

# Formalization of Refinement Calculus for Reactive Systems

Viorel Preoteasa  
Aalto University, Finland

March 17, 2025

## Abstract

We present a formalization of refinement calculus for reactive systems. Refinement calculus is based on monotonic predicate transformers (monotonic functions from sets of post-states to sets of pre-states), and it is a powerful formalism for reasoning about imperative programs. We model reactive systems as monotonic property transformers that transform sets of output infinite sequences into sets of input infinite sequences. Within this semantics we can model refinement of reactive systems, (unbounded) angelic and demonic nondeterminism, sequential composition, and other semantic properties. We can model systems that may fail for some inputs, and we can model compatibility of systems. We can specify systems that have liveness properties using linear temporal logic, and we can refine system specifications into systems based on symbolic transitions systems, suitable for implementations.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Linear Temporal Logic</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Monotonic Predicate Transformers</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	Basic predicate transformers . . . . .	8
3.2	Conjunctive predicate transformers . . . . .	10
3.3	Fusion of predicate transformers . . . . .	14
<b>4</b>	<b>Reactive Systems</b>	<b>16</b>
4.1	Symbolic transition systems . . . . .	18
4.2	Example: COUNTER . . . . .	32
4.3	Example: LIVE . . . . .	34

## 1 Introduction

This is a formalization of refinement calculus for reactive systems that is presented in [6].

Refinement calculus [1, 3] has been developed originally for input output imperative programs, and is based on a predicate transformer semantics of programs with a weakest precondition interpretation.

We extend the standard refinement calculus to reactive systems [4]. Within our framework a reactive system is seen as a system that accepts as input an infinite sequence of values and produces as output an infinite sequence of values. The semantics of these systems is given as *monotonic property transformers*. These are monotonic functions which maps sets of output sequences (output properties) into sets of input sequences (input properties). For a set of output sequences  $q$ , the monotonic property transformer  $S$  applied to  $q$  returns all input sequences from which the computation of  $S$  always produces a sequence from  $q$ .

Our work extends also the relational interfaces framework of [7] which can handle only finite safety properties to infinite properties and liveness.

This formalization is organized in three sections. Section 2 presents an algebraic formalization of linear temporal logic. Section 3 introduces basic constructs from refinement calculus, and finally Section 4 applies the refinement calculus to reactive systems.

```
theory Temporal imports Main
begin
```

## 2 Linear Temporal Logic

In this section we introduce an algebraic axiomatization of Linear Temporal Logic (LTL). We model LTL formulas semantically as predicates on traces. For example the LTL formula  $\alpha = \square \diamond (x = 1)$  is modeled as a predicate  $\alpha : (nat \Rightarrow nat) \Rightarrow bool$ , where  $\alpha x = True$  if  $x i = 1$  for infinitely many  $i : nat$ . In this formula  $\square$  and  $\diamond$  denote the always and eventually operators, respectively. Formulas with multiple variables are modeled similarly. For example a formula  $\alpha$  in two variables is modeled as  $\alpha : (nat \Rightarrow 'a) \Rightarrow (nat \Rightarrow 'b) \Rightarrow bool$ , and for example  $(\square \alpha) x y$  is defined as  $(\forall i. \alpha x[i..] y[i..])$ , where  $x[i..] j = x (i + j)$ . We would like to construct an algebraic structure (Isabelle class) which has the temporal operators as operations, and which has instantiations to  $(nat \Rightarrow 'a) \Rightarrow bool$ ,  $(nat \Rightarrow 'a) \Rightarrow (nat \Rightarrow 'b) \Rightarrow bool$ , and so on. Ideally our structure should be such that if we have this structure on a type  $'a :: temporal$ , then we could extend it to  $(nat \Rightarrow 'b) \Rightarrow 'a$  in a way similar to the way Boolean algebras are extended from a type  $'a :: boolean_algebra$  to  $'b \Rightarrow 'a$ . Unfortunately, if we use for example  $\square$  as primitive operation on our temporal structure, then we cannot extend  $\square$

from  $'a :: \text{temporal}$  to  $(\text{nat} \Rightarrow 'b) \Rightarrow 'a$ . A possible extension of  $\square$  could be

$$(\square \alpha) x = \bigwedge_{i:\text{nat}} \square(\alpha x[i..]) \text{ and } \square b = b$$

where  $\alpha : (\text{nat} \Rightarrow 'b) \Rightarrow 'a$  and  $b : \text{bool}$ . However, if we apply this definition to  $\alpha : (\text{nat} \Rightarrow 'a) \Rightarrow (\text{nat} \Rightarrow 'b) \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ , then we get

$$(\square \alpha) x y = (\forall i j. \alpha x[i..] y[j..])$$

which is not correct.

To overcome this problem we introduce as a primitive operation  $!! : 'a \Rightarrow \text{nat} \Rightarrow 'a$ , where  $'a$  is the type of temporal formulas, and  $\alpha !! i$  is the formula  $\alpha$  at time point  $i$ . If  $\alpha$  is a formula in two variables as before, then

$$(\alpha !! i) x y = \alpha x[i..] y[i..].$$

and we define for example the the operator always by

$$\square \alpha = \bigwedge_{i:\text{nat}} \alpha !! i$$

#### notation

**bot** ( $\langle \perp \rangle$ ) **and**  
**top** ( $\langle \top \rangle$ ) **and**  
**inf** (**infixl**  $\langle \sqcap \rangle$  70)  
**and sup** (**infixl**  $\langle \sqcup \rangle$  65)

```

class temporal = complete-boolean-algebra +
  fixes at ::  $'a \Rightarrow \text{nat} \Rightarrow 'a$  (infixl  $\langle \text{!!} \rangle$  150)
  assumes [simp]:  $a !! i !! j = a !! (i + j)$ 
  assumes [simp]:  $a !! 0 = a$ 
  assumes [simp]:  $\top !! i = \top$ 
  assumes [simp]:  $-(a !! i) = (-a) !! i$ 
  assumes [simp]:  $(a \sqcap b) !! i = (a !! i) \sqcap (b !! i)$ 
  begin
    definition always ::  $'a \Rightarrow 'a$  ( $\langle \square (-) \rangle$  [900] 900) where
       $\square p = (\text{INF } i . p !! i)$ 

    definition eventually ::  $'a \Rightarrow 'a$  ( $\langle \diamond (-) \rangle$  [900] 900) where
       $\diamond p = (\text{SUP } i . p !! i)$ 

    definition next ::  $'a \Rightarrow 'a$  ( $\langle \circ (-) \rangle$  [900] 900) where
       $\circ p = p !! (\text{Suc } 0)$ 

    definition until ::  $'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow 'a$  (infix  $\langle \text{until} \rangle$  65) where
       $(p \text{ until } q) = (\text{SUP } n . (\text{Inf} (\text{at } p \ ' \{i . i < n\})) \sqcap (q !! n))$ 
  end
```

Next lemma, in the context of complete boolean algebras, will be used to prove  $\neg(p \text{ until } \neg p) = \square p$ .

```

context complete-boolean-algebra
begin

lemma until-always: ( $\text{INF } n. (\text{SUP } i \in \{i. i < n\}. - p i) \sqcup ((p :: \text{nat} \Rightarrow 'a)$   

 $n)) \leq p n$ 
proof -
  have ( $\text{INF } n. (\text{SUP } i \in \{i. i < n\}. - p i) \sqcup p n \leq (\text{INF } i \in \{i. i \leq n\}. p i)$ 
    proof (induction n)
      have ( $\text{INF } n. (\text{SUP } i \in \{i. i < n\}. - p i) \sqcup p n \leq (\text{SUP } i \in \{i. i < 0\}. - p i) \sqcup p 0$ 
        by (rule INF-lower, simp)
        also have ...  $\leq (\text{INF } i \in \{i. i \leq 0\}. p i)$ 
        by simp
        finally show ( $\text{INF } n. (\text{SUP } i \in \{i. i < n\}. - p i) \sqcup p n \leq (\text{INF } i \in \{i. i \leq 0\}. p i)$ 
          by simp
        next
          fix  $n :: \text{nat}$  assume ( $\text{INF } n. (\text{SUP } i \in \{i. i < n\}. - p i) \sqcup p n \leq (\text{INF }$   

 $i \in \{i. i \leq n\}. p i)$ 
            also have  $\bigwedge i. i \leq n \implies \dots \leq p i$  by (rule INF-lower, simp)
            finally have [simp]:  $\bigwedge i. i \leq n \implies (\text{INF } n. (\text{SUP } i \in \{i. i < n\}. - p$   

 $i) \sqcup p n) \leq p i$ 
              by simp
              show ( $\text{INF } n. (\text{SUP } i \in \{i. i < n\}. - p i) \sqcup p n \leq (\text{INF } i \in \{i. i \leq$   

 $\text{Suc } n\}. p i)$ 
                proof (rule INF-greatest, safe, cases)
                  fix  $i :: \text{nat}$ 
                  assume  $i \leq n$  from this show ( $\text{INF } n. (\text{SUP } i \in \{i. i < n\}. - p$   

 $i) \sqcup p n) \leq p i$  by simp
                  next
                    fix  $i :: \text{nat}$ 
                    have  $A: \{i. i \leq n\} = \{i. i < \text{Suc } n\}$  by auto
                    have  $B: (\text{SUP } i \in \{i. i \leq n\}. - p i) \leq -(\text{INF } n. (\text{SUP } i \in \{i. i <$   

 $n\}. - p i) \sqcup p n)$ 
                      by (metis (lifting, mono-tags) (( $\text{INF } n. (\text{SUP } i \in \{i. i < n\}. - p$   

 $i) \sqcup p n) \leq (\text{INF } i \in \{i. i \leq n\}. p i)) \text{ compl-mono uminus-INF})
                      assume  $i \leq \text{Suc } n$  and  $\neg i \leq n$ 
                      from this have [simp]:  $i = \text{Suc } n$  by simp
                      have ( $\text{INF } n. (\text{SUP } i \in \{i. i < n\}. - p i) \sqcup p n \leq (\text{INF } n. (\text{SUP }$   

 $i \in \{i. i < n\}. - p i) \sqcup p n) \sqcap ((\text{SUP } i \in \{i. i \leq n\}. - p i) \sqcup p (\text{Suc } n))$ 
                        by (simp add: A, rule INF-lower, simp)
                      also have ...  $\leq ((\text{INF } n. (\text{SUP } i \in \{i. i < n\}. - p i) \sqcup p n) \sqcup (-$   

 $(\text{INF } n. (\text{SUP } i \in \{i. i < n\}. - p i) \sqcup p n)) \sqcup p (\text{Suc } n)))$ 
                        by (rule inf-mono, simp-all, rule-tac y = - (INF n. (SUP i \in {i. i < n}. - p i) \sqcup p n) in order-trans, simp-all add: B)
                      also have ...  $\leq p i$ 
                        by (simp add: inf-sup-distrib1 inf-compl-bot)
                      finally show ( $\text{INF } n. (\text{SUP } i \in \{i. i < n\}. - p i) \sqcup p n \leq p i$  by$ 
```

```

simp
qed
qed
also have (INF i ∈ {i. i ≤ n}. p i) ≤ p n by (rule INF-lower, auto)
finally show (INF n. (SUP i ∈ {i. i < n} . - p i) ⊔ ((p :: nat ⇒ 'a) n))
≤ p n by simp
qed

end

```

We prove now a number of results of the temporal class.

```

context temporal
begin
lemma [simp]: (a ⊔ b) !! i = (a !! i) ⊔ (b !! i)
  by (subst compl-eq-compl-iff [THEN sym], simp)

lemma always-less [simp]: □ p ≤ p
proof -
  have □ p ≤ p !! 0
    by (unfold always-def, rule INF-lower, simp)
  also have p !! 0 = p by simp
  finally show □ p ≤ p by simp
qed

lemma always-and: □ (p ▷ q) = (□ p) ▷ (□ q)
  by (simp add: always-def INF-inf-distrib)

lemma eventually-or: ◇ (p ⊔ q) = (◇ p) ⊔ (◇ q)
  by (simp add: eventually-def SUP-sup-distrib)

lemma neg-until-always: -(p until -p) = □ p
proof (rule order.antisym)
  show -(p until -p) ≤ □ p
    by (simp add: until-def always-def uminus-SUP uminus-INF, rule
INF-greatest, cut-tac p = λ n . p !! n in until-always, simp)
next
  have ⋀ n . □ p ≤ p !! n
    by (simp add: always-def INF-lower)
  also have ⋀ n . p !! n ≤ (SUP x ∈ {i. i < n}. (- p) !! x) ⊔ p !! n
    by simp
  finally show □ p ≤ -(p until -p)
    apply (simp add: until-def uminus-SUP uminus-INF)
    by (rule INF-greatest, simp)
qed

lemma neg-always-eventually: □ p = - ◇ (- p)
  by (simp add: fun-eq-iff always-def eventually-def until-def uminus-SUP)

lemma neg-true-until-always: -(⊤ until -p) = □ p

```

```
by (simp add: fun-eq-iff always-def until-def uminus-SUP uminus-INF)
```

```
lemma true-until-eventually: ( $\top$  until  $p$ ) =  $\diamond p$ 
  by (cut-tac  $p = -p$  in neg-always-eventually, cut-tac  $p = -p$  in neg-true-until-always,
  simp)
end
```

Boolean algebras with  $b!!i = b$  form a temporal class.

```
instantiation bool :: temporal
begin
  definition at-bool-def [simp]: ( $p::\text{bool}$ ) !!  $i = p$ 
instance proof
  qed auto
end
```

```
type-synonym ' $a$  trace = nat  $\Rightarrow$  ' $a$ 
```

Asuming that ' $a :: \text{temporal}$ ' is a type of class *temporal*, and ' $b$ ' is an arbitrary type, we would like to create the instantiation of ' $b$  trace  $\Rightarrow$  ' $a$ ' as a temporal class. However Isabelle allows only instatiations of functions from a class to another class. To solve this problem we introduce a new class called *trace* with an operation *suffix* :: ' $a \Rightarrow \text{nat} \Rightarrow 'a$ ' where *suffix*  $a$   $i$   $j = (a[i..])$   $j = a$  ( $i + j$ ) when  $a$  is a trace with elements of some type ' $b$ ' (' $a = \text{nat} \Rightarrow 'b$ ).

```
class trace =
  fixes suffix :: ' $a \Rightarrow \text{nat} \Rightarrow 'a$  (( $\cdot$ -[ $\cdot$ ..]) [80, 15] 80)
  assumes [simp]:  $a[i..][j..] = a[i + j..]$ 
  assumes [simp]:  $a[0..] = a$ 
begin
  definition next-trace :: ' $a \Rightarrow 'a$  (( $\odot$  (-)) [900] 900) where
     $\odot p = p[\text{Suc } 0..]$ 
end

instantiation fun :: (trace, temporal) temporal
begin
  definition at-fun-def: ( $P::'a \Rightarrow 'b$ ) !!  $i = (\lambda x . (P(x[i..]))) !! i$ 
  instance proof qed (simp-all add: at-fun-def add.commute fun-eq-iff
  le-fun-def)
end
```

In the last part of our formalization, we need to instantiate the functions from *nat* to some arbitrary type ' $a$ ' as a trace class. However, this again is not possible using the instantiation mechanism of Isabelle. We solve this problem by creating another class called *nat*, and then we instantiate the functions from ' $a :: \text{nat}$ ' to ' $b$ ' as traces. The class *nat* is defined such that if we have a type ' $a :: \text{nat}$ ', then ' $a$ ' is isomorphic to the type *nat*.

```
class nat = zero + plus + minus +
```

```

fixes RepNat :: 'a ⇒ nat
fixes AbsNat :: nat ⇒ 'a
assumes [simp]: RepNat (AbsNat n) = n
and [simp]: AbsNat (RepNat x) = x
and zero-Nat-def: 0 = AbsNat 0
and plus-Nat-def: a + b = AbsNat (RepNat a + RepNat b)
and minus-Nat-def: a - b = AbsNat (RepNat a - RepNat b)
begin
  lemma AbsNat-plus: AbsNat (i + j) = AbsNat i + AbsNat j
    by (simp add: plus-Nat-def)
  lemma AbsNat-zero [simp]: AbsNat 0 + i = i
    by (simp add: plus-Nat-def)

  subclass comm-monoid-diff
    apply (unfold-locales)
    apply (simp-all add: plus-Nat-def zero-Nat-def minus-Nat-def add.assoc)
    by (simp add: add.commute)
end

```

The type natural numbers is an instantiation of the class *nat*.

```

instantiation nat :: nat
begin
  definition RepNat-nat-def [simp]: (RepNat:: nat ⇒ nat) = id
  definition AbsNat-nat-def [simp]: (AbsNat:: nat ⇒ nat) = id
  instance proof
    qed auto
end

```

Finally, functions from '*a* :: *nat* to some arbitrary type '*b* are instantiated as a trace class.

```

instantiation fun :: (nat, type) trace
begin
  definition at-trace-def [simp]: ((t :: 'a ⇒ 'b)[i..]) j = (t (AbsNat i + j))
  instance proof
    qed (simp-all add: fun-eq-iff AbsNat-plus add.assoc)
end

```

By putting together all class definitions and instantiations introduced so far, we obtain the temporal class structure for predicates on traces with arbitrary number of parameters.

For example in the next lemma *r* and *r'* are predicate relations, and the operator always is available for them as a consequence of the above construction.

```

lemma (□ r) OO (□ r') ≤ (□ (r OO r'))
  by (simp add: le-fun-def always-def at-fun-def, auto)

end
theory Refinement imports Main

```

begin

### 3 Monotonic Predicate Transformers

In this section we introduce the basics of refinement calculus [3]. Part of this theory is a reformulation of some definitions from [5], but here they are given for predicates, while [5] uses sets.

#### notation

```
bot (<⊥>) and
top (<⊤>) and
inf (infixl <⊓> 70)
and sup (infixl <⊔> 65)
```

#### 3.1 Basic predicate transformers

##### definition

```
demonic :: ('a => 'b::lattice) => 'b => 'a => bool (<[: - :]> [0] 1000) where
[:Q:] p s = (Q s ≤ p)
```

##### definition

```
assert::'a::semilattice-inf => 'a => 'a (<{. - .}> [0] 1000) where
{.p.} q ≡ p ⊓ q
```

##### definition

```
assume::('a::boolean-algebra) => 'a => 'a (<[. - .]> [0] 1000) where
[p.] q ≡ (¬p ⊔ q)
```

##### definition

```
angelic :: ('a ⇒ 'b:{semilattice-inf,order-bot}) ⇒ 'b ⇒ 'a ⇒ bool (<{: - :}> [0] 1000) where
[:Q:] p s = (Q s ⊓ p ≠ ⊥)
```

#### syntax

```
-assert :: patterns => logic => logic ((1{.-/ -.}))
```

#### translations

```
-assert (-patterns x xs) P == CONST assert (CONST id (-abs (-pattern x xs) P))
-assert x P == CONST assert (CONST id (-abs x P))
```

**term** {.x,z . P x y.}

**syntax** -update :: patterns => patterns => logic => logic (<- ~> - . → 0)  
**translations**

```
-update (-patterns x xs) (-patterns y ys) t == CONST id (-abs
(-pattern x xs) (CONST id (-abs (-pattern y ys) t)))
-update x y t == CONST id (-abs x (CONST id (-abs y t)))
```

**term** [: x ~ z . (P::'a ⇒ 'b ⇒ 'c ⇒ 'd ⇒ bool) x y y' z :]

```

term [: x, y ~> y', z . (P::'a => 'b => 'c => 'd => bool) x y y' z :]
term { : x, y ~> y', z . (P::'a => 'b => 'c => 'd => bool) x y y' z :}

lemma demonic-demonic: [:r:] o [:r':] = [:r OO r:]
  by (simp add: fun-eq-iff le-fun-def demonic-def, auto)

lemma assert-demonic-comp: {.p.} o [:r:] o {.p'.} o [:r':] =
  {.x . p x ∧ (∀ y . r x y → p' y).} o [:r OO r:]
  by (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff le-fun-def assert-def demonic-def)

lemma demonic-assert-comp: [:r:] o {.p.} = {.x.(∀ y . r x y → p y).} o [:r:]
  by (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff le-fun-def assert-def demonic-def)

lemma assert-assert-comp: {.p::'a::lattice.} o {.p'.} = {.p ⊓ p'.}
  by (simp add: fun-eq-iff le-fun-def assert-def demonic-def inf-assoc)

definition inpt r x = (Ǝ y . r x y)

definition trs r = { . inpt r . } o [:r:]

lemma trs (λ x y . x = y) q x = q x
  by (simp add: trs-def fun-eq-iff assert-def demonic-def inpt-def bot-fun-def
    le-fun-def)

lemma assert-demonic-prop: {.p.} o [:r:] = {.p.} o [:(λ x y . p x) ⊓ r:]
  by (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff assert-def demonic-def)

lemma relcompp-exists: relcompp r r' x y = (Ǝ u . r x u ∧ r' u y)
  by auto

lemma trs-trs: (trs r) o (trs r') = trs ((λ s t. (∀ s' . r s s' → (inpt r' s'))) ⊓
  (r OO r')) (is ?S = ?T)
  proof -
    have [simp]: (λx. inpt r x ∧ (∀ y . r x y → inpt r' y)) = inpt ((λs t. ∀ s'. r s
      s' → inpt r' s') ⊓ r OO r')
      by (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff inpt-def relcompp-exists, blast)
    have [simp]: (λx y. inpt r x ∧ (∀ y . r x y → inpt r' y)) ⊓ r OO r' = (λs t.
      ∀ s'. r s s' → inpt r' s') ⊓ r OO r'
      by (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff inpt-def)
    have ?S = { . inpt r . } o [:r :] o { . inpt r' . } o [:r':]
      by (simp add: trs-def comp-assoc[symmetric])
    also have ... = { . λx. inpt r x ∧ (∀ y . r x y → inpt r' y) . } o [:r OO r' :]
      by (simp add: assert-demonic-comp)
    also have ... = { . λx. inpt r x ∧ (∀ y . r x y → inpt r' y) . } o [:(λ x y . inpt
      r x ∧ (∀ y . r x y → inpt r' y)) ⊓ (r OO r'):]
      by (subst assert-demonic-prop, simp)
    also have ... = ?T
      by (simp add: trs-def)
    finally show ?thesis by simp

```

**qed**

**lemma** *assert-demonic-refinement*:  $(\{.p.\} o [:r:] \leq \{.p'.\} o [:r':]) = (p \leq p' \wedge (\forall x . p x \longrightarrow r' x \leq r x))$   
**by** (auto simp add: le-fun-def assert-def demonic-def)

**lemma** *trs-refinement*:  $(trs r \leq trs r') = ((\forall x . inpt r x \longrightarrow inpt r' x) \wedge (\forall x . inpt r x \longrightarrow r' x \leq r x))$   
**by** (simp add: trs-def assert-demonic-refinement, simp add: le-fun-def)

**lemma** *trs*  $(\lambda x y . x \geq 0) \leq trs (\lambda x y . x = y)$   
**by** (simp add: trs-def le-fun-def assert-def demonic-def inpt-def)

**lemma** *trs*  $(\lambda x y . x \geq 0) q x = (if q = \top then x \geq 0 else False)$   
**by** (auto simp add: trs-def fun-eq-iff assert-def demonic-def inpt-def bot-fun-def)

**lemma**  $[:r:] \sqcap [:r':] = [:r \sqcup r':]$   
**by** (simp add: fun-eq-iff demonic-def)

**lemma** *spec-demonic-choice*:  $(\{.p.\} o [:r:]) \sqcap (\{.p'.\} o [:r']):) = (\{.p \sqcap p'.\} o [:r \sqcup r':])$   
**by** (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff demonic-def assert-def)

**lemma** *trs-demonic-choice*:  $trs r \sqcap trs r' = trs ((\lambda x y . inpt r x \wedge inpt r' x) \sqcap (r \sqcup r'))$

**proof** –

**have** [simp]:  $inpt ((\lambda x y . inpt r x \wedge inpt r' x) \sqcap (r \sqcup r')) = inpt r \sqcap inpt r'$   
**by** (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff inpt-def)

**have**  $trs r \sqcap trs r' = \{. inpt r \sqcap inpt r' .\} \circ [:r \sqcup r' :]$   
**by** (simp add: trs-def spec-demonic-choice)

**also have** ...  $= \{. inpt r \sqcap inpt r' .\} \circ [:(\lambda x y . inpt r x \wedge inpt r' x) \sqcap (r \sqcup r') :]$

**by** (subst assert-demonic-prop, simp)

**also have** ...  $= trs ((\lambda x y . inpt r x \wedge inpt r' x) \sqcap (r \sqcup r'))$

**by** (simp add: trs-def)

**finally show** ?thesis **by** simp

**qed**

**lemma**  $p \sqcap p' = \perp \implies (\{.p.\} o [:r:]) \sqcup (\{.p'.\} o [:r']):) = \{.p \sqcup p'.\} o [:(\lambda x y . p x \longrightarrow r x y) \sqcup ((\lambda x y . p' x \longrightarrow r' x y) :)]$   
**by** (simp add: fun-eq-iff assert-def demonic-def, auto)

### 3.2 Conjunctive predicate transformers

**definition** *conjunctive* ( $S :: 'a :: complete-lattice \Rightarrow 'b :: complete-lattice$ )  $= (\forall Q . S (Inf Q) = Inf (S ` Q))$

**definition** *sconjunctive* ( $S :: 'a :: complete-lattice \Rightarrow 'b :: complete-lattice$ )  $= (\forall Q . (\exists x . x \in Q) \longrightarrow S (Inf Q) = Inf (S ` Q))$

```

lemma [simp]: conjunctive S ==> sconjunctive S
  by (simp add: conjunctive-def sconjunctive-def)

lemma [simp]: conjunctive ⊤
  by (simp add: conjunctive-def)

lemma conjunctive-demonic [simp]: conjunctive [:r:]
proof (auto simp add: conjunctive-def fun-eq-iff demonic-def)
  fix Q::'a set fix y::'a fix x :: 'b
  assume A: y ∈ Q
  assume r x ≤ Inf Q
  also from A have Inf Q ≤ y
    by (rule Inf-lower)
  finally show r x ≤ y by simp
next
  fix Q::'a set fix x :: 'b
  assume A : ∀ y∈Q. r x ≤ y
  show r x ≤ Inf Q
    by (rule Inf-greatest, simp add: A)
qed

lemma sconjunctive-assert [simp]: sconjunctive { .p. }
proof (auto simp add: sconjunctive-def assert-def image-def cong: INF-cong-simp,
rule antisym, auto)
  fix Q :: 'a set
  have [simp]: ⋀ x . x ∈ Q ==> Inf Q ≤ x
    by (rule Inf-lower, simp)
  have A: ⋀ x . x ∈ Q ==> p □ Inf Q ≤ p □ x
    by (simp, rule-tac y = Inf Q in order-trans, simp-all)
  show p □ Inf Q ≤ (INF x∈Q. p □ x)
    by (rule Inf-greatest, safe, rule A, simp)
next
  fix Q :: 'a set
  fix x :: 'a
  assume A: x ∈ Q
  have Inf {y. ∃ x∈Q. y = p □ x} ≤ p □ x
    by (rule Inf-lower, cut-tac A, auto)
  also have ... ≤ p
    by simp
  finally show (INF x∈Q. p □ x) ≤ p
    by (simp only: image-def)
next
  fix Q :: 'a set
  show (INF x∈Q. p □ x) ≤ Inf Q
  proof (rule Inf-greatest)
    fix x::'a
    assume A: x ∈ Q
    have Inf {y. ∃ x∈Q. y = p □ x} ≤ p □ x
      by (cut-tac A, rule Inf-lower, blast)

```

```

also have ... ≤ x
  by simp
finally show (INF x∈Q. p ∩ x) ≤ x
  by (simp only: image-def)
qed
qed

lemma sconjunctive-simp: x ∈ Q ==> sconjunctive S ==> S (Inf Q) = Inf (S ` Q)
  by (auto simp add: sconjunctive-def)

lemma sconjunctive-INF-simp: x ∈ X ==> sconjunctive S ==> S (Inf (Q ` X)) =
= Inf (S ` (Q ` X))
  by (cut-tac x = Q x and Q = Q ` X in sconjunctive-simp, auto)

lemma demonic-comp [simp]: sconjunctive S ==> sconjunctive S' ==> sconjunctive (S o S')
  proof (subst sconjunctive-def, safe)
    fix X :: 'c set
    fix a :: 'c
    assume [simp]: sconjunctive S
    assume [simp]: sconjunctive S'
    assume [simp]: a ∈ X
    have A: S' (Inf X) = Inf (S' ` X)
      by (rule-tac x = a in sconjunctive-simp, auto)
    also have B: S (Inf (S' ` X)) = Inf (S ` (S' ` X))
      by (rule-tac x = S' a in sconjunctive-simp, auto)
    finally show (S o S') (Inf X) = Inf ((S o S') ` X) by (simp add: image-comp)
  qed

lemma [simp]: conjunctive S ==> S (Inf (Q ` X)) = (Inf ((S o Q) ` X))
  by (metis INF-image conjunctive-def)

lemma conjunctive-simp: conjunctive S ==> S (Inf Q) = Inf (S ` Q)
  by (metis conjunctive-def)

lemma conjunctive-monotonic: sconjunctive S ==> mono S
  proof (rule monoI)
    fix a b :: 'a
    assume [simp]: a ≤ b
    assume [simp]: sconjunctive S
    have [simp]: a ∩ b = a
      by (rule antisym, auto)
    have A: S a = S a ∩ S b
      by (cut-tac S = S and x = a and Q = {a, b} in sconjunctive-simp, auto)
    show S a ≤ S b
      by (subst A, simp)
  qed

```

```

definition grd  $S = - S \perp$ 

lemma grd [:r:] = inpt r
  by (simp add: fun-eq-iff grd-def demonic-def le-fun-def inpt-def)

definition fail  $S = -(S \top)$ 
definition term  $S = (S \top)$ 

lemma fail ({.p.} o [:r :: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  'b  $\Rightarrow$  bool:]) =  $-p$ 
  by (simp add: fail-def fun-eq-iff assert-def demonic-def le-fun-def top-fun-def)

definition Fail =  $\perp$ 

lemma mono ( $S :: 'a :: \text{boolean-algebra} \Rightarrow 'b :: \text{boolean-algebra}$ )  $\Longrightarrow (S = \text{Fail}) = (\text{fail } S = \top)$ 
  proof auto
    show fail ( $\text{Fail} :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b$ ) =  $\top$ 
      by (metis Fail-def bot-apply compl-bot-eq fail-def)
  next
    assume  $A : \text{mono } S$ 
    assume  $B : \text{fail } S = \top$ 
    show  $S = \text{Fail}$ 
      proof (rule antisym)
        show  $S \leq \text{Fail}$ 
          by (metis (opaque-lifting, no-types)  $A B$  bot.extremum-unique compl-le-compl-iff fail-def le-fun-def monoD top-greatest)
    next
      show  $\text{Fail} \leq S$ 
        by (metis Fail-def bot.extremum)
    qed
  qed

definition Skip = id

lemma [simp]: {.T :: 'a :: bounded-lattice.} = Skip
  by (simp add: fun-eq-iff assert-def Skip-def)

lemma [simp]: Skip o  $S = S$ 
  by (simp add: fun-eq-iff assert-def Skip-def)

lemma [simp]:  $S$  o Skip =  $S$ 
  by (simp add: fun-eq-iff assert-def Skip-def)

lemma [simp]: mono  $S \Longrightarrow \text{mono } S' \Longrightarrow \text{mono } (S \circ S')$ 
  by (simp add: mono-def)

lemma [simp]: mono {.p :: ('a  $\Rightarrow$  bool).}
  by (simp add: conjunctive-monotonic)

```

```

lemma [simp]: mono [:r::('a  $\Rightarrow$  'b  $\Rightarrow$  bool):]
  by (simp add: conjunctive-monotonic)

lemma [simp]:{.  $\lambda x . \text{True}$  .} = Skip
  by (simp add: fun-eq-iff assert-def Skip-def)

lemma [simp]:  $\perp o S = \perp$ 
  by (simp add: fun-eq-iff)

lemma [simp]: {. $\perp$ ::'a::boolean-algebra.} =  $\perp$ 
  by (simp add: fun-eq-iff assert-def)

lemma [simp]:  $\top o S = \top$ 
  by (simp add: fun-eq-iff)

lemma left-comp:  $T o U = T' o U' \implies S o T o U = S o T' o U'$ 
  by (simp add: comp-assoc)

lemma assert-demonic: { $.p.$ }  $o$  [:r:] = { $.p.$ }  $o$  [ $\lambda x y . p x \wedge r x y$ ]:
  by (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff assert-def demonic-def le-fun-def)

lemma trs  $r \sqcap$  trs  $r' =$  trs  $(\lambda x y . \text{inpt } r x \wedge \text{inpt } r' x \wedge (r x y \vee r' x y))$ 
  by (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff trs-def assert-def demonic-def inpt-def)

```

### 3.3 Fusion of predicate transformers

In this section we define the fusion operator from [2]. The fusion of two programs  $S$  and  $T$  is intuitively equivalent with the parallel execution of the two programs. If  $S$  and  $T$  assign nondeterministically some value to some program variable  $x$ , then the fusion of  $S$  and  $T$  will assign a value to  $x$  which can be assigned by both  $S$  and  $T$ .

```

definition fusion ::  $(('a \Rightarrow \text{bool}) \Rightarrow ('b \Rightarrow \text{bool})) \Rightarrow (('a \Rightarrow \text{bool}) \Rightarrow ('b \Rightarrow \text{bool}))$ 
   $\Rightarrow (('a \Rightarrow \text{bool}) \Rightarrow ('b \Rightarrow \text{bool}))$  (infixl  $\parallel$  70) where
   $(S \parallel S') q x = (\exists (p::'a \Rightarrow \text{bool}) p' . p \sqcap p' \leq q \wedge S p x \wedge S' p' x)$ 

lemma fusion-spec:  $(\{.p.\} \circ [:r:]) \parallel (\{.p'.\} \circ [:r']):= (\{.p \sqcap p'.\} \circ [:r \sqcap r'])$ 
  by (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff fusion-def assert-def demonic-def le-fun-def)

lemma fusion-assoc:  $S \parallel (T \parallel U) = (S \parallel T) \parallel U$ 
  proof (rule antisym, auto simp add: fusion-def)
    fix  $p p' q s s' :: 'a \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ 
    fix  $a$ 
    assume  $A: p \sqcap p' \leq q$  and  $B: s \sqcap s' \leq p'$ 
    assume  $C: S p a$  and  $D: T s a$  and  $E: U s' a$ 
    from  $A$  and  $B$  have  $F: (p \sqcap s) \sqcap s' \leq q$ 
      by (simp add: le-fun-def)
    have  $(\exists v v'. v \sqcap v' \leq (p \sqcap s) \wedge S v a \wedge T v' a)$ 
      by (metis C D order-refl)

```

```

show  $\exists u u'. u \sqcap u' \leq q \wedge (\exists v v'. v \sqcap v' \leq u \wedge S v a \wedge T v' a) \wedge U u' a$ 
  by (metis F C D E order-refl)
next
  fix p p' q s s' :: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  bool
  fix a
  assume A:  $p \sqcap p' \leq q$  and B:  $s \sqcap s' \leq p$ 
  assume C:  $S s a$  and D:  $T s' a$  and E:  $U p' a$ 
  from A and B have F:  $s \sqcap (s' \sqcap p') \leq q$ 
    by (simp add: le-fun-def)
  have ( $\exists v v'. v \sqcap v' \leq s' \sqcap p' \wedge T v a \wedge U v' a$ )
    by (metis D E eq-iff)
  show  $\exists u u'. u \sqcap u' \leq q \wedge S u a \wedge (\exists v v'. v \sqcap v' \leq u' \wedge T v a \wedge U v' a)$ 
    by (metis F C D E order-refl)
qed

```

**lemma**  $P \leq Q \implies P' \leq Q' \implies P \parallel P' \leq Q \parallel Q'$   
**by** (simp add: le-fun-def fusion-def, metis)

**lemma** conjunctive S  $\implies S \parallel \top = \top$   
**by** (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff fusion-def le-fun-def conjunctive-def)

**lemma** fusion-spec-local:  $a \in init \implies ([x \rightsquigarrow u, y . u \in init \wedge x = y] \circ \{p.\} \circ [r:]) \parallel (\{p'.\} \circ [r'])$   
 $= [x \rightsquigarrow u, y . u \in init \wedge x = y] \circ \{u, x . p(u, x) \wedge p' x.\} \circ [u, x \rightsquigarrow y . r(u, x) y \wedge r' x y]$  (**is** ?p  $\implies$  ?S = ?T)  
**proof** –  
**assume** ?p  
**from** this **have** [simp]:  $(\lambda x. \forall a. a \in init \longrightarrow p(a, x) \wedge p' x) = (\lambda x. \forall a. a \in init \longrightarrow p(a, x)) \sqcap p'$   
**by** auto  
**have** [simp]:  $(\lambda x. (u, y). u \in init \wedge x = y) OO (\lambda(u, x) y. r(u, x) y \wedge r' x y) = (\lambda x. (u, y). u \in init \wedge x = y) OO r \sqcap r'$   
**by** auto  
**have** ?S =  
 $(\{\lambda x. \forall a. a \in init \longrightarrow p(a, x)\} \circ [\lambda x. (u, y). u \in init \wedge x = y]) \circ [r] \parallel (\{p'\} \circ [r'])$   
**by** (simp add: demonic-assert-comp)  
**also have** ... =  $\{\lambda x. \forall a. a \in init \longrightarrow p(a, x)\} \sqcap p' \circ [(\lambda x. (u, y). u \in init \wedge x = y) OO r \sqcap r']$   
**by** (simp add: comp-assoc demonic-demonic fusion-spec)  
**also have** ... = ?T  
**by** (simp add: demonic-assert-comp comp-assoc demonic-demonic fusion-spec)  
**finally show** ?thesis **by** simp  
**qed**

**lemma** fusion-spec-local-a:  $a \in init \implies ([x \rightsquigarrow u, y . u \in init \wedge x = y] \circ \{p.\} \circ [r:]) \parallel [r']$   
 $= ([x \rightsquigarrow u, y . u \in init \wedge x = y] \circ \{p.\} \circ [u, x \rightsquigarrow y . r(u, x) y \wedge r' x y])$   
**by** (cut-tac p' = T **and** init = init **and** p = p **and** r = r **and** r' = r' **in**

*fusion-spec-local, auto*

```

lemma fusion-local-refinement:
   $a \in init \implies (\bigwedge x u y . u \in init \implies p' x \implies r(u, x) y \implies r' x y) \implies$ 
   $\{.p'.\} o (([:x \rightsquigarrow u, y . u \in init \wedge x = y:] \circ \{.p.\} \circ [:r:]) \parallel [:r']):] \leq [:x \rightsquigarrow u, y$ 
 $. u \in init \wedge x = y:] \circ \{.p.\} \circ [:r:]$ 

proof -
  assume  $A: a \in init$ 
  assume [simp]:  $(\bigwedge x u y . u \in init \implies p' x \implies r(u, x) y \implies r' x y)$ 
  have  $\{. x. p' x \wedge (\forall a. a \in init \longrightarrow p(a, x)) .\} \circ [:(\lambda x (u, y). u \in init \wedge x$ 
 $= y) OO (\lambda(u, x) y. r(u, x) y \wedge r' x y) :] \leq \{. \lambda x. \forall a. a \in init \longrightarrow p(a, x) .\} \circ [:(\lambda x (u, y). u \in init \wedge x = y)$ 
 $OO r :]$ 
  by (auto simp add: assert-demonic-refinement)
  from this have  $\{. x. p' x \wedge (\forall a. a \in init \longrightarrow p(a, x)) .\} \circ [:(\lambda x (u, y). u \in$ 
 $init \wedge x = y) OO (\lambda(u, x) y. r(u, x) y \wedge r' x y) :] \leq \{. \lambda x. \forall a. a \in init \longrightarrow p(a, x) .\} \circ [:(\lambda x (u, y). u \in init \wedge x = y)$ 
 $\circ [:r :]$ 
  by (simp add: comp-assoc demonic-demonic)
  from this have  $\{. p' .\} \circ [: \lambda x (u, y). u \in init \wedge x = y :] \circ \{. p .\} \circ [: \lambda (u, x)$ 
 $y. r(u, x) y \wedge r' x y :] \leq [:x \rightsquigarrow u, y. u \in init \wedge x = y :] \circ \{. p .\} \circ [:r :]$ 
  by (simp add: demonic-assert-comp assert-demonic-comp)
  from this have  $\{. p' .\} \circ [:x \rightsquigarrow (u, y) . u \in init \wedge x = y :] \circ \{. p .\} \circ [: (u,$ 
 $x) \rightsquigarrow y . r(u, x) y \wedge r' x y :] \leq [:x \rightsquigarrow (u, y) . u \in init \wedge x = y :] \circ \{. p .\} \circ [:r :]$ 
  by (simp add: comp-assoc [THEN sym])
  from A and this show ?thesis
  by (unfold fusion-spec-local-a, simp)
  qed
end
theory Reactive
imports Temporal Refinement
begin

```

## 4 Reactive Systems

In this section we introduce reactive systems which are modeled as monotonic property transformers where properties are predicates on traces. We start with introducing some examples that uses LTL to specify global behaviour on traces, and later we introduce property transformers based on symbolic transition systems.

```

definition HAVOC =  $[:x \rightsquigarrow y . True:]$ 
definition ASSERT-LIVE =  $\{. \Box \Diamond (\lambda x . x 0).\}$ 
definition GUARANTY-LIVE =  $[:x \rightsquigarrow y . \Box \Diamond (\lambda y . y 0):]$ 
definition AE = ASSERT-LIVE o HAVOC
definition SKIP =  $[:x \rightsquigarrow y . x = y:]$ 

```

```

lemma [simp]:  $\text{SKIP} = \text{id}$ 
  by (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff SKIP-def demonic-def)

definition  $\text{REQ-RESP} = [ : \square(\lambda xs ys . xs (0::nat) \longrightarrow (\diamond (\lambda ys . ys (0::nat))))$ 
 $ys) : ]$ 
definition  $\text{FAIL} = \perp$ 

lemma  $\text{HAVOC} o \text{ASSERT-LIVE} = \text{FAIL}$ 
  by (auto simp add: HAVOC-def AE-def FAIL-def ASSERT-LIVE-def fun-eq-iff
assert-def demonic-def always-def at-fun-def le-fun-def eventually-def)

lemma  $\text{HAVOC} o \text{AE} = \text{FAIL}$ 
  by (auto simp add: HAVOC-def AE-def FAIL-def ASSERT-LIVE-def fun-eq-iff
assert-def demonic-def always-def at-fun-def le-fun-def eventually-def)

lemma  $\text{HAVOC} o \text{ASSERT-LIVE} = \text{FAIL}$ 
  by (auto simp add: HAVOC-def AE-def FAIL-def ASSERT-LIVE-def fun-eq-iff
assert-def demonic-def always-def at-fun-def eventually-def)

lemma  $\text{SKIP} o \text{AE} = \text{AE}$ 
  by simp

lemma  $(\text{REQ-RESP} o \text{AE}) = \text{AE}$ 
  proof (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff HAVOC-def AE-def FAIL-def REQ-RESP-def
ASSERT-LIVE-def assert-def
demonic-def always-def le-fun-def eventually-def at-fun-def)
  fix  $x :: 'a \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ 
  fix  $xa :: \text{nat} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ 
  fix  $xb :: \text{nat}$ 
  assume  $\forall xb :: \text{nat} \Rightarrow \text{bool} . (\forall x. xa x \longrightarrow Ex(xb[x ..])) \longrightarrow (\forall x. \exists a. xb(x + a)) \wedge All x$ 
  then have  $(\forall x. xa x \longrightarrow Ex(xa[x ..])) \longrightarrow (\forall x. \exists a. xa(x + a)) \wedge All x$ 
    by auto
  then show  $\exists x. xa(xb + x)$ 
    by (auto, rule-tac  $x = 0$  in exI, simp)
  next
    fix  $x :: 'a \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ 
    fix  $xa :: \text{nat} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ 
    fix  $xb :: 'a$ 
    assume  $\forall xb :: \text{nat} \Rightarrow \text{bool} . (\forall x. xa x \longrightarrow Ex(xb[x ..])) \longrightarrow (\forall x. \exists a. xb(x + a)) \wedge All x$ 
    from this show  $x xb$ 
      by (metis at-trace-def le0)
  next
    fix  $x :: 'a \Rightarrow \text{bool}$  and  $xa :: \text{nat} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$  and  $xb :: \text{nat} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$  and  $xc :: \text{nat}$ 
    assume  $A: \forall x. xa x \longrightarrow Ex(xb[x ..])$ 
    assume  $B: \forall x. \exists xb. xa(x + xb)$ 
    have  $\exists x1. xc \leq \text{AbsNat } x1$  by (metis (full-types) le-add2 plus-Nat-def)

```

```

thus  $\exists x. xb (xc + x)$  using A B by (metis AbsNat-plus add.commute
at-trace-def le-Suc-ex trans-le-add2)
qed

```

## 4.1 Symbolic transition systems

In this section we introduce property transformers basend on symbolic transition systems. These are systems with local state. The execution starts in some initial state, and with some input value the system computes a new state and an output value. Then using the current state, and a new input value the system computes a new state, and a new output, and so on. The system may fail if at some point the input and the current state do not statisfy a required predicate.

In the folowing definitions the variables  $u$ ,  $x$ ,  $y$  stand for the state of the system, the input, and the output respectively. The *init* is the property that the initial state should satisfy. The predicate  $p$  is the precondition of the input and the current state, and the relation  $r$  gives the next state and the output based on the input and the current state.

```

definition fail-sys init p r x = ( $\exists n u y . u \in init \wedge (\forall i < n . r(u i) (u(Suc i)) (x i)) \wedge (\neg p(u n) (u(Suc n)) (x n))$ )

```

```

definition run r u x y = ( $\forall i . r(u i) (u(Suc i)) (x i) (y i)$ )

```

```

definition LocalSystem init p r q x = ( $\neg fail-sys init p r x \wedge (\forall u y . (u \in init \wedge run r u x y) \longrightarrow q y)$ )

```

```

lemma fail (LocalSystem init p r) = fail-sys init p r

```

```

by (simp add: fun-eq-iff LocalSystem-def fail-def fail-sys-def run-def)

```

```

definition inpt-st r u u' x = ( $\exists y . r(u u' x y)$ )

```

```

definition lft-pred-st p u x =  $p(u(0::nat)) (u 1) (x(0::nat))$ 

```

```

definition lft-pred-loc-st p u x =  $p(u(0::nat)) (x(0::nat))$ 

```

```

definition lft-rel-st r u x y =  $r(u(0::nat)) (u 1) (x(0::nat)) (y(0::nat))$ 

```

```

definition prec-st p r =  $-((lft-pred-st(inpt-st r)) \text{ until } -(lft-pred-st p))$ 

```

```

lemma prec-st-simp: prec-st p r u x = ( $\forall n . (\forall i < n . inpt-st r(u i) (u(Suc i)) (x i)) \longrightarrow p(u n) (u(Suc n)) (x n))$ )

```

```

by (simp add: prec-st-def until-def lft-pred-st-def inpt-st-def at-fun-def, metis)

```

```

definition SymSystem init p r =  $[z \sim u, x . u \in init \wedge z = x] o \{.u, x . prec-st p r u x.\} o [u, x \sim y . (\square(lft-rel-st r)) u x y :]$ 

```

```

lemma SymSystem-rel: SymSystem init p r =  $\{.x . \forall u. u \in init \longrightarrow prec-st p r u x.\} o$ 

```

```

[:  $x \rightsquigarrow y . \exists u . u \in init \wedge (\square lft\text{-}rel\text{-}st r) u x y :]$ 
proof –
  have [simp]:  $((\lambda z (u, x). u \in init \wedge z = x) OO (\lambda (x, y). (\square lft\text{-}rel\text{-}st r) x y)) = (\lambda x y. \exists u. u \in init \wedge (\square lft\text{-}rel\text{-}st r) u x y)$ 
    by auto
  show ?thesis by (simp add: SymSystem-def demonic-assert-comp comp-assoc
demonic-demonic)
qed

theorem SymSystem init p r q x = LocalSystem init p r q x
proof
  assume SymSystem init p r q x
  then show LocalSystem init p r q x
    apply (auto simp add: SymSystem-def LocalSystem-def assert-def
demonic-def prec-st-simp lft-rel-st-def lft-pred-st-def inpt-st-def
always-def le-fun-def fail-sys-def run-def at-fun-def)
    by metis
next
  assume LocalSystem init p r q x
  then show SymSystem init p r q x
    apply (auto simp add: SymSystem-def LocalSystem-def assert-def
demonic-def prec-st-simp lft-rel-st-def lft-pred-st-def inpt-st-def
always-def le-fun-def fail-sys-def run-def at-fun-def)
    by metis
qed

definition local-init init S = Inf (S ` init)

definition zip-set A B = {u . ((fst o u) ∈ A) ∧ ((snd o u) ∈ B)}
definition nzip:: ('x ⇒ 'a) ⇒ ('x ⇒ 'b) ⇒ 'x ⇒ ('a × 'b) (infixl ◉||⟩ 65) where
(xs || ys) i = (xs i, ys i)

lemma [simp]: fst ∘ x || y = x
  by (simp add: fun-eq-iff nzip-def)

lemma [simp]: snd ∘ x || y = y
  by (simp add: fun-eq-iff nzip-def)

lemma [simp]: x ∈ A ⇒ y ∈ B ⇒ (x || y) ∈ zip-set A B
  by (simp add: zip-set-def)

lemma local-demonic-init: local-init init (λ u . {x . p u x}) o [: $x \rightsquigarrow y . r u x y :$ ] =
  [: $z \rightsquigarrow u, x . u \in init \wedge z = x:$ ] o {u, x . p u x} o [: $u, x \rightsquigarrow y . r u x y :$ ]
  by (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff demonic-def assert-def local-init-def le-fun-def)

lemma local-init-comp: u' ∈ init' ⇒ (∀ u. sconjunctive (S u)) ⇒ (local-init
init S) o (local-init init' S')
  = local-init (zip-set init init') (λ u . (S (fst o u)) o (S' (snd o

```

```

u)))
proof (subst fun-eq-iff, auto)
  fix  $x :: 'f$ 
  assume  $A: u' \in init'$ 
  assume  $\forall u . sconjunctive (S u)$ 
  from this have [simp]:  $\bigwedge u . sconjunctive (S u)$  by simp
  from A have [simp]:  $\bigwedge y . S y (\text{INF } y' \in init'. S' y' x) = (\text{INF } y' \in init' . S y (S' y' x))$ 
    by (simp add: sconjunctive-INF-simp image-comp)
  have [simp]:  $(\text{INF } y \in init . (\text{INF } y' \in init' . S y (S' y' x))) \leq (\text{INF } u \in \text{zip-set } init \text{ init}' . S (fst \circ u) (S' (snd \circ u) x))$ 
    proof (rule INF-greatest, auto simp add: zip-set-def)
      fix  $u :: 'a \Rightarrow 'c \times 'b$ 
      assume [simp]:  $fst \circ u \in init$ 
      assume [simp]:  $snd \circ u \in init'$ 
      have  $(\text{INF } y \in init . \text{INF } y' \in init' . S y (S' y' x)) \leq (\text{INF } y' \in init' . S (fst \circ u) (S' y' x))$ 
        by (rule INF-lower, simp)
        also have ...  $\leq S (fst \circ u) (S' (snd \circ u) x)$ 
        by (rule INF-lower, simp)
        finally show  $(\text{INF } y \in init . \text{INF } y' \in init' . S y (S' y' x)) \leq S (fst \circ u) (S' (snd \circ u) x)$ 
        by simp
    qed
  have [simp]:  $(\text{INF } u \in \text{zip-set } init \text{ init}' . S (fst \circ u) (S' (snd \circ u) x)) \leq (\text{INF } y \in init . (\text{INF } y' \in init' . S y (S' y' x)))$ 
    proof (rule INF-greatest, rule INF-greatest)
      fix  $y :: 'a \Rightarrow 'c$  and  $y' :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b$ 
      assume [simp]:  $y \in init$ 
      assume [simp]:  $y' \in init'$ 
      have  $(\text{INF } u \in \text{zip-set } init \text{ init}' . S (fst \circ u) (S' (snd \circ u) x)) \leq S (fst \circ (y || y') (S' (snd \circ (y || y')) x))$ 
        by (rule INF-lower, simp)
        also have ...  $\leq S y (S' y' x)$ 
        by simp
        finally show  $(\text{INF } u :: 'a \Rightarrow 'c \times 'b \in \text{zip-set } init \text{ init}' . S (fst \circ u) (S' (snd \circ u) x)) \leq S y (S' y' x)$ 
        by simp
    qed
  have local-init  $init S (\text{local-init } init' S' x) = (\text{INF } y \in init . S y (\text{INF } y' \in init' . S' y' x))$ 
    by (simp add: local-init-def image-comp)
  also have ...  $= (\text{INF } y \in init . (\text{INF } y' \in init' . S y (S' y' x)))$ 
    by simp
  also have ...  $= (\text{INF } u \in \text{zip-set } init \text{ init}' . S (fst \circ u) \circ S' (snd \circ u)) x$ 
    by (rule antisym) (simp-all add: image-comp)
  also have ...  $= \text{local-init} (\text{zip-set } init \text{ init}') (\lambda u . (S (fst \circ u)) \circ (S' (snd \circ u))) x$ 

```

```

    by (simp add: local-init-def)
  finally show local-init init S (local-init init' S' x) = local-init (zip-set init
init') (λu::'a ⇒ 'c × 'b. S (fst ∘ u) ∘ S' (snd ∘ u)) x
    by simp
qed

lemma init-state: [:z ~ u, x . u ∈ init ∧ z = x:] o {u, x . p u x.} o [:u, x ~ y
. r u x y :]
  = [:z ~ u, x . z = x:] o {u, x . u ∈ init → p u x.} o [:u, x ~ y . u ∈ init
∧ r u x y :]
  by (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff demonic-def assert-def local-init-def le-fun-def)

lemma always-lft-rel-comp: (□ lft-rel-st r) (fst ∘ u) OO (□ lft-rel-st r') (snd ∘
u)
  = (□ lft-rel-st (λ (u, v) (u', v') . ((r u u') OO (r' v v')))) u
proof (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff lft-rel-st-def always-def at-fun-def relcompp-exists)
  fix x::nat ⇒ 'a and
    y::nat ⇒ 'b and
    v::nat ⇒ 'c and
    n:: nat
  assume ∀ i . r (fst (u i)) (fst (u (Suc i))) (x i) (v i)
  and ∀ i . r' (snd (u i)) (snd (u (Suc i))) (v i) (y i)
  from this show (case u n of (u, v) ⇒ λ(u', v'). r u u' OO r' v v') (u (Suc
n)) (x n) (y n)
    by (metis (mono-tags, lifting) prod.case-eq-if relcompp.relcompI)
next
  fix x::nat ⇒ 'a and
    z::nat ⇒ 'b
  define a where a n = (SOME y . r (fst (u n)) (fst (u (Suc n))) (x n) y ∧
r' (snd (u n)) (snd (u (Suc n))) y (z n))
    for n
  assume ∀ i . (case u i of (u, v) ⇒ λ(u', v'). r u u' OO r' v v') (u (Suc i))
(x i) (z i)
  from this and a-def have (∀ i :: nat. r (fst (u i)) (fst (u (Suc i))) (x i) (a
i)) ∧ (∀ i :: nat. r' (snd (u i)) (snd (u (Suc i))) (a i) (z i))
    apply auto
    apply (metis (mono-tags, lifting) pick-middlep prod.collapse split-conv
tfl-some)
    by (metis (mono-tags, lifting) pick-middlep prod.collapse split-conv tfl-some)
    from this show ∃ a . (∀ i . r (fst (u i)) (fst (u (Suc i))) (x i) (a i)) ∧ (∀ i .
r' (snd (u i)) (snd (u (Suc i))) (a i) (z i))
    by blast
qed

theorem SymSystem-comp: u' ∈ init' ⇒ SymSystem init p r o SymSystem init'
p' r'
  = [:z ~ u, x . fst o u ∈ init ∧ snd o u ∈ init' ∧ z = x:]
    o {u, x . prec-st p r (fst ∘ u) x ∧ (∀ y. (□ lft-rel-st r) (fst ∘ u) x
y → prec-st p' r' (snd ∘ u) y .)}

```

```


$$o [: u, x \sim y . (\square lft-rel-st (\lambda(u, v) (u', v'). r u u' OO r' v v')) u x$$


$$y :]$$


$$(\text{is } ?p \implies ?S = ?T)$$


proof –



assume  $A: ?p$



have  $?S =$


$$[: z \sim (u, x) . u \in init \wedge z = x :] \circ \{.x, y. prec-st p r x y.\} \circ$$


$$[: id (\lambda(u, x). id ((\square lft-rel-st r) u x)) :] \circ$$


$$([: z \sim u, x . u \in init' \wedge z = x :] \circ \{.x, y. prec-st p' r' x y.\} \circ$$


$$[: id (\lambda(u, x). id ((\square lft-rel-st r') u x)) :])$$


by (unfold SymSystem-def, simp)



also have ... = local-init init ( $\lambda u :: nat \Rightarrow 'e. \{. id (prec-st p r u) .\} \circ [: id$   

 $(\lambda x. id ((\square lft-rel-st r) u x)) :]) \circ$   

 $local-init init' (\lambda u. \{. id (prec-st p' r' u) .\} \circ [: id (\lambda x :: nat \Rightarrow 'd. id ((\square$   

 $lft-rel-st r') u x)) :])$ 

by (unfold local-demonic-init [THEN sym], simp)



also from  $A$  have ... = local-init (zip-set init init')


$$(\lambda u. \{. prec-st p r (fst \circ u) .\} \circ [: (\square lft-rel-st r) (fst \circ u) :] \circ \{. prec-st$$

 $p' r' (snd \circ u) .\} \circ [: (\square lft-rel-st r') (snd \circ u) :])$ 

by (simp add: local-init-comp)



also have ... = local-init (zip-set init init')


$$(\lambda u. \{. prec-st p r (fst \circ u) .\} \circ [: (\square lft-rel-st r) (fst \circ u) :] \circ \{. prec-st p'$$

 $r' (snd \circ u) .\} \circ [: (\square lft-rel-st r') (snd \circ u) :])$ 

by (simp add: comp-assoc [THEN sym])



also have ... = local-init (zip-set init init')


$$(\lambda u. \{. x . prec-st p r (fst \circ u) x \wedge (\forall y. (\square lft-rel-st r) (fst \circ u) x y \longrightarrow$$

 $prec-st p' r' (snd \circ u) y) .\} \circ$ 
 $[: (\square lft-rel-st (\lambda(u, v) (u', v'). r u u' OO r' v v')) u :])$ 

by (simp add: assert-demonic-comp always-lft-rel-comp)



also have ... = local-init (zip-set init init')


$$(\lambda u. \{. x . prec-st p r (fst \circ u) x \wedge (\forall y. (\square lft-rel-st r) (fst \circ u) x y \longrightarrow$$

 $prec-st p' r' (snd \circ u) y) .\} \circ$ 
 $[: id (\lambda x :: nat \Rightarrow 'c. id ((\square lft-rel-st (\lambda(u, v) (u', v'). r u u' OO r' v v')) u$ 
 $x)) :])$ 

by simp



also have ... = ?T



by (unfold local-demonic-init, simp add: zip-set-def)



finally show ?thesis by simp



qed



lemma always-lft-rel-comp-a:  $(\square lft-rel-st r) u OO (\square lft-rel-st r') v$   

 $= (\square lft-rel-st (\lambda(u, v) (u', v'). ((r u u') OO (r' v v')))) (u || v)$



by (unfold always-lft-rel-comp [THEN sym], auto)


```

**theorem** SymSystem-comp-a:  $u' \in init' \implies SymSystem init p r o SymSystem$   
 $init' p' r'$   
 $= \{.x . \forall u v . u \in init \wedge v \in init' \longrightarrow (prec-st p r u x \wedge (\forall y. (\square$   
 $lft-rel-st r) u x y \longrightarrow prec-st p' r' v y)) .\}$

```


$$o [ : x \sim y . \exists u v . u \in init \wedge v \in init' \wedge (\square lft-rel-st (\lambda(u, v) (u', v')). r u u' OO r' v v')) (u || v) x y :]$$


$$(\text{is } ?p \implies ?S = ?T)$$

proof –
assume  $A: u' \in init'$ 
from  $A$  have [simp]:  $(\lambda x. (\forall u. u \in init \rightarrow prec-st p r u x) \wedge (\forall y. (\exists u. u \in init \wedge (\square lft-rel-st r) u x y) \rightarrow (\forall u. u \in init' \rightarrow prec-st p' r' u y)))$ 
 $= (\lambda x. \forall u v. u \in init \wedge v \in init' \rightarrow prec-st p r u x \wedge (\forall y. (\square lft-rel-st r) u x y \rightarrow prec-st p' r' v y))$ 
by (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff)
have [simp]:  $(\lambda x y. \exists u. u \in init \wedge (\square lft-rel-st r) u x y) OO (\lambda x y. \exists u. u \in init' \wedge (\square lft-rel-st r') u x y)$ 
 $= (\lambda x y. \exists u v. u \in init \wedge v \in init' \wedge (((\square lft-rel-st r) u) OO ((\square lft-rel-st r') v)) x y)$ 
by (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff)

from  $A$  have  $?S = \{x . \forall u . u \in init \rightarrow prec-st p r u x\} \circ$ 
 $[ : x \sim y . \exists u::nat \Rightarrow 'e. u \in init \wedge (\square lft-rel-st r) u x y :] \circ$ 
 $(\{x . \forall u . u \in init' \rightarrow prec-st p' r' u x.\} \circ [ : x \sim y . \exists u . u \in init' \wedge (\square lft-rel-st r') u x y :])$ 
by (simp add: SymSystem-rel)
also have ... =  $\{. \lambda x . \forall u . u \in init \rightarrow prec-st p r u x .\} \circ [ : x \sim y . \exists u . u \in init \wedge (\square lft-rel-st r) u x y :] \circ$ 
 $\{. x . \forall u . u \in init' \rightarrow prec-st p' r' u x .\} \circ [ : x \sim y . \exists u . u \in init' \wedge (\square lft-rel-st r') u x y :]$ 
by (simp add: comp-assoc [THEN sym])
also have ... =  $?T$ 
by (simp add: assert-demonic-comp always-lft-rel-comp-a)
finally show ?thesis
by simp
qed

```

We show next that the composition of two SymSystem  $S$  and  $S'$  is not equal to the SymSystem of the composition of local transitions of  $S$  and  $S'$

```

definition initS =  $\{u . fst (u (0::nat)) = (0::nat)\}$ 
definition localPrecS =  $(\top:: nat \times nat \Rightarrow nat \times nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow bool)$ 
definition localRelS =  $(\lambda (u::nat, v) (u', v'::nat) (x::nat) (y::nat) . u = 0 \wedge u' = 1 \wedge v = v')$ 

definition initS' =  $(\top::(nat \Rightarrow (nat \times nat)) set)$ 
definition localPrecS' =  $(\perp:: nat \times nat \Rightarrow nat \times nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow bool)$ 
definition localRelS' =  $(\lambda (u::nat, v) (u', v'::nat) (x::nat) (y::nat) . u = u')$ 

definition symbS = SymSystem initS localPrecS localRelS
definition symbS' = SymSystem initS' localPrecS' localRelS'

definition localPrecSS' =  $(\lambda (u::nat, v::nat) (u', v') (x::nat) . 0 < u)$ 
definition localRelSS' =  $(\lambda (u, v::nat) (u'::nat, v'::nat) (x::nat) (z::nat) . (u::nat) = 0 \wedge u' = 1)$ 

```

```

lemma localSS'-aux: (  $\lambda x. \forall (a::nat) (aa::nat) (b::nat). \neg (\text{case } x \text{ of } (x::nat,$ 
 $u::nat, v::nat) \Rightarrow \lambda ab. u = 0 \wedge$ 
 $(\text{case } ab \text{ of } (y, u', v') \Rightarrow u' = \text{Suc } 0 \wedge v = v')) (a, aa, b)$ )
 $= (\lambda (x, u, v) . u > 0)$ 
by (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff)

lemma localSS'-aux-b: (( $\lambda (x, u, v) ab. u = 0 \wedge (\text{case } ab \text{ of } (y, u', v') \Rightarrow u' =$ 
 $\text{Suc } 0 \wedge v = v')$ ) OO ( $\lambda (x, u, v) (y, u', v'). u = u'$ ))
 $= (\lambda (x, u, v) (y, u', v') . u = 0 \wedge u' = 1)$ 
by (simp add: fun-eq-iff relcompp-exists)

lemma { $x, (u, v) . \text{localPrecS } (u, v) (a, b) x.$ } o [: $x, (u, v) \rightsquigarrow y, (u', v') . \text{localRelS}$ 
 $(u, v) (u', v') x y:] o$ 
 $\quad \{.x, (u, v) . \text{localPrecS}' (u, v) (c, d) x.\} o [:x, (u, v) \rightsquigarrow y, (u', v') . \text{localRelS}'$ 
 $(u, v) (u', v') x y:]$ 
 $\quad = \{.x, (u, v) . \text{localPrecSS}' (u, v) (e, f) x.\} o [:x, (u, v) \rightsquigarrow y, (u', v') .$ 
 $\text{localRelSS}' (u, v) (u', v') x y:]$ 
by (simp add: assert-demonic-comp localPrecS'-def localPrecS-def localRelS-def
localRelS'-def
relcompp-exists localPrecSS'-def localRelSS'-def localSS'-aux localSS'-aux-b)

lemma [simp]: [:  $\perp :: ('a \Rightarrow 'b \Rightarrow ('c::boolean-algebra))$  :] =  $\top$ 
by (simp add: fun-eq-iff demonic-def)

definition symbSS' = SymSystem initS localPrecSS' localRelSS'

lemma symbSS'-aux: (  $\lambda x. \forall u. \text{fst } (u 0) = 0 \longrightarrow$ 
 $(\forall n. (\forall i < n. \text{Ex } ((\text{case } u i \text{ of } (u, v) \Rightarrow \lambda (u', v'::nat) x z. u = 0 \wedge u'$ 
 $= \text{Suc } 0) (u (\text{Suc } i)) (x i)))$ 
 $\longrightarrow (\text{case } u n \text{ of } (u, v) \Rightarrow \lambda (u', v') x. 0 < u) (u (\text{Suc } n)) (x n))$  ) =  $\perp$ 
apply (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff)
by (rule-tac x =  $\lambda i . (i::nat, i)$  in exI, simp)

lemma symbSS': symbSS' =  $\perp$ 
by (simp add: symbSS'-def SymSystem-rel initS-def localPrecSS'-def local-
RelSS'-def prec-st-simp inpt-st-def symbSS'-aux)

lemma symbS: symbS =  $\top$ 
proof (simp add: symbS-def SymSystem-rel initS-def localPrecS-def localRelS-def)
have [simp]:  $(\lambda x. \forall u. \text{fst } (u 0) = 0 \longrightarrow \text{prec-st } \top (\lambda (u, v) (u', v') x y . u$ 
 $= 0 \wedge u' = \text{Suc } 0 \wedge v = v') u x) = \top$ 
by (simp-all add: fun-eq-iff prec-st-def always-def lft-rel-st-def at-fun-def
lft-pred-st-def inpt-st-def until-def)

have [simp]:  $(\lambda x y. \exists u. \text{fst } (u 0) = 0 \wedge (\square \text{lft-rel-st } (\lambda (u, v) (u', v') (x) (y).$ 
 $u = 0 \wedge u' = \text{Suc } 0 \wedge v = v') u x y) = \perp$ 
proof (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff always-def lft-rel-st-def at-fun-def)

```

```

fix x::nat => 'a and xa :: nat => 'b and u::nat => nat × 'c
assume A: ∀ a . (case u a of (e, f) => λ(u', v') x y. e = 0 ∧ u' = Suc 0 ∧ f
= v') (u (Suc a)) (x a) (xa a)
{fix n:: nat
  from A have fst (u n) = 0 ∧ fst (u (Suc n)) = Suc 0
  by (drule-tac x = n in spec, case-tac u n, case-tac u (Suc n), auto)
}
note B = this
then have fst (u (Suc 0)) = 0 by auto
moreover have fst (u (Suc 0)) = Suc 0 using B [of 0] by auto
ultimately show (0) < fst (u (0)) by auto
qed

show {. λx. ∀ u. fst (u 0) = 0 → prec-st ⊤ (λ(u, v) (u', v') x y. u = 0 ∧ u'
= Suc 0 ∧ v = v') u x .} o
[ : λ x y . ∃ u . fst (u 0) = 0 ∧ (□ lft-rel-st (λ(u, v) (u', v') x y. u = 0 ∧
u' = Suc 0 ∧ v = v')) u x y :] =
  ⊤
  by simp
qed

lemma symbS o symbS' ≠ symbSS'
by (simp add: symbSS' symbS fun(eq-iff))

lemma prec-st-inpt: prec-st (inpt-st r) r = (□ (lft-pred-st (inpt-st r)))
by (simp add: prec-st-def neg-until-always)

lemma grd (SymSystem init p r) = Sup ((¬ prec-st p r ∨ (□ (lft-pred-st (inpt-st
r)))) ` init)
proof (unfold fun(eq-iff), auto simp add: grd-def SymSystem-rel demonic-def
assert-def)
fix x :: nat => 'a and xa :: nat => 'b and u :: nat => 'c
assume ∀ xa::nat => 'c ∈ init. prec-st p r xa x ∧ ¬ (□ lft-pred-st (inpt-st r))
xa x
and u ∈ init
and (□ lft-rel-st r) u x xa
then show False
by (auto simp add: always-def lft-pred-st-def inpt-st-def at-fun-def lft-rel-st-def)
next
fix x :: nat => 'a and xa :: nat => 'c
assume B: xa ∈ init
assume (λy . ∃ u . u ∈ init ∧ (□ lft-rel-st r) u x y) ≤ ⊥
then have A: ∀ y u . u ∉ init ∨ ¬ (□ lft-rel-st r) u x y
  by auto
let ?y = λ n . (SOME z . r (xa n) (xa (Suc n)) (x n) z)
from B and A have ¬ (□ lft-rel-st r) xa x ?y by simp
moreover assume (□ lft-pred-st (inpt-st r)) xa x
ultimately show False
apply (simp add: always-def lft-pred-st-def inpt-st-def at-fun-def lft-rel-st-def)

```

```

by (metis (full-types) tfl-some)
qed

definition guard S = {.(grd S)::'a⇒bool).} o S

lemma ((grd (local-init init S))::'a⇒bool) = Sup ((grd o S) ` init)
  by (simp add: fun-eq-iff local-init-def assert-def grd-def)

lemma u ∈ init ⟹ guard ([:z ∼ u, x . u ∈ init ∧ z = x:] o { .u, x . p u x.} o
[:u, x ∼ y . r u x y :])
  = [:z ∼ u, x . u ∈ init ∧ z = x:] o { .u, x . u ∈ init ∧ (exists a. a ∈ init ∧ (p a x
→ Ex (r a x))) ∧ p u x.} o [:u, x ∼ y . ((r u x y)::bool) :]
  by (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff local-init-def guard-def grd-def assert-def de-
monic-def le-fun-def)

lemma inpt-str-comp-aux: (∀ n. (∀ i < n. inpt-st (λ(u, v) (u', v'). r u u' OO r' v
v') (u i) (u (Suc i)) (x i)) →
  inpt-st r (fst (u n)) (fst (u (Suc n))) (x n) ∧ (∀ y. r (fst (u n)) (fst (u (Suc
n))) (x n) y → inpt-st r' (snd (u n)) (snd (u (Suc n))) y)) →
  (∀ i < n. inpt-st r ((fst o u) i) ((fst o u) (Suc i)) (x i) ∧ (∀ y. r (fst (u i))
(fst (u (Suc i))) (x i) y → inpt-st r' (snd (u i)) (snd (u (Suc i))) y))
  (is (∀ n . ?p n) → ?q n)
proof (induction n)
  case 0
  show ?case by auto
next
  case (Suc n)
  show ?case
  proof auto
    fix i::nat
    assume B: ∀ n . ?p n
    then have A: ?p n (is ?A → ?B)
      by simp
    from Suc and B have C: ?q n
      by simp
    assume i < Suc n
    then show inpt-st r (fst (u i)) (fst (u (Suc i))) (x i)
      proof cases
        assume i < n
        then show ?thesis
          by (metis Suc.IH B comp-apply)
      next
        assume ¬ i < n
        from this and ⟨i < Suc n⟩ have [simp]: i = n by simp
        show ?thesis
        proof cases
          assume ?A
          from this and A have D: ?B by simp

```

```

from D show ?thesis
  by (metis ‹i = n›)
next
  assume  $\neg ?A$ 
  then obtain j where  $j : j < n \wedge \neg \text{inpt-st}(\lambda(u, v) . \lambda(u', v') . r u$ 
 $u' OO r' v v') (u j) (u (\text{Suc } j)) (x j)$ 
    by auto
  with C have  $\text{inpt-st } r (\text{fst } (u j)) (\text{fst } (u (\text{Suc } j))) (x j) \wedge (\forall y. r (\text{fst } (u j)) (\text{fst } (u (\text{Suc } j))) (x j) y \longrightarrow \text{inpt-st } r' (\text{snd } (u j)) (\text{snd } (u (\text{Suc } j))) y)$ 
    by auto
  with j show ?thesis
    apply (case-tac u j)
    apply (case-tac u (Suc j))
    apply (simp add: inpt-st-def)
    by (metis relcompp.relcompI)
qed
qed
next
  fix i::nat fix y :: 'e
  assume B:  $\forall n . ?p n$ 
  then have A:  $?p n (\text{is } ?A \longrightarrow ?B)$ 
    by simp
  from Suc and B have C:  $\forall i < n. \text{inpt-st } r (\text{fst } (u i)) (\text{fst } (u (\text{Suc } i))) (x i) \wedge (\forall y. r (\text{fst } (u i)) (\text{fst } (u (\text{Suc } i))) (x i) y \longrightarrow \text{inpt-st } r' (\text{snd } (u i)) (\text{snd } (u (\text{Suc } i))) y)$ 
    by simp
  assume E:  $r (\text{fst } (u i)) (\text{fst } (u (\text{Suc } i))) (x i) y$ 
  assume i < Suc n
  then show  $\text{inpt-st } r' (\text{snd } (u i)) (\text{snd } (u (\text{Suc } i))) y$ 
  proof cases
    assume i < n
    from this and E and C show ?thesis
      by simp
next
  assume  $\neg i < n$ 
  from this and ‹i < Suc n› have [simp]:  $i = n$  by simp
  show ?thesis
  proof (cases ?A)
    case True
    with A have D: ?B by simp
    from D and E show ?thesis
      by (metis ‹i = n›)
next
  case False
  then obtain j where  $j : j < n \wedge \neg \text{inpt-st}(\lambda(u, v) . \lambda(u', v') . r u$ 
 $u' OO r' v v') (u j) (u (\text{Suc } j)) (x j)$ 
    by auto
  with C have  $\text{inpt-st } r (\text{fst } (u j)) (\text{fst } (u (\text{Suc } j))) (x j) \wedge (\forall y. r (\text{fst } (u j)) (\text{fst } (u (\text{Suc } j))) (x j) y \longrightarrow \text{inpt-st } r' (\text{snd } (u j)) (\text{snd } (u (\text{Suc } j))) y)$ 

```

```

    by auto
  with j show ?thesis
    by (case-tac u j, case-tac u (Suc j), simp add: inpt-st-def, metis
relcompp.relcompI)
qed
qed
qed
qed

lemma inpt-str-comp-aux-a: ( $\forall n. (\forall i < n. \text{inpt-st}(\lambda(u, v) (u', v'). r u u' OO r' v v') (u i) (u (\text{Suc } i)) (x i)) \rightarrow$ 
 $\text{inpt-st } r (\text{fst } (u n)) (\text{fst } (u (\text{Suc } n))) (x n) \wedge (\forall y. r (\text{fst } (u n)) (\text{fst } (u (\text{Suc } n))) (x n) y \rightarrow \text{inpt-st } r' (\text{snd } (u n)) (\text{snd } (u (\text{Suc } n))) y)) \Rightarrow$ 
 $\text{inpt-st } r ((\text{fst } o u) n) ((\text{fst } o u) (\text{Suc } n)) (x n) \wedge (\forall y. r (\text{fst } (u n)) (\text{fst } (u (\text{Suc } n))) (x n) y \rightarrow \text{inpt-st } r' (\text{snd } (u n)) (\text{snd } (u (\text{Suc } n))) y)$ 
by (cut-tac n = Suc n and r = r and r' = r' and u = u and x = x in
inpt-str-comp-aux, simp)

definition rel-st r r' = ( $\lambda(u, v) (u', v') x z. \text{inpt-st } r u u' x \wedge (\forall y. r u u' x y \rightarrow \text{inpt-st } r' v v' y) \wedge (r u u' OO r' v v') x z)$ 

lemma inpt-str-comp-a: ( $\text{prec-st}(\text{inpt-st } r) r (\text{fst } o u) x \wedge (\forall y. (\square \text{lft-rel-st } r) (\text{fst } o u) x y \rightarrow \text{prec-st}(\text{inpt-st } r') r' (\text{snd } o u) y) =$ 
 $\text{prec-st}(\lambda u u' x. \text{inpt-st } r (\text{fst } u) (\text{fst } u') x \wedge (\forall y. r (\text{fst } u) (\text{fst } u') x y \rightarrow (\text{inpt-st } r' (\text{snd } u) (\text{snd } u') y))) (\lambda(u, v) (u', v'). r u u' OO r' v v') u x$ 
proof (auto simp add: prec-st-inpt prec-st-simp)
fix n:: nat
assume ( $\square \text{lft-pred-st}(\text{inpt-st } r) (\text{fst } o u) x$ 
then show  $\text{inpt-st } r (\text{fst } (u n)) (\text{fst } (u (\text{Suc } n))) (x n)$ 
by (simp add: always-def lft-pred-st-def at-fun-def)

next
fix n:: nat and y :: 'c
assume A: ( $\square \text{lft-pred-st}(\text{inpt-st } r) (\text{fst } o u) x$ 
assume B:  $r (\text{fst } (u n)) (\text{fst } (u (\text{Suc } n))) (x n) y$ 
assume C:  $\forall i < n. \text{inpt-st}(\lambda(u::'a, v::'d) (u::'a, v::'d). r u u' OO r' v v') (u i) (u (\text{Suc } i)) (x i)$ 
let ?y =  $\lambda i. (\text{if } i = n \text{ then } y \text{ else } (\text{SOME } y. r ((\text{fst } o u) i) ((\text{fst } o u) (\text{Suc } i)) (x i) y))$ 
assume  $\forall y. (\square \text{lft-rel-st } r) (\text{fst } o u) x y \rightarrow (\square \text{lft-pred-st}(\text{inpt-st } r')) (\text{snd } o u) y$ 
then have D: ( $\square \text{lft-rel-st } r) (\text{fst } o u) x ?y \rightarrow (\square \text{lft-pred-st}(\text{inpt-st } r')) (\text{snd } o u) ?y$ 
by simp
from A and B have E: ( $\square \text{lft-rel-st } r) (\text{fst } o u) x ?y$ 
apply (auto simp add: always-def at-fun-def lft-rel-st-def lft-pred-st-def
inpt-st-def)
by (metis tfl-some)
from D and E have ( $\square \text{lft-pred-st}(\text{inpt-st } r') (\text{snd } o u) ?y$ ) by simp

```

```

from A and E and this show inpt-st r' (snd (u n)) (snd (u (Suc n))) y
  apply (simp add: always-def lft-pred-st-def at-fun-def)
  apply (drule-tac x = n in spec)
  apply (drule-tac x = n in spec)
  by (drule-tac x = n in spec, simp)
next
  assume  $\forall n . (\forall i < n. \text{inpt-st } (\lambda(u::'a, v::'d) (u'::'a, v'::'d). r u u' OO r' v v') (u i) (u (\text{Suc } i)) (x i)) \rightarrow$ 
    inpt-st r (fst (u n)) (fst (u (\text{Suc } n))) (x n)  $\wedge (\forall y::'c. r (\text{fst } (u n)) (\text{fst } (u (\text{Suc } n))) (x n) y \rightarrow \text{inpt-st } r' (\text{snd } (u n)) (\text{snd } (u (\text{Suc } n))) y)$ 
  then show ( $\square$  lft-pred-st (inpt-st r)) (fst o u) x
    apply (auto simp add: always-def lft-pred-st-def at-fun-def)
    apply (drule inpt-str-comp-aux-a)
    by auto
next
fix y::nat  $\Rightarrow$  'c
  assume  $\forall n . (\forall i < n. \text{inpt-st } (\lambda(u::'a, v::'d) (u'::'a, v'::'d). r u u' OO r' v v') (u i) (u (\text{Suc } i)) (x i)) \rightarrow$ 
    inpt-st r (fst (u n)) (fst (u (\text{Suc } n))) (x n)  $\wedge (\forall y::'c. r (\text{fst } (u n)) (\text{fst } (u (\text{Suc } n))) (x n) y \rightarrow \text{inpt-st } r' (\text{snd } (u n)) (\text{snd } (u (\text{Suc } n))) y)$ 
  moreover assume ( $\square$  lft-rel-st r) (fst o u) x y
  ultimately show ( $\square$  lft-pred-st (inpt-st r')) (snd o u) y
    apply (auto simp add: always-def lft-pred-st-def at-fun-def)
    apply (drule inpt-str-comp-aux-a)
    by (auto simp add: lft-rel-st-def)
qed

lemma inpt-str-comp-b: prec-st ( $\lambda u u' x . \text{inpt-st } r (\text{fst } u) (\text{fst } u') x \wedge$ 
 $(\forall y . r (\text{fst } u) (\text{fst } u') x y \rightarrow (\text{inpt-st } r' (\text{snd } u) (\text{snd } u') y)) (\lambda(u, v) (u', v'). r u u' OO r' v v') u x$ 
 $= (\square (\text{lft-pred-st } (\text{inpt-st } (\text{rel-st } r r')))) u x$ 
proof (auto simp add: prec-st-simp always-def lft-pred-st-def at-fun-def rel-st-def)
fix m::nat
  assume A:  $\forall n . (\forall i < n. \text{inpt-st } (\lambda(u, v) (u', v'). r u u' OO r' v v') (u i) (u (\text{Suc } i)) (x i)) \rightarrow$ 
    inpt-st r (fst (u n)) (fst (u (\text{Suc } n))) (x n)
     $\wedge (\forall y. r (\text{fst } (u n)) (\text{fst } (u (\text{Suc } n))) (x n) y \rightarrow \text{inpt-st } r' (\text{snd } (u n)) (\text{snd } (u (\text{Suc } n))) y)$  (is  $\forall n . ?p n \rightarrow ?q n \wedge ?r n$ )
  then have ?q m
    by (drule-tac n = m in inpt-str-comp-aux-a, simp)
    then obtain y where B:  $r ((\text{fst } o u) m) ((\text{fst } o u) (\text{Suc } m)) (x m) y$  by
      (auto simp add: inpt-st-def)
    from A have ?r m
      by (drule-tac n = m in inpt-str-comp-aux-a, simp)
      from this B show inpt-st ( $\lambda(u, v) (u', v') (x::'c) z . \text{inpt-st } r u u' x \wedge (\forall y. r u u' x y \rightarrow \text{inpt-st } r' v v' y) \wedge (r u u' OO r' v v') x z$ ) (u m) (u (\text{Suc } m)) (x m)
        apply (case-tac u m)
        apply (case-tac u (\text{Suc } m))

```

```

apply (simp add: inpt-st-def)
by (metis relcompp.relcompI)
next
fix m::nat
assume  $\forall m. \text{inpt-st}(\lambda(u, v)(u', v')(x)z. \text{inpt-st} r u u' x \wedge (\forall y. r u u' x$ 
 $y \rightarrow \text{inpt-st} r' v v' y)$ 
 $\wedge (r u u' OO r' v v') x z) (u m) (u (\text{Suc } m)) (x m) (\text{is } \forall m. ?p m)$ 
then have ?p m by simp
then show inpt-st r (fst (u m)) (fst (u (\text{Suc } m))) (x m)
apply (simp add: inpt-st-def)
by (case-tac u m, case-tac u (\text{Suc } m), simp)
next
fix m::nat and y :: 'e
assume  $\forall m. \text{inpt-st}(\lambda(u, v)(u', v')(x)z. \text{inpt-st} r u u' x \wedge (\forall y. r u u' x$ 
 $y \rightarrow \text{inpt-st} r' v v' y)$ 
 $\wedge (r u u' OO r' v v') x z) (u m) (u (\text{Suc } m)) (x m) (\text{is } \forall m. ?p m)$ 
then have ?p m by simp
moreover assume r (fst (u m)) (fst (u (\text{Suc } m))) (x m) y
ultimately show inpt-st r' (snd (u m)) (snd (u (\text{Suc } m))) y
apply (simp add: inpt-st-def)
by (case-tac u m, case-tac u (\text{Suc } m), simp)
qed

lemma inpt-str-comp: (prec-st (inpt-st r) r (fst o u) x  $\wedge (\forall y. (\square lft-rel-st r) (fst$ 
 $\circ u) x y \rightarrow \text{prec-st} (\text{inpt-st} r') r' (\text{snd} \circ u) y))$ 
 $= (\square (\text{lft-pred-st} (\text{inpt-st} (\text{rel-st} r r')))) u x$ 
by (simp add: inpt-str-comp-a inpt-str-comp-b)

lemma RSysTmp-inpt-comp:  $u' \in \text{init}' \Rightarrow \text{SymSystem init} (\text{inpt-st} r) r o \text{Sym-}$ 
 $\text{System init}' (\text{inpt-st} r') r'$ 
 $= \text{SymSystem} (\text{zip-set init init}') (\text{inpt-st} (\text{rel-st} r r')) (\text{rel-st} r r')$ 
proof -
assume A :  $u' \in \text{init}'$ 
have [simp]: ( $\lambda x y. (\text{case } x \text{ of } (x, xa) \Rightarrow (\square \text{lft-pred-st} (\text{inpt-st} (\text{rel-st} r r'))))$ 
 $x xa) \wedge$ 
 $(\text{case } x \text{ of } (x, xa) \Rightarrow (\square \text{lft-rel-st} (\lambda(u, v)(u', v'). r u u' OO r' v v')) x xa)$ 
y)
 $= (\lambda(x, y). (\square \text{lft-rel-st} (\text{rel-st} r r')) x y) (\text{is } ?a = ?b)$ 
proof (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff always-def at-fun-def lft-pred-st-def lft-rel-st-def
rel-st-def inpt-st-def)
fix a :: nat  $\Rightarrow 'e \times 'a$  and b :: nat  $\Rightarrow 'c \times 'b$  and x :: nat  $\Rightarrow 'b$  and xa :: nat
assume  $\forall xa::nat. (\text{case } a \text{ xa of } (u::'e, v::'a) \Rightarrow \lambda(u::'e, v::'a). r u u' OO$ 
 $r' v v') (a (\text{Suc } xa)) (b xa) (x xa) (\text{is } \forall xa. ?P xa)$ 
then have A: ?P xa by simp
assume  $\forall x. \text{Ex} ((\text{case } a \text{ xa of } (u, v) \Rightarrow \lambda(u', v')(x)z. \text{Ex} (r u u' x) \wedge$ 
 $(\forall y. r u u' x y \rightarrow \text{Ex} (r' v v' y)) \wedge (r u u' OO r' v v') x z) (a (\text{Suc } x)) (b x))$ 
 $(\text{is } \forall xa. ?Q xa)$ 
then have ?Q xa by simp
from this and A show (case a xa of (u, v)  $\Rightarrow \lambda(u', v')(x)z. \text{Ex} (r u u'$ 
```

```

 $x) \wedge (\forall y. r u u' x y \longrightarrow Ex (r' v v' y)) \wedge (r u u' OO r' v v' x z) (a (Suc xa)) (b$ 
 $xa) (x xa)$ 
    by (case-tac a xa, case-tac a (Suc xa), simp)
next
fix a :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  'e  $\times$  'a and b :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  'c and x :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  'b and xa :: nat
assume  $\forall xa . (case a xa of (u::'e, v::'a) \Rightarrow \lambda(u::'e, v::'a) (x::'c) z::'b.$ 
 $Ex (r u u' x) \wedge (\forall y::'d. r u u' x y \longrightarrow Ex (r' v v' y)) \wedge (r u u' OO r' v v' x z)$ 
 $(a (Suc xa)) (b xa) (x xa) (\text{is } \forall xa . ?Q xa)$ 
then have ?Q xa by simp
then show (case a xa of (u::'e, v::'a)  $\Rightarrow$   $\lambda(u::'e, v::'a). r u u' OO r' v$ 
 $v' (a (Suc xa)) (b xa) (x xa)$ 
    by (case-tac a xa, case-tac a (Suc xa), simp)
qed

```

```

from A have SymSystem init (inpt-st r) r o SymSystem init'(inpt-st r') r' =
[: z  $\sim$  u, x . fst  $\circ$  u  $\in$  init  $\wedge$  snd  $\circ$  u  $\in$  init'  $\wedge$  z = x :]  $\circ$ 
  ({.u, x . prec-st (inpt-st r) r (fst  $\circ$  u) x  $\wedge$  ( $\forall y::nat \Rightarrow$  'd. ( $\square$  lft-rel-st r) (fst
 $\circ$  u) x y  $\longrightarrow$  prec-st (inpt-st r') r' (snd  $\circ$  u) y).}  $\circ$ 
  [: ( $\lambda(u, x). ((\square lft-rel-st (\lambda(u, v) (u', v'). r u u' OO r' v v')) u x)) :]$ 
  by (unfold SymSystem-comp, simp add: comp-assoc)
also have ... = [: z  $\sim$  u, x . fst  $\circ$  u  $\in$  init  $\wedge$  snd  $\circ$  u  $\in$  init'  $\wedge$  z = x :]  $\circ$  ({.
x, y . ( $\square$  lft-pred-st (inpt-st (rel-st r r'))) x y .}  $\circ$  [: ?b :])
by (subst assert-demonic, simp add: inpt-str-comp)
also have ... = SymSystem (zip-set init init') (inpt-st (rel-st r r')) (rel-st r
r')
by (simp add: SymSystem-def prec-st-inpt comp-assoc zip-set-def)
finally show ?thesis by simp
qed

```

**definition** GrdSymSystem init r = [:z  $\sim$  u, x . u  $\in$  init  $\wedge$  z = x:] o trs ( $\lambda (u,$ 
 $x) y . (\square (lft-rel-st r)) u x y)$

```

lemma inpt-always: inpt ( $\lambda(x, y). (\square lft-rel-st r) x y) = (\lambda(x, y). (\square lft-pred-st$ 
 $(inpt-st r)) x y)$ 
proof (auto simp add: fun-eq-iff)
fix a :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  'a and b :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  'b
assume inpt ( $\lambda(x, y). (\square lft-rel-st r) x y) (a, b)$ 
then show ( $\square lft-pred-st (inpt-st r)) a b$ 
by (auto simp add: inpt-def lft-pred-st-def inpt-st-def always-def at-fun-def
lft-rel-st-def)
next
fix a :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  'a and b :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  'b
let ?y =  $\lambda n . (SOME y . r (a n) (a (Suc n)) (b n) y)$ 
assume ( $\square lft-pred-st (inpt-st r)) a b$ 
then have ( $\square lft-rel-st r) a b ?y$ 
apply (auto simp add: always-def at-fun-def lft-rel-st-def inpt-st-def lft-pred-st-def)
by (metis tfl-some)
then show inpt ( $\lambda(x, y). (\square lft-rel-st r) x y) (a, b)$ 
by (auto simp add: inpt-def)

```

**qed**

```
lemma GrdSymSystem init r = SymSystem init (inpt-st r) r
by (simp add: GrdSymSystem-def SymSystem-def trs-def prec-st-inpt comp-assoc
inpt-always)
```

## 4.2 Example: COUNTER

In this section we introduce an example counter that counts how many times the input variable  $x$  is true. The input is a sequence of boolean values and the output is a sequence of natural numbers. The output at some moment in time is the number of true values seen so far in the input.

We defined the system counter in two different ways and we show that the two definitions are equivalent. The first definition takes the entire input sequence and it computes the corresponding output sequence. We introduce the second version of the counter as a reactive system based on a symbolic transition system. We use a local variable to record the number of true values seen so far, and initially the local variable is zero. At every step we increase the local variable if the input is true. The output of the system at every step is equal to the local variable.

```
primrec count :: bool trace  $\Rightarrow$  nat trace where
  count x 0 = (if x 0 then 1 else 0) |
  count x (Suc n) = (if x (Suc n) then count x n + 1 else count x n)
```

```
definition Counter-global n = {x . ( $\forall k$  . count x k  $\leq$  n).} o [:x ~ y . y = count x:]
```

```
definition prec-count M u u' x = (u  $\leq$  M)
definition rel-count u u' x y = ((x  $\rightarrow$  u' = Suc u)  $\wedge$  ( $\neg$  x  $\rightarrow$  u' = u)  $\wedge$  y = u')
```

```
lemma counter-a-aux: u 0 = 0  $\implies \forall i < n$ . (x i  $\rightarrow$  u (Suc i) = Suc (u i))  $\wedge$ 
( $\neg$  x i  $\rightarrow$  u (Suc i) = u i)  $\implies (\forall i < n$  . count x i = u (Suc i))
proof (induction n)
  case 0
  show ?case by simp
next
  case (Suc n)
  {fix j::nat
    assume  $\forall i < Suc n$ . (x i  $\rightarrow$  u (Suc i) = Suc (u i))  $\wedge$  ( $\neg$  x i  $\rightarrow$  u (Suc i) = u i)
    and j < Suc n
    and u (0::nat) = (0::nat)
    from this and Suc have count x j = u (Suc j)
    by (case-tac j, auto)
  }
  from Suc and this show ?case
```

by auto  
qed

**lemma** counter-b-aux:  $u 0 = 0 \implies \forall n. (xa n \rightarrow u (Suc n) = Suc (u n)) \wedge (\neg xa n \rightarrow u (Suc n) = u n) \wedge xb n = u (Suc n)$   
 $\implies count xa n = u (Suc n)$

by (induction n, simp-all)

**definition** COUNTER M = SymSystem {u . u 0 = 0} (prec-count M) rel-count

**lemma** COUNTER = Counter-global

proof –

have A:  $(\lambda x y . \exists u::nat \Rightarrow nat. u (0::nat) = (0::nat) \wedge (\square lft-rel-st rel-count) u x y) = (\lambda x y . y = count x)$

proof (simp add: fun-eq-iff lft-rel-st-def rel-count-def always-def at-fun-def, safe)

fix x :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  bool and xa :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  nat and u:: nat  $\Rightarrow$  nat and xb :: nat

assume A:  $u 0 = 0$

assume B:  $\forall xb . (x xb \rightarrow u (Suc xb) = Suc (u xb)) \wedge (\neg x xb \rightarrow u (Suc xb) = u xb) \wedge xa xb = u (Suc xb)$

from A and this have count x xb = xa xb

by (drule-tac counter-b-aux, auto)

then show xa xb = count x xb by simp

next

fix x::nat  $\Rightarrow$  bool and xa::nat  $\Rightarrow$  nat

define u where  $u i = (if i = 0 then 0 else count x (i - 1))$  for i

assume B:  $\forall xb::nat. xa xb = count x xb$

{fix xb::nat

from u-def and B have  $u 0 = 0 \wedge ((x xb \rightarrow u (Suc xb) = Suc (u xb))$

$\wedge (\neg x xb \rightarrow u (Suc xb) = u xb) \wedge xa xb = u (Suc xb))$

by (case-tac xb, auto)

}

then show  $\exists u::nat \Rightarrow nat. u 0 = 0 \wedge (\forall xb. (x xb \rightarrow u (Suc xb) = Suc (u xb)) \wedge (\neg x xb \rightarrow u (Suc xb) = u xb) \wedge$

$xa xb = u (Suc xb))$

by auto

qed

{fix x :: nat

have  $(\lambda xa . \forall u . u (0::nat) = (0::nat) \rightarrow prec-st (prec-count x) rel-count$

$u xa) =$

$(\lambda xa::nat \Rightarrow bool. \forall k::nat. count xa k \leq x)$

proof (simp add: fun-eq-iff lft-rel-st-def prec-st-def until-def

lft-pred-st-def prec-count-def at-fun-def inpt-st-def rel-count-def, safe)

fix xa::nat  $\Rightarrow$  bool and k:: nat

define uu where  $uu i = (if i = 0 then 0 else count xa (i - 1))$  for i

assume  $(\forall u . u 0 = 0 \rightarrow (\forall xb . (\exists x < xb. xa x \wedge u (Suc x) \neq Suc (u x))$

$\vee \neg xa x \wedge u (Suc x) \neq u x) \vee u xb \leq x))$  (is  $\forall u . ?s u$ )

then have ?s uu (is ?p  $\rightarrow (\forall xb . (\exists x < xb . ?q xb x) \vee ?r xb))$

```

    by auto
from this and uu-def have ( $\forall xb . (\exists x < xb . ?q xb x) \vee ?r xb$ )
    by simp
then have ( $\exists x < (Suc k) . ?q (Suc k) x) \vee ?r (Suc k)$ 
    by simp
then obtain xb where  $xb < (Suc k) \wedge (?q (Suc k) xb \vee ?r (Suc k))$ 
    by auto
from this and uu-def show count xa k  $\leq x$ 
    by (case-tac xb, auto)
next
fix xa::nat  $\Rightarrow$  bool and u::nat  $\Rightarrow$  nat and xaa::nat
assume C:  $\forall k::nat. count xa k \leq x$ 
assume A:  $u (0::nat) = (0::nat)$ 
assume B:  $\neg u xaa \leq x$ 
from A and B have D:  $xaa > 0$ 
    by (metis le0 neq0-conv)
from this and B and C have count xa (xa - 1)  $\neq u xaa$ 
    by metis
from this and D have E:  $\exists i < xaa. count xa i \neq u (Suc i)$ 
    by (metis One-nat-def Suc-diff-1 diff-Suc-less)
have  $u 0 = 0 \implies \forall i < xaa. (xa i \rightarrow u (Suc i) = Suc (u i)) \wedge (\neg xa i \rightarrow u (Suc i) = u i) \implies \forall i < xaa. count xa i = u (Suc i)$ 
    by (rule counter-a-aux, simp)
from this and A and E show ( $\exists x < xaa. xa x \wedge u (Suc x) \neq Suc (u x) \vee \neg xa x \wedge u (Suc x) \neq u x$ )
    by auto
qed
}
note B = this
show ?thesis
by (simp add: fun-eq-iff COUNTER-def SymSystem-rel Counter-global-def A
B)

qed

```

### 4.3 Example: LIVE

The last example of this formalization introduces a system which does some local computation, and ensures some global liveness property. We show that this example is the fusion of a symbolic transition system and a demonic choice which ensures the liveness property of the output sequence. We also show that assuming some liveness property for the input, we can refine the example into an executable system that does not ensure the liveness property of the output on its own, but relies on the liveness of the input.

```

definition rel-ex u u' x y = (((x  $\wedge$  u' = u + (1::int))  $\vee$  ( $\neg x \wedge u' = u - 1$ )  $\vee$  u' = 0)  $\wedge$  (y = (u' = 0)))
definition prec-ex u u' x = (-1  $\leq$  u  $\wedge$  u  $\leq$  3)

```

**definition**  $LIVE = [x \rightsquigarrow u, x' . u (0::nat) = 0 \wedge x = x'] o \{u, x . prec-st prec-ex rel-ex u x.\}$

$o [u, x \rightsquigarrow y . (\square(\lambda u x y . rel-ex (u 0) (u 1) (x 0) (y 0))) u x y \wedge (\square(\diamond(\lambda y . y 0))) y]$

**lemma**  $LIVE\text{-fusion}: LIVE = (SymSystem \{u . u 0 = 0\} prec-ex rel-ex) \parallel [x \rightsquigarrow y . (\square(\diamond(\lambda y . y 0))) y]$

**proof** –

define  $init$  where  $init = \{u . u (0::nat) = (0::int)\}$

then have  $A: (\lambda i::nat . 0::int) \in init$

by simp

then have  $([x \rightsquigarrow (u, y). u \in init \wedge x = y] \circ \{(x, y). prec-st prec-ex rel-ex x y.\}) \circ [\lambda(x, y). (\square lft-rel-st rel-ex) x y]$

$= [x \rightsquigarrow (u, y). u \in init \wedge x = y] \circ \{(x, y). prec-st prec-ex rel-ex x y.\} \circ$

$[(u, x) \rightsquigarrow y. (\square lft-rel-st rel-ex) u x y \wedge (\square \diamond(\lambda y. y 0)) y]$

by (unfold fusion-spec-local-a, auto)

then show ?thesis

by (simp add: init-def SymSystem-def)

(auto simp add: LIVE-def lft-rel-st-def always-def at-fun-def)

qed

**definition**  $preca-ex x = (x 1 = (\neg x 0))$

**lemma**  $monotonic\text{-}SymSystem[simp]: mono (SymSystem init p r)$

by (simp add: SymSystem-def)

**lemma**  $event-ex-aux-a: a 0 = (0::int) \implies \forall n. xa (Suc n) = (\neg xa n) \implies \forall n. (xa n \wedge a (Suc n) = a n + 1 \vee \neg xa n \wedge a (Suc n) = a n - 1 \vee a (Suc n) = 0) \implies (a n = -1 \longrightarrow xa n) \wedge (a n = 1 \longrightarrow \neg xa n) \wedge -1 \leq a n \wedge a n \leq 1$

**proof** (induction n)

case 0

show ?case

by (metis 0.prems(1) le-minus-one-simps(1) minus-zero zero-le-one zero-neq-neg-one)

next

case (Suc n)

{assume a (Suc n) = - (1::int) from this and Suc have xa (Suc n)}

by (metis add.commute add-le-same-cancel2 not-one-le-zero zero-neq-neg-one)}

note A = this

{assume a (Suc n) = (1::int) and xa (Suc n) from this and Suc have False}

by (metis eq-iff le-iff-diff-le-0 not-one-le-zero)}

note B = this

{assume a n ≠ - (1::int) from this and Suc have - (1::int) ≤ a (Suc n)}

by (metis add.commute monoid-add-class.add.left-neutral le-less not-le)

right-minus uminus-add-conv-diff zle-add1-eq-le)}

note C = this

{assume a n = - (1::int) from this and Suc have - (1::int) ≤ a (Suc n)}

by (metis add.commute le-minus-one-simps(4) monoid-add-class.add.right-neutral)

```

not-le right-minus zle-add1-eq-le) }

note D = this
from C and D and Suc have E:  $- (1::int) \leq a (\text{Suc } n)$  by auto
from Suc have F:  $a (\text{Suc } n) \leq (1::int)$ 
by (metis eq-iff int-one-le-iff-zero-less le-iff-diff-le-0 le-less not-le zle-add1-eq-le)
from A B E F show ?case by auto
qed

lemma event-ex-aux:  $a 0 = (0::int) \implies \forall n. xa (\text{Suc } n) = (\neg xa n) \implies$ 
 $\forall n. (xa n \wedge a (\text{Suc } n) = a n + 1 \vee \neg xa n \wedge a (\text{Suc } n) = a n - 1 \vee a$ 
 $(\text{Suc } n) = 0) \implies$ 
 $(\forall n. (a n = -1 \longrightarrow xa n) \wedge (a n = 1 \longrightarrow \neg xa n) \wedge -1 \leq a n \wedge a n \leq$ 
1)
by (clarify, drule event-ex-aux-a, auto)

lemma { $\square$  preca-ex.} o LIVE  $\leq$  SymSystem { $u . u 0 = 0$ } prec-ex rel-ex
proof (unfold LIVE-fusion SymSystem-def, rule fusion-local-refinement, simp-all)
fix z::nat  $\Rightarrow$  bool and u :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  int and x::nat  $\Rightarrow$  bool
assume A:  $u 0 = 0$ 
assume ( $\square$  preca-ex) z
then have B:  $\forall x::nat. z (\text{Suc } x) = (\neg z x)$ 
by (auto simp add: preca-ex-def lft-rel-st-def rel-ex-def always-def at-fun-def)
assume ( $\square$  lft-rel-st rel-ex) u z x
then have C:  $\forall xa . (z xa \wedge u (\text{Suc } xa) = u xa + 1 \vee \neg z xa \wedge u (\text{Suc } xa)$ 
 $= u xa - 1 \vee u (\text{Suc } xa) = 0) \wedge x xa = (u (\text{Suc } xa) = 0)$ 
by (auto simp add: preca-ex-def lft-rel-st-def rel-ex-def always-def at-fun-def)
have D:  $(\forall n . (u n = -1 \longrightarrow z n) \wedge (u n = 1 \longrightarrow \neg z n) \wedge -1 \leq u n \wedge u$ 
 $n \leq 1)$ 
by (cut-tac A B C, rule event-ex-aux, auto)
{
  fix a::nat
  assume u (Suc a) = 0 from this A B C have  $\exists b . u (\text{Suc } (a + b)) = 0$ 
  by (metis monoid-add-class.add.right-neutral)
  note 1 = this
  assume u (Suc a) = -1 from this A B C D have  $\exists b . u (\text{Suc } (a + b))$ 
= 0
  by (metis add-Suc-right diff-minus-eq-add diff-self monoid-add-class.add.right-neutral)
  note 2 = this
  assume u (Suc a) = 1 from this A B C D have  $\exists b . u (\text{Suc } (a + b))$ 
= 0
  by (metis add-Suc-right diff-self monoid-add-class.add.right-neutral)
  note 3 = this
  from 1 2 3 A B C D have  $\exists b . x (a + b)$ 
  by (simp, metis diff-0 int-one-le-iff-zero-less le-less not-le zle-diff1-eq)
}
then show ( $\square \diamond (\lambda y . y 0)$ ) x
by (simp add: always-def eventually-def preca-ex-def at-fun-def rel-ex-def
lft-rel-st-def)
qed

```

end

## References

- [1] R.-J. Back. *On the correctness of refinement in program development*. PhD thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of Helsinki, 1978.
- [2] R.-J. Back and M. Butler. Exploring summation and product operators in the refinement calculus. In B. Möller, editor, *Mathematics of Program Construction*, volume 947 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 128–158. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1995.
- [3] R.-J. Back and J. von Wright. *Refinement Calculus. A systematic Introduction*. Springer, 1998.
- [4] D. Harel and A. Pnueli. On the development of reactive systems. In K. R. Apt, editor, *Logics and Models of Concurrent Systems*, pages 477–498. 1985.
- [5] V. Preoteasa and R.-J. Back. Semantics and data refinement of invariant based programs. In G. Klein, T. Nipkow, and L. Paulson, editors, *The Archive of Formal Proofs*. <http://isa-afp.org/entries/DataRefinementIBP.shtml>, May 2010. Formal proof development.
- [6] V. Preoteasa and S. Tripakis. Refinement calculus of reactive systems. Jun 2014. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1406.6035>.
- [7] S. Tripakis, B. Lickly, T. A. Henzinger, and E. A. Lee. A theory of synchronous relational interfaces. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 33(4):14:1–14:41, July 2011.