




OSVAuto: semi-automatic verifier for functional specifications of operating systems

Yulun Wu  

School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, China

Bohua Zhan  

Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd., China

Bican Xia   

School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, China

Abstract

We present a tool OSVAuto for semi-automatic verification of functional specification for operating system kernels. Such verification is usually carried out using interactive theorem provers, taking advantage of the expressiveness of their language to define records, algebraic datatypes, lists and maps commonly used in the specification. However, proofs about these data types are still mostly manual, making the verification process tedious and difficult for newcomers. In contrast, OSVAuto is designed from the start to provide native support for data types commonly occurring in operating system verification, together with algorithms for encoding proof goals into a form suitable for SMT solvers. The use of SMT solvers combined with a tactic language allows semi-automatic proofs about the functional specification. We apply our tool to proof goals arising in an existing verification of the μ C-OS/II operating system in Coq, demonstrating a large reduction in the proof effort due to increased level of automation.

2012 ACM Subject Classification [Program verification](#)

Keywords and phrases program verification, operation system, automatic verification, SMT

Digital Object Identifier [10.4230/LIPIcs.CVIT.2016.38](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CVIT.2016.38)

1 Introduction

Verification of operating system kernels is one of the major application areas of interactive theorem proving, with well-known projects such as the verification of the seL4 microkernel [11] and CertiKOS [10]. While there is a great variety of techniques and program logics involved in the different projects, there is also similarity in the general approach. Usually, specification of the OS kernel is defined using a functional language at several levels of abstraction. The specifications include abstract behavior of each kernel API, as well as invariant that must be satisfied by the internal data structures. The verification task can then be roughly divided into two parts:

1. Correctness of functional specification, including refinement relations between specification at different levels of abstraction, preservation of invariants, and that the specification at the most abstract level satisfies important system properties (such as information-flow security).
2. Refinement between the functional specification and the concrete implementation (usually in C). This involves reasoning about semantics of C programs, in particular issues of memory management and aliasing (often done using some version of separation logic).

In realistic verification projects, the invariant of the OS kernel is highly complex, and proof of invariant preservation and refinement between different levels of functional specification take up a large proportion of the proof effort [11]. Unfortunately, there is still insufficient support for automation of such proofs. Part of the reason is that the functional specification



© Author: Please provide a copyright holder;

licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0

42nd Conference on Very Important Topics (CVIT 2016).

Editors: John Q. Open and Joan R. Access; Article No. 38; pp. 38:1–38:18

Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics



Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

makes extensive use of the expressiveness of the language in interactive theorem provers to define new structure (records) and algebraic datatypes, as well as reasoning about lists and partial maps. The existing tools for invoking SMT solvers from interactive theorem provers, such as Sledgehammer in Isabelle [3] and similar efforts in Coq [6, 8], only translates these data types in a generic manner, in particular using various heuristic search techniques to find relevant theorems. This makes their performance on proof goals related to operating system verification rather unstable, and counterexamples usually cannot be provided in case of failed proof.

In another direction, there is a large amount of work on semi-automatic verification tools, such as Why3 [9] and Dafny [13] for program verification, and TLA and Ivy for verification of distributed systems [12, 19]. These tools give a larger focus on translating proof goals into a form suitable for SMT solvers. However, their main focus is in domains other than operating system verification. We will make more detailed comparison with these work in Section 7.

In this paper, we present a new tool, called OSVAuto, that is specially designed for proving correctness results about functional specification during the verification of an operating system kernel. This work is motivated by the need to improve efficiency in extending an existing verification [25] of the $\mu\text{C}/\text{OS-II}$ operating system [16], as well as for verification of other OS kernels in the future. In the design of our tool, we focus in particular on providing a language that is accessible to programmers who do not necessarily have a background in formal methods. In the translation of proof goals to SMT, we largely opted for simpler transformation rules and logics, with the aim that the resulting formula should be easily decided by the SMT solver (either success or quickly returning a counterexample). We do not aim for completeness of the translation, instead relying on a tactic language for user guidance to the proof. Finally, we focus only on proof tasks for correctness of functional specification. Issues of memory correctness and separation logic are outside the scope of our work. Instead, we intend that this tool will be combined with other tools for reasoning about separation logic to enable verification at the implementation level.

In the next section, we begin with an overview of the functional verification of $\mu\text{C}/\text{OS-II}$, which provides motivation of our work. The remaining sections present our contribution, summarized as follows.

- We define a language for specifying and verifying functional properties of programs, with a particular view to operating system verification (Section 3). The language is closer to that of a regular programming language, intended to be easier to read and write by programmers.
- We present algorithms for systematically encoding data in our language, including structures, algebraic datatypes and maps, into a form suitable for SMT solvers (Section 4.1 to 4.3).
- We present other functionalities of OSVAuto that helps the user debug problems and guide the proof, including reconstruction of model from the SMT solver (Section 4.4), and a tactic language system (Section 5).

Finally, we evaluate the tool on a suite of lemmas from an existing verification of the $\mu\text{C}/\text{OS-II}$ operating system (Section 6), demonstrating a large reduction in proof effort due to improvements in automation. We review related work in Section 7 and conclude in Section 8.

2 Overview: Functional Verification of $\mu\text{C}/\text{OS-II}$

In this section, we give an overview of the existing functional verification of the $\mu\text{C}/\text{OS-II}$ operating system in the Coq proof assistant [25]. The purpose is to provide a background for

```

struct addrval {
  int32u block;
  int32u offset
}

struct TCB {
  val next;
  val prev;
  val eptr;
  val msg;
  int32u dly;
  int32u stat;
  int32u prio;
  int32u x;
  int32u y;
  int32u bitx;
  int32u bity;
  int32u flag
}

datatype val = Vundef | Vnull | Vint32(int32u n)
              | Vptr(addrval addr)

datatype tcbstats =
  os_stat_sem (addrval ev)
| os_stat_q (addrval ev)
| os_stat_time
| os_stat_mbox (addrval ev)
| os_stat_mutexsem (addrval ev)

datatype taskstatus =
  rdy | wait(tcbstats stat, int32u time)

struct AbsTCB {
  int32u prio;
  taskstatus stat;
  val msg;
  bool sus
}

```

■ **Figure 1** Examples of high-level and low-level state descriptions for the Task Control Block (TCB). The left side shows definition of address and low-level TCB. The right side shows definition of concrete values, abstract task status, and high-level TCB.

this work, in particular the kind of specifications and proof goals that commonly appear in operating system verification.

The $\mu\text{C}/\text{OS-II}$ is a small operating system kernel, whose core modules include task management, event management, timers, and so on. Previous work [25] verified in Coq most of the key functionalities in the kernel. The verification makes use of a concurrent separation logic with refinement that handles preemptive interrupts. On the abstract level, functional specification is defined for each API function at two levels of refinement (which we call high-level and low-level). The operating system invariant include properties satisfied by the data structures at each of the two levels, as well as refinement relation between the two levels.

To give a concrete example, the task control block (TCB) is described on the high-level by four parts: priority, task status, message, and suspend status. The priority is an integer ranging from 0 to 63 (smaller value means higher priority); task status include ready, waiting for event, and waiting for time delay; message is a pointer for sending messages, suspend status indicates whether the task is suspended (which is independent from whether the task is waiting for event).

The low-level task control block corresponds more closely to the C code. It contains a bitfield for both task status and suspend status, as well as additional fields that are derived from priority for efficiency in computation. The definitions of high-level and low-level states are shown in Figure 1. Example of invariant on the low-level state, and refinement relationship between high-level and low-level state are shown in Figure 3. For ease of readability, we write the definitions using the language defined in this paper.

Many of the proof obligations involve showing that the transition of the system preserves refinement relations. For example, in Figure 3, we show a proof goal corresponding to part of the correctness of refinement between the high-level and low-level specification of the task suspend function. For task suspend, the high-level transition assigns field `sus` to `true`, while the low-level transition adds flag `OS_STAT_SUSPEND` to field `stat`. The proof goal states that the refinement relation `R_TCB_Status_P` is preserved by these two transitions.

```

predicate RL_TCBblk_P (struct TCB tcb) {
  0 <= tcb.prio && tcb.prio < 64 &&
  tcb.prio & 7 == tcb.x && tcb.prio >> 3 == tcb.y &&
  1 << tcb.x == tcb.bitx && 1 << tcb.y == tcb.bity &&
  (tcb.stat == OS_STAT_RDY || tcb.stat == OS_STAT_SUSPEND ||
   tcb.stat == OS_STAT_SEM || tcb.stat == OS_STAT_Q || ... ||
   tcb.stat == OS_STAT_SEM | OS_STAT_SUSPEND || ...) &&
  (tcb.stat == OS_STAT_RDY || tcb.stat == OS_STAT_SUSPEND) ->
  tcb.eptr == Vnull
}

predicate prio_not_in_tbl(int32u prio, int32u[] rtbl) {
  rtbl[prio >> 3] & (1 << (prio & 7)) == 0
}

predicate RHL_WaitMS_Suspend_P(
  struct TCB tcb, int32u[] rtbl, struct AbstTCB abstcb) {
  switch (abstcb) {
  case AbstTCB{{prio: prio, stat: wait(os_stat_mutexsem(eid), dly),
               sus: true}}:
    tcb.prio == prio && prio_not_in_tbl(prio, rtbl) &&
    tcb.eptr == Vptr(eid) &&
    tcb.stat == OS_STAT_MUTEX | OS_STAT_SUSPEND;
  default: true;
  }
}

```

■ **Figure 2** Examples of invariants. `RL_TCBblk_P` gives invariants that must be satisfied by the low-level TCB (some cases of `tcb.stat` are omitted). `prio_not_in_tbl` defines that priority `prio` is not in the priority map `rtbl`. `RHL_WaitMS_Suspend_P` defines the refinement relation between high-level and low-level TCB in the case of waiting for a delay.

3 Language

In this section, we give formal definition of the specification language of OSVAuto. We present the syntax for types, terms and declarations of the theory, focusing on the distinct design choices made in our work.

3.1 Types

The type system of OSVAuto is that of a many-sorted first-order logic with polymorphic types. The syntax for types is as follows.

$$\tau ::= \text{void} \mid \text{bool} \mid \text{int8u} \mid \text{int16u} \mid \text{int32u} \mid \tau[] \mid c \mid c(\bar{\tau})$$

We provide built-in support for primitive types including `void`, `bool`, and bitvector types `int8u`, `int16u`, `int32u`, and type combinators such as arrays (`$\tau[]$`). User-defined types (`c` , or `$c(\bar{\tau})$` in the case with type parameters) include structures, algebraic datatypes, or axiomatic types.

Structures are similar to records in Isabelle or Coq. It is specified by a structure name and a list of typed fields. Examples of structure declarations for `addrval`, `TCB` and `AbstTCB` are given in Figure 1. Algebraic datatypes correspond to **datatype** in Isabelle or **Inductive** in Coq. It specifies the datatype as a list of constructors. Each constructor may take a list of typed arguments. We require that if an argument appears in more than one constructor, then its type must be the same in all appearances. In Figure 1, the types for `val`, `tcbstats` and `taskstatus` are defined as algebraic datatypes.

```

query R_TCB_Status_P_suspend {
  fixes tcb : struct TCB;
  fixes rtbl : int32u[];
  fixes rtbl2 : int32u[];
  fixes abstcb : struct AbsTCB;
  assumes prio_not_in_tbl(tcb.prio, rtbl2);
  assumes tcb.prio < 64;
  assumes R_TCB_Status_P(tcb, rtbl, abstcb);
  shows R_TCB_Status_P(tcb{stat := tcb.stat | OS_STAT_SUSPEND}, rtbl2,
                       abstcb{sus := true})
  proof { auto }
}

```

■ **Figure 3** Part of the proof goal for correctness of refinement for task suspend.

We allow user-defined types to depend on type parameters in the usual way. For example, the type `List` is defined as an algebraic datatype in the usual way:

```
datatype List<E> = nil | cons (E ele, List<E> rest)
```

This allows definitions and theorems about lists, maps, etc. to be proved once and used for all element types. We also support a simple type abbreviation mechanism. For example, the list of (high-level) TCBs and mapping from task pointers to TCBs (both commonly used in the specification) are defined as follows.

```
typedef TCBList = List<struct TCB>;
typedef TCBMap = Map<addrval, struct AbsTCB>;
```

We implement a standard type inference algorithm. This allows users to omit most of the type annotations on terms. To ease the burden of type inference, we do require types specified for all parameters and return value of a function.

3.2 Terms

Next, we present the term language. Many aspects of the syntax follow the usual choices in interactive theorem provers. However, we also directed our design to be closer to that of regular programming languages, such as in the use of switch statements, structure literals, brackets for quantifiers, and so on. The syntax of terms is given below.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{const} &::= n \mid \text{true} \mid \text{false} \\
 \text{pat} &::= _ \mid \text{var} \mid \text{const} \mid \text{struct}\{\{\text{field:pat}, \dots\}\} \mid \text{constr}(\text{pat}, \dots) \\
 \text{branch} &::= \text{case pat: } t \mid \text{default: } t \\
 \text{quant} &::= \text{forall} \mid \text{exists} \\
 t &::= \text{const} \mid \text{var} \mid \text{uop } t \mid t \text{ bop } t \mid t[t] \mid t[t := t] \mid \text{func}(t, \dots) \mid \\
 &\quad \text{struct}\{\{\text{field:t}, \dots\}\} \mid t\{\text{field:t}, \dots\} \mid \\
 &\quad \text{switch}(t)\{\text{branch}; \dots\} \mid \text{quant}(\tau t)\{t\} \mid \text{quant}(\tau t \text{ in } t)\{t\}
 \end{aligned}$$

Here constants are either integer or boolean values. Unary and binary operators include logical and arithmetic (include bit-wise) operators. Array access and update are denoted $t[t]$ and $t[t := t]$. Function application include both constructors of algebraic datatypes and user-defined functions. The remainder parts of the syntax are concerned with structures, pattern matching, and quantification, which we explain in more detail in the following paragraphs.

Structure literals and updates. We provide custom syntax for structure literals and structure updates. Structure literal is given by the name of the structure, followed by the full list of field values. Structure update is given by an initial term followed by a subset of new field values.

Switch statements. We support a general form of switch statements, where the pattern for each branch can be an arbitrary nested combination of structure literals, datatype constructors. In the syntax for patterns (*pat*), wildcard `_` and variable *var* matches anything, constant *const* means the term at this location must equal to the constant. Structure patterns match a subset of fields of the structure. Constructor patterns match the term against application of one of the constructors. An example of the use of generalized patterns appears in `RHL_WaitMS_Suspend_P` in Figure 2. In this definition, the pattern `case AbsTCB{{...}}` means the `stat` field of `abstcb` must be in the form `wait(os_stat_mutexsem(eid), dly)`, and the `sus` field must be true. Field `msg` (which appears in `AbsTCB` but not in this pattern) can be arbitrary. Variables `prio`, `eid` and `dly` in the pattern are bound variables that can be used in the body. In comparison, the same condition is written in Coq as

```
forall prio eid dly m,
  abstcb = (prio, wait (os_stat_mutexsem eid) dly, m, true) -> ...
```

The syntax in our language is intended to be closer to the habit of regular programmers. Moreover, it eliminates the use of universal quantifiers on `prio`, `eid`, `dly` and `m`. Later (in Section 4.2), we show that this expression will be translated into a quantifier-free expression for input to the SMT solver, which reduces the burden on the SMT solver to figure out the correct quantifier instantiations.

Quantifiers. We support both “regular” quantifiers (over a type) and quantification over a collection such as list and map. As an example of the latter, universal quantification over the keys of a `TCBMap` is written as:

```
forall (addrval tid in tbl) { body }
```

When encoding for the SMT solver, this is simply translated into `forall (addrval tid) { indom(tid, tbl) -> body }` (here `indom` is the domain function of a map, detailed in Section 4.3). The rationale for introducing this notation is more than just syntactic sugar. During model finding and diagnosis (Section 4.4), we wish to evaluate each expression in the query on an explicit model obtained from the SMT solver. For this purpose, quantifiers that are over lists and maps are obviously evaluable. In the future, we will also consider translating quantifiers over collections directly to SMT, to take advantage of possible optimizations for quantification over finite domains.

3.3 Declarations

A theory consists of a list of *declarations*. The syntax for declarations can be briefly presented as follows.

```
decl ::= struct name {field, ...} | consts {name = n, ...} |
      datatype name = branches | function name(arg, ...) {t}
      query name {query-decl, ...}
```

We have the usual declaration of structures, constants, algebraic datatypes, and functions. Each *query* represents a top-level proof goal. It consists of a list of type parameters, variables, assumptions, and conclusion. Each conclusion may be followed by a tactic for its proof (see the description of tactic language in Section 5).

4 Encoding and Model Finding

The workhorse of proof automation in OSVAuto is provided by the SMT solver (the Z3 prover [7] in the actual implementation). The basic workflow starting from the current proof state is given in Figure 4.




Figure 4 Workflow of OSVAuto.

Starting from the current proof state, we first perform a set of simplification rules. This is followed by an encoding procedure which translates the data types supported by the tool into first-order formulas suitable for the SMT solver. A list of lemmas provided by the user are likewise encoded. The resulting formulas are sent to the SMT solver, which either resolves the state, or in the case of failure returns a counterexample most of the time. When a counterexample can be obtained from the solver, it is translated back into a model that is expressed in the language of OSVAuto. This is then used for diagnosis on the original proof state.

We now describe some of the details of the above workflow. In particular, we describe how to encode structures, algebraic datatypes, and operations on them into form suitable for SMT solvers. In the end, we also discuss the model reconstruction procedure and its uses in diagnosing the proof state.

4.1 Encoding of structures and algebraic datatypes

For structures, each structure type is translated into a declared sort \mathcal{T} , with each field translated into a function from \mathcal{T} into the type of the field. A structure literal $t = \text{struct}\{\{f_i : v_i\}\}$ is translated into a new variable $c_t : \mathcal{T}$, together with constraints $f_i(t) = v_i$ equating each field of t to the corresponding value. Likewise, a structure update $t = t_0\{f_i := v_i\}$ is translated into a new variable $c_t : \mathcal{T}$, together with constraints $f_i(t) = v_i$ for each field f_i , and $g_j(t) = g_j(t_0)$ for each field g_j of the structure not appearing in the list f_i . Moreover, for each equality $s = t$ between structures, we add the constraint $(s = t) \iff \bigwedge_i f_i(s) = f_i(t)$, rewriting the equality into a conjunction of equalities of each field.

The encoding for algebraic datatypes is only a bit more complicated. Each (concrete instantiation of) datatype is translated into a declared sort \mathcal{T} , with each constructor translated into a constant or function with return type \mathcal{T} , and each field f translated into a function $\mathcal{T}.f$ from \mathcal{T} into the type of the field. Moreover, for each datatype \mathcal{T} , we introduce a function $\mathcal{T}.id$ from \mathcal{T} to the type of integers, indicating the index of the branch of any value of the datatype. It satisfies the constraint $0 \leq \mathcal{T}.id(v) < n_{\mathcal{T}}$, where $n_{\mathcal{T}}$ is the number of branches of the datatype. For terms t appearing in the proof that are applications of constructors, constraints equating each field of t to the corresponding value are added. For each equality $s = t$ between values of the datatype, if neither s and t are applications of constructors, we add the constraint rewriting $s = t$ to the expanded version of the condition, dividing into

one case for each branch of the datatype. For example, in the case of the `List` datatype, we have:

$$(s = t) \longleftrightarrow \text{List.id}(s) = \text{List.id}(t) \wedge (\text{List.id}(s) = 0 \longrightarrow \text{true}) \wedge (\text{List.id}(t) = 1 \longrightarrow \text{List.ele}(s) = \text{List.ele}(t) \wedge \text{List.rest}(s) = \text{List.rest}(t))$$

An important point to note here is that for recursive datatypes, we do not further expand the equalities that result from this expansion. In the example above, we do not expand $\text{List.rest}(s) = \text{List.rest}(t)$, even though they are also equality between lists. This avoids the infinite expansion that could result from a naive encoding for recursive datatypes.

The above encoding for datatypes is incomplete (which is to be expected due to the complexity of reasoning about recursive datatypes in general [21, 15]). A simple example of a proof goal that cannot be covered is given as follows.

```
datatype A = f(int32u x) | g(int32u y)
query testDatatypeEqual {
  fixes a: A; fixes b: A; fixes h: A -> A;
  assumes switch(a, b) { case (f(u), f(v)): u == v; default: false };
  shows h(a) == h(b)
}
```

This goal cannot be solved because the crucial goal $a == b$ does not appear in the proof. However, this can be addressed with user guidance using the tactics language (Section 5), in this case by adding an assertion $a == b$.

4.2 Normalization and encoding of switch statements

As we discussed in Section 3.2, we support switch statements with general kind of patterns. We now show how these switch statements can be first converted into standard form, and then into a form suitable for the SMT solver.

A switch statement is in *standard form* if each branch is a constructor applied to a list of variables, except possibly for a last branch that is the default branch. Any switch expression can be converted into standard form according to the following reduction rules. Below we use t_s to denote the expression to switch on.

- If the first branch is a wildcard, a structure pattern without any fields, or a variable, the switch expression can be replaced by the body of that branch (in the case of variable v , substituting v for t_s in the body).
- If the first branch is a structure pattern with at least one field, let the first field be $f_1 : pat_1$. Then the switch statement can be replaced by a switch on the field f_1 of t_s . In the case of matching on pat_1 , the remaining fields of the structure pattern are matched. Otherwise, the remaining branches of the original switch expression are matched.
- If the head of t_s is a constructor for some datatype, then the switch statement can be simplified by removing all cases with different constructors.
- In the general case where the head of t_s is not a constructor (so it is a priori unknown which branch of the datatype it is in), we perform possible reductions for each case of the switch statement. If the pattern in each case is already a constructor whose arguments are all variables, then the switch statement is already in standard form. Otherwise, suppose $c_i(\dots, t_j, \dots)$ is the first branch where some argument t_j is not a variable, rewrite this branch into matching on $c_i(\dots, v_j, \dots)$ for new variable v_j , followed by matching on v_j with pattern t_j .

Proceeding in the above manner, we can reduce all terms to only contain switch statements in standard form. In the next step, the switch statement is rewritten into if-then-else

statements, with the help of the *id* function for datatypes introduced in Section 4.2. Finally, the if-then-else statement is converted in the usual way into an SMT formula.

4.3 Encoding of maps

Maps are used extensively in the functional specification of the $\mu\text{C}/\text{OS-II}$ system. For example, the high-level task control blocks are collected together into a value of type `Map<addrval, struct AbstrTCB>`. We represent maps as a pair of functions `indom` and `get`. For each concrete instantiation of map type `Map<K,V>`, the corresponding `indom` function has type `K -> Map<K,V> -> bool`, and the `get` function has type `K -> Map<K,V> -> V`. Intuitively, the `indom` function returns whether a given key is in the domain of the map, and the `get` function returns the value corresponding to a key if it exists, and an arbitrary value otherwise.

In the original formalization in Coq, several other functions and relations are defined on maps. For example, the original formalization makes frequent use of the `join` relation, where `join(k, v, m1, m2)` means the key `k` is not originally in `m1`, and `m2` is obtained by adding the key-value pair `(k, v)` to `m1`. In our case, we can define the relation in terms of `indom` and `get` as follows.

```
predicate join<K,V>(K key, V value, Map<K,V> m1, Map<K,V> m2) {
  forall (K k).
    (k != key -> indom(k, m1) == indom(k, m2) &&
      (indom(k, m1) -> get(k, m1) == get(k, m2))) &&
    (!indom(key, m1) && indom(key, m2) && get(key, m2) == value)
}
```

Likewise, we can define the other relations such as merge of two maps, subtraction between maps, etc., using `indom` and `get`. The equality between two maps is expanded into the following.

```
predicate mapEq<K,V>(Map<K,V> m1, Map<K,V> m2) {
  forall (K k). indom(k, m1) == indom(k, m2) &&
    (indom(k, m1) -> get(k, m1) == get(k, m2))
}
```

This expansion is used to expand any equality $m_1 = m_2$ between maps that appear in the proof, in the same way as the handling of equality between structures and algebraic datatypes as in Section 4.1.

4.4 Model reconstruction and diagnosis

When the SMT solver fails to prove some goal (that is, it is unable to show the input constraints are unsatisfiable), it is often desirable to obtain a model demonstrating the satisfiability of the input constraints. This can help the user to debug the input problem, perhaps by adding missing conditions.

Due to the encoding presented in the previous subsections, the model returned by the SMT solver (in our case Z3) cannot be immediately given back to the user. Instead, we must undo the encoding for structures, algebraic datatypes, and maps, converting the model into a form directly expressed in our language.

The main difficulty encountered is how to interpret the model returned by the SMT solver for the various functions introduced in the encoding. For the Z3 prover, models of functions are given by lists of input-value pairs, followed by the *else branch* that expresses the output of the function in terms of the inputs in the remaining cases. We do not attempt to interpret the expression in each branch of the function, instead relying on the evaluation function in

the Z3 API, which reduces evaluation of a function on explicit arguments to the simplest form in most cases.

Assuming evaluation of functions is successful, model reconstruction for the various kinds of data is relatively straightforward.

- For values of structure type, evaluate each field of the structure, the values of which form the structure literal.
- For values of algebraic datatypes, first evaluate the *id* of the value, then for the constructor for that branch of the datatype, evaluate fields corresponding to each argument of the constructor.
- For values that are maps, first evaluate the *indom* function for that map type on all terms of key type in the model. For those terms whose *indom* value is true, evaluate the *get* function for the corresponding values. These information are collected together to form the map literal.

The resulting model, expressed in the language of our system, is then presented to the user. The model is additionally used for *diagnosis* on the current query. We evaluate each part of assumption and conclusion of the query using the model. Unless there is a bug in the system, each assumption should evaluate to true and the conclusion should evaluate to false. Often, the predicate for the conclusion is itself a conjunction of several predicates. To provide further information to the user in this case, we further expand such predicates and evaluate each conjunct. This helps the user to determine which part of the conclusion is problematic.

5 Tactic system

In this section, we describe the tactic system that enables manual guidance of the proof. The tactic system is similar to that in Coq, but with improvements (partly motivated by Isar [24] in Isabelle) that clarifies the overall structure of the proof.

The syntax for tactics is as follows.

```

auto ::= auto | auto(theorem, ...)
branch ::= case constr(args) : tactic | n : tactic | default:tactic
tactic ::= skip | auto | cases(t){branch, ...} | induction(t){branch, ...} |
          assumption | simplify | skolemize | ... |
          split-conj(name, [names, ...]) | match-show(name) | apply(name)
          assert(name : t) {tactic}

```

The meaning of these tactics follow the practice of most other proof assistants, so we do not go into details on this respect. Instead, we focus on the special design decisions of our tool.

- The `auto` tactic is the workhorse of automation in our system. It invokes the SMT solver on the current proof state. The tactic takes an optional list of theorems, which are also given as input to the SMT solver. The `auto` tactic is expected to resolved the current proof state completely - an exception is raised if otherwise.
- The `cases` and `induction` tactics correspond to case analysis and induction on an algebraic datatype, respectively. Both tactics are followed by a list of branches with corresponding tactics, where each branch either correspond to a constructor of the datatype or is the default branch.

- The tactics `assumption` attempt to match the current goal with one of the assumptions. Several other tactics (such as `simplify` and `skolemize`) perform some operation on the current proof state, and is guaranteed to return exactly one proof state.
- If the previous tactic transforms a proof state into exactly one proof state, it may be followed by another tactic using the `;;` operator. On the other hand, if a tactic transforms a proof state into more than one proof states, it must be followed by a bracket and a list of branches, with each branch either numbered or labeled by a constructor.
- The `assert` tactic starts its own scope for proving the asserted statement, followed by the `;;` operator.

The rationale for the design of this language is to always make the structure of the proof (i.e. which tactics serve to prove which subgoal) clear. Moreover, we force the user to explicitly name any assumption or introduced facts that are used later in the proof - the use of facts with automatically generated names pose significant issues for the maintenance of long proofs in Coq.

The tactic system is implemented internally using proof states. As for queries, each proof state is specified by lists of type parameters, parameters, assumptions, and goal. Unlike in other proof assistants, we define proof states to contain the sub-proof states recursively. This permits easy printing of the location of each failed proof for potentially complex combination of tactics.

6 Evaluation

The tool is implemented using Python, making use of the Python API for the Z3 prover [7, 2]. The tool is available for download at ¹. We now describe the evaluation of our system on the verification of $\mu\text{C}/\text{OS-II}$ operating system.

6.1 Tests for maps and bitvectors

Our system is able to convert proof goals about maps and bitvectors directly to SMT. Here we demonstrate that it works on automatically proving lemmas related to maps and bitvectors.

Figure 5 shows some sample lemmas related to maps, encompassing the usage of the predicates `join`, `disjoin`, `remove`, and `merge`, the definition of variables and their types is omitted here, only the content of the lemma is presented.

Figure 6 shows how map is involved in verifying $\mu\text{C}/\text{OS-II}$, Here `TCBMap` is a map type whose type of key is `addrval` and type of value is `TCB`.

Figure 7 shows lemmas related to bitvectors proved by `OSVAuto`. All these lemmas are successfully proved in a negligible amount of time, indicating that the bitvector calculations involved in the refinement-based verification of the operating system are well within the efficient solving capabilities of the Z3 solver.

6.2 Verification of functional specification

We now show results from proof of actual theorems related to verification of functional specification.

Figure 3 shows the proof state of Lemma `R_TCB_Status_P_suspend` which comes from verification of the API call on task `suspend`. This lemma states that assuming `tcb` is in the task

¹ <https://github.com/leopardcat/OSVAuto>

```

Map_Join_mapEq {
  assumes join(k1,v1,m3,m1);
  assumes join(k2,v2,m3,m2);
  shows k1==k2 && v1==v2 -> mapEq(m1,m2)
}
remove_cancel_put{
  shows join(k,v,m_o,m_j) -> remove(k,m_j,m_r1)
    -> remove(k,m_o,m_r2) -> MapEq(m_r1, m_r2)
}
extend_presv_disj_left{
  shows disjoint(m_o1,m_o2) -> !indom(k,m_o2)
    -> join(k,v,m_o1,m_n) -> disjoint(m_o2,m_n)
}
in_merge_not_right_in_left{
  shows merge(m1, m2, m_n) -> indom(k, m_n)
    -> !indom(k, m2)-> indom(k, m1)
}

```

■ **Figure 5** Lemma related to axiomatic map proved by OSVAuto

```

query map_get_ucos_test {
  fixes prio : int32u;
  fixes tid2 : addrval;
  fixes abstcb2 : struct AbsTCB;
  fixes tcbcls : TCBMap;
  fixes tcbcls_join : TCBMap;
  assumes H1: join(tid2, abstcb2, tcbcls, tcbcls_join);
  assumes H2: forall (addrval tid).
    if (indom(tid, tcbcls_join)) {
      get(tid, tcbcls_join).prio != prio
    } else {true};
  shows [trigger] forall (addrval tid).
    if (indom(tid, tcbcls)){
      get(tid, tcbcls).prio != prio
    } else {true}
}

```

■ **Figure 6** axiomatic map used in $\mu C/OS-II$ verifying

```

Z_lxor_range {
  fixes x, y: bit;
  assumes 0 <= x && x <= 4294967295;
  assumes 0 <= y && y <= 4294967295;
  shows 0 <= x | y && x | y <= 4294967295
}

Z_add_Arth_goal {
  fixes z1, z2: bit;
  assumes 0 <= z1 && z1 <= 4294967295;
  assumes 0 <= z2 && z2 <= 4294967295;
  shows (z1 + (z2 - z1)) - (z2 - z1) == z1
}

```

■ **Figure 7** Lemma related to bits proved by OSVAuto

```

query update_rtbl_tcblist_hold {
  fixes vptr : val;
  fixes tcbList: TCBList;
  fixes rtbl : int32u[];
  fixes tcbcls : TCBMap;
  fixes prio : int32u;
  assumes H1: forall (addrval tid).
    if (indom(tid, tcbcls)) {
      get(tid, tcbcls).prio != prio
    } else { true };
  assumes H2: TCBList_P(vptr, tcbList, rtbl, tcbcls);
  shows TCBList_P(vptr, tcbList, rtbl[prio >> 3 := rtbl[prio >> 3] & ~(1
    << (prio & 7))], tcbcls)
  proof {
    induction(tcbList, [vptr, tcbcls]) {
      case nil: auto;
      case cons(tcb, rest):
        cases(vptr) {
          case Vptr(tid):
            simplify;;
            skolemize;;
            split_conj(H2, [H21, H22, H23]);;
            match_show(H23) {
              1: apply_theorem(TCBNode_P_prioneq_prop_hold) {
                1: auto;
                2: assumption;
              };
              2: match_assume(IH_rest) {
                1: apply_theorem(map_get_test, [H23, H1]);
                2: assumption; }; };
            default: auto; }; }
        }
    }
  }
}

```

■ **Figure 8** Proof state of lemma `update_rtbl_tcblist_hold`

ready table *rtbl2*, and *tcb*, *rtbl* and *abstcb* maintain a refinement relations `R_TCB_Status_P` for TCB. If the *stat* field of *tcb* is updated to the value `tcb.stat | OS_STAT_SUSPEND`, and the *sus* field of *abstcb* is updated to true, *tcb*, *rtbl2* and *abstcb* still maintain the refinement relationship.

With `R_TCB_Status_P` being a complex invariant composed of numerous simpler invariants, proving this lemma appears quite challenging. However, for an SMT solver, this is merely a mechanical search and backtracking process. So for this lemma, the tool uses the `Auto` strategy to directly invoke the SMT solver and finish the proving process in around a second. In contrast, the original proof in Coq required 1011 lines.

Figure 8 shows the proof state of Lemma `update_rtbl_tcblist_hold` which comes from proof of a time delay API in previous work [25]. For this lemma, directly invoking SMT with the `Auto` strategy for solving leads to failure. Therefore, it is necessary to use the tactic system described in Section 5 to decompose the original proof goal into multiple subgoals to be solved separately.

As shown earlier, *tcbList* is a recursively defined list, where each element is of type TCB. Therefore, we first induct *tcbList*, decomposing the original proof state into two cases, replacing *tcbList* with *nil* and *cons(tcb, rest)* respectively. For case *nil*, the proof goal can be solved directly by `Auto`, and for case *cons(tcb, rest)*, we further perform case analysis on the variable *vptr*. As a result, four branches are created, where only the last branch cannot be directly solved by `Auto`, when *vptr* takes the form of *Vptr(tid)*.

```

H1: ...
H21: TCBNode_P(ele, rtbl, abstcb)
H22: TCBLList_P(ele.next, rest, rtbl, tcbcls2)
H23: join(addr, abstcb, tcbcls2, tcbcls)
IH_rest: forall (TCBMap tcbcls, val vptr).
  forall (struct addrval tid).
    if (indom(tid, tcbcls)) { get(tid, tcbcls).prio != prio }
    else { true }
  -> TCBLList_P(vptr, rest, rtbl, tcbcls) ->
  TCBLList_P(vptr, rest, rtbl[prio >> 3 := rtbl[prio >> 3] & ~(1 << (prio
& 7))], tcbcls)
goal: exists (struct AbsTCB abstcb, TCBMap tcbcls2).
  TCBNode_P(ele, rtbl[prio >> 3 := rtbl[prio >> 3] &
~(1 << (prio & 7))], abstcb) && TCBLList_P(ele.next, rest,
rtbl[prio >> 3 := rtbl[prio >> 3] & ~(1 << (prio & 7))], tcbcls2) &&
join(addr, abstcb, tcbcls2, tcbcls)

```

■ **Figure 9** Status of proof after applying `simplify` and `split_conj`

In this state, it is necessary to first perform some simplifications (tactic `simplify`), and split the assumption `H2` into `H21`, `H22`, `H23` (tactic `split_conj`). The resulting new state is as shown in Figure 9.

In this state, fact `H23` can be applied on the goal, resulting in the proof of the `join(addr, abstcb, tcbcls2, tcbcls)` part of the goal, which in turn generates two new proof states, one with sub-goal `TCBNode_P(ele, rtbl[prio >> 3 := rtbl[prio >> 3] & ~(1 << (prio & 7))], abstcb)` and the other with sub-goal `TCBLList_P(ele.next, rest, rtbl[prio >> 3 := rtbl[prio >> 3] & (1 << ~(prio & 7))], tcbcls2)`.

For the first state, we utilize a proven lemma `TCBNode_P_prioneq_prop_hold`, applying it to the goal results in two sub-goals `prio != abstcb.prio` and `TCBNode_P(ele, rtbl, abstcb)`, the former of which can be directly proven by `Auto`, while the latter matches assumption `H21` and is proven using `assumption`.

For the second state, the goal matches the conclusion of assumption `IH_rest` generated by `induction`. Applying `match_assume` produce two new proof states whose sub-goal corresponding to two premises of `IH_rest`.

The first state matches conclusion of lemma `map_get_test` (see Section 6.1), so applying it to this goal generate two new subgoals corresponding to two assumptions of lemma `map_get_test` which matches `H23` and `H1` respectively. The second state matches assumption `H1`, so all sub-goals of lemma `update_rtbl_tcblist_hold` produced by tactics are now proved.

6.3 Summary

We summarize the examples in Table 1, the proof work for these three categories of lemmas bitvectors, maps and specification in $\mu\text{C-OS/II}$ operating system kernel verifying were respectively analyzed, all those lemmas used for testing are from previous work in Coq. The column “Queries” in the table represents the total number of lemmas for each test family, the second column represents the number of lines of code used by OSVAuto to prove each lemma family, the third column represents the number of lines of code used to prove each test family in Coq.

We can see that by using OSVAuto, the workload of the human user is significantly reduced. In particular, for the 28 proof goals related to the functional specification, the original Coq proof required a total of 2576 lines, which is reduced to 46 lines using our

Category	# Queries	Line of proof	Line of proof (Coq)
Bitvectors	14	14	161
Maps	42	42	389
Specification	28	46	2576

■ **Table 1** Summary of line counts for examples.

tool. Many of these lemmas can be proved by `Auto` directly, while some others (such as `update_rtbl_tcblist_hold` above) requires only a dozen lines of guidance.

6.4 Future improvements

We list some issues encountered during our work, and propose some further improvements. Some of these concern the tool alone, others involve more cooperation or adjustment of the SMT solver.

- While we reduced the amount of quantifiers compared to the original specification in Coq, some quantifiers invariably remain in the specification. This includes quantifiers over collections such as lists and maps, as well as translation of existing theorems.
- There are still cases where the Z3 solver got stuck on a goal, even when the input does not involve quantifiers. We suspect it is the combination of arrays and bitvectors that contributed to the slow-down. More predictability from the SMT solver is still desired, as also observed in many existing work.
- Currently, we are unable to always recover the model from the SMT solver, due to the non-standard format for the model returned for the functions.
- We expect work on the user-interface will greatly improve the usability of our tool.

7 Related Work

Interactive theorem proving has been successfully applied to full verification of operating system kernels, for example of seL4 [11] and in the CertiKOS project [10]. Our work is based on the verification of μ C-OS/II operating system kernel in [25], which is of smaller scale, but nevertheless contains relatively complete descriptions of task, event, and timer modules, making it suitable for experimentation.

The difficulty with verification of operating systems by interactive theorem proving have led researchers to consider more automatic methods in the recent years. In particular, there have been attempts at fully-automatic (push-button) verification, by both restructuring the implementation to make it easier to verify, and to apply methods such as symbolic execution [18, 17]. However, these methods so far can only verify relatively simple properties, instead of the full system invariant and functional specification of these systems.

The methods used in our paper, encoding the proof goals to SMT solvers, are most closely related to other semi-automatic program verification tools such as Why3 [9] and Dafny [13]. Also related are tools for verifying concurrent and distributed systems such as TLA (which provides a proof mode [12] in addition to model checking) and Ivy [19, 23]. All these verification tools give greater focus to encoding proof goals into a form suitable for SMT solving, with a view toward particular verification tasks in their chosen domains. One common difficulty faced by such tools is the unstability of SMT solvers, in particular due to quantifier instantiation, which may be partially addressed with the assignment of triggers [14]. While we also attempted to reduce quantifiers in the encoding as much as possible, we found

it impractical to remove all quantifiers in these domain, with some quantifiers still remaining from user lemmas. Hence, we only aim to not introduce new quantifiers in our encoding, and allow users to break the proof into smaller parts, with choice of existing lemmas to apply on each SMT call.

Finally, there are other work on counterexample generation in interactive theorem provers. Existing work, such as Nitpick [4] and QuickCheck [5] (ported to Coq as QuickChick [20]) make use of methods such as random testing, SAT solvers, and relational model finders for counterexample generation. Instead, we make use of models returned by the SMT solver Z3, which provides a complementary approach that is well-suited for queries arising in OS verification.

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we presented a tool OSVAuto for semi-automatic verification of functional specification of operating systems. The main components of the design of this tool include a programmer-friendly language for writing functional specifications, encoding of commonly-arising data types for SMT solvers, model reconstruction, and a simple tactic system allowing users to provide guidance of the proof.

In the future, we wish to link this tool with other tools for reasoning about memory correctness of C programs using eparation logic (e.g. [26]). In the direction of reducing the trust-code-base of the tool, we will also consider proof generation into other proof assistants, making use of existing work on checking or reconstruction of proofs provided by the SMT solver [1, 22].

References

- 1 Bruno Andreotti, Hanna Lachnitt, and Haniel Barbosa. Carcara: An efficient proof checker and elaborator for SMT proofs in the alethe format. In Sriram Sankaranarayanan and Natasha Sharygina, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems - 29th International Conference, TACAS 2023, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2022, Paris, France, April 22-27, 2023, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 13993 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 367–386. Springer, 2023. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-30823-9_19.
- 2 Nikolaj S. Bjørner, Leonardo de Moura, Lev Nachmanson, and Christoph M. Wintersteiger. Programming Z3. In Jonathan P. Bowen, Zhiming Liu, and Zili Zhang, editors, *Engineering Trustworthy Software Systems - 4th International School, SETSS 2018, Chongqing, China, April 7-12, 2018, Tutorial Lectures*, volume 11430 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 148–201. Springer, 2018. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-17601-3_4.
- 3 Jasmin Christian Blanchette, Sascha Böhme, and Lawrence C. Paulson. Extending sledgehammer with SMT solvers. *J. Autom. Reason.*, 51(1):109–128, 2013. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10817-013-9278-5>, doi:10.1007/S10817-013-9278-5.
- 4 Jasmin Christian Blanchette and Tobias Nipkow. Nitpick: A counterexample generator for higher-order logic based on a relational model finder. In Matt Kaufmann and Lawrence C. Paulson, editors, *Interactive Theorem Proving, First International Conference, ITP 2010, Edinburgh, UK, July 11-14, 2010. Proceedings*, volume 6172 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 131–146. Springer, 2010. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-14052-5_11.
- 5 Lukas Bulwahn. The new quickcheck for isabelle - random, exhaustive and symbolic testing under one roof. In Chris Hawblitzel and Dale Miller, editors, *Certified Programs and Proofs - Second International Conference, CPP 2012, Kyoto, Japan, December 13-15, 2012. Proceedings*, volume 7679 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 92–108. Springer, 2012. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-35308-6_10.

- 6 Lukasz Czajka and Cezary Kaliszyk. Hammer for coq: Automation for dependent type theory. *J. Autom. Reason.*, 61(1-4):423–453, 2018. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10817-018-9458-4>, doi:10.1007/S10817-018-9458-4.
- 7 Leonardo Mendonça de Moura and Nikolaj S. Bjørner. Z3: an efficient SMT solver. In C. R. Ramakrishnan and Jakob Rehof, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, 14th International Conference, TACAS 2008, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2008, Budapest, Hungary, March 29–April 6, 2008. Proceedings*, volume 4963 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 337–340. Springer, 2008. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-78800-3_24.
- 8 Burak Ekici, Alain Mebsout, Cesare Tinelli, Chantal Keller, Guy Katz, Andrew Reynolds, and Clark W. Barrett. Smtcoq: A plug-in for integrating SMT solvers into coq. In Rupak Majumdar and Viktor Kuncak, editors, *Computer Aided Verification - 29th International Conference, CAV 2017, Heidelberg, Germany, July 24–28, 2017, Proceedings, Part II*, volume 10427 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 126–133. Springer, 2017. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-63390-9_7.
- 9 Jean-Christophe Filliâtre and Andrei Paskevich. Why3 - where programs meet provers. In Matthias Felleisen and Philippa Gardner, editors, *Programming Languages and Systems - 22nd European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2013, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2013, Rome, Italy, March 16–24, 2013. Proceedings*, volume 7792 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 125–128. Springer, 2013. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-37036-6_8.
- 10 Ronghui Gu, Zhong Shao, Hao Chen, Xiongnan (Newman) Wu, Jieung Kim, Vilhelm Sjöberg, and David Costanzo. CertiKOS: An extensible architecture for building certified concurrent os kernels. In Kimberly Keeton and Timothy Roscoe, editors, *12th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, OSDI 2016, Savannah, GA, USA, November 2–4, 2016*, pages 653–669. USENIX Association, 2016. URL: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi16/technical-sessions/presentation/gu>.
- 11 Gerwin Klein, June Andronick, Kevin Elphinstone, Toby C. Murray, Thomas Sewell, Rafal Kolanski, and Gernot Heiser. Comprehensive formal verification of an OS microkernel. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.*, 32(1):2:1–2:70, 2014. doi:10.1145/2560537.
- 12 Igor Konnov, Jure Kukovec, and Thanh-Hai Tran. TLA+ model checking made symbolic. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 3(OOPSLA):123:1–123:30, 2019. doi:10.1145/3360549.
- 13 K. Rustan M. Leino. Dafny: An automatic program verifier for functional correctness. In Edmund M. Clarke and Andrei Voronkov, editors, *Logic for Programming, Artificial Intelligence, and Reasoning - 16th International Conference, LPAR-16, Dakar, Senegal, April 25–May 1, 2010, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 6355 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 348–370. Springer, 2010. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-17511-4_20.
- 14 K. Rustan M. Leino and Clément Pit-Claudel. Trigger selection strategies to stabilize program verifiers. In Swarat Chaudhuri and Azadeh Farzan, editors, *Computer Aided Verification - 28th International Conference, CAV 2016, Toronto, ON, Canada, July 17–23, 2016, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 9779 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 361–381. Springer, 2016. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-41528-4_20.
- 15 Christof Löding, P. Madhusudan, and Lucas Peña. Foundations for natural proofs and quantifier instantiation. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 2(POPL):10:1–10:30, 2018. doi:10.1145/3158098.
- 16 Micrium. The real-time kernel: $\mu\text{c}/\text{os-ii}$. <https://micrium.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/osiidoc/overview>. Accessed: 2024/3/17.
- 17 Luke Nelson, James Bornholt, Ronghui Gu, Andrew Baumann, Emina Torlak, and Xi Wang. Scaling symbolic evaluation for automated verification of systems code with serval. In Tim Brecht and Carey Williamson, editors, *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, SOSP 2019, Huntsville, ON, Canada, October 27–30, 2019*, pages 225–242. ACM, 2019. doi:10.1145/3341301.3359641.

- 18 Luke Nelson, Helgi Sigurbjarnarson, Kaiyuan Zhang, Dylan Johnson, James Bornholt, Emina Torlak, and Xi Wang. Hyperkernel: Push-button verification of an OS kernel. In *Proceedings of the 26th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, Shanghai, China, October 28-31, 2017*, pages 252–269. ACM, 2017. doi:10.1145/3132747.3132748.
- 19 Oded Padon, Kenneth L. McMillan, Aurojit Panda, Mooly Sagiv, and Sharon Shoham. Ivy: safety verification by interactive generalization. In Chandra Krintz and Emery D. Berger, editors, *Proceedings of the 37th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2016, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, June 13-17, 2016*, pages 614–630. ACM, 2016. doi:10.1145/2908080.2908118.
- 20 Zoe Paraskevopoulou, Catalin Hritcu, Maxime Dénès, Leonidas Lampropoulos, and Benjamin C. Pierce. Foundational property-based testing. In Christian Urban and Xingyuan Zhang, editors, *Interactive Theorem Proving - 6th International Conference, ITP 2015, Nanjing, China, August 24-27, 2015, Proceedings*, volume 9236 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 325–343. Springer, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-22102-1_22.
- 21 Andrew Reynolds and Jasmin Christian Blanchette. A decision procedure for (co)datatypes in SMT solvers. *J. Autom. Reason.*, 58(3):341–362, 2017. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10817-016-9372-6>, doi:10.1007/S10817-016-9372-6.
- 22 Hans-Jörg Schurr, Mathias Fleury, and Martin Desharnais. Reliable reconstruction of fine-grained proofs in a proof assistant. In André Platzer and Geoff Sutcliffe, editors, *Automated Deduction - CADE 28 - 28th International Conference on Automated Deduction, Virtual Event, July 12-15, 2021, Proceedings*, volume 12699 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 450–467. Springer, 2021. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-79876-5_26.
- 23 Marcelo Taube, Giuliano Losa, Kenneth L. McMillan, Oded Padon, Mooly Sagiv, Sharon Shoham, James R. Wilcox, and Doug Woos. Modularity for decidability of deductive verification with applications to distributed systems. In Jeffrey S. Foster and Dan Grossman, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2018, Philadelphia, PA, USA, June 18-22, 2018*, pages 662–677. ACM, 2018. doi:10.1145/3192366.3192414.
- 24 Markus Wenzel. *Isabelle, Isar - a versatile environment for human readable formal proof documents*. PhD thesis, Technical University Munich, Germany, 2002. URL: <http://tumb1.biblio.tu-muenchen.de/publ/diss/in/2002/wenzel.pdf>.
- 25 Fengwei Xu, Ming Fu, Xinyu Feng, Xiaoran Zhang, Hui Zhang, and Zhaohui Li. A practical verification framework for preemptive OS kernels. In Swarat Chaudhuri and Azadeh Farzan, editors, *Computer Aided Verification - 28th International Conference, CAV 2016, Toronto, ON, Canada, July 17-23, 2016, Proceedings, Part II*, volume 9780 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 59–79. Springer, 2016. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-41540-6_4.
- 26 Litao Zhou, Jianxing Qin, Qinshi Wang, Andrew W. Appel, and Qinxiang Cao. VST-A: A foundationally sound annotation verifier. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 8(POPL):2069–2098, 2024. doi:10.1145/3632911.