

# HHLPar: Automated Theorem Prover for Parallel Hybrid Communicating Sequential Processes

Xiangyu Jin<sup>1,2</sup>, Bohua Zhan<sup>3</sup>, Shuling Wang<sup>4</sup>, and Naijun Zhan<sup>5,1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Key Laboratory of System Software and State Key Lab. of Computer Science, ISCAS

<sup>2</sup> University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

<sup>3</sup> Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd.

<sup>4</sup> National Key Laboratory of Space Integrated Information System, ISCAS

<sup>5</sup> School of Computer Science, Peking University

**Abstract.** We present a tool called HHLPar for verifying hybrid systems modelled in Hybrid Communicating Sequential Processes (HCSP). HHLPar is built upon a Hybrid Hoare Logic for HCSP, which is able to reason about continuous-time properties of differential equations, as well as communication and parallel composition of parallel HCSP processes with the help of parameterised trace assertions and their synchronization. The logic was formalised and proved to be sound in Isabelle/HOL, which constitutes a trustworthy foundation for the verification conducted by HHLPar. HHLPar implements the Hybrid Hoare Logic in Python and supports automated verification: On one hand, it provides functions for symbolically decomposing HCSP processes, generating specifications for separate sequential processes and then composing them via synchronization to obtain the final specification for the whole parallel HCSP processes; On the other hand, it is integrated with external solvers for handling differential equations and real arithmetic properties. We have conducted experiments on a simplified cruise control system to validate the performance of the tool.

**Keywords:** Hybrid System · Hybrid Hoare Logic · Automated Theorem Proving.

## 1 Introduction

Hybrid systems involve complex interactions of continuous-time evolving physical processes and discrete control. In networked applications such as cyber-physical systems, communications and parallel composition are fundamental elements to realise the interactions among different components. Hybrid and cyber-physical systems arise in many safety-critical areas including aviation, spacecrafts, high-speed trains and so on, and it is a very challenging task to guarantee the safety of such systems due to their complexity. Formal verification has been recognized in both academic community and industry as an important approach to guarantee correctness of the behavior of hybrid systems. Especially, a verification tool that is sound to produce trustworthy results and meanwhile supports automation of the verification process will be very helpful to the design of safety-critical systems in reality.

There are two mainstream verification techniques of hybrid systems: model checking, which verifies a system model (usually in the form of hybrid automata [1]) automatically on exhaustively computing and checking all reachable system states, and thus

faces the intrinsic difficulty caused by infinite state domains and the increasing complexity for hybrid systems; and deductive theorem proving, which conducts verification via logical reasoning by induction on system models. A prerequisite for deductive verification is to have a compositional modelling language for hybrid and cyber-physical systems and meanwhile a specification logic for reasoning about the formal models such that the verification of a complex system can be reduced to the verification of decomposed components of the system. Differential dynamic logic ( $d\mathcal{L}$ ) [13,14,2,16] is a first-order dynamic logic for specifying and verifying hybrid systems modelled as hybrid programs, a sequential program notation for encoding hybrid automata. KeYmaera [17] is a hybrid theorem prover that is implemented based on  $d\mathcal{L}$ , which supports automatic proof search of rules of  $d\mathcal{L}$  and an integration of computer algebra tools for solving differential equations and real arithmetic formulas. The successor KeYmaera X [6] improves in obtaining more automation of proofs and better soundness guarantees through a small trusted prover kernel.

In this paper, we propose an automated theorem prover, called HHLPar, for specifying and verifying hybrid systems modelled in hybrid CSP (HCSP) [8,29,22,7]. HCSP is an extension of Hoare’s CSP [9] with ordinary differential equations (ODEs) to model continuous behavior. It makes the full use of communication and parallel composition of CSP notation to realise the flexible interactions between continuous physical processes and discrete control. The specification and verification of HCSP have been studied by extending the traditional Hoare logic to handle continuous-time properties, using duration calculus [28,27,11] or first-order trace-based theories [26]. Both of the approaches have been implemented in Isabelle/HOL [12] for tool support but via interactive theorem proving [23,26], which brings a proof burden to users. HHLPy [20,21], an automated verification tool, is implemented in Python for specifying and verifying HCSP processes. It is integrated with external SMT solvers such as Z3 [3] and Wolfram Engine [24] for proving properties of ODEs, however, it is restricted to the sequential subset of HCSP without support for communications and parallel composition.

Compared to the previous works, HHLPar supports more features of hybrid and cyber-physical systems. It is built on a trace-based Hybrid Hoare Logic composed of a set of proof rules for specifying both discrete and continuous properties of HCSP and a set of trace synchronization rules for handling communication and parallel composition of parallel processes. It achieves soundness as the whole logic has been proved to be sound in Isabelle/HOL. Furthermore, it supports automated theorem proving by symbolically decomposing and executing HCSP models according to the proof rules of the logic, and meanwhile, inherits HHLPy in the integration of Wolfram Engine to handle differential equations and address real arithmetic properties.

In this paper, we will first give an overview of HCSP (Section 3), and then present the trace-based Hybrid Hoare Logic, including the assertions (Section 4), proof rules for sequential HCSP and assertion synchronization rules for parallel HCSP (Section 5). Based on this logic, we implemented the verification tool using Python and JavaScript and evaluated it on a case study (Section 6). The code including the formalization and proof of the logic in Isabelle/HOL [10], the python implementation files and the case study of HHLPar can be found at <https://github.com/AgHHL/gHHL2024.git>.

## 2 Related Work

Model checking tools of hybrid systems endeavor to compute reachable states of continuous dynamics efficiently in an algorithmic approach, by achieving high scalability while maintaining high accuracy, e.g. the representative PHAVer [4] for linear hybrid automata, HSolver [19] and SpaceEx [5] for both linear and non-linear dynamics. Deduction verification tools are developed upon program logics and conduct proofs via theorem proving. KeYmaera [17] and its successor KeYmaera X [6] are automated and interactive theorem provers built upon differential dynamic logic ( $d\mathcal{L}$ ) [13,14,16], which proposes a complete set of rules [15,18] for reasoning about continuous dynamics such as differential invariants, differential weakening, differential cut, and differential ghosts. Both the tools combine deductive reasoning of  $d\mathcal{L}$ , real algebraic and computer algebraic provers for automated verification. HHLPy [21] is a tool for deductive verification of hybrid programs written in the sequential fragment of HCSP, focusing on the verification of continuous dynamics with the assistance of differential rules adapted from  $d\mathcal{L}$  [14]. Compared to these work, HHLPar extends HHLPy to handle the parallel fragment of HCSP, including communication, parallel composition, interrupt, which are very fundamental elements for hybrid and cyber-physical systems. It inherits from HHLPy the integration of external solvers for addressing real arithmetic and ODEs, but moreover, realises the automated deductive verification of communication and parallel composition of processes based on trace-based assertions and their synchronization.

## 3 An Overview of HCSP

**Syntax of HCSP** Hybrid Communicating Sequential Processes (HCSP) extends CSP as a formal language tailored for delineating Hybrid Systems (HSs). It introduces Ordinary Differential Equations (ODEs) to model continuous evolution and interrupts. Within this definition, communication serves as the sole means for data exchange among processes. Notably, shared variables between different processes in parallel are disallowed.

The syntax for HCSP is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} c & ::= \text{skip} \mid x := e \mid ch?x \mid ch!e \mid c_1 \sqcup c_2 \mid c_1; c_2 \mid c^* \mid \text{if } B \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2 \mid \\ & \quad \langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \rangle \mid \text{wait } e \mid \langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \times c \rangle \triangleright \parallel_{i \in L} (ch_i^* \rightarrow c_i) \\ pc & ::= c \mid pc_1 \parallel_{cs} pc_2 \end{aligned}$$

where  $c$  and  $c_i$  represent sequential processes, and  $pc$  and  $pc_i$  represent parallel processes.  $\dot{x}$  stands for the derivative of  $x$  w.r.t. time,  $\vec{x}$  (resp.  $\vec{e}$ ) is a vector of variables (expressions).  $ch$  is a channel name,  $ch_i^*$  is either an input event  $ch_i?x$  or output event  $ch_i!e$ , and  $L$  is a non-empty set of indices;  $B$  and  $e$  are Boolean and arithmetic expressions, respectively;  $cs$  is a set of channel names.

Input  $ch?x$  receives a value along channel  $ch$  and assigns it to variable  $x$ ; output  $ch!e$  sends the value of  $e$  along  $ch$ . Either of them may block waiting for the corresponding dual party to be ready. Continuous evolution  $\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \rangle$  evolves continuously according to the ODE  $\dot{\vec{x}} = \vec{e}$  as long as the *domain*  $B$  holds, and terminates whenever  $B$  becomes false. Wait statement  $\text{wait } e$  keeps static for a period of time calculated by  $e$ . Communication interruption  $\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \times c \rangle \triangleright \parallel_{i \in L} (ch_i^* \rightarrow c_i)$  evolves according

to the ODE  $\vec{x} = \vec{e}$ , as long as it is preempted by one of the communication events  $ch_i^*$ , followed by the corresponding  $c_i$ ; or goes beyond the domain  $B$  and executes  $c$ , thus when  $B$  is *true*,  $c$  will never be executed.  $pc_1 \parallel_{cs} pc_2$  behaves as  $pc_1$  and  $pc_2$  run independently except that all communications along the set of common channels  $cs$  between  $pc_1$  and  $pc_2$  are synchronized. The meaning of other statements such as assignment, internal choice, sequential composition, and so on are as usual.

**Events and Traces** Events and trajectories are used to describe the behavior of HCSP processes. Each event describes an observable step in the behavior of a process. There are two types of events: discrete event and continuous event.

- Discrete event is of the form  $\langle ch \triangleright, v \rangle$ , where  $\triangleright$  is  $?$  or  $!$ , indicating input and output, and  $v$  is a real value transmitted during the communication.
- Continuous event is of the form  $\langle d, p, rdy \rangle$ . Here  $d$  is a positive value specifies the length of this event,  $p$  is a continuous function from  $[0, d]$  to states, describing the evolution of states over time, where a state is a map from variables to real values, and  $rdy$  is the set of channels that are waiting for communication in this duration.

A trace  $tr$  is an ordered sequence of events as the result of executing a (sequential or parallel) HCSP process, which can be an empty trace  $\epsilon$ , or the concatenation  $tr_1 \widehat{\ } tr_2$  of two traces  $tr_1$  and  $tr_2$  recursively.

**Trace Synchronization** Given two traces  $tr_1, tr_2$  and a set of shared channels  $cs$ , a relation is defined to synchronize  $tr_1$  and  $tr_2$  over  $cs$  and results in a trace  $tr$ , denoted by  $tr_1 \parallel_{cs} tr_2 \Downarrow tr$ . The derivation rules are given in Appendix A.1. They define the time and value synchronization of traces of parallel processes.

**Big-step Semantics** The full big-step semantics for HCSP is shown in Appendix A.2. The semantic of a process  $c$  is defined as a set of transition rules, denoted by  $(c, s) \Rightarrow (s', tr)$ , which means that  $c$  carries initial state  $s$  to final state  $s'$  with resulting trace  $tr$ .

## 4 Assertions

In this section, we introduce the assertions for defining hybrid Hoare Logic. It establishes the basis for the automatic processing of inference rules given in next section.

### 4.1 Path Assertions

A path assertion is a predicate on time and state. A parameterized path assertion is a predicate on starting state, time and state. We use  $(s_0, t, s) \models I$  to express that for starting state  $s_0$ , time  $t$  and state  $s$  satisfy path assertion  $I$  in a duration of evolution.

The simplest path assertion is  $id\_inv$ , defined by  $(s_0, t, s) \models id\_inv \triangleq (s = s_0)$ . It describes a path where the state at any time equals the starting state. The path assertion  $I_1 ::= (s = s_0[x \mapsto x + t])$  means the state at any time  $t$  equals the starting state with the value of variable  $x$  incremented by  $t$ . It describes the solution to the ODE  $\langle \dot{x} = 1 \rangle$ . We have  $(s_0, t, s) \models I_1$  iff  $s(x) = s_0(x) + t$  and  $s(y) = s_0(y)$  for any variable  $y \neq x$ . In

this way, path assertions can be used to describe explicit solutions to ODEs. If the ODE cannot be solved explicitly, but we can find a differential invariant for the ODE, such an invariant can be expressed in the path assertion as well. In this case,  $I = \text{inv}(s, s_0)$ , where  $\text{inv}$  is the differential invariant that always holds for the evolution of the ODE.

## 4.2 Parameterized Assertions

In hybrid Hoare triples, assertions over state and trace are used as predicates in pre- and postconditions. Based on this, we introduce a new type named parameterized assertions that take an additional state as argument. Formally, we use  $(s, tr) \models P$  to denote state  $s$  and trace  $tr$  satisfying an assertion  $P$ , and we use the notation  $(s_0, s, tr) \models P'$  for a parameterized assertion  $P'$ .

There are some simple assertions and common operations on assertions:

$$\begin{aligned} (s_0, s, tr) \models \text{true} &\longleftrightarrow \text{true} & (s_0, s, tr) \models \text{false} &\longleftrightarrow \text{false} \\ (s_0, s, tr) \models P \bullet Q &\longleftrightarrow (s_0, s, tr) \models P \bullet (s_0, s, tr) \models Q & \bullet \in \{\wedge, \vee\} \end{aligned}$$

$\text{true}$  and  $\text{false}$  respectively represent assertions satisfying every triple and not satisfying any triple, and parameterized assertions also support disjunction and conjunction. We can lift the boolean expression on starting state as a boolean assertion:

$$(s_0, s, tr) \models \uparrow b \longleftrightarrow b(s_0)$$

We typically prefer boolean assertions to appear in the form of  $\uparrow b \wedge P$  with some assertion  $P$ , rather than appearing alone. For the change regarding the starting state, we define the corresponding substitution assertion for a variable (the case for a vector of variables can be defined similarly):

$$(s_0, s, tr) \models P[x := e] \longleftrightarrow (s_0[x \mapsto e], s, tr) \models P$$

Next, we'll introduce a series of assertions describing modifications to traces. The simplest init assertion means the state equals starting state and the trace is empty:

$$(s_0, s, tr) \models \text{init} \longleftrightarrow s_0 = s \wedge tr = \epsilon$$

Assertion for input has the form  $\text{wait\_in}(I, ch, P)$ , where  $I$  is a path assertion,  $ch$  is a channel name, and  $P$  is a parameterized assertion over delay  $d$  and input value  $v$ .

$$\frac{(s_0, s, tr) \models P(0, v)}{(s_0, s, \langle ch?, v \rangle \wedge tr) \models \text{wait\_in}(I, ch, P)} \\ \frac{0 < d \quad (s_0, s, tr) \models P(d, v) \quad \forall t \in \{0..d\}. (s_0, t, p(t)) \models I}{(s_0, s, \langle d, p, \{ch?\} \rangle \wedge \langle ch?, v \rangle \wedge tr) \models \text{wait\_in}(I, ch, P)}$$

The first rule corresponds to communicating immediately, so the delay given to  $P$  is 0. The second case corresponds to communicating after waiting for time  $d > 0$ , so the delay given to  $P$  is  $d$ . The path taken by the state during waiting is given by  $p$ , which satisfies the path assertion  $I$  (for the input command, the path is constant, we write the more general form to prepare for the interrupt case later).

Similarly, we define the assertion for output, with the form  $\text{wait\_outv}(I, ch, e, P)$ , defined by the following two rules.

$$\frac{(s_0, s, tr) \models P(0)}{(s_0, s, \langle ch!, e(s_0) \rangle \wedge tr) \models \text{wait\_outv}(I, ch, e, P)} \\ \frac{0 < d \quad (s_0, s, tr) \models P(d) \quad \forall t \in [0, d]. (s_0, t, p(t)) \models I}{(s_0, s, \langle d, p, \{ch!\} \rangle \wedge \langle ch!, e(s_0) \rangle \wedge tr) \models \text{wait\_outv}(I, ch, e, P)}$$

It's worth noting that different from input, the output value is determined by  $e$  and  $P$  is a parameterized assertion only over delay  $d$ .

The assertion for wait has the form  $\text{wait}(I, e, P)$ , where  $e$  is an expression specifying the delay in terms of starting state.  $P$  is parameterized over delay  $d$ .

$$\frac{e(s_0) > 0 \quad (s_0, s, tr) \models P(e(s_0)) \quad \forall t \in [0, e(s_0)]. (s_0, t, p(t)) \models I}{(s_0, s, \langle e(s_0), p, \emptyset \rangle \wedge tr) \models \text{wait}(I, e, P)}$$

$$\frac{e(s_0) \leq 0 \quad (s_0, s, tr) \models P(0)}{(s_0, s, tr) \models \text{wait}(I, e, P)}$$

We are ready to introduce interrupt assertions in the form  $\text{interrupt}(I, e, P, cm)$ , composed of the following six rules: evolving for  $e$  or zero time units (the first two); interrupted by an input or an output immediately or after  $d$  time's waiting (the last four).

$$\frac{e(s_0) > 0 \quad (s_0, s, tr) \models P(e(s_0)) \quad \forall t \in [0, e(s_0)]. (s_0, t, p(t)) \models I}{(s_0, s, \langle e(s_0), p, \text{rdy}(cm) \rangle \wedge tr) \models \text{interrupt}(I, e, P, cm)}$$

$$\frac{e(s_0) \leq 0 \quad (s_0, s, tr) \models P(0)}{(s_0, s, tr) \models \text{interrupt}(I, e, P, cm)}$$

$$\frac{cm[i] = \langle ch?, Q \rangle \quad (s_0, s, tr) \models Q(0, v)}{(s_0, s, \langle ch?, v \rangle \wedge tr) \models \text{interrupt}(I, e, P, cm)}$$

$$\frac{cm[i] = \langle ch?, Q \rangle \quad 0 < d \leq e(s_0) \quad (s_0, s, tr) \models Q(d, v) \quad \forall t \in [0, d]. (s_0, t, p(t)) \models I}{(s_0, s, \langle d, p, \text{rdy}(cm) \rangle \wedge \langle ch?, v \rangle \wedge tr) \models \text{interrupt}(I, e, P, cm)}$$

$$\frac{cm[i] = \langle ch!, f, Q' \rangle \quad (s_0, s, tr) \models Q'(0)}{(s_0, s, \langle ch!, f(0, s_0) \rangle \wedge tr) \models \text{interrupt}(I, e, P, cm)}$$

$$\frac{cm[i] = \langle ch!, f, Q' \rangle \quad 0 < d \leq e(s_0) \quad (s_0, s, tr) \models Q'(d) \quad \forall t \in [0, d]. (s_0, t, p(t)) \models I}{(s_0, s, \langle d, p, \text{rdy}(cm) \rangle \wedge \langle ch!, f(d, s_0) \rangle \wedge tr) \models \text{interrupt}(I, e, P, cm)}$$

Here  $e$  specifies the *maximum* waiting time of the interrupt,  $P$  specifies the remaining behavior if the waiting stops upon reaching the time computed by  $e$ ,  $cm$  specifies the list of communications that can happen at any time not exceeding  $e(s_0)$ .  $cm$  is given by a list of elements like  $\langle ch?, Q \rangle$  or  $\langle ch!, f, Q' \rangle$ , which specifies what happens after the corresponding interrupt is triggered, where  $Q$  is an assertion parameterized by the delay and communicated value,  $f$  is a function mapping from delay to the output value and  $Q'$  is an assertion parameterized only by delay.  $\text{rdy}(cm)$  denotes the ready set corresponding to  $cm$ .

There is an important special case deserve consideration: often we know the maximum waiting time is infinite, for example when the domain of the ODE is always true, if communication does not occur, the system will not execute the next command.

$$\frac{cm[i] = \langle ch?, Q \rangle \quad (s_0, s, tr) \models Q(0, v)}{(s_0, s, \langle ch?, v \rangle \wedge tr) \models \text{interrupt}_\infty(I, cm)}$$

$$\frac{cm[i] = \langle ch?, Q \rangle \quad 0 < d \quad (s_0, s, tr) \models Q(d, v) \quad \forall t \in [0, d]. (s_0, t, p(t)) \models I}{(s_0, s, \langle d, p, \text{rdy}(cm) \rangle \wedge \langle ch?, v \rangle \wedge tr) \models \text{interrupt}_\infty(I, cm)}$$

$$\frac{cm[i] = \langle ch!, f, Q' \rangle \quad (s_0, s, tr) \models Q'(0)}{(s_0, s, \langle ch!, f(0, s_0) \rangle \wedge tr) \models \text{interrupt}_\infty(I, cm)}$$

$$\frac{cm[i] = \langle ch!, f, Q' \rangle \quad 0 < d \quad (s_0, s, tr) \models Q'(d) \quad \forall t \in [0, d]. (s_0, t, p(t)) \models I}{(s_0, s, \langle d, p, \text{rdy}(cm) \rangle \wedge \langle ch!, f(d, s_0) \rangle \wedge tr) \models \text{interrupt}_\infty(I, cm)}$$

Thus we obtain the definition of  $\text{interrupt}_\infty(I, cm)$  from above four rules.

The assertions  $\text{wait\_in}$ ,  $\text{wait\_out}$  and  $\text{wait}$  are all special cases of  $\text{interrupt}$  or  $\text{interrupt}_\infty$ . The exact equations are as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\text{interrupt}_\infty(I, [(ch?, P)]) &= \text{wait\_in}(I, ch, P) \\ \text{interrupt}_\infty(I, [(ch!, \{d \Rightarrow e\}, P)]) &= \text{wait\_outv}(I, ch, e, P) \\ \text{interrupt}(I, e, P, []) &= \text{wait}(I, e, P)\end{aligned}$$

The last assertion we introduce is Recursion assertion in the form  $\text{Rec } R. P \vee F(R)$ , where  $F$  is a function from parameterized assertions to parameterized assertions which is constructed by the above assertion operators such as substitution,  $\text{wait}$ ,  $\text{wait\_in}$ ,  $\text{wait\_outv}$ ,  $\text{interrupt}$  and  $\text{interrupt}_\infty$ , and the logic compositions such as disjunction and conjunction.

$$\frac{(s_0, s, tr) \models P}{(s_0, s, tr) \models \text{Rec } R. P \vee F(R)} \quad \frac{\exists n > 0. (s_0, s, tr) \models F^n(P)}{(s_0, s, tr) \models \text{Rec } R. P \vee F(R)}$$

### 4.3 Entailment Properties

Given two assertions  $P$  and  $Q$  on state and trace (that is, without starting state), we define the entailment between  $P$  and  $Q$  as follows:

$$P \Longrightarrow Q \triangleq \forall s \text{ tr}. (s, tr) \models P \longrightarrow (s, tr) \models Q$$

Obviously, this entailment relationship satisfies the transitivity and reflexivity. There are some common entailment rules, for example introduction and elimination rules for conjunction or disjunction. Some special notes of entailment related to monotonicity and substitution of parameterized assertions are stated in the following.

The assertions  $\text{wait\_in}$ ,  $\text{wait\_outv}$ ,  $\text{wait}$ , etc. all satisfy monotonicity rules, that reduce entailment relations among similar assertions to entailments on its components. For example, monotonicity of  $\text{wait\_in}$  take the following form:

$$\frac{\forall d v. P_1(d, v)(s_0) \Longrightarrow P_2(d, v)(s_0)}{\text{wait\_in}(I, ch, P_1)(s_0) \Longrightarrow \text{wait\_in}(I, ch, P_2)(s_0)}$$

This rule permits deducing entailment between two  $\text{wait\_in}$  assertions that differ only in the ensuing assertion. There are similar rules for  $\text{wait\_outv}$ ,  $\text{wait}$ ,  $\text{interrupt}$  and  $\text{interrupt}_\infty$ . The monotonicity rule for substitution has the following form:

$$\frac{P_1(s_0[x \mapsto e]) \Longrightarrow P_2(s_0[x \mapsto e])}{P_1[x := e](s_0) \Longrightarrow P_2[x := e](s_0)}$$

This rule means in order to show an entailment between substitution  $[x := e]$  on assertions  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , it suffices to show an entailment between  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . Through these monotonicities, we can prove that the assertion  $\text{Rec } R. P \vee F(R)$  we defined is the least fixed point based on the relationship of entailment which satisfies  $P \vee F(Q) \iff Q$ .

Performing substitution  $[x := e]$  on an assertion such as  $\text{wait\_in}$  can be reduced to performing the same assertion on its components. This can also be interpreted as performing the syntactical substitution on the expression for the assertion. For example, the entailment rule for  $\text{wait\_in}$  is:

$$\text{wait\_in}(I, ch, P)[x := e](s_0) \Longrightarrow \text{wait\_in}(I[x := e], ch, P[x := e])(s_0)$$

Note the substitution on  $I$  performs the replacement on the variables corresponding to the initial state  $s_0$ , same as the substitution on  $P$ .

## 5 Specification and Verification

We present hybrid Hoare Logic on parameterized assertions, including the specifications, the inference rules for reasoning about both sequential and parallel processes, and the complete proof procedure according to this logic.

### 5.1 Specification

In previous work on hybrid Hoare Logic [26], the specification of a given process  $c$  takes the form of Hoare triple  $\{P\} c \{Q\}$ , where  $P$  and  $Q$  are assertions on state and trace. The validity of this triple is defined in terms of big-step semantics as follows:

$$\models \{P\} c \{Q\} \triangleq \forall s_1 s_2 tr tr'. (s_1, tr) \models P \longrightarrow (c, s_1) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr') \longrightarrow (s_2, tr \hat{\ } tr') \models Q$$

In this paper, we utilize a new method of specification definition based on Hoare triples with parameterised assertions named `spec_of`:

$$\text{spec\_of}(p, c, R) \triangleq \forall s_0. p(s_0) \longrightarrow \models \{s = s_0 \wedge tr = \epsilon\} c \{R(s_0)\}$$

We usually abbreviate the `spec_of`( $p, c, R$ ) as `spec_of`( $c, R$ ) if  $p$  is true. This specification means that if this process starts with a state  $s_0$  which satisfies the initial condition  $p$ , then when the process terminates, the end state and the trace produced should meet the assertion  $R(s_0)$ . We have the following consequence rule:

$$\frac{\text{spec\_of}(c, R_1) \quad \forall s_0. p(s_0) \longrightarrow R_1(s_0) \Longrightarrow R_2(s_0)}{\text{spec\_of}(p, c, R_2)}$$

### 5.2 Proof Procedure

Before presenting the inference rules, we explain the proof procedure for a given HCSP process with respect to the specification. The process can be either sequential or parallel. In order to deal with parallel processes, we define the parameterized assertion `sync`( $chs, P, Q$ ) denoting the synchronization if given two parameterized assertions  $P$  and  $Q$  for two processes and the set of channels  $chs$  through which communication can occur between them:

$$\frac{(s_{11}, s_{21}, tr_1) \models P \quad (s_{12}, s_{22}, tr_2) \models Q \quad tr_1 \parallel_{chs} tr_2 \Downarrow tr}{(s_{11} \uplus s_{12}, s_{21} \uplus s_{22}, tr) \models \text{sync}(chs, P, Q)}$$

By the above definition of `sync` assertion and specification, we can easily obtain the following conclusion describing the specification of a parallel process:

$$\frac{\text{spec\_of}(c_1, P) \quad \text{spec\_of}(c_2, Q)}{\text{spec\_of}(c_1 \parallel_{chs} c_2, \text{sync}(chs, P, Q))}$$

However, we cannot intuitively derive properties from the `sync` assertion of two components directly from the above definition. Thus, our goal is to find an assertion  $R$  that can be constructed from the ways introduced in Section 4 to replace `sync`( $chs, P, Q$ ) which describes whole behaviour of parallel process. We conclude this procedure as:

$$\frac{\forall s_0. p(s_0) \longrightarrow p_1^\uparrow(s_0) \quad \forall s_0. p(s_0) \longrightarrow p_2^\uparrow(s_0)}{\text{spec\_of}(p_1, c_1, P) \quad \text{spec\_of}(p_2, c_2, Q) \quad \forall s_0. p(s_0) \longrightarrow \text{sync}(chs, P, Q)(s_0) \Longrightarrow R(s_0)}{\text{spec\_of}(p, c_1 \parallel_{chs} c_2, R(s_0))}$$

If  $c_1$  or  $c_2$  is still a parallel process, we reuse this lemma. Otherwise, we apply sequential rules to generate  $P$  and  $Q$ . For last condition, we apply synchronization rules to get  $R$ . Both types of rules are presented next and all rules shown are proved in Isabelle/HOL. Then, from  $R$  we can analyze the properties of this process by other external means.



### 5.3 Sequential Rules

For each sequential HCSP command in single process, there are two forms of inference rules: one for the command alone, and one for the case where the command is followed by a subsequent program  $c$ . Actually, the former ones can be obtained by replacing  $c$  with skip and applying the skip rule, thus we put them in Appendix B as a complement.

For skip, assignment, input, output, wait and if commands, we have following rules:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\text{spec\_of}(\text{skip}, \text{init})} \quad \frac{\text{spec\_of}(c, Q)}{\text{spec\_of}(\text{skip}; c, Q)} \quad \frac{\text{spec\_of}(c, Q)}{\text{spec\_of}(x := e; c, Q[x := e])} \\
\frac{\text{spec\_of}(c_1; c, P) \quad \text{spec\_of}(c_2; c, Q)}{\text{spec\_of}(\text{if } B \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2; c, (\uparrow(B) \wedge P) \vee (\uparrow(\neg B) \wedge Q))} \\
\frac{\text{spec\_of}(ch?x; c, \text{wait\_in}(\text{id\_inv}, ch, \{(d, v) \Rightarrow Q[x := v]\}))}{\text{spec\_of}(c, Q)} \\
\frac{\text{spec\_of}(ch!e; c, \text{wait\_outv}(\text{id\_inv}, ch, e, \{d \Rightarrow Q\}))}{\text{spec\_of}(c, Q)} \\
\frac{}{\text{spec\_of}(\text{wait } e; c, \text{wait}(\text{id\_inv}, e, \{d \Rightarrow Q\}))}
\end{array}$$

We now state the rules for evolution along ODE and interrupt commands. These rules assume that a (unique) solution to the ODE is known. First, we summarize the concept of a parameterized solution to the ODE with open boundary. The predicate  $\text{paramODEsol}(\vec{x} = \vec{e}, B, \vec{p}, e)$  is introduced:  $\vec{x} = \vec{e}$  is an equation between variables and their derivative expressions;  $B$  is a predicate on the state, specifying the boundary condition;  $\vec{p}$  is the solution of  $\vec{x} = \vec{e}$  with initial state  $s_0$  at time  $t$ ;  $e$  maps the starting state to the length of time before the unique solution to the ODE reaches the boundary.

We can then state the inference rule for the continuous evolution as follows:

$$\frac{\text{paramODEsol}(\vec{x} = \vec{e}, B, \vec{p}, e) \quad \text{lipschitz}(\vec{x} = \vec{e}) \quad \text{spec\_of}(c, Q)}{\text{spec\_of}(\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \rangle; c, \text{wait}(s = s_0[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(s_0, t)], e, \{d \Rightarrow Q[\vec{x} := \vec{p}(s_0, d)]\}))}$$

The meaning of this rule is as follows. Suppose  $\vec{x} = \vec{e}$  with boundary condition  $B$  has parameterized solution  $\vec{p}$  with time given by  $e$  (both functions of  $s_0$ ) and the lipschitz predicate ensures that there is a unique solution to this ODE, then the specification of  $\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \rangle; c$  is first evolution along the path  $s = s_0[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(s_0, t)]$  for time  $d = e(s_0)$ , then obtains the updated starting state  $\vec{p}(s_0, d)$ , followed by the behavior of  $c$  as specified by  $Q$ .

The inference rule for interrupt can be seen as the combination of rules for ODE, input, and output. Given an interrupt command  $\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \times c' \rangle \triangleright \llbracket_{i \in L} (ch_i^* \rightarrow c_i) \rrbracket$ , where we use  $es$  to denote the list of communications in the form  $(ch?x \rightarrow c_i)$  or  $(ch!e \rightarrow c_i)$ , and  $\vec{p}$  is a parameterized solution to  $\vec{x} = \vec{e}$ , the assertion of the communication list is computed by  $\text{rel\_cm}(es, c, \vec{p})$ , if for each  $es[i] = (ch?y \rightarrow c_i)$ , we have  $\text{spec\_of}(c_i; c, Q_i)$  then

$$\text{rel\_cm}(es, c, \vec{p})[i] = \langle ch?, \{(d, v) \Rightarrow Q_i[y := v][\vec{x} := \vec{p}(s_0, d)]\} \rangle,$$

and for each  $es[i] = (ch!e \rightarrow c_i)$ , we have  $\text{spec\_of}(c_i; c, Q_i)$  then

$$\text{rel\_cm}(es, c, \vec{p})[i] = \langle ch!, \{d \Rightarrow e(p(s_0, d))\}, \{d \Rightarrow Q_i[\vec{x} := \vec{p}(s_0, d)]\} \rangle$$

Then the inference rule for interrupt is:

$$\frac{\text{paramODEsol}(\vec{x} = \vec{e}, B, \vec{p}, e) \quad \text{lipschitz}(\vec{x} = \vec{e}) \quad \text{spec\_of}(c'; c, P)}{\text{spec\_of}(\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \propto c' \rangle \triangleright \llbracket_{i \in L} (ch_i^* \rightarrow c_i); c, \text{interrupt}(s = s_0[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(s_0, t)], e, \{d \Rightarrow P[\vec{x} := \vec{p}(s_0, d)]\}, \text{rel\_cm}(es, c, \vec{p}))$$

The meaning of this rule is as follows: the specification of the interrupt is first evolution along the path  $s = s_0[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(s_0, t)]$ , and one of the following three situations occurs:

- If the evolution is interrupted by an input communication ( $ch?x \rightarrow c_i$ ) at time  $d$  and with value  $v$ , then update the state to  $s_0[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(s_0, d)][x \mapsto v]$ , followed by the behavior of  $c_i$ ;  $c$  as specified by  $Q_i$ .
- If the evolution is interrupted by an output communication ( $ch!e \rightarrow c_i$ ) at time  $d$  and with value  $v = e(s_0[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(s_0, d)])$ , and then update the state to  $s_0[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(s_0, d)]$ , followed by the behavior of  $c_i$ ;  $c$  as specified by  $Q_i$ .
- If no interrupt occurs before time  $d = e(s_0)$ , then update the state to  $s_0[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(s_0, d)]$ , followed by the behavior of  $c'$ ;  $c$  as specified by  $P$ .

The above assumes that the ODE with boundary condition has a solution of finite length for any starting state. Another important case is when the ODE has a solution of infinite length, in particular when the boundary condition is true. In this case, the appropriate assertion is  $\text{interrupt}_\infty$ . We first define predicate  $\text{paramODEsolInf}(\vec{x} = \vec{e}, p)$ , meaning that  $\vec{p}$  is the (infinite length) solution to  $\vec{x} = \vec{e}$ , then the corresponding Hoare triple is:

$$\frac{\text{paramODEsolInf}(\vec{x} = \vec{e}, \vec{p}) \quad \text{lipschitz}(\vec{x} = \vec{e})}{\text{spec\_of}(\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& \text{true} \propto c' \rangle \triangleright \llbracket_{i \in L} (ch_i^* \rightarrow c_i); c, \text{interrupt}_\infty(s = s_0[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(s_0, t)], \text{rel\_cm}(es, c, \vec{p}))$$

For the nondeterministic repetition command, we have the following rule:

$$\frac{\text{spec\_of}(c', P) \quad \forall d Q. \text{spec\_of}(d, Q) \longrightarrow \text{spec\_of}(c; d, F(Q))}{\text{spec\_of}(c^*; c', \text{Rec } R. P \vee F(R))$$

In this rule,  $P$  represents the assertion of proceeding directly to subsequent processes without executing the loop and  $F$  represents the change in assertion resulting from executing once loop which remains constant regardless of the subsequent processes and their assertions. This recursion assertion can be seen as the loop invariant of repetition.

#### 5.4 Synchronization Rules

We present the synchronization rules for reasoning about  $\text{sync}(P, Q)(s_0) \Longrightarrow R(s_0)$ , where some parts of  $P$  and/or  $Q$  are pulled out of sync on the right side  $R$  and  $s_0$  and  $s_1 \uplus s_2$  are different ways of describing a parallel state. By repeatedly using synchronization rules (as well as monotonicity rules and other entailments among assertions), we can gradually reduce an assertion headed by sync into one without sync assertions.

First, we introduce the rules involving the common operators of assertions.

$$\frac{\text{sync}(chs, \text{false}, P)(s_0) \Longrightarrow \text{false}(s_0)}{\text{false rule}}$$

if one side is false assertion, we obtain a result of false assertion.

$$\frac{\text{sync}(chs, P_1, Q)(s_0) \Longrightarrow R_1(s_0) \quad \text{sync}(chs, P_2, Q)(s_0) \Longrightarrow R_2(s_0)}{\text{sync}(chs, P_1 \vee P_2, Q)(s_0) \Longrightarrow (R_1 \vee R_2)(s_0)} \text{ disj rule}$$

if one side is a disjunction, we can eliminate this to its components.

$$\frac{b(s_1) \longrightarrow \text{sync}(chs, P, Q)(s_1 \uplus s_2) \Longrightarrow R(s_1 \uplus s_2)}{\text{sync}(chs, \uparrow b \wedge P, Q)(s_1 \uplus s_2) \Longrightarrow (\uparrow b^\uparrow \wedge R)(s_1 \uplus s_2)} \text{ bool rule}$$

where  $b^\uparrow(s_1 \uplus s_2) \longleftarrow b(s_1)$ , if one side is a conjunction with a boolean assertion  $b$ , we perform synchronization on the rest assertions under  $b$  and pull out  $b$  lifted on a parallel state as a new condition.

$$\frac{}{\text{sync}(chs, P[x := e], Q)(s_1 \uplus s_2) \Longrightarrow \text{sync}(chs, P, Q)[x|_{s_1} := e^\uparrow](s_1 \uplus s_2)} \text{ subst rule}$$

where  $e^\uparrow(s_1 \uplus s_2) = e(s_1)$ , if one side is a substitution assertion, the substitution can be pulled out after lifting. We will use  $b^\uparrow$  or  $e^\uparrow$  to represent the lifting of expressions  $b$  and  $e$  onto a parallel state.

Synchronization involving recursive assertions is typically very complex, often requiring inductive analysis tailored to specific cases. As such, here we only provide the rule for a specific scenario to facilitate automated implementation.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \forall Q. \text{sync}(chs, P_1, F_2(Q))(s_0) \Longrightarrow \text{false}(s_0) \\ \forall Q. \text{sync}(chs, F_1(Q), P_2)(s_0) \Longrightarrow \text{false}(s_0) \\ \text{sync}(chs, P_1, P_2)(s_0) \Longrightarrow P(s_0) \\ \forall Q_1 Q_2. \text{sync}(chs, F_1(Q_1), F_2(Q_2))(s_0) \Longrightarrow F(\text{sync}(chs, Q_1, Q_2))(s_0) \end{array}}{\text{sync}(chs, \text{Rec } R_1. P_1 \vee F_1(R_1), \text{Rec } R_2. P_2 \vee F_2(R_2))(s_0) \Longrightarrow \text{Rec } R. P \vee F(R)(s_0)} \text{ rec rule}$$

The first two conditions state that if one side loops while the other doesn't, synchronization results in false. The third condition specifies that when both sides don't loop, synchronization is achieved. The last condition states that if both sides loop, synchronization depends on their outermost loops finishing together. Meeting all four conditions results in a new recursive assertion. This requires consistent recursion counts and simultaneous start and end of each iteration for both sides.

In principle, since `wait_out`, `wait_in` and `wait` are all special cases of `interrupt`, it suffices to state the synchronization rule for `interrupt` only. While synchronizing two given `interrupt` assertions `interrupt(I1, e1, P1, cm1)` and `interrupt(I2, e2, P2, cm2)`, we need to determine whether there is a communication between two sides. The method of judgement is to check if there exists a channel name in the set  $chs$ , where its input is in the  $rdy$  set on one side and its output is in the  $rdy$  set on the other side. Define predicate `compat` to be the negation of this condition:

$$\text{compat}(rdy(cm_1), rdy(cm_2)) \triangleq \neg (\exists ch \in chs. (ch! \in rdy(cm_1) \wedge ch? \in rdy(cm_2)) \vee (ch? \in rdy(cm_1) \wedge ch! \in rdy(cm_2)))$$

In the case where this predicate holds true, both sides are waiting to be interrupted by external communication, thus its synchronization result should still be in the form of `interrupt` assertion, and its maximum waiting time is the smaller of  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ . While reaching the maximum waiting time, the shorter one will behave as the tail assertion and the longer one stays in an incomplete `interrupt` assertion which we denoted as `delay(d, interrupt(I, e, P, cm))`:

$$\text{delay}(d, \text{interrupt}(I, e, P, cm)) \triangleq \text{interrupt}(I[t := t + d], e - d, \{d' \Rightarrow P(d' + d)\}, \text{delay\_cm}(cm, d))$$

where for input  $cm[i] = \langle ch?, Q \rangle$  and output  $cm[i] = \langle ch!, f, Q \rangle$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{delay\_cm}(cm, d)[i] &= \langle ch?, \{(d', v) \Rightarrow Q(d' + d, v)\} \rangle \\ \text{delay\_cm}(cm, d)[i] &= \langle ch!, \{d' \Rightarrow f(d' + d)\}, \{d' \Rightarrow Q(d' + d)\} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

we can easily find that  $\text{delay}(0, \text{interrupt}(I, e, P, cm)) = \text{interrupt}(I, e, P, cm)$ . By performing synchronization on them, we get the new tail assertion. A potential external interruption from  $cm_1$  or  $cm_2$  that does not belong to the shared set  $chs$  may occur during the waiting. Then, one side will behave as the corresponding assertion recorded in  $cm_1$  or  $cm_2$ , the other side will remain its incomplete interrupt assertion. For this case, the synchronization produces the new communication list composed of two parts:

$$\text{rel1}(cm_1|_{chs^c}, \text{interrupt}(I_2, e_2, P_2, cm_2)) @ \text{rel2}(cm_2|_{chs^c}, \text{interrupt}(I_1, e_1, P_1, cm_1))$$

where  $cm_1|_{chs^c}$  and  $cm_2|_{chs^c}$  are lists of communications not in  $chs$  extracted from  $cm_1$  and  $cm_2$ . The list functions  $\text{rel1}$  and  $\text{rel2}$  are set as: if  $cm[i] = \langle ch?, Q \rangle$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rel1}(cm, P)[i] &= \langle ch?, \{(d, v) \Rightarrow \text{sync}(chs, Q(d, v), \text{delay}(d, P))\} \rangle \\ \text{rel2}(cm, P)[i] &= \langle ch?, \{(d, v) \Rightarrow \text{sync}(chs, \text{delay}(d, P), Q(d, v))\} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

if  $cm[i] = \langle ch!, f, Q \rangle$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rel1}(cm, P)[i] &= \langle ch!, \{d \Rightarrow f(d)^\uparrow\}, \{d \Rightarrow \text{sync}(chs, Q(d), \text{delay}(d, P))\} \rangle \\ \text{rel2}(cm, P)[i] &= \langle ch!, \{d \Rightarrow f(d)^\uparrow\}, \{d \Rightarrow \text{sync}(chs, \text{delay}(d, P), Q(d))\} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

So far we can obtain the following rules:

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{e1(s_1) < e2(s_2) \wedge e2(s_2) > 0 \quad \text{compat}(rdy(cm_1), rdy(cm_2))}{\text{sync}(chs, \text{interrupt}(I_1, e_1, P_1, cm_1), \text{interrupt}(I_2, e_2, P_2, cm_2))(s_1 \uplus s_2) \Longrightarrow \\ \text{interrupt}(I_1 \uplus I_2, e_1^\uparrow, \{d \Rightarrow \text{sync}(chs, P_1(d), \text{delay}(d, \text{interrupt}(I_2, e_2, P_2, cm_2))\}) \\ \text{rel1}(cm_1|_{chs^c}, \text{interrupt}(I_2, e_2, P_2, cm_2)) @ \\ \text{rel2}(cm_2|_{chs^c}, \text{interrupt}(I_1, e_1, P_1, cm_1)))(s_1 \uplus s_2)} \\ e1(s_1) = e2(s_2) \vee (e1(s_1) \leq 0 \wedge e2(s_2) \leq 0) \quad \text{compat}(rdy(cm_1), rdy(cm_2))}{\text{sync}(chs, \text{interrupt}(I_1, e_1, P_1, cm_1), \text{interrupt}(I_2, e_2, P_2, cm_2))(s_1 \uplus s_2) \Longrightarrow \\ \text{interrupt}(I_1 \uplus I_2, e_1^\uparrow, \{d \Rightarrow \text{sync}(chs, P_1(d), \text{delay}(d, \text{interrupt}(I_2, e_2, P_2, cm_2))\}) \\ \vee \text{sync}(chs, \text{delay}(d, \text{interrupt}(I_1, e_1, P_1, cm_1)), P_2(d))\}) \\ \text{rel1}(cm_1|_{chs^c}, \text{interrupt}(I_2, e_2, P_2, cm_2)) @ \\ \text{rel2}(cm_2|_{chs^c}, \text{interrupt}(I_1, e_1, P_1, cm_1)))(s_1 \uplus s_2)} \end{array}$$

Note that in the definition of interrupt assertion, if the expression of waiting time calculated as a negative value then it has equivalent meaning with 0. That is why we need to compare the expression with 0.

In the case where the  $\text{compat}$  function is false, there are three possible scenarios. The first is nondeterministically executing one of the possible handshakes among all that could occur which we represent as  $\text{comm}(cm_1, cm_2)$ . It is a disjunction of  $\text{sync}(chs, P(0, f(0)^\uparrow), Q(0))$  and  $\text{sync}(chs, P'(0), Q'(0, f(0)^\uparrow))$  for all the pairs satisfying one of the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} ch \in chs \wedge cm_1[i] = \langle ch?, P \rangle \wedge cm_2[j] = \langle ch!, f, Q \rangle \\ ch \in chs \wedge cm_1[i] = \langle ch!, f, P' \rangle \wedge cm_2[j] = \langle ch?, Q' \rangle \end{aligned}$$

The second is that if the maximum waiting time  $e_1$  or  $e_2$  is less than 0, then the corresponding side may immediately transit to the tail assertion. The last one is there is an external interrupt occurring at time 0. We obtain the following rule:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{---compat}(rdy(cm_1), rdy(cm_2)) \\
\hline
\text{sync}(chs, \text{interrupt}(I_1, e_1, P_1, cm_1), \text{interrupt}(I_2, e_2, P_2, cm_2))(s_1 \uplus s_2) \implies \\
\text{interrupt}(I_1 \uplus I_2, 0, \{d \Rightarrow \text{comm}(cm_1, cm_2)\} \vee \\
(\uparrow (e_1^\uparrow \leq 0) \wedge \text{sync}(chs, P_1(0), \text{interrupt}(I_2, e_2, P_2, cm_2))) \vee \\
(\uparrow (e_2^\uparrow \leq 0) \wedge \text{sync}(chs, \text{interrupt}(I_1, e_1, P_1, cm_1), P_2(0))))\}, \\
\text{rel1}(cm_1|_{chs^c}, \text{interrupt}(I_2, e_2, P_2, cm_2))@ \\
\text{rel2}(cm_2|_{chs^c}, \text{interrupt}(I_1, e_1, P_1, cm_1))(s_1 \uplus s_2)
\end{array}$$

While synchronizing an interrupt assertion and an init assertion (representing the termination of one side), we have to consider whether there is an external interrupt occurring at time 0 and whether the interrupt assertion turns into the tail assertion at once. Thus, we have the rule:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{---} \\
\hline
\text{sync}(chs, \text{interrupt}(I, e, P, cm), \text{init})(s_1 \uplus s_2) \implies \\
\text{interrupt}(I \uplus \text{id\_inv}, 0, \{d \Rightarrow \uparrow (e^\uparrow \leq 0) \wedge \text{sync}(chs, P(0), \text{init})\} \\
\text{rel\_init1}(cm|_{chs^c}, \text{init}))(s_1 \uplus s_2)
\end{array}$$

The list function `rel_init1` is obtained from `rel1` by replacing `delay(d, P)` by `init`.

## 6 Implementation

In this section, we will introduce two main features of our tool HHLPar implemented in Python: generating specifications for sequential processes and assertion synchronization for parallel processes.

### 6.1 Generating Specification

HHLPar implements an algorithm that decomposes a HCSP sequential process and generates its specification composed of the assertions defined in Section 4, according to the rules given in Section 5.3 recursively. To specify and verify such processes automatically, we first introduced some concepts. We constructed all the forms of parameterized assertions defined in Section 4, and provided corresponding functions manipulating the assertions including assertion substitution and delay. Especially, we define a new type to represent parameterized assertions over one or two bounded variables, such as  $\{(d, v) \Rightarrow Q\}$  for inputs or  $\{d \Rightarrow Q\}$  for outputs.

When dealing with continuous evolution or interrupt involving ODEs in HCSP, we invoke the external solver Wolfram Engine to solve the ODEs and obtain their solutions in symbolic form. Consider continuous evolution  $\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \rangle$  or interrupt  $\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \propto c' \rangle \sqsupseteq \prod_{i \in L} (ch_i^* \rightarrow c_i)$ . If the domain constraint  $B$  is *true*, we get false assertion for the former (indicating the non-termination of the evolution) and  $\text{interrupt}_\infty$  assertion for the later. Otherwise, we need to compute the maximum waiting time based on constraint  $B$ . We replace the continuous variables  $\vec{x}$  occurring in  $B$  with the corresponding solutions and invoke Wolfram Engine to compute the time boundary. For the sake of expressiveness and convenience, we choose to create a fresh time variable representing the length of this duration and record the constraints of this time variable in the boolean assertion. For example,  $\langle \dot{x} = 1 \& x < 5 \rangle$  corresponds to  $\uparrow (t_1 = 5 - x) \wedge \text{wait}(s = s0[x \mapsto x + t], t_1, \{d \Rightarrow \text{init}[x := x + d]\})$ .

## 6.2 Performing Synchronization of Assertions

Variables in different processes are independent and cannot be shared in HCSP. Consequently, when same variable names occur in parallel processes and subsequently in their specifications, we consider them different. This also applies to bounded variables occurring in assertions. Therefore, before synchronization of assertions, we assign process names to different parallel processes and their corresponding assertions. Typically, we designate them as uppercase letters (A, B, C, etc.), and attach them to all variables in assertions, except for the time variable  $t$  in path assertions.

When merging assertions according to the synchronization rules, we maintain a boolean expression denoted by  $cond$  to track the conditions accumulated during verification. This expression assists in future inference of properties. If the user provides an initial condition before merging, we initialize  $cond$  with it, otherwise it defaults to  $true$ . When the assertion of one side to be merged is a boolean assertion in the form  $\uparrow b \wedge P$ , we check for the conflicts between the current condition  $cond$  and  $b$ . If there is a conflict, we directly obtain a false assertion; otherwise, we strengthen the condition  $cond$  to be  $b \wedge cond$  and continue the synchronization. If one side is a substitution assertion like  $P[x := e]$ , the substitution will be extracted in the synchronization and in correspondence, the condition  $cond$  needs to be rewritten to align with the synchronization as  $\exists v. cond[v/x] \wedge x = e[v/x]$ .

While applying the rec rule, we can choose to provide an assistant recursion condition named  $rec\_cond$  which has to satisfy two requirements. First,  $rec\_cond$  can be implied by current  $cond$ . Second, we need to ensure that after replacing  $cond$  with  $rec\_cond$  and going through once synchronized repetition, the updated  $rec\_cond'$  implies  $rec\_cond$ . This  $rec\_cond$  is default to be  $true$ . Intuitively,  $rec\_cond$  represents the auxiliary conditions that we know before each loop starts.

When dealing with interrupt assertions, we need to compare the maximum waiting times of two sides and then select different synchronization rules accordingly. We include all the possible outcomes of these comparisons using disjunction, examine conflicts with existing conditions accumulated by now, update the conditions, and then implement the synchronization rules recursively. The final assertion is a disjunction of synchronized assertions under various circumstances. Moreover, when handling parameterized assertions in the form  $\{d \Rightarrow P\}$ , the delay value  $d$  typically has a limited range. This constraint should also be incorporated into the condition if encountered.

## 6.3 Case Study

We experimented with a series of examples to test HHLPar across various situations. In this section, we illustrate its ability to handle simple branches in bulk through one case study, demonstrating how HHLPar can effectively verify processes with ODEs, interrupts, communications, repetition and parallel composition involved.

The simplified case study on a cruise control system (CCS) is taken from [25], for which the verification was performed via interactive theorem proving. The model of the CCS comprises two parts: a controller (Control) and a physical plant (Plant). The Plant process models the vehicle's movement, continuously evolving along a given ODE. The evolution is periodically disrupted by the transmission of velocity  $v$  and position  $p$  to the Control, followed by the reception of updated acceleration  $a$  from the Control.

$$Plant \triangleq ch1!v; ch2!p; (ch3?a; (\dot{p} = v, \dot{v} = a \& true \propto skip) \triangleright \llbracket [ch1!v \rightarrow ch2!p] \rrbracket^*$$

The Control process computes and sends the appropriate vehicle acceleration, determined by the received velocity and position, with respect to a period  $T$ .

$$\begin{aligned} Control \triangleq & ch1?v; ch2?p; (pp := p + v \cdot T + \frac{1}{2} \cdot da \cdot T^2; vv := v + da \cdot T; \\ & \text{(if } 2 \cdot am \cdot (op - pp) \geq v m^2 \text{ then } vlm := v m^2 \text{ else} \\ & \quad \text{if } op - pp > 0 \text{ then } vlm := 2 \cdot am \cdot (op - pp) \text{ else } vlm := 0); \\ & \text{(if } vv \leq 0 \vee vv^2 \leq vlm \text{ then } a := da \text{ else} \\ & \quad pp := p + v \cdot T; \\ & \quad \text{(if } 2 \cdot am \cdot (op - pp) \geq v m^2 \text{ then } vlm := v m^2 \text{ else} \\ & \quad \quad \text{if } op - pp > 0 \text{ then } vlm := 2 \cdot am \cdot (op - pp) \text{ else } vlm := 0); \\ & \quad \text{if } v \leq 0 \vee v^2 \leq vlm \text{ then } a := 0 \text{ else } a := -am); \\ & ch3!a; \text{wait } T; ch1?v; ch2?p)^* \end{aligned}$$

where constants  $T$ ,  $op$ ,  $ad$ ,  $am$  represent the time period, the position of obstacle, the fixed acceleration during speeding up and deceleration separately, and the variable  $vlm$  is the upper limit of velocity based on the concept of Maximum Protection Curve.

In this case, the triple  $(DPlant, D, DControl)$  is provided to the tool HHLPar, where  $D$  is a dictionary declaring the set of shared communication channels between the parallel composition, the initial condition and the recursion condition,  $DPlant$  and  $DControl$  are dictionaries declaring the process names of  $Plant$  and  $Control$  (set as  $A$  and  $B$  below) and their process definitions in text form respectively. By applying HHLPar, this case produces 21 branches in each repetition, and only 8 of them is possible to happen by providing the *rec\_cond* as given below:

$$\begin{aligned} & BT > 0 \wedge Bam > 0 \wedge Bda > 0 \wedge Bvm > 0 \wedge Ap \leq Bop \wedge Av = Bv \wedge Ap = Bp \\ & \quad \wedge ((2 \cdot Bam \cdot (Bop - Ap) \geq Bvm^2 \wedge Av \leq Bvm) \vee \\ & \quad (2 \cdot Bam \cdot (Bop - Ap) < Bvm^2 \wedge (Av \leq 0 \vee Av^2 \leq 2 \cdot Bam \cdot (Bop - Ap)))) \end{aligned}$$

under the following initial condition:

$$\begin{aligned} & BT > 0 \wedge Bam > 0 \wedge Bda > 0 \wedge Bvm > 0 \wedge Ap \leq Bop \\ & \quad \wedge ((2 \cdot Bam \cdot (Bop - Ap) \geq Bvm^2 \wedge Av \leq Bvm) \vee \\ & \quad (2 \cdot Bam \cdot (Bop - Ap) < Bvm^2 \wedge (Av \leq 0 \vee Av^2 \leq 2 \cdot Bam \cdot (Bop - Ap)))) \end{aligned}$$

indicating the requirements on constants and that the initial position does not exceed the obstacle and the initial velocity is within the MPC. The final specification obtained by HHLPar for the whole system is strong enough to guarantee the safety property of the system  $Ap \leq Bop$  which can be verified by an external prover like Isabelle/HOL.

## 7 Conclusion

We presented HHLPar, an automated theorem prover for verifying parallel HCSP processes, which cover basic ingredients of hybrid and cyber-physical systems including discrete control, continuous dynamics, communication, interrupts and parallel composition. HHLPar implements a Hybrid Hoare Logic, that is composed of a set of sequential rules for specifying sequential HCSP processes and a set of synchronization rules for specifying parallel HCSP processes, with the help of trace-based assertions and their synchronization. HHLPar provides both guarantee to soundness from the formalization of the logic in Isabelle/HOL and automation via symbolically decomposing and executing HCSP processes according to the logic and the integration with external solvers to handle differential equations and real arithmetic properties. We will apply HHLPar to more case studies in the future.

## References

1. R. Alur, C. Courcoubetis, T. A. Henzinger, and P.-H. Ho. Hybrid automata: An algorithmic approach to the specification and verification of hybrid systems. In *Hybrid Systems'92, LNCS 736*, pages 209–229. Springer, 1993.
2. R. Bohrer, V. Rahli, I. Vukotic, M. Völpl, and A. Platzer. Formally verified differential dynamic logic. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs*, pages 208–221, 2017.
3. L. M. de Moura and N. S. Bjørner. Z3: An efficient smt solver. In *International conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, pages 337–340. Springer, 2008.
4. G. Frehse. Phaver: algorithmic verification of hybrid systems past hytech. *Int. J. Softw. Tools Technol. Transf.*, 10(3):263–279, 2008.
5. G. Frehse, C. Le Guernic, A. Donzé, S. Cotton, R. Ray, O. Lebeltel, R. Ripado, A. Girard, T. Dang, and O. Maler. Spaceex: Scalable verification of hybrid systems. In *Computer Aided Verification: 23rd International Conference, CAV 2011, Snowbird, UT, USA, July 14–20, 2011. Proceedings 23*, pages 379–395. Springer, 2011.
6. N. Fulton, S. Mitsch, J.-D. Quesel, M. Völpl, and A. Platzer. Keymaera X: an axiomatic tactical theorem prover for hybrid systems. In *CADE-25*, volume 9195 of *LNCS*, pages 527–538. Springer, 2015.
7. D. P. Guelev, S. Wang, N. Zhan, and C. Zhou. Super-dense computation in verification of hybrid CSP processes. In *FACS'13, LNCS 8348*, pages 13–22. Springer, 2013.
8. J. He. From CSP to hybrid systems. In *A classical mind*, pages 171–189. Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd., 1994.
9. C. A. R. Hoare. *Communicating Sequential Processes*. Prentice-Hall, 1985.
10. Fabian Immler and Johannes Hölzl. Numerical analysis of ordinary differential equations in Isabelle/HOL. In *ITP'12*, volume 7406 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 377–392, 2012.
11. J. Liu, J. Lv, Z. Quan, N. Zhan, H. Zhao, C. Zhou, and L. Zou. A calculus for hybrid CSP. In *APLAS 2010, LNCS 6461*, pages 1–15. Springer, 2010.
12. Tobias Nipkow, Lawrence C. Paulson, and Markus Wenzel. *Isabelle/HOL - A Proof Assistant for Higher-Order Logic*, volume 2283 of *LNCS*. Springer, 2002.
13. A. Platzer. Differential dynamic logic for hybrid systems. *J. Autom. Reason.*, 41(2):143–189, 2008.
14. A. Platzer. *Logical Analysis of Hybrid Systems*. Springer, 2010.
15. A. Platzer. A complete uniform substitution calculus for differential dynamic logic. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 59(2):219–265, 2017.
16. A. Platzer. *Logical Foundations of Cyber-Physical Systems*. Springer, 2018.
17. A. Platzer and J.-D. Quesel. Keymaera: A hybrid theorem prover for hybrid systems (system description). In *IJCAR 2008*, volume 5195 of *LNCS*, pages 171–178. Springer, 2008.
18. A. Platzer and Y. K. Tan. Differential equation invariance axiomatization. *J. ACM*, 67(1):6:1–6:66, 2020.
19. S. Ratschan and Z. She. Safety verification of hybrid systems by constraint propagation-based abstraction refinement. *ACM Trans. Embed. Comput. Syst.*, 6(1):8, 2007.
20. H. Sheng, A. Bentkamp, and B. Zhan. Hhlpy: Practical verification of hybrid systems using hoare logic. *CoRR*, abs/2210.17163, 2022.
21. H. Sheng, A. Bentkamp, and B. Zhan. Hhlpy: Practical verification of hybrid systems using hoare logic. In *FM 2023*, volume 14000 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 160–178. Springer, 2023.



22. S. Wang, N. Zhan, and D. P. Guelev. An assume/guarantee based compositional calculus for hybrid CSP. In *TAMC'12, LNCS 7287*, pages 72–83, 2012.
23. S. Wang, N. Zhan, and L. Zou. An improved HHL prover: An interactive theorem prover for hybrid systems. In *ICFEM'15, LNCS 9407*, pages 382–399, 2015.
24. Wolfram Research, Inc. Wolfram Engine, Version 13.1. Champaign, IL, 2022.
25. X. Xu, S. Wang, B. Zhan, X. Jin, J.-P. Talpin, and N. Zhan. Unified graphical co-modeling, analysis and verification of cyber-physical systems by combining AADL and simulink/stateflow. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 903:1–25, 2022.
26. N. Zhan, X. Jin, B. Zhan, S. Wang, and D. P. Guelev. A generalized hybrid hoare logic. *CoRR*, abs/2303.15020, 2023.
27. C. Zhou and M. R. Hansen. *Duration Calculus: A Formal Approach to Real-Time Systems*. Series: Monographs in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series. Springer, 2004.
28. C. Zhou, C. A. R. Hoare, and Anders P. Ravn. A calculus of durations. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 40(5):269–276, 1991.
29. C. Zhou, J. Wang, and A. P. Ravn. A formal description of hybrid systems. In *Hybrid systems, LNCS 1066*, pages 511–530. Springer, 1996.

## A Trace-based HHL

### A.1 Trace Synchronization

The full definition of trace synchronization function is defined as following:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{ch \in cs \quad tr_1 \parallel_{cs} tr_2 \Downarrow tr}{\langle ch!, v \rangle \wedge tr_1 \parallel_{cs} \langle ch?, v \rangle \wedge tr_2 \Downarrow \langle ch, v \rangle \wedge tr} \text{SyncIO} \\
\frac{ch \notin cs \quad tr_1 \parallel_{cs} tr_2 \Downarrow tr}{\langle ch?, v \rangle \wedge tr_1 \parallel_{cs} tr_2 \Downarrow \langle ch?, v \rangle \wedge tr} \text{NoSyncIO} \quad \frac{ch \in cs}{\langle ch?, v \rangle \wedge tr_1 \parallel_{cs} \epsilon \Downarrow \delta} \text{SyncEmpty1} \\
\frac{tr_1 \parallel_{cs} \epsilon \Downarrow tr}{\langle d, \vec{p}_1, rdy_1 \rangle \wedge tr_1 \parallel_{cs} \epsilon \Downarrow \delta} \text{SyncEmpty2} \quad \frac{}{\epsilon \parallel_{cs} \epsilon \Downarrow \epsilon} \text{SyncEmpty3} \\
\frac{tr_1 \parallel_{cs} tr_2 \Downarrow tr \quad \text{compat}(rdy_1, rdy_2) \quad d > 0}{\langle d, \vec{p}_1, rdy_1 \rangle \wedge tr_1 \parallel_{cs} \langle d, \vec{p}_2, rdy_2 \rangle \wedge tr_2 \Downarrow \langle d, \vec{p}_1 \uplus \vec{p}_2, (rdy_1 \cup rdy_2) - cs \rangle \wedge tr} \text{SyncWait1} \\
\frac{d_1 > d_2 > 0 \quad \text{compat}(rdy_1, rdy_2)}{\langle d_1 - d_2, \vec{p}_1(\cdot + d_2), rdy_1 \rangle \wedge tr_1 \parallel_{cs} tr_2 \Downarrow tr} \text{SyncWait2} \\
\frac{\langle d_1, \vec{p}_1, rdy_1 \rangle \wedge tr_1 \parallel_{cs} \langle d_2, \vec{p}_2, rdy_2 \rangle \wedge tr_2 \Downarrow \langle d_2, \vec{p}_1 \uplus \vec{p}_2, (rdy_1 \cup rdy_2) - cs \rangle \wedge tr}{}
\end{array}$$

### A.2 Big-step Semantics

The full big-step semantics of HCSP process is defined by the following rules:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{(\text{skip}, s) \Rightarrow (s, \epsilon)} \text{SkipB} \quad \frac{}{(x := e, s) \Rightarrow (s[x \mapsto e], \epsilon)} \text{AssignB} \\
\frac{}{\langle ch!e, s \rangle \Rightarrow (s, \langle ch!, s(e) \rangle)} \text{OutB1} \\
\frac{}{\langle ch!e, s \rangle \Rightarrow (s, \langle d, I_s, \{ch!\} \rangle \wedge \langle ch!, s(e) \rangle)} \text{OutB2} \\
\frac{}{\langle ch?x, s \rangle \Rightarrow (s[x \mapsto v], \langle ch?, v \rangle)} \text{InB1} \\
\frac{}{\langle ch?x, s \rangle \Rightarrow (s[x \mapsto v], \langle d, I_s, \{ch?\} \rangle \wedge \langle ch?, v \rangle)} \text{InB2} \\
\frac{}{(c^*, s) \Rightarrow (s, \epsilon)} \text{RepB1} \quad \frac{(c, s) \Rightarrow (s_1, tr_1) \quad (c^*, s_1) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr_2)}{(c^*, s) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr_1 \hat{\ } tr_2)} \text{RepB2} \\
\frac{(c, s_1) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr_1) \quad (c_2, s_2) \Rightarrow (s_3, tr_2)}{(c_1; c_2, s_1) \Rightarrow (s_3, tr_1 \hat{\ } tr_2)} \text{SeqB}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{s_1(B) \quad (c_1, s_1) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr)}{\text{(if } B \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2, s_1) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr)} \text{CondB1} \quad \frac{(c_1, s_1) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr)}{(c_1 \sqcup c_2, s_1) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr)} \text{IChoiceB1} \\
\frac{\neg s_1(B) \quad (c_2, s_1) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr)}{\text{(if } B \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2, s_1) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr)} \text{CondB2} \quad \frac{(c_2, s_1) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr)}{(c_1 \sqcup c_2, s_1) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr)} \text{IChoiceB2} \\
\frac{\neg B(s)}{\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \rangle, s \rangle \Rightarrow (s, \epsilon)} \text{ContB1} \\
\frac{\vec{p} \text{ is a solution of the ODE } \vec{x} = \vec{e} \quad \vec{p}(0) = s(\vec{x}) \quad \forall t \in [0, d]. s[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(t)](B) \quad \neg s[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(d)](B)}{\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \rangle, s \rangle \Rightarrow (s[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(d)], \langle d, \vec{p}, \{\} \rangle)} \text{ContB2} \\
\frac{i \in L \quad ch_i^* = ch!e \quad (c_i, s_1) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr)}{\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \times c \rangle \triangleright \llbracket_{i \in L} (ch_i^* \rightarrow c_i), s_1 \rrbracket \Rightarrow (s_2, \langle ch!, s_1(e) \rangle \wedge tr)} \text{IntB1} \\
\frac{\vec{p} \text{ is a solution of the ODE } \vec{x} = \vec{e} \quad \vec{p}(0) = s_1(\vec{x}) \quad \forall t \in [0, d]. s_1[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(t)](B) \quad i \in L \quad ch_i^* = ch!e \quad (c_i, s_1[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(d)]) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr)}{\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \times c \rangle \triangleright \llbracket_{i \in L} (ch_i^* \rightarrow c_i), s_1 \rrbracket \Rightarrow (s_2, \langle d, \vec{p}, rdy(\cup_{i \in L} ch_i^*) \rangle \wedge \langle ch!, s_1[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(d)](e) \rangle \wedge tr)} \text{IntB2} \\
\frac{i \in L \quad ch_i^* = ch?y \quad (c_i, s_1[y \mapsto v]) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr)}{\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \times c \rangle \triangleright \llbracket_{i \in L} (ch_i^* \rightarrow c_i), s_1 \rrbracket \Rightarrow (s_2, \langle ch?, v \rangle \wedge tr)} \text{IntB3} \\
\frac{\vec{p} \text{ is a solution of the ODE } \vec{x} = \vec{e} \quad \vec{p}(0) = s_1(\vec{x}) \quad \forall t \in [0, d]. s_1[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(t)](B) \quad i \in L \quad ch_i^* = ch?y \quad (c_i, s_1[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(d), y \mapsto v]) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr)}{\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \times c \rangle \triangleright \llbracket_{i \in L} (ch_i^* \rightarrow c_i), s_1 \rrbracket \Rightarrow (s_2, \langle d, \vec{p}, rdy(\cup_{i \in L} ch_i^*) \rangle \wedge \langle ch?, v \rangle \wedge tr)} \text{IntB4} \\
\frac{\neg s(B) \quad (c, s_1) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr)}{\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \times c \rangle \triangleright \llbracket_{i \in L} (ch_i^* \rightarrow c_i), s_1 \rrbracket \Rightarrow (s_2, tr)} \text{IntB5} \\
\frac{\vec{p} \text{ is a solution of the ODE } \vec{x} = \vec{e} \quad \vec{p}(0) = s_1(\vec{x}) \quad \forall t \in [0, d]. s_1[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(t)](B) \quad \neg s_1[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(d)](B) \quad (c, s_1[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(d)]) \Rightarrow (s_2, tr)}{\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \times c \rangle \triangleright \llbracket_{i \in L} (ch_i^* \rightarrow c_i), s_1 \rrbracket \Rightarrow (s_2, \langle d, \vec{p}, rdy(\cup_{i \in L} ch_i^*) \rangle \wedge tr)} \text{IntB6} \\
\frac{(c_1, s_1) \Rightarrow (s'_1, tr_1) \quad (c_2, s_2) \Rightarrow (s'_2, tr_2) \quad tr_1 \parallel_{cs} tr_2 \Downarrow tr}{(c_1 \parallel_{cs} c_2, s_1 \uplus s_2) \Rightarrow (s'_1 \uplus s'_2, tr)} \text{ParB}
\end{array}$$

**B Complement Sequential Rules**

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\text{spec\_of}(x := e, \text{init}[x := e])} \\
\frac{\text{spec\_of}(c_1, P) \quad \text{spec\_of}(c_2, Q)}{\text{spec\_of}(\text{if } B \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2, (\uparrow(B) \wedge P) \vee (\uparrow(\neg B) \wedge Q))} \\
\frac{}{\text{spec\_of}(ch?x, \text{wait\_in}(\text{id\_inv}, ch, \{(d, v) \Rightarrow \text{init}[x := v]\}))} \\
\frac{}{\text{spec\_of}(ch!e, \text{wait\_outv}(\text{id\_inv}, ch, e, \{d \Rightarrow \text{init}\}))} \\
\frac{}{\text{spec\_of}(\text{Wait}(e), \text{wait}(\text{id\_inv}, e, \{d \Rightarrow \text{init}\}))} \\
\frac{\text{paramODEsol}(\vec{x} = \vec{e}, B, \vec{p}, e) \quad \text{lipschitz}(\vec{x} = \vec{e})}{\text{spec\_of}(\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \rangle, \text{wait}(s = s_0[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(s_0, t)], e, \{d \Rightarrow \text{init}[\vec{x} := \vec{p}(s_0, d)]\}))} \\
\frac{\forall d Q. \text{spec\_of}(d, Q) \longrightarrow \text{spec\_of}(c; d, F(Q))}{\text{spec\_of}(c^*, \text{Rec } R. \text{init} \vee F(R))} \\
\frac{\text{paramODEsol}(\vec{x} = \vec{e}, B, \vec{p}, e) \quad \text{lipschitz}(\vec{x} = \vec{e}) \quad \text{spec\_of}(c', P)}{\text{spec\_of}(\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& B \times c' \rangle \sqsupseteq \llbracket_{i \in L} (ch_i^* \rightarrow c_i), \text{interrupt}(s = s_0[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(s_0, t)], e, \{d \Rightarrow P[\vec{x} := \vec{p}(s_0, d)]\}), \text{rel\_cm}(es, \text{skip}, \vec{p}))} \\
\frac{\text{paramODEsolInf}(\vec{x} = \vec{e}, \vec{p}) \quad \text{lipschitz}(\vec{x} = \vec{e})}{\text{spec\_of}(\langle \vec{x} = \vec{e} \& \text{true} \times c' \rangle \sqsupseteq \llbracket_{i \in L} (ch_i^* \rightarrow c_i), \text{interrupt}_\infty(s = s_0[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{p}(s_0, t)], \text{rel\_cm}(es, \text{skip}, \vec{p}))}
\end{array}$$