynamic logics. We call this proposed formalism *parameterized dynamic logic*, denoted by DL_p . Strictly speaking, DL_p is not a dynamic logic in traditional sense, but of a more general formalism, in which we assume programs and formulas are in general forms as ‘parameters’, and only keep the modal operator $[\cdot]$ in traditional dynamic logics to express program properties. In order to capture the executions of general programs, we also introduce *program configurations* in general forms as the *labels* of DL_p formulas. So, a DL_p dynamic formula is of the form: $\sigma : [\alpha]\phi$, where program α , formula ϕ and configuration σ come from interested domains. (α, σ) is thus a structure containing all information about an execution state of a program. Formula $\sigma : [\alpha]\phi$ has the meaning that from (α, σ) , all terminal execution paths end by satisfying formula ϕ .

To see how this labelled form of a DL_p formula actually works, let us see a simple example. We prove a formula $\phi =_{df} (x \geq 0 \Rightarrow [x := x + 1]x > 0)$ in first-order dynamic logic [19] expressed as a sequent (see Section 3), where x is a variable ranging over the set of natural numbers. ϕ intuitively means that if $x \geq 0$ holds, then $x > 0$ holds after the execution of $x := x + 1$. By applying the structural rule $(x := e)$ for assignment: $\frac{\psi[x/e]}{[x := e]\psi} (x:=e)$ on formula $[x := x + 1]x > 0$, we substitute x of $x > 0$ by $x + 1$, and obtain $x + 1 > 0$. So formula ϕ becomes $\phi' =_{df} x \geq 0 \Rightarrow x + 1 > 0$, which is always true for any natural number $x \in \mathbb{N}$.

In DL_p , on the other hand, formula ϕ can be expressed as a labelled form: $\psi =_{df} (\{x \mapsto t\} : x \geq 0 \Rightarrow \{x \mapsto t\} : [x := x + 1]x > 0)$, where $\{x \mapsto t\}$ is a program configuration with t a free variable, meaning “mapping x to an arbitrary value t ”. This form may seem tedious at first sight. But one soon can find out that with a configuration explicitly showing up, we can skip the assignment rule $(x := e)$ and directly base on the symbolic execution of program $x := x + 1$ as: $(x := x + 1, \{x \mapsto t\}) \longrightarrow (\downarrow, \{x \mapsto t + 1\})$ to derive formula ψ . Here \downarrow indicates a program termination. Then formula ψ becomes $\psi' =_{df} (\{x \mapsto t\} : x \geq 0 \Rightarrow \{x \mapsto t + 1\}[\downarrow] : x > 0)$ after the execution of $x := x + 1$, which is actually $\psi'' =_{df} (\{x \mapsto t\} : x \geq 0 \Rightarrow \{x \mapsto t + 1\} : x > 0)$ since \downarrow contributes nothing. By defining the applications of $\{x \mapsto t\}$ and $\{x \mapsto t + 1\}$ on formulas $x \geq 0$ and $x > 0$ respectively in a usual way: i.e. replacing every free occurrence of x by t (or $t + 1$), we obtain the same valid formula $\phi' : t \geq 0 \Rightarrow t + 1 > 0$.

DL_p formulas benefit from that no structural rules special for a target program are needed, but only a program operational semantics and a definition of how a configuration applies to a non-

dynamical formula. Normally, for existing programs and system models, formalizing a program's operational semantics (like $(x := x + 1, \{x \mapsto t\}) \longrightarrow (\downarrow, \{x \mapsto t + 1\})$) is easier and more direct than designing an inference rule (like rule $(x := e)$). As will be illustrated in Section 4.2, in some case, for a target program with a certain structure, there might exist no structural rules, or, designing such a rule can be complex.

To give the semantics of DL_p , we follow the way of traditional dynamic logics by defining a special Kripke structure based on the target programs' operational semantics. After linking evaluations and configurations through the Kripke structures (Definition 6), we manage to define the validity of a DL_p formula in normal sense based on evaluations (Definition 8).

After building the theory of DL_p , in this paper, we propose a proof system for DL_p , which provides a set of rules to support reasoning via programs' operational semantics. Unlike traditional dynamic logics which base on structural rules to dissolve program structures, the derivations of a DL_p formula may result in an infinite proof structure. To solve this problem, we adopt the *cyclic proof* approach (cf. [10]), a technique to ensure that a certain proof structure, called *preproof*, is a correct proof if it satisfies some *soundness condition*. We propose a cyclic preproof structure for DL_p (Definitions 11 and 12) and prove that the proof system of DL_p is sound.

To summarize, our contributions are mainly three folds:

- We give the syntax and semantics of DL_p formulas.
- We build a cyclic proof system for DL_p .
- We prove the soundness of the proof system of DL_p .

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 defines the syntax and semantics of DL_p formulas. In Section 3 we propose a cyclic proof system for DL_p , whose soundness is analyzed and proved in Section 3.4. We show two case studies in Section 4. Section 5 introduces some previous work that is closely related to ours, while Section 6 makes some discussions and talks about future work.

2 Dynamic Logic DL_p

In this section, we build the theory of DL_p . What mostly distinguishes DL_p from other dynamic logics is that its program models and formulas are not in particular forms, but instead can be of any forms, only provided that their structures and operational semantics of the programs respect some restrictions (see Definition 1). The so-called “labels” are introduced in DL_p , which dynamically associate a formula with a configuration, enabling reasoning directly via program symbolic executions.

Below, Section 2.1 introduces the syntax of DL_p , while Section 2.2 gives the semantics of DL_p .

2.1 Definition of DL_p

Our construction relies on several assumptions of general structures and constructions as below without formal definitions, which depend on specific discussed domains.

Programs, Configurations and Program Behaviours Assume a set of programs **Prog** and a set of program configurations **Conf**. Their elements belongs to a term algebra $\mathbf{TA}(\Sigma, Var)$ — a freely generated algebraic structure built upon a signature Σ with a set of variables Var . For example, we can have terms like $f(x)$, $f(x, y)$, $g(f(c), x)$, if $f, g \in \Sigma$ are functions, $c \in \Sigma$ is a constant (function), and $x, y \in Var$ are variables. $\mathbf{TA}(\Sigma, Var)$ is an assumed structure depending on interested domains. It is commonly known that many interested structures in computer programs and system models can be captured as a term algebra (cf. [37]). Variables in Var are usually denoted by x, y, z . Terms without variables in term algebra $\mathbf{TA}(\Sigma, \emptyset)$ (simply $\mathbf{TA}(\Sigma)$) are called *closed terms* of algebra $\mathbf{TA}(\Sigma, Var)$. Other terms of algebra $\mathbf{TA}(\Sigma, Var)$ are called *open terms*. An evaluation $\rho : Var \rightarrow \mathbf{TA}(\Sigma)$ maps a variable to a closed term. Given a term t , $\rho(t)$ means the closed term obtained by substituting each free variable x with value $\rho(x)$ in usual sense. We use $t_1 \equiv t_2$ to denote that two terms t_1 and t_2 are

identical. Two terms t_1 and t_2 are *equivalent*, denoted by $t_1 = t_2$, if $\rho(t_1) \equiv \rho(t_2)$ for any ρ . Usually, we use $\mathbf{Cl}(A)$ to represent the set of closed terms of set A , use $\mathbf{Cl}(t)$ to express the set of closed instances of term t : $\mathbf{Cl}(t) =_{df} \{u \mid \text{there is an evaluation } \rho \text{ such that } \rho(t) = u\}$.

We distinguish two special closed terms in **Prog**, namely \downarrow and \uparrow . \downarrow indicates a termination of a program, while \uparrow means an abortion of a program. A *program state* is defined as a pair (α, σ) of closed terms over $\mathbf{Cl}(\mathbf{Prog}) \times \mathbf{Cl}(\mathbf{Conf})$.

A *program transition* between two program states (α, σ) and (α', σ') is a binary relation $(\alpha, \sigma) \rightarrow (\alpha', \sigma')$. We use \rightarrow^* (resp. \rightarrow^+) to denote the reflexive and transitive (resp. transitive) closure of \rightarrow . The *structural operational semantics* [34] (also called *small-step semantics*) of programs is a (possibly infinite) set Λ of program transitions. Usually, Λ can be expressed by a finite set of rules (or more strictly speaking, rule schemata) according to the syntactic structure of the programs in **Prog**, in a manner that a transition $((\alpha, \sigma) \rightarrow (\alpha', \sigma')) \in \Lambda$ if $(\alpha, \sigma) \rightarrow (\alpha', \sigma')$ can be inferred based on these rules in a finite number of steps (see the example below in Table 1 for rule schemata). An *execution path* over Λ is a finite or infinite sequence of program transitions $(\alpha_1, \sigma_1) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow (\alpha_n, \sigma_n) \rightarrow \dots$ ($n \geq 1$), with each transition $((\alpha_i, \sigma_i) \rightarrow (\alpha_{i+1}, \sigma_{i+1})) \in \Lambda$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$). A path is *terminal*, or can terminate, if it ends with a program \downarrow . We call an execution path *minimum*, in the sense that in it there is no two equivalent program states.

In this paper, we confine our discussion to a certain type of programs whose operational semantics satisfy the following properties, we simply call *program properties*.

Definition 1 (Program Properties). *The operational semantics Λ of programs in **Prog** satisfies that for each program $\alpha \in \mathbf{Cl}(\mathbf{Prog})$, the following properties hold:*

- I. *Well-definedness.* For any program state (α, σ) , there exists at least one transition $(\alpha, \sigma) \rightarrow (\alpha', \sigma') \in \Lambda$ for some α' and σ' , unless α is either \downarrow or \uparrow , when there is no transitions from (α, σ) in Λ .
- II. *Branching Finiteness.* From any program state (α, σ) , there exists only a finite number of transitions in Λ .
- III. *Termination Finiteness.* From any program state (α, σ) , there is only a finite number of minimum terminal execution paths.

These restrictions are crucial for the soundness of DL_p discussed in Section 3.4. Our current discussion domain of programs actually includes a rich set of programs with discrete behaviours. Among them are, for example, all deterministic programs (i.e., there is only one transition from any program state) and programs with finite behaviours (i.e., starting from a program state, only a finite number of program states can be reached). However, there exist types of programs that do not satisfy some of the program properties I — III. For example, hybrid programs (cf. [31]) with continuous behaviours do not satisfy branching finiteness. Some non-deterministic programs, like probabilistic programs [3], do not satisfy termination finiteness.

Table 1 shows examples of particular **Prog**, **Conf** and Λ . Both *while* programs and Esterel programs are deterministic programs (for Esterel programs, cf. [7]), thus satisfy the program properties in Definition 1. However, *while* programs and Esterel programs have different syntax and configurations. The operational semantics of *while* programs is given by a finite set of inference rules. We do not give the operational semantics of Esterel programs here due to its complexity. One can refer to [35] for more details.

Syntax of DL_p In DL_p , we assume a set of logical formulas **Form**, where each formula is composed by the terms in $\mathbf{TA}(\Sigma, \mathbf{Var})$ using a set **L** of predicates and logical connectives distinguished from Σ . For example, formulas can be $p(t_1, t_2)$, $p_1(t_1) \rightarrow p_2(t_2)$, $p_1 \wedge p_2$ or $p_1 \vee p_2$, where $p, p_1, p_2, \rightarrow, \wedge, \vee \in \mathbf{L}$. A formula that has only closed terms is called a *closed formula*, otherwise it is called *open*. Given an evaluation ρ , $\rho(\phi)$ represents the formula in which all terms t of ϕ are replaced by $\rho(t)$. Similar to terms, we use $\phi_1 \equiv \phi_2$ to express that two formulas are identical.

A closed formula in **Form** has a boolean semantics of either true or false. A formula ϕ is *satisfied* by an evaluation ρ , denoted by $\rho \models \phi$, is defined such that $\rho(\phi)$ is true. A formula ϕ is *valid*, denoted by $\models \phi$, if $\rho(\phi)$ is true for any ρ .

<p>While programs:</p> $WP =_{df} x := e \mid WP ; WP \mid \text{if } b \text{ then } WP \text{ else } WP \text{ end} \mid \text{while } b \text{ do } WP \text{ end}$ $\sigma =_{df} \text{ a set of assignments of the form: } x \mapsto e$
$\frac{}{(x := e, \sigma) \longrightarrow (\downarrow, \sigma[x \mapsto e(\sigma)])} \quad (x:=e) \quad \frac{(WP_1, \sigma) \longrightarrow (WP'_1, \sigma')}{(WP_1; WP_2, \sigma) \longrightarrow (WP'_1; WP_2, \sigma')} \quad (:) \quad \frac{(WP_1, \sigma) \longrightarrow (\downarrow, \sigma')}{(WP_1; WP_2, \sigma) \longrightarrow (WP_2, \sigma')} \quad (;\downarrow)$ $\frac{(WP_1, \sigma) \longrightarrow (WP'_1, \sigma') \quad \phi \triangleright \sigma \text{ is true}}{(\text{while } \phi \text{ do } WP_1 \text{ end}, \sigma) \longrightarrow (WP'_1; \text{while } \phi \text{ do } WP_1 \text{ end}, \sigma')} \quad (wh1)$ $\frac{(WP_1, \sigma) \longrightarrow (\downarrow, \sigma') \quad \phi \triangleright \sigma \text{ is true}}{(\text{while } \phi \text{ do } WP_1 \text{ end}, \sigma) \longrightarrow (\text{while } \phi \text{ do } WP_1 \text{ end}, \sigma'), \Delta} \quad (wh1\downarrow)$ $\frac{\phi \triangleright \sigma \text{ is false}}{(\text{while } \phi \text{ do } WP_1 \text{ end}, \sigma) \longrightarrow (\downarrow, \sigma)} \quad (wh2)$
<p>Esterel programs:</p> $E =_{df} \text{nothing} \mid \text{pause} \mid E ; E \mid E \parallel E \mid \text{loop } E \text{ end} \mid \text{signal } S \text{ in } E \text{ end} \mid \text{emit } S \mid$ $\text{present } S \text{ then } E \text{ else } E \text{ end} \mid \text{suspend } E \text{ when } S \mid \text{trap } T \text{ in } E \text{ end} \mid \text{exit } T$ $\sigma =_{df} \text{ a stack of assignments of the form: } x \mapsto e$

Table 1: Examples of programs, configurations and operational semantics

A configuration is assumed to be applied to a formula through a function: $\cdot \triangleright \cdot : \mathbf{Form} \times \mathbf{Conf} \rightarrow \mathbf{Form}$. In other words, for a formula $\phi \in \mathbf{Form}$ and a configuration $\sigma \in \mathbf{Conf}$, $\phi \triangleright \sigma$ returns a formula in \mathbf{Form} w.r.t. ϕ and σ .

Based on the assumed sets \mathbf{Prog} , \mathbf{Conf} and \mathbf{Form} , we give the syntax of DL_p . We firstly define a general dynamic logical (GDL) formulas in Definition 2, then we define DL_p in Definition 3.

Definition 2 (Syntax of GDL). *A general dynamic logical (GDL) formula is inductively defined as follows: 1. Any formula in \mathbf{Form} is a GDL formula. 2. $\neg\phi$ and $\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ are GDL formulas if ϕ , ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are GDL formulas. 3. $[\alpha]\phi$ is a GDL formula if α is a program in \mathbf{Prog} and ϕ is a GDL formula.*

We also call $[\alpha]$ the *dynamic part* of a GDL formula. Call a formula having a dynamic part a *dynamic formula*. Intuitively, formula $[\alpha]\phi$ means that after all executions of program α , formula ϕ holds. $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is the dual operator of $[\cdot]$. Formula $\langle \alpha \rangle \phi$ can be expressed by $\neg[\alpha]\neg\phi$. Other formulas with logical connectives such as \vee and \rightarrow can be expressed by formulas with \neg and \wedge accordingly.

Definition 3 (DL_p Formulas). *A parameterized dynamic logical (DL_p) formula is a formula of the form $\sigma : \phi$, where $\sigma \in \mathbf{Conf}$ is a configuration, ϕ is a GDL formula.*

In order to reason about termination of programs in DL_p and to prove the soundness of the proof system of DL_p as shown later in Section 3, the concept of *well-founded relation* is introduced.

Definition 4 (Well-foundedness). *A set is ‘well-founded’ w.r.t. a partially-ordered relation $<$, if for any element a in this set, there is no infinite descent sequence: $a > a_1 > a_2 > \dots$ in this set. Relation $<$ is also called a well-founded relation.*

In DL_p , we assume a partial function $\mathcal{T} : \mathbf{Conf} \rightarrow \mathbf{TA}(\Sigma)$ that assigns a configuration $\sigma \in \mathbf{Conf}$ with a sub-term t appeared in σ , called *termination factor*. And we assume a well-founded relation $<$ between these termination factors. A termination factor measures how close a program is from terminations. Usually, we write $\sigma\{t\}$ if $t \equiv \mathcal{T}(\sigma)$. \mathcal{T} is a function as usually we only care about one such factor. \mathcal{T} is partial as in a configuration there might not exist such a factor.

2.2 Semantics of DL_p

Traditionally, the semantics of a dynamic logic is denotational and is given as a Kripke structure [20]. Following a similar manner, to give the semantics of DL_p formulas, we firstly build a special Kripke structure consisting of closed configurations as worlds, and operational semantics of programs as relations between worlds. This structure allows us to define a satisfaction relation of GDL formulas by evaluations and configurations, based on which, the semantics of DL_p is given.

Definition 5 (Kripke Structure of GDL). *Given \mathbf{Prog} , \mathbf{Conf} and \mathcal{I} , the Kripke structure of GDL is a triple $M =_{df} (\mathbf{Cl}(\mathbf{Conf}), \rightarrow, \mathcal{I})$, where $\mathbf{Cl}(\mathbf{Conf})$ is the set of closed configurations as ‘worlds’, $\rightarrow \subseteq \mathbf{Cl}(\mathbf{Conf}) \times (\mathbf{Cl}(\mathbf{Prog}) \times \mathbf{Cl}(\mathbf{Prog})) \times \mathbf{Cl}(\mathbf{Conf})$ is a set of labelled transitions, $\mathcal{I} : \mathbf{Cl}(\mathbf{Form}) \rightarrow 2^{\mathbf{Cl}(\mathbf{Conf})}$ is an interpretation of closed formulas in \mathbf{Form} on the set of worlds, satisfying the following conditions:*

1. For each world σ , $\sigma \xrightarrow{\alpha/\alpha'} \sigma'$ iff $((\alpha, \sigma) \rightarrow (\alpha', \sigma')) \in \Lambda$.
2. For each formula $\phi \in \mathbf{Cl}(\mathbf{Form})$, $\sigma \in \mathcal{I}(\phi)$ iff $\phi \triangleright \sigma$ is true.

Different from the traditional Kripke structure (cf. [20]), in the Kripke structure of GDL , the transitions between worlds are defined according to the operational semantics, rather than the syntactic structures of programs.

Below we do not distinguish $\sigma \xrightarrow{\alpha/\alpha'} \sigma'$ from $(\alpha, \sigma) \rightarrow (\alpha', \sigma')$ and also call it a ‘transition’, and call $\sigma_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha_1/\alpha_2} \sigma_2 \xrightarrow{\alpha_2/\alpha_3} \dots \xrightarrow{\alpha_{n-1}/\alpha_n} \sigma_n \dots$ an “execution path”.

Definition 6 (Satisfaction Relation of GDL Formulas on Kripke Structure). *Given the Kripke structure $M = (\mathbf{Cl}(\mathbf{Conf}), \rightarrow, \mathcal{I})$ of GDL , the satisfaction of a GDL formula ϕ w.r.t. an evaluation ρ and a configuration $\sigma \in \mathbf{Conf}$, denoted by $\rho, \sigma \models_M \phi$ (or simply $\rho, \sigma \models \phi$), is inductively defined as follows:*

1. $\rho, \sigma \models_M \phi$ where $\phi \in \mathbf{Form}$, if $\rho(\sigma) \in \mathcal{I}(\rho(\phi))$.
2. $\rho, \sigma \models_M \neg\phi$, if $\rho, \sigma \not\models_M \phi$.
3. $\rho, \sigma \models_M \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$, if both $\rho, \sigma \models_M \phi_1$ and $\rho, \sigma \models_M \phi_2$.
4. $\rho, \sigma \models_M [\alpha]\phi$, if (1) $\rho(\alpha)$ is \downarrow and $\rho, \sigma \models_M \phi$, or (2) for all execution paths $\sigma \xrightarrow{\rho(\alpha)/\alpha_1} \dots \xrightarrow{\alpha_n/\downarrow} \sigma'$, $\rho, \sigma' \models_M \phi$.

Note that $\rho, \sigma \models_M \phi$ differs from $\rho \models \phi$ introduced in Section 2.1 as σ has an impact on formula ϕ through operator $\cdot \triangleright \cdot$. The satisfaction relation $\rho, \sigma \models_M \langle \alpha \rangle \phi$ can be formally defined as: $\rho, \sigma \models_M \langle \alpha \rangle \phi$, if (1) $\rho(\alpha)$ is \downarrow and $\rho, \sigma \models_M \phi$, or (2) there exists an execution path $\sigma \xrightarrow{\rho(\alpha)/\alpha_1} \dots \xrightarrow{\alpha_n/\downarrow} \sigma'$ such that $\rho, \sigma' \models_M \phi$.

We define the semantics of a DL_p formula naturally based on the Kripke structure of GDL and the satisfaction of GDL formulas on the Kripke structure.

Definition 7 (Semantics of DL_p Formulas). *The semantics of a DL_p formula $\sigma : \phi$ is given as the satisfaction relation by an evaluation ρ as follows: $\rho \models \sigma : \phi$, if $\rho, \sigma \models \phi$.*

The satisfiability and validity of DL_p formulas are introduced as follows. They are defined in a standard way.

Definition 8 (Satisfiability and Validity). *A DL_p formula $\sigma : \phi$ is ‘satisfiable’, if there exists an evaluation ρ such that $\rho \models \sigma : \phi$. A DL_p formula $\sigma : \phi$ is ‘valid’, if $\rho \models \sigma : \phi$ for all evaluations ρ , denoted by $\models \sigma : \phi$.*

$\frac{\{\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma' : [\alpha']\phi, \Delta\}_{(\alpha', \sigma') \in \Phi}}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : [\alpha]\phi, \Delta} \quad {}^2 \text{ } ([\alpha]\sigma), \quad \text{where } \Phi = \left\{ (\alpha', \sigma') \left \begin{array}{l} \text{for any } \rho, \text{ if } \rho \models \Gamma, \\ \text{then } ((\rho(\alpha), \rho(\sigma)) \longrightarrow (\rho(\alpha'), \rho(\sigma')))) \in \Lambda \end{array} \right. \right\}$	
$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma' \{t'\} : \langle \alpha' \rangle \phi, \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma \{t\} : \langle \alpha \rangle \phi, \Delta} \quad {}^2 \text{ } (\langle \alpha \rangle \sigma), \quad \text{for any } \rho, \text{ if } \rho \models \Gamma, \text{ then } ((\rho(\alpha), \rho(\sigma)) \longrightarrow (\rho(\alpha'), \rho(\sigma')))) \in \Lambda, t' \preceq t$	
$\frac{}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \quad {}^1 \text{ } (\sigma Ter) \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : \phi, \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : [\downarrow]\phi, \Delta} \quad ([\downarrow]\sigma) \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : \phi, \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : [\downarrow]\phi, \Delta} \quad ([\downarrow]\sigma) \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : [\uparrow]\phi, \Delta} \quad ([\uparrow]\sigma) \quad \frac{\Gamma, \sigma : \phi \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : (\neg\phi), \Delta} \quad (\neg\sigma R)$	
$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : \phi, \Delta}{\Gamma, \sigma : (\neg\phi) \Rightarrow \Delta} \quad (\neg\sigma L) \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : \phi, \Delta \quad \Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : \psi, \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : (\phi \wedge \psi), \Delta} \quad (\wedge\sigma) \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : \phi, \sigma : \psi, \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : (\phi \vee \psi), \Delta} \quad (\vee\sigma) \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \phi \triangleright \sigma, \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : \phi, \Delta} \quad {}^3 \text{ } (\sigma Int)$	
¹ (1) for each formula ϕ in Γ or Δ , $\phi \in \mathbf{Form}$; (2) $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ is valid. ² $\alpha \notin \{\downarrow, \uparrow\}$. ³ $\phi \in \mathbf{Form}$.	

Table 2: A Proof System for DL_p

3 A Cyclic Proof System for DL_p

Sequent Calculus In this paper, we adopt *sequents* [16] as the derivation form of the logic. Sequent is a convenient structure for derivation, as it can describe both top-down and bottom-up natural deductions as bottom-up deductions on the left and right sides of the arrow ‘ \Rightarrow ’ of a sequent. By using sequents, the implementation of DL_p would become nature in theorem provers like Coq or Isabelle, whose deduction structure is actually in the form of a sequent.

A sequent is a logical argumentation of the form: $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$, where Γ and Δ are finite multisets of formulas. $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ expresses the formula $(\bigwedge_{\phi \in \Gamma} \phi) \rightarrow (\bigvee_{\phi \in \Delta} \phi)$. In this paper, we do not distinguish a sequent and its corresponding formula.

An inference rule in a sequent calculus is of the form $\frac{\Gamma_1 \Rightarrow \Delta_1 \quad \dots \quad \Gamma_n \Rightarrow \Delta_n}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}$, where $\Gamma_1 \Rightarrow \Delta_1, \dots, \Gamma_n \Rightarrow \Delta_n$ are called *premises*, $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ is called a *conclusion*. The semantics of the rule is that the validity of sequents $\Gamma_1 \Rightarrow \Delta_1, \dots, \Gamma_n \Rightarrow \Delta_n$ implies the validity of sequent $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$.

A *proof tree* is a tree structure formed by deducing a sequent as a conclusion backwardly by consecutively applying a set of proof rules. In a proof tree, each node is a sequent of an instance of a proof rule. The root node of the tree is the conclusion. Each leaf node of the tree is called *terminal*, if it is a sequent of an instance of an axiom.

3.1 A Proof System for DL_p

As shown in Table 2, the proof system of DL_p consists of a set of rules for deriving DL_p labeled dynamic formulas based on program executions according to their operational semantics. These rules forms the core part of a general verification framework in which to prove the validity of a DL_p formula, we transform it into proof obligations of the formulas in **Form**. Notice that in practical deductions, additional rules in special domains may be needed for constructing suitable labelled formulas in order to obtain a preproof structure. See Section 4.1 for an example.

Rules $([\alpha]\sigma)$ and $(\langle \alpha \rangle \sigma)$ deal with dynamic parts of DL_p formulas based on the operational semantics of programs. In rule $([\alpha]\sigma)$, $\{\dots\}_{(\alpha', \sigma') \in \Phi}$ represents the collection of premises for all $(\alpha', \sigma') \in \Phi$. Φ is a set consisting of distinct elements w.r.t. equivalence $=$ between terms. In other words, for any $t_1, t_2 \in \Phi$, $t_1 \neq t_2$. By II of Definition 1, set Φ is finite. So rule $([\alpha]\sigma)$ has a finite number of premises. We write ‘ $\rho \models \Gamma$ ’ to mean that $\rho \models \phi$ for each $\phi \in \Gamma$. Intuitively, rule $([\alpha]\sigma)$ says that to prove that $[\alpha]\phi$ holds under configuration σ in the context Γ , we prove that for any execution from (α, σ) to (α', σ') (w.r.t. a ρ), $[\alpha']\phi$ holds under configuration σ' in the context Γ . Compared to rule $([\alpha]\sigma)$, rule $(\langle \alpha \rangle \sigma)$ only has one premise for some pair (α', σ') . Termination factor t is required by partial

function \mathcal{T} in σ to indicate program terminations. Intuitively, rule $(\langle\alpha\rangle\sigma)$ says that to prove $\langle\alpha\rangle\phi$ holds under configuration σ in the context Γ , after some execution from (α, σ) to (α', σ') (w.r.t. a ρ), $\langle\alpha'\rangle\phi$ holds under configuration σ' in the context Γ . At the same time, the termination factor t' is forbidden to grow larger than t w.r.t. the well-founded relation \prec . Note that in both rules $([\alpha]\sigma)$ and $(\langle\alpha\rangle\sigma)$, we assume that there always exists an execution from (α, σ) to (α', σ') (w.r.t. a ρ) since α is neither \downarrow nor \uparrow . This is guaranteed by the well-definedness of the operational semantics, as stated in I of Definition 1.

Note that in practice, form (α', σ') in rule $(\sigma[\alpha]\phi)$, $(\sigma\langle\alpha\rangle)$ can be easily obtained by the program's operational semantics. Check Section 4.1 for an example.

Rule (σTer) declares a termination of a proof branch. When each formula in Γ and Δ is a formula in **Form**. We can conclude the proof branch if sequent $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ is valid.

Rules $([\downarrow]\sigma)$, $(\langle\downarrow\rangle\sigma)$ and $([\uparrow]\sigma)$ deal with the situations when program α is either a termination \downarrow or an abortion \uparrow . Note that there is no rules for formula $\sigma : \langle\uparrow\rangle\phi$. Intuitively, it is not hard to see that $\langle\uparrow\rangle\phi$ is false under any configuration because \uparrow never terminates.

Rules $(\neg\sigma R)$, $(\neg\sigma L)$, $(\wedge\sigma)$ and $(\vee\sigma)$ deal with logic connectives \neg , \wedge and \vee in a labelled DL_p formula. They correspond to the rules in traditional propositional logic (without labels) for \neg , \wedge and \vee . Note that rule $(\vee\sigma)$ is primitive, as rule $(\wedge\sigma)$ only expresses the deduction on the right side of the sequent for connective \wedge .

Rule (σInt) is an introduction rule for labels, used when ϕ is a formula in **Form** without any dynamic parts. To prove that ϕ holds under configuration σ , we prove that $\phi \triangleright \sigma$ is a valid formula.

In the above rules, we often call the formulas distinguished from Γ and Δ that are changed from the conclusion to the premise the *target formulas* of the rule.

3.2 Infiniteness of DL_p Proof System and Well-founded Relations

Based on the semantics of DL_p given in Section 2.2, it is not hard to prove that each proof rule of Table 2 is sound. When each branch of a proof tree terminates with a valid sequent in **Form**, the whole proof is sound.

However, a branch of a proof tree in DL_p system does not always terminate, since the process of symbolically executing a program via rule $([\alpha]\sigma)$ or/and rule $(\langle\alpha\rangle\sigma)$ might not stop. This is well known when a program has a loop structure that may runs infinitely, for example, a while program *while true do $x := x + 1$ end*.

To avoid potentially infinite derivations in DL_p , in this paper, we adopt the so-called *cyclic proof* approach (cf. [10]), a technique to insure a sound conclusion even when its proof tree contains infinite derivations. A *preproof* is a proof tree with a finite structure (which means having a finite number of nodes) but containing infinite derivation paths. A preproof structure can lead to a sound conclusion if a certain soundness condition is met. This condition guarantees that any counterexamples from an invalid conclusion would cause an infinite descent sequence w.r.t. a well-founded relation (Definition 4) that is related to the semantics of DL_p , which, however, is a contradiction to the definition of the well-foundedness itself. We will expand it in detail in Section 3.3.

To apply the cyclic proof approach, we need 3 critical well-founded relations that are related to the semantics of DL_p . One of them, relation \prec , has already been introduced in Section 2.1. With these relations, in Section 3.3, we will define a preproof structure, and give the soundness condition in which a preproof is a sound proof.

In the following, we introduce another 2 well-founded relations. The first relation \prec_s is the suffix relation between two execution paths; while the second relation \prec_m is between two finite sets of execution paths.

Definition 9 (Relation \prec_s). *Given two execution paths tr_1 and tr_2 , relation $tr_1 \prec_s tr_2$ is defined if tr_2 is a proper suffix of tr_1 . Write $tr_1 \preceq_s tr_2$ if tr_1 is a suffix of tr_2 .*

It is trivial that in a set of finite paths, relation \prec_s is well-founded. Because every finite path has only a finite number of suffixes.

Relation \prec_m is based on the definition of relation \prec_s .

Definition 10 (Relation \prec_m). Given two finite sets C_1 and C_2 of finite paths, $C_1 \prec_m C_2$ is defined if set C_1 can be obtained from C_2 by replacing (or removing) one or more elements of C_2 with a finite number of elements, such that for each replaced element $tr \in C_2$, its replacements tr_1, \dots, tr_n ($n \geq 1$) in C_1 satisfies that $tr_i \prec_s tr$ for any i , $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Write $C_1 \preceq_m C_2$ if $C_1 = C_2$ or $C_1 \prec_m C_2$.

Note that in Definition 10 it is not hard to see that $C_1 \prec_m C_2$ implies $C_1 \neq C_2$.

For example, let $C_1 = \{tr_1, tr_2, tr_3\}$, where $tr_1 =_{df} (\alpha, \sigma) \rightarrow (\alpha_1, \sigma_1) \rightarrow (\alpha_2, \sigma_2) \rightarrow (\alpha_3, \sigma_3) \rightarrow (\downarrow, \sigma_4)$, $tr_2 =_{df} (\alpha, \sigma) \rightarrow (\alpha_1, \sigma_1) \rightarrow (\beta_1, \delta_1) \rightarrow (\beta_2, \delta_2) \rightarrow (\downarrow, \delta_3)$ and $tr_3 =_{df} (\alpha, \sigma) \rightarrow (\downarrow, \tau)$; $C_2 = \{tr'_1, tr'_2\}$, where $tr'_1 =_{df} (\alpha_1, \sigma_1) \rightarrow (\alpha_2, \sigma_2) \rightarrow (\alpha_3, \sigma_3) \rightarrow (\downarrow, \sigma_4)$, $tr'_2 =_{df} (\alpha_1, \sigma_1) \rightarrow (\beta_1, \delta_1) \rightarrow (\beta_2, \delta_2) \rightarrow (\downarrow, \delta_3)$. We see that $tr'_1 \prec_s tr_1$ and $tr'_2 \prec_s tr_2$. C_2 can be obtained from C_1 by replacing tr_1 and tr_2 with tr'_1 and tr'_2 respectively, and removing tr_3 . Hence $C_2 \prec_m C_1$.

Relation \prec_m is in fact a special case of the “multiset ordering” introduced in [12], where it has shown that multiset ordering is well-founded. Therefore, \prec_m is well-founded.

3.3 Construction of A Cyclic Preproof Structure in DL_p

A *preproof* is a finite proof tree in which each non-terminal node is identical to one of its ancestors in the tree. Such a non-terminal node is called a *bud* (cf. [10]). The ancestor equivalent to a bud N is called a *companion of N* . A bud and one of its companions is together called a *back-link*.

A *derivation path* in a preproof is a possibly infinite sequence of nodes $n_1 n_2 \dots n_m \dots$ ($m \geq 1$) starting from the root n_1 , where each pair of nodes (n_i, n_{i+1}) ($i \geq 1$) is either a conclusion-premise pair of the instance of a proof rule, or a back-link of the preproof. A *derivation trace* is a possibly infinite sequence $\tau_1 \tau_2 \dots \tau_m \dots$ of formulas over a derivation path $n_1 n_2 \dots n_m \dots$ ($m \geq 1$) such that each τ_i is a formula appeared in node n_i ($i \geq 1$).

We introduce the notion of (*progressive*) *derivation traces* (cf. [10]) in a preproof of DL_p , which is critical for a preproof structure to be a sound proof. The key idea is that if each derivation trace of a preproof structure is progressive, then it is impossible for the conclusion of the preproof to be invalid. Otherwise, an infinite descent sequence of counterexamples of finite sets of execution traces of a program can be constructed, contradicting the fact that the relation \prec_s or \prec_m mentioned in Section 3.2 is well-founded.

Definition 11 (Progressive Step/Progressive Derivation Trace in DL_p). In a preproof of DL_p , given an infinite derivation trace $\tau_1 \tau_2 \dots \tau_m \dots$ along a derivation path $n_1 n_2 \dots n_m \dots$ ($m \geq 1$), a formula pair (τ_i, τ_{i+1}) ($1 \leq i \leq m$) of the derivation trace is called a “progressive step”, if τ_i, τ_{i+1} are the formulas appeared in the sequent pair (n_i, n_{i+1}) respectively, as:

$$\begin{aligned} n_i : \Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : [\alpha]\phi, \Delta, \\ n_{i+1} : \Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma' : [\alpha']\phi, \Delta, \end{aligned}$$

which is in an instance of rule $([\alpha]\sigma)$ and where τ_i is formula $\sigma : [\alpha]\phi$, τ_{i+1} is formula $\sigma' : [\alpha']\phi$;

Or as:

$$\begin{aligned} n_i : \Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma\{t\} : \langle\alpha\rangle\phi, \Delta, \\ n_{i+1} : \Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma'\{t'\} : \langle\alpha'\rangle\phi, \Delta, \end{aligned}$$

which is in an instance of rule $(\langle\alpha\rangle\sigma)$ and where τ_i is formula $\sigma\{t\} : \langle\alpha\rangle\phi$, τ_{i+1} is formula $\sigma'\{t'\} : \langle\alpha'\rangle\phi$, and termination factors t, t' satisfy $t' \prec t$.

If a derivation trace has an infinite number of progressive steps, we say that the trace is ‘progressive’, or it is a “progressive trace”.

Note that when (n_i, n_{i+1}) is in an instance of rule $(\langle\alpha\rangle\sigma)$, the execution from (α, σ) to (α', σ') observes a termination factor t' strictly less than t w.r.t. relation \prec . This, as will be seen later in Section 3.4, actually indicates the termination of a counter-example path of program α , which is the key to prove Theorem 1.

Now we give the soundness condition for a preproof structure to lead a sound conclusion in DL_p .

Definition 12 (A Cyclic Preproof of DL_p). In DL_p , a preproof is a ‘cyclic’ one, if there exists a progressive trace along any infinite derivation path.

The following theorem is the main result of this section.

Theorem 1 (Soundness of A Cyclic Preproof of DL_p). A cyclic preproof of DL_p always has a valid conclusion.

About the Completeness of DL_p Since DL_p is not a specific logic in traditional sense, its completeness relies on specific structures of programs, configurations and formulas given as **Prog**, **Conf** and **Form** respectively. The completeness of DL_p depends on whether we can build a cyclic preproof for every valid formula in this logic by constructing suitable configurations so that every infinite derivation path has a progressive derivation trace.

3.4 Soundness of the Cyclic Proof System for DL_p

In this subsection, we analyze and prove Theorem 1. We only focus on the case when the conclusion is of the form $\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : [\alpha]\phi$ or $\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : \langle \alpha \rangle \phi$, where dynamic DL_p formulas $\sigma : [\alpha]\phi$ and $\sigma : \langle \alpha \rangle \phi$ are the only formula on the right side of the sequent. Other cases are trivial.

To prove Theorem 1 we need to show that if a preproof is cyclic (Definition 12), that is, if any infinite derivation path is followed by a progressive trace, then the conclusion is valid. The proof is carried out by contradiction following the main idea behind [8]. Suppose the conclusion is invalid, that is, $\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : [\alpha]\phi$ (resp. $\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : \langle \alpha \rangle \phi$) is invalid. Then we show that it induces an infinite descent sequence of elements ordered by well-founded relation \prec_m introduced in Section 3.2, which is contradict to Definition 4.

Before proving Theorem 1, we need some preparations stated as the following lemmas and definitions.

Definition 13. A “counter-example” $F(\rho, \alpha, \sigma, \phi)$ of a formula $\tau \in \{\sigma : [\alpha]\phi, \sigma : \langle \alpha \rangle \phi\}$ is a set of minimum terminal execution paths defined as: $F(\rho, \alpha, \sigma, \phi) =_{df} \{(\rho(\alpha), \rho(\sigma)) \longrightarrow^* (\downarrow, \sigma') \mid \rho, \sigma' \not\models \phi\}$.

Recall that a path being minimum is defined in Section 2.1.

Intuitively, a *corresponding path* is a result of symbolic executions by the instances of rules $(\sigma[\alpha])$ and $(\sigma\langle \alpha \rangle)$ along a derivation trace.

Definition 14. Given a derivation trace $\tau_1\tau_2\ldots\tau_m\ldots$ over a derivation path $n_1n_2\ldots n_m\ldots$ ($m \geq 1$), where $\tau_1 \in \{\sigma : [\alpha]\phi, \sigma : \langle \alpha \rangle \phi\}$, each pair (τ_i, τ_{i+1}) ($i \geq 1$) either satisfies $\tau_i \equiv \tau_{i+1}$ or (n_i, n_{i+1}) is a conclusion-premise pair of an instance of rule $(\sigma[\alpha])$ or $(\sigma\langle \alpha \rangle)$, a “corresponding path” $(\alpha_1, \sigma_1) \longrightarrow \ldots \longrightarrow (\alpha_n, \sigma_n) \longrightarrow \ldots$ ($n \geq 1$) of the derivation trace $\tau_1\tau_2\ldots\tau_m\ldots$ satisfies that $\alpha_1 \in \mathbf{Cl}(\alpha)$, $\sigma_1 \in \mathbf{Cl}(\sigma)$, and for any $(\alpha_k, \sigma_k) \longrightarrow (\alpha_{k+1}, \sigma_{k+1})$ ($k \geq 1$) of the path and formula $\tau_i =_{df} \sigma_i : [\alpha_i]\phi$ (resp. $\tau_i =_{df} \sigma_i : \langle \alpha_i \rangle \phi$, $i \geq 1$) such that $\alpha_k \in \mathbf{Cl}(\alpha_i)$ and $\sigma_k \in \mathbf{Cl}(\sigma_i)$, there is a pair (τ_j, τ_{j+1}) over (n_j, n_{j+1}) ($i \leq j$) such that $\tau_i \equiv \ldots \equiv \tau_j$, (n_i, n_{i+1}) is a conclusion-premise pair of an instance of rule $(\sigma[\alpha])$ (resp. rule $(\sigma\langle \alpha \rangle)$), and $\tau_{j+1} =_{df} \sigma_{j+1}[\alpha_{j+1}]\phi$ (resp. $\tau_{j+1} =_{df} \sigma_{j+1}\langle \alpha_{j+1} \rangle \phi$) such that $\alpha_{k+1} \in \mathbf{Cl}(\alpha_i)$ and $\sigma_{k+1} \in \mathbf{Cl}(\sigma_i)$.

Lemma 1. In a cyclic preproof of sequent $\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : \langle \alpha \rangle \phi$, given an evaluation ρ satisfying $\rho \models \Gamma$, any corresponding path tr starting from $(\rho(\alpha), \rho(\sigma))$ of an infinite derivation trace $\tau_1\tau_2\ldots$ starting from $\tau_1 =_{df} \sigma : \langle \alpha \rangle \phi$ eventually terminates.

Proof. Since every derivation trace is progressive, according to rule $(\sigma\langle \alpha \rangle)$ and Definition 14, if path tr does not terminate, then along the path there exists an infinite sequence of configurations $\sigma_1\{t_1\}, \ldots, \sigma_n\{t_n\}, \ldots$ where their termination factors satisfy $t_1 \succ \ldots \succ t_n \succ \ldots$. This violates the well-foundedness of relation \prec (see below Definition 4). \square

Lemma 2. In a cyclic preproof, let $\tau \in \{\sigma : [\alpha]\phi, \sigma : \langle \alpha \rangle \phi\}$ be a formula in an invalid node $n =_{df} (\Gamma \Rightarrow \tau)$, $\rho \models \Gamma$, and $F(\rho, \alpha, \sigma, \phi)$ is a finite counter-example of τ . Then there exists a formula pair (τ, τ') appeared in the node pair (n, n') and a set $F(\rho, \alpha', \sigma', \phi)$ such that n' is invalid, $F(\rho, \alpha', \sigma', \phi)$ is a finite counter-example of τ' , and $F(\rho, \alpha', \sigma', \phi) \preceq_m F(\rho, \alpha, \sigma, \phi)$. Moreover, if (τ, τ') is a progressive step, then $F(\rho, \alpha', \sigma', \phi) \prec_m F(\rho, \alpha, \sigma, \phi)$.

Proof. Consider the rule application from node n , actually the only non-trivial cases are when it is an instance of rule $([\alpha]\sigma)$ (namely “case 1”) or rule $(\langle\alpha\rangle\sigma)$ (namely “case 2”).

Case 1: If from node n rule $([\alpha]\sigma)$ is applied with $\tau =_{df} \sigma : [\alpha]\phi$ the target formula in n , by $\rho \models \Gamma$ and the invalidity of n , $\rho \not\models \sigma : [\alpha]\phi$. By the semantics of $\sigma : [\alpha]\phi$, there is a pair (α', σ') and a transition $(\rho(\alpha), \rho(\sigma)) \rightarrow (\rho(\alpha'), \rho(\sigma')) \in \Lambda$ such that $\rho \not\models \sigma' : [\alpha']\phi$. This means that there exists an invalid sequent $n' =_{df} \Gamma \Rightarrow \tau'$ as a premise of n , in which formula $\tau' =_{df} \sigma' : [\alpha']\phi$ is invalid. And because of this, $F(\rho, \alpha', \sigma', \phi)$ is non-empty. We observe that by the transition $(\rho(\alpha), \rho(\sigma)) \rightarrow (\rho(\alpha'), \rho(\sigma'))$, each path in $F(\rho, \alpha', \sigma', \phi)$ is actually a proper suffix of a path in $F(\rho, \alpha, \sigma, \phi)$. So from the finiteness of $F(\rho, \alpha, \sigma, \phi)$, we obtain the finiteness of $F(\rho, \alpha', \sigma', \phi)$, and by Definition 10, we have $F(\rho, \alpha', \sigma', \phi) \prec_m F(\rho, \alpha, \sigma, \phi)$.

Case 2: If from node n rule $(\langle\alpha\rangle\sigma)$ is applied with $\tau =_{df} \sigma : \langle\alpha\rangle\phi$ the target formula in n , let $n' =_{df} \Gamma \Rightarrow \tau'$ and $\tau' =_{df} \sigma' : \langle\alpha'\rangle\phi$. By Lemma 1, any path $(\rho(\alpha), \rho(\sigma)) \rightarrow (\rho(\alpha'), \rho(\sigma')) \rightarrow^* (\downarrow, \sigma'')$ that corresponds to an infinite derivation trace $\tau_1\tau_2\ldots$ starting from $\tau_1 =_{df} \sigma : \langle\alpha\rangle\phi$ and $\tau_2 =_{df} \sigma' : \langle\alpha'\rangle\phi$ in the sense of Definition 14 eventually terminates. And since $\rho \not\models \sigma : \langle\alpha\rangle\phi$, $\rho, \sigma'' \not\models \phi$. As there must exist an infinite derivation trace $\tau_1\tau_2\ldots$ as described above (otherwise violating the assumption that n is invalid), $F(\rho, \alpha', \sigma', \phi)$ is non-empty. By the transition $(\rho(\alpha), \rho(\sigma)) \rightarrow (\rho(\alpha'), \rho(\sigma'))$, each path in $F(\rho, \alpha', \sigma', \phi)$ is a proper suffix of $F(\rho, \alpha, \sigma, \phi)$. So the finiteness of $F(\rho, \alpha, \sigma, \phi)$ implies the finiteness of $F(\rho, \alpha', \sigma', \phi)$, and we have $F(\rho, \alpha', \sigma', \phi) \prec_m F(\rho, \alpha, \sigma, \phi)$. \square

From the “case 2” of the above proof, we see that it does not have to be a progressive step in order to obtain a strictly-smaller-than relation $F(\rho, \alpha', \sigma', \phi) \prec_m F(\rho, \alpha, \sigma, \phi)$. However, progressive steps are still required for proving the termination of paths in Lemma 1.

As the end of this subsection, we give the proof of Theorem 1 as follows.

Proof (Proof of Theorem 1). As stated previously we only focus on the cases where the conclusion of a cyclic preproof is either of the form $\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : [\alpha]\phi$ or $\Gamma \Rightarrow \sigma : \langle\alpha\rangle\phi$.

Let $\tau \in \{\sigma : [\alpha]\phi, \sigma : \langle\alpha\rangle\phi\}$. Suppose $\Gamma \Rightarrow \tau$ is invalid. If the counter-example set $F(\rho, \alpha, \sigma, \phi)$ of τ is finite, according to Lemma 2, we can obtain an infinite derivation trace $\tau_1\tau_2\ldots\tau_m\ldots$ over a derivation path $n_1n_2\ldots n_m\ldots$ ($m \geq 1$) and each set F_i (with $F_1 =_{df} F(\rho, \alpha, \sigma, \phi)$) as a finite counter-example of formula τ_i ($i \geq 1$). Note that there must exist at least one infinite derivation trace, otherwise, $\Gamma \Rightarrow \tau$ is valid. By Lemma 2, from these counter-examples we obtain an infinite relation chain: $F_1 \succeq_m F_2 \succeq_m \ldots \succeq_m F_m \succeq_m \ldots$. Moreover, since $\tau_1\tau_2\ldots\tau_m\ldots$ is progressive (Definition 12), there must be an infinite number of relation \succ_m among these relations. This thus forms an infinite descent sequence w.r.t. relation \succ_m , violating the well-foundedness of relation \succ_m (cf. Section 3.2).

It remains to show that $F(\rho, \alpha, \sigma, \phi)$ is finite in different cases of τ . However, this is direct by III of Definition 1. \square

4 Case Studies

In this section, we give two case studies from different types of programs as described in Table 1, showing how the proposed DL_p can be used to derive different types of programs step by step according to their operational semantics and how it lifts other rules in specific domains.

4.1 Example One: A While Program

The first example is a traditional while program:

$$WP_1 =_{df} \{s := 0; \text{ while } (n > 0) \text{ do } s := s + n; n := n - 1 \text{ end } \}.$$

Given an initial value of variables n , this program computes the sum from n to 1 stored in variable s . We prove a property described in a sequent of DL_p formulas as follows:

$$P_1 =_{df} \sigma_1 : (n \geq 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_1 : [WP_1](s = \frac{(n+1)n}{2}),$$

$ \begin{array}{r} \frac{12}{11} \\ \frac{10}{9} \\ \frac{9}{4} \\ \frac{3}{2} \\ 1 \end{array} \begin{array}{l} (\sigma \text{ Ter}) \\ (\sigma \text{ Int}) \\ ([\alpha]\sigma) \\ ([\alpha]\sigma) \\ ([\alpha]\sigma) \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{l} 1: \sigma_1(v, u) : (n \geq 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_1(v, u) : [s := 0; \alpha_1] \phi_1 \\ 2: \sigma_1(v, u) : (n \geq 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_2(v) : [\text{while } (n > 0) \text{ do } \beta_1 \text{ end}] \phi_1 \\ 3: \sigma_1(v, u) : (n \geq 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_3(v) : [\text{while } (n > 0) \text{ do } \beta_1 \text{ end}] \phi_1 \\ 4: \sigma_1(v, u) : (n > 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_3(v) : [\text{while } (n > 0) \text{ do } \beta_1 \text{ end}] \phi_1 \\ 5: \sigma_1(v, u) : (n = 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_3(v) : [\text{while } (n > 0) \text{ do } \beta_1 \text{ end}] \phi_1 \\ 6: \sigma_1(v, u) : (n = 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_3(v) : [\downarrow] \phi_1 \\ 7: \sigma_1(v, u) : (n = 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_3(v) : (s = ((n+1)n)/2) \\ 8: \sigma_1(v, u) : (n = 0) \Rightarrow (s = ((n+1)n)/2) \triangleright \sigma_3(v) \\ 9: \sigma_1(v, u) : (n > 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_4(v) : [n := n - 1; \alpha_1] \phi_1 \\ 10: \sigma_1(v, u) : (n > 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_5(v) : [\text{while } (n > 0) \text{ do } \beta_1 \text{ end}] \phi_1 \\ 11: \sigma_1(v', u) : (n \geq 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_3(v') : [\text{while } (n > 0) \text{ do } \beta_1 \text{ end}] \phi_1 \\ 12: \sigma_1(v, u) : (n \geq 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_3(v) : [\text{while } (n > 0) \text{ do } \beta_1 \text{ end}] \phi_1 \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{l} \alpha_1 =_{df} \text{while } (n > 0) \text{ do } \beta_1 \text{ end} \\ \beta_1 =_{df} s := s + n; n := n - 1 \\ \phi_1 =_{df} (s = ((n+1)n)/2) \\ \sigma_1(v, u) =_{df} \{n \mapsto v, s \mapsto u\} \\ \sigma_2(v) =_{df} \{n \mapsto v, s \mapsto 0\} \\ \sigma_3(v) =_{df} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} n \mapsto v, \\ s \mapsto ((n+v+1)(n-v))/2 \end{array} \right\} \\ \sigma_4(v) =_{df} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} n \mapsto v, \\ s \mapsto ((n+v)(n-v+1))/2 \end{array} \right\} \\ \sigma_5(v) =_{df} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} n \mapsto v - 1, \\ s \mapsto ((n+v)(n-v+1))/2 \end{array} \right\} \end{array} $
---	--	---

Fig. 1: Derivations of Example 1

where $\sigma_1 =_{df} \{n \mapsto v, s \mapsto u\}$ with v, u free variables. P_1 says that given an initial value of n , after executing E_1 , s equals to $((n+1)n)/2$, which is the sum of $1 + 2 + \dots + n$.

A configuration σ of a while program is a storage that maps some variable to a value of the integer domain \mathbb{Z} . For example, $\{n \mapsto 100, s \mapsto 0\}$ denotes a configuration that maps n to 100 and s to 0. Part of the operation semantics of Program WP_1 are described as inference rules in Table 1. $\phi \triangleright \sigma$ is defined as the formula after the variable assignments according to configuration σ in ϕ . For example, $(n \geq 0) \triangleright \{n \mapsto 1, s \mapsto 0\}$ assigns n to 1 in $n \geq 0$ and thus we get $1 \geq 0$.

Figure 1 shows the derivation of this formula. The inferences with no names aside do not belong to Table 2, but are the additional rules for constructing proper labelled formulas. The derivation from sequent 2 to 3 is according to the fact that $\sigma_2(v) = \sigma_3(v)$. Configuration $\sigma_3(v)$ constructed in sequent 3 is crucial, as starting from it, we can find a bud node — 12 — that is identical to it. The derivation from sequent 3 to $\{4, 5\}$ is dividing sequent 3 into two cases: $n > 0$ and $n = 0$. Sequent 11 is obtained by substituting v with $v' + 1$ from sequent 10. We observe that $\sigma_5(v)$ is just $\sigma_3(v - 1)$. The left side of 11 comes from the fact that $\{u \mapsto v' + 1, s \mapsto u\} : (n > 0)$ is logically equivalent to $\{u \mapsto v', s \mapsto u\} : (n \geq 0)$, which is the left side of sequent 11. From sequent 11 to sequent 12, we simply replace the free variable name v' with v , which does not change the validity of the sequent.

The whole proof tree is a cyclic preproof because the only infinite derivation path: $1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 3, 4, 9, \dots$ has a progressive derivation trace consisting of the target formulas underlined in Figure 1.

Readers may notice that if we choose the configuration as a free variable X and try to prove $X : (n \geq 0) \Rightarrow X : [WP_1](s = \frac{(n+1)n}{2})$, then our approach is no different from using the ‘update’ structure in previous work like [4]. In this way, a configuration has no explicit structure itself, but just a variable carrying updates, for example, $X[s \mapsto 0]$, which updates the value of s to 0 in X . One of the advantages of the configurations in DL_p compared to the ‘update’ approach is that it allows explicit forms of programs’ or system models’ structures.

4.2 Example Two: A Synchronous Loop Program

The second example we consider is a synchronous program written in Esterel language [7]:

$$E_2 =_{df} A \parallel B,$$

where

$$A = \text{trap loop } \underbrace{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{if } x > 0 \text{ then} \\ \quad x := x - 1; \text{ emit } T; \text{ pause} \\ \text{else} \\ \quad \text{emit } S; \text{ exit} \\ \text{end} \end{array} \right\}}_{A_l} \text{ end end}, \quad B = \text{trap loop } \underbrace{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{present } S \text{ then} \\ \quad \text{exit} \\ \text{else} \\ \quad \text{pause} \\ \text{end} \end{array} \right\}}_{B_l} \text{ end end}$$

are two programs running in parallel. Their loop bodies are represented by A_l and B_l respectively. Different from *while* programs, the behaviour of a synchronous program is characterized by a sequence of *instances*. At each instance, several (atomic) executions of a program occur. A synchronous program model guarantees that when some programs run in parallel, the program state at the end of an instance is unique, regardless of the orders of all executions during that instance. Therefore, at each instance, the behaviour of a parallel synchronous program is deterministic.

In this example, program A decreases a variable x by 1 every instance, while program B listens to a control signal S from A , and only terminates when program A emits S . Key word *pause* ends the current instance of a program. “*present S...*” means “if S is emitted...”. *exit* terminates either program A or B by jumping out of a *trap* statement. At each instance, when $x > 0$, program A executes $x := x - 1$ and *emit* T , while program B simply pauses by doing nothing. When $x \leq 0$, program A emits S and terminates, while program B just terminates at the same instance. And the whole program $A \parallel B$ terminates. When initializing x as 5, the state of all variables at the end of each instance is listed as follows: (*inst* 1 : $x = 4, S = \perp, T = \top$), (*inst* 2 : $x = 3, S = \perp, T = \top$), (*inst* 3 : $x = 2, S = \perp, T = \top$), (*inst* 4 : $x = 1, S = \perp, T = \top$), (*inst* 5 : $x = 0, S = \top, T = \perp$), where \top and \perp represent the presence and absence of a signal respectively.

Different from Example 1, a configuration in Esterel is a stack structure [35], allowing expressing local variables with same names. For example, $\{x \mapsto 5 \mid T \mapsto \perp \mid S \mapsto \top \mid T \mapsto \top\}$ represents a configuration in which there are 4 variables: x , S and two T s with different values. We use “ \mid ” instead of “ $,$ ” to remind that it is a stack structure, with the right-most side as the top of the stack. In this example, for simplicity, we assume that the 3 variables x , T and S are already declared, so an initial configuration of the program is always of the form: $\{x \mapsto v \mid T \mapsto \perp \mid S \mapsto \perp\}$ for an arbitrary value v . $\phi \triangleright \sigma$ has a similar meaning as in Example 1, the only difference is that, a variable, say x , is explained by the top-most variable x in the stack of σ . For instance, $(x > 0) \triangleright \{x \mapsto 5 \mid x \mapsto 2 \mid y \mapsto 1\}$ is $2 > 0$, rather than $5 > 0$.

The operational semantics of an Esterel program is quite complex, which can be understood in two scopes. In micro scope, each transition represents an atomic execution of a program in an instance. In macro scope, there can be more than one transitions in an instance. After the last transition, all signals are reset to “absence” and a new instance starts. During executions in an instance, auxiliary processes (called ‘Can’ processes [35]) are needed in order to guarantee the consistency of all variables. In this paper, for simplicity, we do not list the inference rules for Esterel but only give the transitions needed for the deductions as below.

Contrast with *while* programs, Esterel programs do not directly support structural rules. Intuitively, for a sequence program $\alpha; \beta$ in Esterel, program α cannot simply proceed independently from program β , unless all atomic executions in β occur at a different instance from any execution in α . One needs to collect all atomic executions in $\alpha; \beta$ at current instance together, in order to check that all variables are consistent. More analysis was given in [17].

We prove the following property

$$P_2 =_{df} \{x \mapsto v \mid T \mapsto \perp \mid S \mapsto \perp\} : (x > 0) \Rightarrow \{x \mapsto v \mid T \mapsto \perp \mid S \mapsto \perp\} : \langle E_2 \rangle (x = 0),$$

which says that under any configuration (with v a free variable), if $x > 0$, then there exists an execution of E_2 that terminates and satisfies $x = 0$.

The derivations of P_2 is shown in Figure 2. Instances of rule $(\langle \alpha \rangle \sigma)$ rely on the transitions listed as follows:

- from node 1 to 2: $(A \parallel B, \sigma_1(v)\{v\}) \longrightarrow (A_1 \parallel B, \sigma_2(v)\{v-1\})$
- from node 2 to 3: $(A_1 \parallel B, \sigma_2(v)\{v-1\}) \longrightarrow (A_2 \parallel B_1, \sigma_3(v)\{v-1\})$
- from node 6 to 7: $(A \parallel B, \sigma_2(v)\{v-1\}) \longrightarrow (A_3 \parallel B_2, \sigma_4(v)\{v-1\})$
- from node 7 to 8: $(A_3 \parallel B_2, \sigma_4(v)\{v-1\}) \longrightarrow (\downarrow, \sigma_2(v)\{v-1\})$

The termination factors in E_2 are defined as natural numbers, with the “less-than relation” $<$ between natural numbers as the well-founded relation ($<$) between termination factors. v and $v-1$ are the termination factors in the configurations. From node 4, two situations 5 and 6 are considered based on the loop condition $x > 0$. Node 11 is obtained from node 5 by substituting variable v with $v' + 1$.

$ \begin{array}{c} \frac{12}{5} \\ \frac{11}{5} \\ \frac{8}{6} \\ \frac{7}{6} \\ \frac{4}{3} \\ \frac{3}{2} \\ \frac{2}{1} \end{array} $ <p style="text-align: right;"> σ_{Ter} (σ_{Int}) $(\langle \downarrow \rangle \sigma)$ $(\langle \alpha \rangle \sigma)$ $(\langle \alpha \rangle \sigma)$ $(\langle \alpha \rangle \sigma)$ $(\langle \alpha \rangle \sigma)$ </p>	$ \begin{array}{l} 1: \sigma_1(v) : (x > 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_1(v)\{v\} : \langle A \parallel B \rangle (x = 0) \\ 2: \sigma_1(v) : (x > 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_2(v)\{v-1\} : \langle A_1 \parallel B \rangle (x = 0) \\ 3: \sigma_1(v) : (x > 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_3(v)\{v-1\} : \langle A_2 \parallel B_1 \rangle (x = 0) \\ 4: \sigma_1(v) : (x > 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_2(v)\{v-1\} : \langle A \parallel B \rangle (x = 0) \\ 5: \sigma_1(v) : (x > 1) \Rightarrow \sigma_2(v)\{v-1\} : \langle A \parallel B \rangle (x = 0) \\ 6: \sigma_1(v) : (x = 1) \Rightarrow \sigma_2(v)\{v-1\} : \langle A \parallel B \rangle (x = 0) \\ 7: \sigma_1(v) : (x = 1) \Rightarrow \sigma_4(v)\{v-1\} : \langle A_3 \parallel B_2 \rangle (x = 0) \\ 8: \sigma_1(v) : (x = 1) \Rightarrow \sigma_2(v)\{v-1\} : \langle \downarrow \rangle (x = 0) \\ 9: \sigma_1(v) : (x = 1) \Rightarrow \sigma_2(v)\{v-1\} : (x = 0) \\ 10: \sigma_1(v) : (x = 1) \Rightarrow (x = 0) \triangleright \sigma_2(v)\{v-1\} \\ 11: \sigma_1(v') : (x > 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_1(v')\{v'\} : \langle A \parallel B \rangle (x = 0) \\ 12: \sigma_1(v) : (x > 0) \Rightarrow \sigma_1(v)\{v\} : \langle A \parallel B \rangle (x = 0) \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{l} \beta_1 =_{df} s := s + n; n := n - 1 \\ A_1 =_{df} \text{trap loop emit } T; \text{ pause}; A_l \text{ end end} \\ A_2 =_{df} \text{trap loop pause}; A_l \text{ end end} \\ B_1 =_{df} \text{trap loop pause}; B_l \text{ end end} \\ A_3 =_{df} \text{trap loop exit}; A_l \text{ end end} \\ B_2 =_{df} \text{trap loop exit}; B_l \text{ end end} \\ \sigma_1(v)\{v\} =_{df} \{x \mapsto v \mid T \mapsto \perp \mid S \mapsto \perp\} \\ \sigma_2(v)\{v-1\} =_{df} \{x \mapsto v-1 \mid T \mapsto \perp \mid S \mapsto \perp\} \\ \sigma_3(v)\{v-1\} =_{df} \{x \mapsto v-1 \mid T \mapsto \top \mid S \mapsto \perp\} \\ \sigma_4(v)\{v-1\} =_{df} \{x \mapsto v-1 \mid T \mapsto \perp \mid S \mapsto \top\} \end{array} $
---	---	---

Fig. 2: Derivations of Example 2

Node 12 is a bud with node 2 as its companion, which is obtained by replace the free variable name v' with v in node 11. The whole preproof is progressive as the derivation step from 1 to 2 is progressive (with $v-1 < v$). So all infinite derivation traces are progressive.

5 Related Work

Reasoning about programs directly through their executable semantics is not a new idea. As far as we know, the first related work was matching logic, proposed by Rosu and Stefanescu in [36]. Matching logic is based on patterns and pattern matching. Its basic form, a reachability rule $\varphi \Rightarrow \varphi'$ (note that \Rightarrow means differently there than in our sequents), captures whether pattern φ' is reachable from pattern φ in a given pattern reachability system. One-path reachability logic [37] and all-paths reachability logic [39] were developed based on matching logic by adding conditional rules and a all-paths reachability rule $\varphi \Rightarrow^\forall \varphi'$ respectively. The concept of ‘patterns’ in matching/reachability logics has a wider scope of meaning than the concepts of ‘programs’, ‘configurations’ and ‘formulas’ in DL_p . The program specifications described with modal operator $[\cdot]$ in DL_p cannot be expressed in matching logic and one-path reachability logic when the program models are non-deterministic, as $[\cdot]$ captures “the reachability of ALL execution paths”. However, the semantics of $[\cdot]$ can be captured by the reachability rule $\varphi \Rightarrow^\forall \varphi'$ in all-paths reachability logic. A more powerful matching μ -logic [11] was developed by adding a least fixpoint μ -binder to matching logic. We conjecture that matching μ -logic can encode DL_p , as it has been declared in [11] that it can encode traditional dynamic logics. So compared to reachability logic and matching- μ logic, our contribution is not about expressiveness, but that we propose a different proof theory rooted in cyclic reasoning (rather than coinduction [37]) and the theory of dynamic logic for program verification via operational semantics.

Compared to all matching, reachability and matching- μ logics above, one advantage of DL_p is that DL_p comes to program deductions in a more natural and direct way, in the sense that the concepts of ‘programs’ and ‘configurations’ are explicitly expressed, and programs and formulas are clearly separated by the modal operator $[\cdot]$. As we put previously, this brings a benefit that we can observe how program behaviours evolve independently from the formulas along the whole derivation processes. On the other hand, to express a DL_p specification like $(\sigma : \phi) \Rightarrow (\sigma : \langle \alpha \rangle \psi)$ in matching logic for example, one needs to ‘mix up’ all structures together to form a pattern, in a form like: $\varphi =_{df} \alpha \wedge \sigma \wedge \phi$ and $\varphi' =_{df} \alpha \wedge \sigma' \wedge \psi$ for some configuration σ' , in order to prove the reachability rule $\varphi \Rightarrow \varphi'$.

[28] proposed a general program verification framework based on coinduction, the theory the reachability logics [37,39] also rely on. Using the terminology in this paper, in [28] a program specification can be expressed as a pair (c, P) with c a program state and P a set of program states, capturing the exact meaning of formula $\sigma : [\alpha]\phi$ in DL_p if we let c be (α, σ) and let set P be the semantics of formula ϕ . The authors designed a method to derive a program specification (c, P) in a coinductive way according to the operational semantics of c . The soundness of the method is

proved by using the greatest fixpoint theory on mathematical sets. Following [28], [26] also proposed a general framework for program reasoning, but via big-step semantics. Unlike the frameworks in [28] and [26], which are directly based on set theory, DL_p has an explicit form of logic, which is more suitable in some cases to catch specifications. The proof system of DL_p is based on the cyclic proof theory (cf. [10]) rather than coinduction, where especially, the soundness of DL_p is proved by contradiction on the well-foundedness of partial-order relations. Besides, in DL_p , one can also express and derive the negation of a dynamic formula $\sigma : [\alpha]\phi$ as the dual formula $\sigma : \langle \alpha \rangle \neg \phi$, whose meaning cannot be captured in the framework of [28].

The structure ‘updates’ in traditional dynamic logics, used in Java dynamic logic [5], differential dynamic logic [31], dynamic trace logic [4], etc., works as a special case of the configurations in this paper. As illustrated at the end of Section 4.1, a configuration is more than just a calculus for substitutions of variables and terms.

The proof system of DL_p relies on the cyclic proof theory which firstly arose in [40], and later developed in different logics such as [10], [8], etc. Traditional dynamic logics’ proof systems are not cyclic ones. In [23], Jungteerapanich proposed a complete cyclic proof system for μ -calculus, which subsumes propositional dynamic logic (PDL) [15] in its expressiveness. In [13], Docherty and Rowe proposed a complete labelled cyclic proof system for PDL . Both μ -calculus and PDL are logics with regular expressions with tests as their program models, which are not in a parameterized form like the program models of DL_p . The labelled form of DL_p formula $\sigma : [\alpha]\phi$ comes from [13], where a labelled PDL formula is of the form $s : [\alpha]\phi$, with s a state in Kripke structure. Rather than just a state, a configuration σ in DL_p allow more forms rather than functions mapping variables to values (see our Example 2). [13] has inspired us to use the well-founded relation \prec_m in the proof of the soundness of DL_p , though we take a different proof approach since unlike PDL , DL_p formulas do not satisfy the “finite model property” (cf. [13]).

6 Some Discussions & Future Work

DL_p can be a very powerful logic calculus due to its general forms. But one should not take DL_p as a “unified framework” for programming and verification, like matching- μ logic and UTP theory [22]. DL_p is more of a second-ordered logic restricted to a particular form so that it facilitates expressing and reasoning about programs and systems. Though we only give two examples in this paper, one can easily see that DL_p can be used to reason about many other types of programs, specially those do not support structural rules, such as neural networks as done recently in [41], and also many abstract system models, such as Kleene algebra with tests [25] and CCS [27].

DL_p can be taken as a general theory that can subsume the existed dynamic logic theories in which program models satisfy the program properties declared in Definition 1. Any rule in a dynamic logic theory can be lifted as a labelled rule in DL_p , which is derived without changing the labels of a formula. For instance, in the example discussed in Section 1, to derive formula $\psi =_{df} (\{x \mapsto t\} : x \geq 0 \Rightarrow \{x \mapsto t\} : [x := x + 1]x > 0)$, one can also apply the “lifting version” of the assignment rule ($x := e$) as: $\frac{\sigma : \psi[x/e]}{\sigma : [x := e]\psi}$, and ψ then becomes $\psi''' =_{df} (\{x \mapsto t\} : x \geq 0) \rightarrow (\{x \mapsto t\} : x + 1 > 0)$, which also can be transformed into formula $\phi' : t \geq 0 \rightarrow t + 1 > 0$ after the applications of $\{x \mapsto t\}$. This “lifting ability” provides DL_p with a flexible framework in which different inference rules can be applied to make a trade-off between structural-based reasoning and symbolic executions in practical deduction processes. More work will be on analyzing how program verification can be benefited from this flexibility of the theory of DL_p .

One future work will focus on implementing a specialized program verifier based on the theory of DL_p . The tool is now under development based on *Cyclist* [9], a proof engine supported by an efficient cyclic-proof-search algorithm. To see the full potential of DL_p , we are also trying to use DL_p to describe and verify more types of programs or structures.

Acknowledgements This work is partially supported by the Youth Project of National Science Foundation of China (No. 62102329), the Project of National Science Foundation of Chongqing (No. cstc2021jcyj-bshX0120), and the Project of National Science Foundation of China (No. 62272397).

References

1. Appel, A.W., Dockins, R., Hobor, A., Beringer, L., Dodds, J., Stewart, G., Blazy, S., Leroy, X.: Program Logics for Certified Compilers. Cambridge University Press (2014)
2. Baier, C., Katoen, J.P.: Principles of Model Checking. The MIT Press (May 2008)
3. Barthe, G., Katoen, J.P., Silva, A.: Foundations of Probabilistic Programming. Cambridge University Press (2020)
4. Beckert, B., Bruns, D.: Dynamic logic with trace semantics. In: Bonacina, M.P. (ed.) Automated Deduction – CADE-24. pp. 315–329. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2013)
5. Beckert, B., Klebanov, V., Weiß, B.: Dynamic Logic for Java, pp. 49–106. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2016)
6. Benevides, M.R., Schechter, L.M.: A propositional dynamic logic for concurrent programs based on the π -calculus. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science **262**, 49–64 (2010), proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Methods for Modalities (M4M-6 2009)
7. Berry, G., Gonthier, G.: The Esterel synchronous programming language: design, semantics, implementation. Science of Computer Programming **19**(2), 87 – 152 (1992)
8. Brotherston, J., Bornat, R., Calcagno, C.: Cyclic proofs of program termination in separation logic. SIGPLAN Not. **43**(1), 101–112 (jan 2008). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1328897.1328453>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/1328897.1328453>
9. Brotherston, J., Gorogiannis, N., Petersen, R.L.: A generic cyclic theorem prover. In: Jhala, R., Igarashi, A. (eds.) Programming Languages and Systems. pp. 350–367. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2012)
10. Brotherston, J., Simpson, A.: Complete sequent calculi for induction and infinite descent. In: 22nd Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2007). pp. 51–62 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2007.16>
11. Chen, X., Rosu, G.: Matching *mu*-logic. In: 2019 34th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS). pp. 1–13. IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA (jun 2019). <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2019.8785675>, <https://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/LICS.2019.8785675>
12. Dershowitz, N., Manna, Z.: Proving termination with multiset orderings. In: Maurer, H.A. (ed.) Automata, Languages and Programming. pp. 188–202. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (1979)
13. Docherty, S., Rowe, R.N.S.: A non-wellfounded, labelled proof system for propositional dynamic logic. In: Cerrito, S., Popescu, A. (eds.) Automated Reasoning with Analytic Tableaux and Related Methods. pp. 335–352. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2019)
14. Feldman, Y.A., Harel, D.: A probabilistic dynamic logic. Journal of Computer and System Sciences **28**(2), 193–215 (1984)
15. Fischer, M.J., Ladner, R.E.: Propositional dynamic logic of regular programs. Journal of Computer and System Sciences **18**(2), 194–211 (1979)
16. Gentzen, G.: Untersuchungen über das logische Schließen. Ph.D. thesis, NA Göttingen (1934)
17. Gesell, M., Schneider, K.: A hoare calculus for the verification of synchronous languages. In: Proceedings of the Sixth Workshop on Programming Languages Meets Program Verification. p. 37–48. PLPV ’12, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2012)
18. Goodfellow, I.J., Bengio, Y., Courville, A.: Deep Learning. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA (2016), <http://www.deeplearningbook.org>
19. Harel, D.: First-Order Dynamic Logic, Lecture Notes in Computer Science (LNCS), vol. 68. Springer (1979)
20. Harel, D., Kozen, D., Tiuryn, J.: Dynamic Logic. MIT Press (2000)
21. Hoare, C.A.R.: An axiomatic basis for computer programming. Commun. ACM **12**(10), 576–580 (Oct 1969)
22. Hoare, C., He, J.: Unifying theories of programming, vol. 14. Prentice Hall (1998)
23. Jungteerapanich, N.: A tableau system for the modal μ -calculus. In: Giese, M., Waaler, A. (eds.) Automated Reasoning with Analytic Tableaux and Related Methods. pp. 220–234. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2009)

24. Kozen, D.: A probabilistic pdl. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* **30**(2), 162–178 (1985). [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000\(85\)90012-1](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000(85)90012-1), <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0022000085900121>
25. Kozen, D.: Kleene algebra with tests. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* **19**(3), 427–443 (may 1997). <https://doi.org/10.1145/256167.256195>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/256167.256195>
26. Li, X., Zhang, Q., Wang, G., Shi, Z., Guan, Y.: Reasoning about iteration and recursion uniformly based on big-step semantics. In: Qin, S., Woodcock, J., Zhang, W. (eds.) *Dependable Software Engineering. Theories, Tools, and Applications*. pp. 61–80. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2021)
27. Milner, R.: *A Calculus of Communicating Systems*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg (1982)
28. Moore, B., Peña, L., Rosu, G.: Program verification by coinduction. In: Ahmed, A. (ed.) *Programming Languages and Systems*. pp. 589–618. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2018)
29. O’Hearn, P.W.: Incorrectness logic. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **4**(POPL) (dec 2019). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3371078>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3371078>
30. Pardo, R., Johnsen, E.B., Schaefer, I., Wařowski, A.: A specification logic for programs in the probabilistic guarded command language. In: *Theoretical Aspects of Computing – ICTAC 2022: 19th International Colloquium*, Tbilisi, Georgia, September 27–29, 2022, *Proceedings*. p. 369–387. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-17715-6_24, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-17715-6_24
31. Platzer, A.: Differential dynamic logic for verifying parametric hybrid systems. In: *International Conference on Theorem Proving with Analytic Tableaux and Related Methods (TABLEAUX)*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (LNCS)*, vol. 4548, pp. 216–232. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (2007)
32. Platzer, A.: Stochastic differential dynamic logic for stochastic hybrid programs. In: Bjørner, N., Sofronie-Stokkermans, V. (eds.) *Automated Deduction – CADE-23*. pp. 446–460. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2011)
33. Platzer, A.: *Logical Foundations of Cyber-Physical Systems*. Springer, Cham (2018)
34. Plotkin, G.D.: A structural approach to operational semantics. *Tech. Rep. DAIMI FN-19*, University of Aarhus (1981), <http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu/plotkin81structural.html>
35. Potop-Butucaru, D., Edwards, S.A., Berry, G.: *Compiling Esterel*. Springer New York, NY (2010)
36. Rořu, G., Ștefănescu, A.: Towards a unified theory of operational and axiomatic semantics. In: Czumaj, A., Mehlhorn, K., Pitts, A., Wattenhofer, R. (eds.) *Automata, Languages, and Programming*. pp. 351–363. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2012)
37. Rosu, G., Stefanescu, A., Ciobăcă, S., Moore, B.M.: One-path reachability logic. In: *2013 28th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. pp. 358–367 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2013.42>
38. Seshia, S.A., Sadigh, D., Sastry, S.S.: Toward verified artificial intelligence. *Commun. ACM* **65**(7), 46–55 (jun 2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3503914>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3503914>
39. Ștefănescu, A., Ciobăcă, Ș., Mereuta, R., Moore, B.M., Șerbănuță, T.F., Rořu, G.: All-path reachability logic. In: Dowek, G. (ed.) *Rewriting and Typed Lambda Calculi*. pp. 425–440. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2014)
40. Stirling, C., Walker, D.: Local model checking in the modal mu-calculus. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **89**(1), 161–177 (aug 1991). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(90\)90110-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(90)90110-4), [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(90\)90110-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(90)90110-4)
41. Zhang, X., Chen, X., Sun, M.: Towards a unifying logical framework for neural networks. In: Seidl, H., Liu, Z., Pasareanu, C.S. (eds.) *Theoretical Aspects of Computing – ICTAC 2022*. pp. 442–461. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2022)
42. Zhang, Y., Mallet, F., Liu, Z.: A dynamic logic for verification of synchronous models based on theorem proving. *Front. Comput. Sci.* **16**(4) (aug 2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11704-022-1374-4>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11704-022-1374-4>
43. Zhang, Y., Wu, H., Chen, Y., Mallet, F.: A clock-based dynamic logic for the verification of ccsl specifications in synchronous systems. *Science of Computer Programming* **203**, 102591 (2021)
44. Zilberstein, N., Dreyer, D., Silva, A.: Outcome logic: A unifying foundation for correctness and incorrectness reasoning. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **7**(OOPSLA1) (apr 2023). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3586045>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3586045>

