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Abstract  
This document concerns the theory of ribbon proofs: a diagrammatic proof system, based on separation logic, for verifying program correctness. We include the syntax, proof rules, and soundness results for two alternative formalisations of ribbon proofs.  
Compared to traditional ‘proof outlines’, ribbon proofs emphasise the structure of a proof, so are intelligible and pedagogical. Because they contain less redundancy than proof outlines, and allow each proof step to be checked locally, they may be more scalable. Where proof outlines are cumbersome to modify, ribbon proofs can be visually manoeuvred to yield proofs of variant programs.  
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1 Introduction

Ribbon proofs are a diagrammatic approach for proving program correctness, based on separation logic. They are due to Wickerson, Dodds and Parkinson [4], and are also described in Wickerson’s PhD dissertation [3]. An early version of the proof system, for proving entailments between quantifier-free separation logic assertions, was introduced by Bean [1].

Compared to traditional ‘proof outlines’, ribbon proofs emphasise the structure of a proof, so are intelligible and pedagogical. Because they contain less redundancy than proof outlines, and allow each proof step to be checked locally, they may be more scalable. Where proof outlines are cumbersome to modify, ribbon proofs can be visually manoeuvred to yield proofs of variant programs.
In this document, we formalise a two-dimensional graphical syntax for ribbon proofs, provide proof rules, and show that any provable ribbon proof can be recreated using the ordinary rules of separation logic.

In fact, we provide two different formalisations. Our “stratified” formalisation sees a ribbon proof as a sequence of rows, with each row containing one step of the proof. This formalisation is very simple, but it does not reflect the visual intuition of ribbon proofs, which suggests that some proof steps can be slid up or down without affecting the validity of the overall proof. Our “graphical” formalisation sees a ribbon proof as a graph; specifically, as a directed acyclic nested graph. Ribbon proofs formalised in this way are more manoeuvrable, but proving soundness is trickier, and requires the assumption that separation logic’s Frame rule has no side-condition (an assumption that can be validated by using, for instance, variables-as-resource [2]).

2 Finite partial functions

theory More-Finite-Map imports 
  HOL-Library.Finite-Map begin

unbundle lifting-syntax
unbundle fmap.lifting

type-notation fmap (infix \rightarrow_f 9)

2.1 Difference

definition 
  map-diff :: ('k \rightarrow 'v) \Rightarrow 'k fset \Rightarrow ('k \rightarrow 'v)
where
  map-diff f ks = restrict-map f (- fset ks)

lift-definition 
  fmap-diff :: ('k \rightarrow_f 'v) \Rightarrow 'k fset \Rightarrow ('k \rightarrow_f 'v) (infix \oplus 110)
is map-diff

2.2 Comprehension

definition 
  make-map :: 'k fset \Rightarrow 'v \Rightarrow ('k \rightarrow 'v)
where
  make-map ks v \equiv \lambda k. if k \in fset ks then Some v else None

lemma make-map-transfer[transfer-rule]: (rel-fset op =====> A =====> rel-map A) make-map make-map

lemma dom-make-map:
  dom (make-map ks v) = fset ks
⟨proof⟩

lift-definition
  make-fmap :: 'k fset ⇒ 'v ⇒ ('k →f 'v) ([ - |⇒ - ]) is make-map parametric make-map-transfer
⟨proof⟩

lemma make-fmap-empty[simp]: [ {||} |⇒ f ] = fmempty
⟨proof⟩

2.3 Domain

lemma fmap-add-commute:
  assumes fmdom A |∩| fmdom B = {||}
  shows A ++f B = B ++f A
⟨proof⟩ including fset.lifting
⟨proof⟩

lemma make-fmap-union:
  [ xs |⇒ v ] ++f [ ys |⇒ v ] = [ xs |∪| ys |⇒ v ]
⟨proof⟩

lemma fdom-make-fmap: fmdom [ ks |⇒ v ] = ks
⟨proof⟩

2.4 Lookup

lift-definition
  lookup :: ('k →f 'v) ⇒ 'k ⇒ 'v is op ◦ the ⟨proof⟩

lemma lookup-make-fmap:
  assumes k ∈ fset ks
  shows lookup [ ks |⇒ v ] k = v
⟨proof⟩

lemma lookup-make-fmap1:
  lookup [ {||} |⇒ v ] k = v
⟨proof⟩

lemma lookup-union1:
  assumes k ∈ fset ys
  shows lookup (xs ++f ys) k = lookup ys k
⟨proof⟩ including fset.lifting
⟨proof⟩
lemma lookup-union2:
  assumes k |∈| fmdom ys
  shows lookup (xs ++ f ys) k = lookup xs k
⟨proof⟩ including fset.lifting
⟨proof⟩

lemma lookup-union3:
  assumes k |∈| fmdom xs
  shows lookup (xs ++ f ys) k = lookup ys k
⟨proof⟩ including fset.lifting
⟨proof⟩

end

3 General purpose definitions and lemmas

theory JHelper imports Main begin

lemma Collect-iff:
  a ∈ {x . P x} ≡ P a
⟨proof⟩

lemma diff-diff-eq:
  assumes C ⊆ B
  shows (A − C) − (B − C) = A − B
⟨proof⟩

lemma nth-in-set:
  [ i < length xs ; xs ! i = x ] ⇒ x ∈ set xs ⟨proof⟩

lemma disjI [intro]:
  assumes ¬ P ⇒ Q
  shows P ∨ Q
⟨proof⟩

lemma empty-eq-Plus-conv:
  ({} = A <+> B) = (A = {} ∧ B = {})
⟨proof⟩

3.1 Projection functions on triples

definition fst3 :: 'a × 'b × 'c ⇒ 'a
  where fst3 ≡ fst

definition snd3 :: 'a × 'b × 'c ⇒ 'b
  where snd3 ≡ fst ∘ snd
definition thd3 :: 'a × 'b × 'c ⇒ 'c
where thd3 ≡ snd o snd

lemma fst3-simp:
\(\forall a \ b \ c. \ \text{fst3} (a,b,c) = a\)
⟨proof⟩

lemma snd3-simp:
\(\forall a \ b \ c. \ \text{snd3} (a,b,c) = b\)
⟨proof⟩

lemma thd3-simp:
\(\forall a \ b \ c. \ \text{thd3} (a,b,c) = c\)
⟨proof⟩

lemma tripleI:
fixes T U
assumes fst3 T = fst3 U
and snd3 T = snd3 U
and thd3 T = thd3 U
shows T = U
⟨proof⟩

end

4 Proof chains

theory Proofchain imports JHelper begin
begin
An ('a, 'c) chain is a sequence of alternating 'a’s and 'c’s, beginning and ending with an 'a. Usually 'a represents some sort of assertion, and 'c represents some sort of command. Proof chains are useful for stating the SMain proof rule, and for conducting the proof of soundness.

datatype ('a,'c) chain =
cNil 'a
| cCons 'a 'c ('a,'c) chain (\{ - \} · · · [0,0,0] 60)

For example, \(\{ a \} · \text{proof} · \{ \text{chain} \} · \text{might} · \{ \text{look} \} · \text{like} · \{ \text{this} \} \).

4.1 Projections

Project first assertion.

fun
\(\text{pre} :: ('a,'c) \text{ chain} ⇒ 'a\)
where
\[
\text{pre } \{ P \} = P
\]
\[
\text{pre } \{ P \} \cdot \cdots = P
\]

Project final assertion.

fun
\text{post} :: (\text{a}, \text{c}) \text{ chain} \Rightarrow \text{a}
where
\text{post} \{ P \} = P
\]
\[
\text{post} (\{ - \} \cdot \cdots \Pi) = \text{post} \Pi
\]

Project list of commands.

fun
\text{comlist} :: (\text{a}, \text{c}) \text{ chain} \Rightarrow \text{c list}
where
\text{comlist} \{ - \} = []
\]
\[
\text{comlist} (\{ - \} \cdot \text{x} \cdot \Pi) = \text{x} \# (\text{comlist} \Pi)
\]

4.2 Chain length

fun
\text{chainlen} :: (\text{a}, \text{c}) \text{ chain} \Rightarrow \text{nat}
where
\text{chainlen} \{ - \} = 0
\]
\[
\text{chainlen} (\{ - \} \cdot \cdots \Pi) = 1 + (\text{chainlen} \Pi)
\]

lemma len-comlist-chainlen:
\text{length} (\text{comlist} \Pi) = \text{chainlen} \Pi

\langle \text{proof} \rangle

4.3 Extracting triples from chains

\text{n nthtriple} \Pi n \text{ extracts the } n\text{th triple of } \Pi, \text{ counting from } 0. \text{ The function is well-defined when } n < \text{ chainlen} \Pi.

fun
\text{n nthtriple} :: (\text{a}, \text{c}) \text{ chain} \Rightarrow \text{nat} \Rightarrow (\text{a} \ast \text{c} \ast \text{a})
where
\text{n nthtriple} (\{ P \} \cdot \text{x} \cdot \Pi) 0 = (P, x, \text{pre} \Pi)
\]
\[
\text{n nthtriple} (\{ P \} \cdot \text{x} \cdot \Pi) (\text{Suc} n) = \text{n nthtriple} \Pi n
\]

The list of middle components of \Pi’s triples is the list of \Pi’s commands.

lemma snds-of-triples-form-comlist:
\text{fixes} \Pi i
\text{shows} i < \text{chainlen} \Pi \Rightarrow \text{snd3} (\text{n nthtriple} \Pi i) = (\text{comlist} \Pi)i

\langle \text{proof} \rangle

4.4 Evaluating a predicate on each triple of a chain

\text{chain-all } \varphi \text{ holds of } \Pi \text{ iff } \varphi \text{ holds for each of } \Pi’s \text{ individual triples.}
fun
chain-all :: (('a × 'c × 'a) ⇒ bool) ⇒ ('a,'c) chain ⇒ bool
where
  chain-all ϕ {σ} = True
| chain-all ϕ ({σ} · x · Π) = (ϕ (σ,x,pre Π) ∧ chain-all ϕ Π)

lemma chain-all-mono [mono]:
  x ≤ y ⇒ chain-all x ≤ chain-all y
⟨proof⟩

lemma chain-all-nthtriple:
  (chain-all ϕ Π) = (∀ i < chainlen Π. ϕ (nthtriple Π i))
⟨proof⟩

4.5  A map function for proof chains

chainmap f g Π maps f over each of Π’s assertions, and g over each of Π’s commands.

fun
chainmap :: ('a ⇒ 'b) ⇒ ('c ⇒ 'd) ⇒ ('a,'c) chain ⇒ (‘b,'d) chain
where
  chainmap f g {P} = {f P}
| chainmap f g ({P} · x · Π) = {f P} · g x · chainmap f g Π

Mapping over a chain preserves its length.

lemma chainmap-preserves-length:
  chainlen (chainmap f g Π) = chainlen Π
⟨proof⟩

lemma pre-chainmap:
  pre (chainmap f g Π) = f (pre Π)
⟨proof⟩

lemma post-chainmap:
  post (chainmap f g Π) = f (post Π)
⟨proof⟩

lemma nthtriple-chainmap:
  assumes i < chainlen Π
  shows nthtriple (chainmap f g Π) i
    = (λt. (f (fst3 t), g (snd3 t), f (thd3 t))) (nthtriple Π i)
⟨proof⟩

4.6  Extending a chain on its right-hand side

fun
cSnoc :: ('a,'c) chain ⇒ 'c ⇒ 'a ⇒ ('a,'c) chain
where
cSnoc {σ} y τ = {σ} · y · {τ}

lemma len-snoc:
  fixes II x P
  shows chainlen (cSnoc II x P) = 1 + (chainlen II)
⟨proof⟩

lemma pre-snoc:
  pre (cSnoc II x P) = pre II
⟨proof⟩

lemma post-snoc:
  post (cSnoc II x P) = P
⟨proof⟩

lemma comlist-snoc:
  comlist (cSnoc II x p) = comlist II ⊕ [x]
⟨proof⟩

end

5 Assertions, commands, and separation logic proof rules

theory Ribbons-Basic imports
  Main
begin

We define a command language, assertions, and the rules of separation logic, plus some derived rules that are used by our tool. This is the only theory file that is loaded by the tool. We keep it as small as possible.

5.1 Assertions

The language of assertions includes (at least) an emp constant, a star-operator, and existentially-quantified logical variables.

typedecl assertion

axiomatization
  Emp :: assertion

axiomatization
  Star :: assertion ⇒ assertion ⇒ assertion (infixr * 55)
where
  star-comm: p * q = q * p and
star-assoc: \( (p \star q) \star r = p \star (q \star r) \) and
star-emp: \( p \star \text{Emp} = p \) and
emp-star: \( \text{Emp} \star p = p \)

lemma star-rot:
\[
q \star p \star r = p \star q \star r
\]
(proof)

axiomatization
\[
\text{Exists} :: \text{string} \Rightarrow \text{assertion} \Rightarrow \text{assertion}
\]
Extracting the set of program variables mentioned in an assertion.

axiomatization
\[
\text{rd-ass} :: \text{assertion} \Rightarrow \text{string set}
\]
where
\[
\text{rd-emp}: \text{rd-ass} \text{Emp} = \{\}
\]
and
\[
\text{rd-star}: \text{rd-ass} \ (p \star q) = \text{rd-ass} p \cup \text{rd-ass} q
\]
and
\[
\text{rd-exists}: \text{rd-ass} \ (\text{Exists} \ x \ p) = \text{rd-ass} p
\]

5.2 Commands
The language of commands comprises (at least) non-deterministic choice, non-deterministic looping, skip and sequencing.

typedec \( \text{command} \)

axiomatization
\[
\text{Choose} :: \text{command} \Rightarrow \text{command} \Rightarrow \text{command}
\]

axiomatization
\[
\text{Loop} :: \text{command} \Rightarrow \text{command}
\]

axiomatization
\[
\text{Skip} :: \text{command}
\]

axiomatization
\[
\text{Seq} :: \text{command} \Rightarrow \text{command} \Rightarrow \text{command} \ (\text{infixr} ;; 55)
\]
where
\[
\text{seq-assoc}: c1 ;; (c2 ;; c3) = (c1 ;; c2) ;; c3
\]
and
\[
\text{seq-skip}: c ;; \text{Skip} = c
\]
and
\[
\text{skip-seq}: \text{Skip} ;; c = c
\]

Extracting the set of program variables read by a command.

axiomatization
\[
\text{rd-com} :: \text{command} \Rightarrow \text{string set}
\]
where
\[
\text{rd-com-choose}: \text{rd-com} \ (\text{Choose} \ c1 \ c2) = \text{rd-com} \ c1 \cup \text{rd-com} \ c2
\]
and
\[
\text{rd-com-loop}: \text{rd-com} \ (\text{Loop} \ c) = \text{rd-com} \ c
\]
and
\[
\text{rd-com-skip}: \text{rd-com} \ (\text{Skip}) = \{\}
\]
and
\[
\text{rd-com-seq}: \text{rd-com} \ (c1 ;; c2) = \text{rd-com} \ c1 \cup \text{rd-com} \ c2
\]

Extracting the set of program variables written by a command.
axiomatization

| wr-com :: | command | ⇒ | string set |

where wr-com-choose: wr-com (Choose c1 c2) = wr-com c1 ∪ wr-com c2

and wr-com-loop: wr-com (Loop c) = wr-com c

and wr-com-skip: wr-com (Skip) = {} 

and wr-com-seq: wr-com (c1 ;; c2) = wr-com c1 ∪ wr-com c2

5.3 Separation logic proof rules

Note that the frame rule has a side-condition concerning program variables. When proving the soundness of our graphical formalisation of ribbon proofs, we shall omit this side-condition.

inductive

prov-triple :: assertion × command × assertion ⇒ bool

where

exists: prov-triple (p, c, q) ⇒ prov-triple (Exists x p, c, Exists x q) 

choose: [ prov-triple (p, c1, q); prov-triple (p, c2, q) ]

⇒ prov-triple (p, Choose c1 c2, q)

loop: prov-triple (p, c, p) ⇒ prov-triple (p, Loop c, p)

frame: [ prov-triple (p, c, q); wr-com(c) ∩ rd-ass(r) = {} ]

⇒ prov-triple (p * r, c, q * r)

skip: prov-triple (p, Skip, p)

seq: [ prov-triple (p, c1, q); prov-triple (q, c2, r) ]

⇒ prov-triple (p, c1 ;; c2, r)

Here are some derived proof rules, which are used in our ribbon-checking tool.

lemma choice-lemma:

assumes prov-triple (p1, c1, q1) and prov-triple (p2, c2, q2)

and p = p1 and p1 = p2 and q = q1 and q1 = q2

shows prov-triple (p, Choose c1 c2, q)

⟨proof⟩

lemma loop-lemma:

assumes prov-triple (p1, c, q1) and p = p1 and p1 = q1 and q1 = q

shows prov-triple (p, Loop c, q)

⟨proof⟩

lemma seq-lemma:

assumes prov-triple (p1, c1, q1) and prov-triple (p2, c2, q2)

and q1 = p2

shows prov-triple (p1, c1 ;; c2, q2)

⟨proof⟩

end
6 Ribbon proof interfaces

theory Ribbons-Interfaces imports
  Ribbons-Basic
  Proofchain
  HOL-Library.FSet
begin

Interfaces are the top and bottom boundaries through which diagrams can be connected into a surrounding context. For instance, when composing two diagrams vertically, the bottom interface of the upper diagram must match the top interface of the lower diagram.

We define a datatype of concrete interfaces. We then quotient by the associativity, commutativity and unity properties of our horizontal-composition operator.

6.1 Syntax of interfaces

datatype conc-interface =
  Ribbon-conc assertion
| HComp-int-conc conc-interface conc-interface (infix \$c_50$
| Emp-int-conc (\$c\$
| Exists-int-conc string conc-interface

We define an equivalence on interfaces. The first three rules make this an equivalence relation. The next three make it a congruence. The next two identify interfaces up to associativity and commutativity of \$op \$c The final two make \$c\$ the left and right unit of \$op \$c.

inductive equiv-int :: conc-interface \Rightarrow conc-interface \Rightarrow bool (infix \approx 45)
where
  refl: P \approx P
| sym: P \approx Q \Rightarrow Q \approx P
| trans: [[P \approx Q; Q \approx R]] \Rightarrow P \approx R
| cong-hcomp1: P \approx Q \Rightarrow P \circ_c P \approx P' \circ_c Q
| cong-hcomp2: P \approx Q \Rightarrow P \circ_c P' \approx Q \circ_c P'
| cong-exists: P \approx Q \Rightarrow Exists-int-conc x P \approx Exists-int-conc x Q
| hcomp-conc-assoc: P \circ_c (Q \circ_c R) \approx (P \circ_c Q) \circ_c R
| hcomp-conc-comm: P \circ_c Q \approx Q \circ_c P
| hcomp-conc-unit1: \varepsilon_c \circ_c P \approx P
| hcomp-conc-unit2: P \circ_c \varepsilon_c \approx P

lemma equiv-int-cong-hcomp:
  \[[P \approx Q; P' \approx Q'] \Rightarrow P \circ_c P' \approx Q \circ_c Q'\]
\(\langle\text{proof}\rangle\)

quotient-type interface = conc-interface / equiv-int
\(\langle\text{proof}\rangle\)
lift-definition
  Ribbon :: assertion ⇒ interface
is Ribbon-conc ⟨proof⟩

lift-definition
  Emp-int :: interface (ε)
is εc ⟨proof⟩

lift-definition
  Exists-int :: string ⇒ interface ⇒ interface
is Exists-int-conc ⟨proof⟩

lift-definition
  HComp-int :: interface ⇒ interface ⇒ interface (infix ⊗ 50)
is HComp-int-conc ⟨proof⟩

lemma hcomp-comm:
  (P ⊗ Q) = (Q ⊗ P)
⟨proof⟩

lemma hcomp-assoc:
  (P ⊗ (Q ⊗ R)) = ((P ⊗ Q) ⊗ R)
⟨proof⟩

lemma emp-hcomp:
  ε ⊗ P = P
⟨proof⟩

lemma hcomp-emp:
  P ⊗ ε = P
⟨proof⟩

lemma comp-fun-commute-hcomp:
  comp-fun-commute (op ⊗)
⟨proof⟩

6.2 An iterated horizontal-composition operator

definition iter-hcomp :: ('a fset) ⇒ ('a ⇒ interface) ⇒ interface
where
  iter-hcomp X f ≡ ffold (op ⊗ ◦ f) ε X

syntax iter-hcomp-syntax ::
  'a ⇒ ('a fset) ⇒ ('a ⇒ interface) ⇒ interface
  ((op ◦) M) (λx. e)
translations M e == CONST iter-hcomp M (λx. e)
term $\bigotimes P \in Ps. f P$ — this is eta-expanded, so prints in expanded form

term $\bigotimes P \in Ps. f P$ — this isn’t eta-expanded, so prints as written

lemma iter-hcomp-cong:
  assumes $\forall v \in fset vs. \varphi v = \varphi' v$
  shows $\bigotimes v \in vs. \varphi v = \bigotimes v \in vs. \varphi' v$
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma iter-hcomp-empty:
  shows $\bigotimes x \in \{\|\}. p x = \varepsilon$
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma iter-hcomp-insert:
  assumes $v \not\in ws$
  shows $\bigotimes x \in finsert v ws. p x = (p v \otimes \bigotimes x \in ws. p x)$
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma iter-hcomp-union:
  assumes $vs \cap ws = \{\|\}$
  shows $\bigotimes x \in vs \cup ws. p x = ((\bigotimes x \in vs. p x) \otimes (\bigotimes x \in ws. p x))$
  ⟨proof⟩

6.3 Semantics of interfaces

The semantics of an interface is an assertion.

fun
  conc-asn :: conc-interface ⇒ assertion
where
  conc-asn (Ribbon-conc p) = p
  | conc-asn (P ⊗ c Q) = (conc-asn P) ★ (conc-asn Q)
  | conc-asn (ε_c) = Emp
  | conc-asn (Exists-int-conc x P) = Exists x (conc-asn P)

lift-definition
  asn :: interface ⇒ assertion
  is conc-asn
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma asn-simps [simp]:
  asn (Ribbon p) = p
  asn (P ⊗ Q) = (asn P) ★ (asn Q)
  asn ε = Emp
  asn (Exists-int x P) = Exists x (asn P)
  ⟨proof⟩

6.4 Program variables mentioned in an interface.

fun
rd-conc-int :: conc-interface ⇒ string set

where
rd-conc-int (Ribbon-conc p) = rd-ass p
| rd-conc-int (P ⊗ c Q) = rd-conc-int P ∪ rd-conc-int Q
| rd-conc-int (εc) = {}
| rd-conc-int (Exists-int-conc x P) = rd-conc-int P

lift-definition
rd-int :: interface ⇒ string set

is rd-conc-int
⟨proof⟩

The program variables read by an interface are the same as those read by its corresponding assertion.

lemma rd-int-is-rd-ass:
rd-ass (asn P) = rd-int P
⟨proof⟩

Here is an iterated version of the Hoare logic sequencing rule.

lemma seq-fold:
\forall II. \[ length cs = chainlen II ; p1 = asn (pre II) ; p2 = asn (post II) ; \]
\forall i. i < chainlen II \implies prov-triple
(ASN (fst3 (nthtriple II i)), cs ! i, ASN (thd3 (nthtriple II i))) \]
\implies prov-triple (p1, foldr (op ;;) cs Skip, p2)
⟨proof⟩

end

7 Syntax and proof rules for stratified diagrams

theory Ribbons-Stratified imports
Ribbons-Interfaces
Proofchain
begin

We define the syntax of stratified diagrams. We give proof rules for stratified diagrams, and prove them sound with respect to the ordinary rules of separation logic.

7.1 Syntax of stratified diagrams

datatype sdiagram = SDiagram (cell × interface) list
and cell =
    Filler interface
| Basic interface command interface
| Exists-sdia string sdiagram
| Choose-sdia interface sdiagram sdiagram interface
| Loop-sdia interface sdiagram interface
datatype-compat  sdiagram cell

type-synonym  row = cell × interface

Extracting the command from a stratified diagram.

fun  
com-sdia :: sdiagram ⇒ command and 
com-cell :: cell ⇒ command
 where
com-sdia (SDiagram ϱ s) = foldr (op ;;) (map (com-cell ◦ fst) ϱs) Skip
| com-cell (Filler P) = Skip
| com-cell (Basic P c Q) = c
| com-cell (Exists-sdia x D) = com-sdia D
| com-cell (Choose-sdia P D E Q) = Choose (com-sdia D) (com-sdia E)
| com-cell (Loop-sdia P D Q) = Loop (com-sdia D)

Extracting the program variables written by a stratified diagram.

fun  
wz-sdia :: sdiagram ⇒ string set and 
wz-cell :: cell ⇒ string set
 where
wz-sdia (SDiagram ϱ s) = (⋃ r ∈ set ϱs. wz-cell (fst r))
| wz-cell (Filler P) = {}
| wz-cell (Basic P c Q) = wz-com c
| wz-cell (Exists-sdia x D) = wz-sdia D
| wz-cell (Choose-sdia P D E Q) = wz-sdia D ∪ wz-sdia E
| wz-cell (Loop-sdia P D Q) = wz-sdia D

The program variables written by a stratified diagram correspond to those written by the commands therein.

lemma wz-sdia-is-wz-com:
 fixes ϱs :: row list
 and ϱ :: row
 shows (wz-sdia D = wz-com (com-sdia D))
 and (wz-cell γ = wz-com (com-cell γ))
 and (⋃ γ ∈ set ϱs. wz-cell (fst γ))
 = wz-com (foldr (op ;;) (map (λ(γ,F). com-cell γ) ϱs) Skip)
 and wz-cell (fst γ) = wz-com (com-cell (fst γ))
 ⟨proof⟩

7.2 Proof rules for stratified diagrams

inductive  
prov-sdia :: [sdiagram, interface, interface] ⇒ bool and 
prov-row :: [row, interface, interface] ⇒ bool and 
prov-cell :: [cell, interface, interface] ⇒ bool
 where
SRibbon: prov-cell (Filler P) P P
7.3 Soundness

**lemma** soundness-strat-helper:
\[
(prov-sdia D P Q \rightarrow prov-triple (asn P, com-sdia D, asn Q)) \land \\
(prov-row \varrho P Q \rightarrow prov-triple (asn P, com-cell (fst \varrho), asn Q)) \land \\
(pro-cell \gamma P Q \rightarrow prov-triple (asn P, com-cell \gamma, asn Q))
\]
\langle proof \rangle

**corollary** soundness-strat:
\[
\text{assumes} \ prov-sdia D P Q \\
\text{shows} \ prov-triple (asn P, com-sdia D, asn Q)
\]
\langle proof \rangle

end

8 Syntax and proof rules for graphical diagrams

**theory** Ribbons-Graphical imports
Ribbons-Interfaces
begin

We introduce a graphical syntax for diagrams, describe how to extract commands and interfaces, and give proof rules for graphical diagrams.

8.1 Syntax of graphical diagrams

Fix a type for node identifiers

```plaintext
typedecl node
```

Note that this datatype is necessarily an overapproximation of syntactically-wellformed diagrams, for the reason that we can’t impose the well-formedness constraints while maintaining admissibility of the datatype declarations. So, we shall impose well-formedness in a separate definition.

```plaintext
datatype assertion-gadget = 
Rib assertion 
| Exists-dia string diagram
```
and command-gadget =
  Com command
| Choose-dia diagram diagram
| Loop dia diagram
and diagram = Graph
  node fset
  node ⇒ assertion-gadget
  (node fset × command-gadget × node fset) list
type-synonym labelling = node ⇒ assertion-gadget
type-synonym edge = node fset × command-gadget × node fset

Projecting components from a graph
fun vertices :: diagram ⇒ node fset (-^V [1000] 1000)
where (Graph V Λ E)^V = V

term this (is^V) = (a test)^V

fun labelling :: diagram ⇒ labelling (-^Λ [1000] 1000)
where (Graph V Λ E)^Λ = Λ

fun edges :: diagram ⇒ edge list (-^E [1000] 1000)
where (Graph V Λ E)^E = E

8.2 Well formedness of graphical diagrams
definition acyclicity :: edge list ⇒ bool
where
  acyclicity E ⇔ acyclic (∪ e ∈ set E. fset (fst3 e) × fset (thd3 e))
definition linearity :: edge list ⇒ bool
where
  linearity E ⇔
  distinct E ∧ (∀ e ∈ set E. ∀ f ∈ set E. e ≠ f →
  fst3 e \ f = {||} ∧
  thd3 e \ f = {||})

lemma linearityD:
  assumes linearity E
  shows distinct E
  and \ A e f. [ e ∈ set E ; f ∈ set E ; e ≠ f ] →
  fst3 e \ f = {||} ∧
  thd3 e \ f = {||}
⟨ proof ⟩

lemma linearityD2:
  linearity E → (∀ e f. e ∈ set E ∧ f ∈ set E ∧ e ≠ f →
  fst3 e \ f = {||} ∧
  thd3 e \ f = {||})
⟨ proof ⟩
inductive
  \( \text{wf-ass} :: \text{assertion-gadget} \Rightarrow \text{bool} \) and
  \( \text{wf-com} :: \text{command-gadget} \Rightarrow \text{bool} \) and
  \( \text{wf-dia} :: \text{diagram} \Rightarrow \text{bool} \)

where
  \( \text{wf-rib} : \text{wf-ass} (\text{Rib} \ p) \)
  \( \text{wf-exists} : \text{wf-dia} \ G \implies \text{wf-ass} (\exists \text{dia} \ x \ G) \)
  \( \text{wf-com} : \text{wf-com} (\text{Com} \ c) \)
  \( \text{wf-choice} : [ \text{wf-dia} \ G ; \text{wf-dia} \ H ] \implies \text{wf-com} (\text{Choose-dia} \ G \ H) \)
  \( \text{wf-loop} : \text{wf-dia} \ G \implies \text{wf-com} (\text{Loop-dia} \ G) \)
  \( \text{wf-dia} : [ \forall e \in \text{set} \ E. \ \text{wf-com} (\text{snd3} \ e) ; \forall v \in \text{fset} \ V. \ \text{wf-ass} (\Lambda \ v) ; \text{acyclicity} \ E ; \text{linearity} \ E ; \forall e \in \text{set} \ E. \ \text{fst3} \ e \ |\cup| \ \text{thd3} \ e \ |\subseteq| \ V ] \implies \text{wf-dia} (\text{Graph} \ V \ \Lambda \ E) \)

inductive-cases \( \text{wf-dia-inv'} : \text{wf-dia} (\text{Graph} \ V \ \Lambda \ E) \)

lemma \( \text{wf-dia-inv'} \):
  assumes \( \text{wf-dia} (\text{Graph} \ V \ \Lambda \ E) \)
  shows \( \forall v \in \text{fset} \ V. \ \text{wf-ass} (\Lambda \ v) \) and
  \( \forall e \in \text{set} \ E. \ \text{wf-com} (\text{snd3} \ e) \) and
  \( \text{acyclicity} \ E \) and
  \( \text{linearity} \ E \) and
  \( \forall e \in \text{set} \ E. \ \text{fst3} \ e \ |\cup| \ \text{thd3} \ e \ |\subseteq| \ V \)
  \( \text{proof} \)

8.3 Initial and terminal nodes

definition
  \( \text{initials} :: \text{diagram} \Rightarrow \text{node} \ \text{fset} \)

where
  \( \text{initials} \ G = \text{ffilter} (\lambda v. (\forall e \in \text{set} \ G \ \setminus \ E. \ v \not\in \ \text{thd3} \ e)) \ G \ ^\ast \ V \)

definition
  \( \text{terminals} :: \text{diagram} \Rightarrow \text{node} \ \text{fset} \)

where
  \( \text{terminals} \ G = \text{ffilter} (\lambda v. (\forall e \in \text{set} \ G \ \setminus \ E. \ v \not\in \ \text{fst3} \ e)) \ G \ ^\ast \ V \)

lemma \( \text{no-edges-imp-all-nodes-initial} : \)
  \( \text{initials} (\text{Graph} \ V \ \Lambda \ [] ) = V \)
  \( \text{proof} \)

lemma \( \text{no-edges-imp-all-nodes-terminal} : \)
  \( \text{terminals} (\text{Graph} \ V \ \Lambda \ [] ) = V \)
  \( \text{proof} \)

lemma \( \text{initials-in-vertices} : \)
  \( \text{initials} \ G \ |\subseteq| \ G \ ^\ast \ V \)
  \( \text{proof} \)
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lemma terminals-in-vertices:
  terminals G \subseteq G^*V
⟨proof⟩

8.4 Top and bottom interfaces

primrec
top-ass :: assertion-gadget ⇒ interface and
top-dia :: diagram ⇒ interface
where
top-dia (Graph V Λ E) = (∏ v |∈| initials (Graph V Λ E). top-ass (Λ v))
| top-ass (Rib p) = Ribbon p
| top-ass (Exists-dia x G) = Exists-int x (top-dia G)

primrec
bot-ass :: assertion-gadget ⇒ interface and
bot-dia :: diagram ⇒ interface
where
bot-dia (Graph V Λ E) = (∏ v |∈| terminals (Graph V Λ E). bot-ass (Λ v))
| bot-ass (Rib p) = Ribbon p
| bot-ass (Exists-dia x G) = Exists-int x (bot-dia G)

8.5 Proof rules for graphical diagrams

inductive
prov-dia :: [diagram, interface, interface] ⇒ bool and
prov-com :: [command-gadget, interface, interface] ⇒ bool and
prov-ass :: assertion-gadget ⇒ bool
where
Skip: prov-ass (Rib p)
| Exists: prov-dia G - - ⇒ prov-ass (Exists-dia x G)
| Basic: prov-triple (asn P, e, asv Q) ⇒ prov-com (Com c) P Q
| Choice: [ prov-dia G P Q ; prov-dia H P Q ]
  ⇒ prov-com (Choose-dia G H) P Q
| Loop: prov-dia G P P ⇒ prov-com (Loop-dia G) P P
| Main: [| wf-dia G ; ∨ v. v ∈ fset G^*V ⇒ prov-ass (G^*A v);
  ∧ e. e ∈ set G^*E ⇒ prov-com (snd3 e)
  (∏ v |∈| fst3 e. bot-ass (G^*A v))
  (∏ v |∈| thd3 e. top-ass (G^*A v)) |]
  ⇒ prov-dia G (top-dia G) (bot-dia G)

inductive-cases main-inv: prov-dia (Graph V Λ E) P Q
inductive-cases loop-inv: prov-com (Loop-dia G) P Q
inductive-cases choice-inv: prov-com (Choose-dia G H) P Q
inductive-cases basic-inv: prov-com (Com c) P Q
inductive-cases exists-inv: prov-ass (Exists-dia x G)
inductive-cases skip-inv: prov-ass (Rib p)
8.6 Extracting commands from diagrams

type-synonym lin = (node + edge) list

A linear extension (lin) of a diagram is a list of its nodes and edges which respects the order of those nodes and edges. That is, if an edge e goes from node v to node w, then v and e and w must have strictly increasing positions in the list.

definition lins :: diagram ⇒ lin set
where
lins G ≡ {π :: lin.
  (distinct π)
  ∧ (set π = (fset G ∖ V) <+> (set G ∖ E))
  ∧ (∀ i j v e. i < length π ∧ j < length π ∧ π!i = Inl v ∧ π!j = Inr e
       ∧ v ∈ | fst3 e → i < j)
  ∧ (∀ j k w e. j < length π ∧ k < length π ∧ π!j = Inr e ∧ π!k = Inl w
       ∧ w ∈ | thd3 e → j < k) }

lemma linsD:
  assumes π ∈ lins G
  shows (distinct π)
  and (set π = (fset G ∖ V) <+> (set G ∖ E))
  and (∀ i j v e. i < length π ∧ j < length π
       ∧ π!i = Inl v ∧ π!j = Inr e ∧ v ∈ | fst3 e → i < j)
  and (∀ j k w e. j < length π ∧ k < length π
       ∧ π!j = Inr e ∧ π!k = Inl w ∧ w ∈ | thd3 e → j < k)
⟨proof⟩

The following lemma enables the inductive definition below to be proved monotonic. It does this by showing how one of the premises of the coms-main rule can be rewritten in a form that is more verbose but easier to prove monotonic.

lemma coms-mono-helper:
(∀ i < length π. case-sum (coms-ass ◦ Λ) (coms-com ◦ snd3) (π!i) (cs!i))
= (∀ i. i < length π ∧ (∃ v. (π!i) = Inl v) →
    coms-ass (Λ (projl (π!i))) (cs!i)) ∧
(∀ i. i < length π ∧ (∃ e. (π!i) = Inr e) →
    coms-com (snd3 (projr (π!i))) (cs!i)))
⟨proof⟩

The coms-dia function extracts a set of commands from a diagram. Each command in coms-dia G is obtained by extracting a command from each of G’s nodes and edges (using coms-ass or coms-com respectively), then picking a linear extension π of these nodes and edges (using lins), and composing the extracted commands in accordance with π.

inductive
  coms-dia :: [diagram, command] ⇒ bool and
\textit{coms-ass} :: [assertion-gadget, command] \Rightarrow bool \textbf{and} \\
\textit{coms-com} :: [command-gadget, command] \Rightarrow bool  \\
\textbf{where} \\
\textit{coms-skip}: \textit{coms-ass} \ (Rib \ p) \ \text{Skip}  \\
\textit{coms-exists}: \textit{coms-dia} \ G \ c \ \Rightarrow \textit{coms-ass} \ (Exists-dia \ x \ G) \ c  \\
\textit{coms-basic}: \textit{coms-com} \ (Com \ c) \ c  \\
\textit{coms-choice}: \left[ \textit{coms-dia} \ G \ c; \textit{coms-dia} \ H \ d \right] \ \Rightarrow \\
\quad \textit{coms-com} \ (Choose-dia \ G \ H) \ (Choose \ c \ d)  \\
\textit{coms-loop}: \textit{coms-dia} \ G \ c \ \Rightarrow \textit{coms-com} \ (Loop-dia \ G) \ (Loop \ c)  \\
\textit{coms-main}: \left[ \pi \in \text{lins} \ (\text{Graph} \ V \ \Lambda \ E); \ length \ cs = length \ \pi; \right.  \\
\quad \forall i<length \ \pi. \ \text{case-sum} \ (\textit{coms-ass} \circ \Lambda) \ (\textit{coms-com} \circ \text{snd3}) \ (\pi!i) \ (cs!i) \left] \ \Rightarrow \textit{coms-dia} \ (\text{Graph} \ V \ \Lambda \ E) \ (\text{foldr} \ (op \ ;;) \ cs \ \text{Skip})  \\
\textbf{monos} \\
\textit{coms-mono-helper}  \\
\textbf{inductive-cases} \textit{coms-skip-inv}: \textit{coms-ass} \ (Rib \ p) \ c  \\
\textbf{inductive-cases} \textit{coms-exists-inv}: \textit{coms-ass} \ (Exists-dia \ x \ G) \ c  \\
\textbf{inductive-cases} \textit{coms-basic-inv}: \textit{coms-com} \ (Com \ c') \ c  \\
\textbf{inductive-cases} \textit{coms-choice-inv}: \textit{coms-com} \ (Choose-dia \ G \ H) \ c  \\
\textbf{inductive-cases} \textit{coms-loop-inv}: \textit{coms-com} \ (Loop-dia \ G) \ c  \\
\textbf{inductive-cases} \textit{coms-main-inv}: \textit{coms-dia} \ G \ c  \\
\textbf{end} \\

\section{Soundness for graphical diagrams} \\
\textbf{theory} Ribbons-Graphical-Soundness \textbf{imports} \\
\quad Ribbons-Graphical  \\
\quad More-Finite-Map  \\
\textbf{begin} \\

We prove that the proof rules for graphical ribbon proofs are sound with respect to the rules of separation logic. 

We impose an additional assumption to achieve soundness: that the Frame rule has no side-condition. This assumption is reasonable because there are several separation logics that lack such a side-condition, such as “variables-as-resource”.

We first describe how to extract proofchains from a diagram. This process is similar to the process of extracting commands from a diagram, which was described in Ribbons-Graphical. When we extract a proofchain, we don’t just include the commands, but the assertions in between them. Our main lemma for proving soundness says that each of these proofchains corresponds to a valid separation logic proof.
9.1 Proofstate chains

When extracting a proofchain from a diagram, we need to keep track of which nodes we have processed and which ones we haven’t. A proofstate, defined below, maps a node to “Top” if it hasn’t been processed and “Bot” if it has.

datatype topbot = Top | Bot

type-synonym proofstate = node → f topbot

A proofstate chain contains all the nodes and edges of a graphical diagram, interspersed with proofstates that track which nodes have been processed at each point.

type-synonym ps-chain = (proofstate, node + edge) chain

The next-ps σ function processes one node or one edge in a diagram, given the current proofstate σ. It processes a node v by replacing the mapping from v to Top with a mapping from v to Bot. It processes an edge e (whose source and target nodes are vs and ws respectively) by removing all the mappings from vs to Bot, and adding mappings from ws to Top.

fun next-ps :: proofstate ⇒ node + edge ⇒ proofstate
where
  next-ps σ (Inl v) = σ ⊖ {v} ++ f [v] |=> Bot
  | next-ps σ (Inr e) = σ ⊖ fst3 e ++ f [thd3 e] |=> Top

The function mk-ps-chain Π π generates from π, which is a list of nodes and edges, a proofstate chain, by interspersing the elements of π with the appropriate proofstates. The first argument Π is the part of the chain that has already been converted.

definition mk-ps-chain :: [ps-chain, (node + edge) list] ⇒ ps-chain
where
  mk-ps-chain ≡ foldl (λΠ x. cSnoc Π x (next-ps (post Π) x))

lemma mk-ps-chain-preserves-length:
  fixes Π π
  shows chainlen (mk-ps-chain Π π) = chainlen Π + length π
  ⟨proof⟩

Distributing mk-ps-chain over op #.

lemma mk-ps-chain-cons:
  mk-ps-chain Π (x # π) = mk-ps-chain (cSnoc Π x (next-ps (post Π) x)) π
  ⟨proof⟩

Distributing mk-ps-chain over snoc.

lemma mk-ps-chain-snoc:
Distributing $mk-ps-chain$ over $cCons$.

**Lemma $mk-ps-chain-ccons$:**

*fixes $\pi \Pi$*

*shows $mk-ps-chain (\{ |\sigma| \} \cdot x \cdot \Pi) \pi = \{ |\sigma| \} \cdot x \cdot mk-ps-chain \Pi \pi$*

*⟨proof⟩*

A chain which is obtained from the list $\pi$, has $\pi$ as its list of commands. The following lemma states this in a slightly more general form, that allows for part of the chain to have already been processed.

**Lemma $comlist-mk-ps-chain$:**

*comlist (mk-ps-chain $\Pi \pi$) = comlist $\Pi \pi$*

*⟨proof⟩*

In order to perform induction over our diagrams, we shall wish to obtain “smaller” diagrams, by removing nodes or edges. However, the syntax and well-formedness constraints for diagrams are such that although we can always remove an edge from a diagram, we cannot (in general) remove a node – the resultant diagram would not be a well-formed if an edge connected to that node.

Hence, we consider “partially-processed diagrams” $(G, S)$, which comprise a diagram $G$ and a set $S$ of nodes. $S$ denotes the subset of $G$’s initial nodes that have already been processed, and can be thought of as having been removed from $G$.

We now give an updated version of the $lins \ G$ function. This was originally defined in Ribbons-Graphical. We provide an extra parameter, $S$, which denotes the subset of $G$’s initial nodes that shouldn’t be included in the linear extensions.

**Definition $lins2 :: [node \ fset, \ diagram] \Rightarrow \lin \ set$**

*where $lins2 \ S \ G \equiv \{ \pi :: \lin .$

*distinct $\pi$)*

$\wedge (\set \ \pi = (\fset \ G \cdot V \ - \ \fset \ S) \ -\tens \ \set \ G \cdot E)$

$\wedge (\forall \ i \ j \ v \ e. \ i < \length \ \pi \wedge j < \length \ \pi$\n
$\wedge \ \pi ! i = \Inl \ v \wedge \ \pi ! j = \Inr \ e \wedge \ e \in \ \fset \ e \ -\tens \ i < j)$

$\wedge (\forall \ j \ k \ w \ e. \ j < \length \ \pi \wedge k < \length \ \pi$\n
$\wedge \ \pi ! j = \Inr \ e \wedge \ \pi ! k = \Inl \ w \wedge \ w \in \ \thd \ e \ -\tens \ j < k \}$

*}
lemma lins2D:
assumes \( \pi \in \text{lins2} S \ G \)
shows distinct \( \pi \)
and set \( \pi = (\text{fset} \ G^V - \text{fset} \ S) \leftrightarrow \text{set} \ G^E \)
and \( \forall i \ j \ v \ e. \ i < \text{length} \ \pi ; \ j < \text{length} \ \pi ; \ \pi!i = \text{Inl} \ v ; \ \pi!j = \text{Inr} \ e ; \ v \in \text{fst3} \ e \ \Rightarrow \ i < j \)
and \( \forall j \ k \ w \ e. \ j < \text{length} \ \pi ; \ k < \text{length} \ \pi ; \ \pi!j = \text{Inr} \ e ; \ \pi!k = \text{Inl} \ w ; \ w \in \text{thd3} \ e \ \Rightarrow \ j < k \)
\langle proof \rangle

lemma lins2I:
assumes distinct \( \pi \)
and set \( \pi = (\text{fset} \ G^V - \text{fset} \ S) \leftrightarrow \text{set} \ G^E \)
and \( \forall i \ j \ v \ e. \ i < \text{length} \ \pi ; \ j < \text{length} \ \pi ; \ \pi!i = \text{Inl} \ v ; \ \pi!j = \text{Inr} \ e ; \ v \in \text{fst3} \ e \ \Rightarrow \ i < j \)
and \( \forall j \ k \ w \ e. \ j < \text{length} \ \pi ; \ k < \text{length} \ \pi ; \ \pi!j = \text{Inr} \ e ; \ \pi!k = \text{Inl} \ w ; \ w \in \text{thd3} \ e \ \Rightarrow \ j < k \)
shows \( \pi \in \text{lins2} S \ G \)
\langle proof \rangle

When \( S \) is empty, the two definitions coincide.

lemma lins-is-lins2-with-empty-S:
lins \( G \) = lins2 {||} \( G \)
\langle proof \rangle

The first proofstate for a diagram \( G \) is obtained by mapping each of its initial nodes to \( \text{Top} \).

definition initial-ps :: \( \text{diagram} \Rightarrow \text{proofstate} \)
where
\( \text{initial-ps} \ G \equiv [ \text{initials} \ G \ |\Rightarrow \text{Top} ] \)

The first proofstate for the partially-processed diagram \( G \) is obtained by mapping each of its initial nodes to \( \text{Top} \), except those in \( S \), which are mapped to \( \text{Bot} \).

definition initial-ps2 :: \([\text{node \ fset}, \text{diagram}] \Rightarrow \text{proofstate} \)
where
\( \text{initial-ps2} \ S \ G \equiv [ \text{initials} \ G - \ S \ |\Rightarrow \text{Top} ] +_{+} f \ [ S \ |\Rightarrow \text{Bot} ] \)

When \( S \) is empty, the above two definitions coincide.

lemma initial-ps-is-initial-ps2-with-empty-S:
\( \text{initial-ps} = \text{initial-ps2} {||} \)
\langle proof \rangle

The following function extracts the set of proofstate chains from a diagram.

definition ps-chains :: \( \text{diagram} \Rightarrow \text{ps-chain \ set} \)
where
\[ \text{ps-chains } G \equiv \text{mk-ps-chain} (\text{cNil (initial-ps } G)) \backslash \text{lins } G \]

The following function extracts the set of proofstate chains from a partially-processed diagram. Nodes in \( S \) are excluded from the resulting chains.

definition
\[ \text{ps-chains2} :: [\text{node node set}, \text{diagram}] \Rightarrow \text{ps-chain set} \]

where
\[ \text{ps-chains2 } S \ G \equiv \text{mk-ps-chain} (\text{cNil (initial-ps2 } S \ G)) \backslash \text{lins2 } S \ G \]

When \( S \) is empty, the above two definitions coincide.

lemma \( \text{ps-chains-is-ps-chains2-with-empty-S} \):
\[ \text{ps-chains} = \text{ps-chains2} \{||\} \]

⟨proof⟩

We now wish to describe proofstates chain that are well-formed. First, let us say that \( f + +_f \text{ disjoint } g \) is defined, when \( f \) and \( g \) have disjoint domains, as \( f + +_f g \). Then, a well-formed proofstate chain consists of triples of the form \((\sigma + +_f \text{ disjoint } \{\{v\}\} \rightarrow \text{Top } \ G), \text{Inl } v, \sigma + +_f \text{ disjoint } \{\{v\}\} \rightarrow \text{Bot } \ G)\), where \( v \) is a node, or of the form \((\sigma + +_f \text{ disjoint } \{\{vs\}\} \rightarrow \text{Bot } \ G), \text{Inr } e, \sigma + +_f \text{ disjoint } \{\{vs\}\} \rightarrow \text{Top } \ G)\), where \( e \) is an edge with source and target nodes \( vs \) and \( ws \) respectively.

The definition below describes a well-formed triple; we then lift this to complete chains shortly.

definition
\[ \text{wf-ps-triple} :: \text{proofstate} \times (\text{node + edge}) \times \text{proofstate} \Rightarrow \text{bool} \]

where
\[ \text{wf-ps-triple } T = (\text{case } \text{snd3 } T \text{ of} \]
\[ \text{Inl } v \Rightarrow (\exists \sigma. \ v \notin f\text{mdom } \sigma \land \text{fst3 } T = \{\{v\}\} \rightarrow \text{Top } \ G) + +_f \sigma \land \text{thd3 } T = \{\{v\}\} \rightarrow \text{Bot } \ G) + +_f \sigma \]
\[ \text{Inr } e \Rightarrow (\exists \sigma. (\text{fst3 } e \cup \text{thd3 } e) \land f\text{mdom } \sigma = \{||\}) \land \text{fst3 } T = \{\text{fst3 } e \rightarrow \text{Bot } \ G\} + +_f \sigma \land \text{thd3 } T = \{\text{thd3 } e \rightarrow \text{Top } \ G\} + +_f \sigma)\]

lemma \( \text{wf-ps-triple-nodeI} \):
\[ \text{assumes } \exists \sigma. \ v \notin f\text{mdom } \sigma \land \sigma 1 = \{\{v\}\} \rightarrow \text{Top } \ G) + +_f \sigma \land \sigma 2 = \{\{v\}\} \rightarrow \text{Bot } \ G) + +_f \sigma \]
\[ \text{shows } \text{wf-ps-triple } (\sigma 1, \text{Inl } v, \sigma 2) \]

⟨proof⟩

lemma \( \text{wf-ps-triple-edgeI} \):
\[ \text{assumes } \exists \sigma. (\text{fst3 } e \cup \text{thd3 } e) \land f\text{mdom } \sigma = \{||\} \land \sigma 1 = \{\text{fst3 } e \rightarrow \text{Bot } \ G\} + +_f \sigma \land \sigma 2 = \{\text{thd3 } e \rightarrow \text{Top } \ G\} + +_f \sigma \]
\[ \text{shows } \text{wf-ps-triple } (\sigma 1, \text{Inr } e, \sigma 2) \]
We wish to prove that every proofstate chain that can be obtained from a linear extension of \( G \) is well-formed and has as its final proofstate that state in which every terminal node in \( G \) is mapped to Bot.

We first prove this for partially-processed diagrams, for then the result for ordinary diagrams follows as an easy corollary.

We use induction on the size of the partially-processed diagram. The size of a partially-processed diagram \((G, S)\) is defined as the number of nodes in \( G \), plus the number of edges, minus the number of nodes in \( S \).

We fix \( k \) for this proof.

```plaintext
lemma wf-chains2:
fixes k
assumes S \( \subseteq \) initials G
and wf-dia G
and \( \Pi \in \text{ps-chains2} \ S \ G \)
```
and \( \text{fcard} \ G \cdot V + \text{length} \ G \cdot E = k + \text{fcard} \ S \) shows \( \text{wf-ps-chain} \ \Pi \land (\text{post} \ \Pi = [\text{terminals} \ G \mid\rightarrow \text{Bot}]) \)

⟨proof⟩

corollary \( \text{wf-chains} \):
assumes \( \text{wf-dia} \ G \)
assumes \( \Pi \in \text{ps-chains} \ G \)
shows \( \text{wf-ps-chain} \ \Pi \land \text{post} \ \Pi = [\text{terminals} \ G \mid\rightarrow \text{Bot}] \)
⟨proof⟩

9.2 Interface chains

type-synonym \( \text{int-chain} = (\text{interface}, \text{assertion-gadget} + \text{command-gadget}) \cdot \text{chain} \)

An interface chain is similar to a proofstate chain. However, where a proof-state chain talks about nodes and edges, an interface chain talks about the assertion-gadgets and command-gadgets that label those nodes and edges in a diagram. And where a proofstate chain talks about proofstates, an interface chain talks about the interfaces obtained from those proofstates.

The following functions convert a proofstate chain into an interface chain.

definition \( \text{ps-to-int} :: [\text{diagram}, \text{proofstate}] \Rightarrow \text{interface} \)
where
\( \text{ps-to-int} \ G \ \sigma \equiv \\bigotimes v \in \text{fmdom} \ \sigma. \ \text{case-topbot} \ \text{top-ass} \ \text{bot-ass} \ (\text{lookup} \ \sigma \ v) \ (G \cdot \Lambda \ v) \)

definition \( \text{ps-chain-to-int-chain} :: [\text{diagram}, \text{ps-chain}] \Rightarrow \text{int-chain} \)
where
\( \text{ps-chain-to-int-chain} \ G \ \Pi \equiv \ \text{chainmap} \ (\text{ps-to-int} \ G) \ ((\text{case-sum} \ (\text{Inl} \circ \ G \cdot \Lambda) \ (\text{Inr} \circ \ \text{snd}3))) \ \Pi \)

lemma \( \text{ps-chain-to-int-chain-simp}: \)
\( \text{ps-chain-to-int-chain} \ (\text{Graph} \ V \ \Lambda \ E) \ \Pi = \) \( \text{chainmap} \ (\text{ps-to-int} \ (\text{Graph} \ V \ \Lambda \ E)) \ ((\text{case-sum} \ (\text{Inl} \circ \ \Lambda) \ (\text{Inr} \circ \ \text{snd}3))) \ \Pi \)
⟨proof⟩

9.3 Soundness proof

We assume that \( \text{wr-com} \) always returns \{\}. This is equivalent to changing our axiomatization of separation logic such that the frame rule has no side-condition. One way to obtain a separation logic lacking a side-condition on its frame rule is to use variables-as-resource.

We proceed by induction on the proof rules for graphical diagrams. We show that: (1) if a diagram \( G \) is provable w.r.t. interfaces \( P \) and \( Q \), then \( P \) and \( Q \) are the top and bottom interfaces of \( G \), and that the Hoare triple \( (\text{asn} \ P, \ c, \ \text{asn} \ Q) \) is provable for each command \( c \) that can be extracted
from $G$; (2) if a command-gadget $C$ is provable w.r.t. interfaces $P$ and $Q$, then the Hoare triple $(asn P, c, asn Q)$ is provable for each command $c$ that can be extracted from $C$; and (3) if an assertion-gadget $A$ is provable, and if the top and bottom interfaces of $A$ are $P$ and $Q$ respectively, then the Hoare triple $(asn P, c, asn Q)$ is provable for each command $c$ that can be extracted from $A$.

**Lemma soundness-graphical-helper:**

**Assumes** no-var-interference: $\forall c. \text{wr-com } c = \{\}$

**Shows**

$(\text{prov-dia } G P Q \rightarrow$

$(P = \text{top-dia } G \land Q = \text{bot-dia } G \land$

$(\forall c. \text{coms-dia } G c \rightarrow \text{prov-triple } (asn P, c, asn Q )))$

$\land (\text{prov-com } C P Q \rightarrow$

$(\forall c. \text{coms-com } C c \rightarrow \text{prov-triple } (asn P, c, asn Q )))$

$\land (\text{prov-ass } A \rightarrow$

$(\forall c. \text{coms-ass } A c \rightarrow \text{prov-triple } (asn (\text{top-ass } A), c, asn (\text{bot-ass } A)))))$

**Proof**

The soundness theorem states that any diagram provable using the proof rules for ribbons can be recreated as a valid proof in separation logic.

**Corollary soundness-graphical:**

**Assumes** $\forall c. \text{wr-com } c = \{\}$

**Assumes** $\text{prov-dia } G P Q$

**Shows** $\forall c. \text{coms-dia } G c \rightarrow \text{prov-triple } (asn P, c, asn Q)$

**Proof**

**References**


