

Data reification in a concurrent rely-guarantee algebra

Larissa A. Meinicke¹[0000–0002–5272–820X], Ian J. Hayes¹[0000–0003–3649–392X], and
Cliff B. Jones²[0000–0002–0038–6623]

¹ School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science,
The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland 4072, Australia

² School of Computing Science,
Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

Abstract. Specifications of significant systems can be made short and perspicuous by using abstract data types; data reification can provide a clear, stepwise, development history of programs that use more efficient concrete representations. Data reification (or “refinement”) techniques for sequential programs are well established. This paper applies these ideas to concurrency, in particular, an algebraic theory supporting rely-guarantee reasoning about concurrency. A concurrent version of the Galler-Fischer equivalence relation data structure is used as an example.

1 Introduction

Data refinement techniques for sequential programs are well established [21, 11, 12, 16]. (This paper mostly uses the verb “reify” and noun “reification” in the sense of making concrete.) The specification of an abstract data structure (or type) includes both initialisation of the data structure and a set of operations on the data structure. The representation of the abstract data structure may use specification data types (e.g. maps) that are not directly available in the target programming language and the specification of the operations may be in terms of preconditions and postconditions, rather than code. The data structure is encapsulated in the sense that it can only be accessed or modified using the operations defined on the data structure. Because the data structure cannot be directly accessed by the program using it, the representation used in an implementation of the data structure may differ from that in the specification in order to provide a concrete data structure that is defined in terms of programming language data types (e.g. a hash table) that provide efficient implementations of the abstract operations.

Let v represent an abstract data structure with initialisation satisfying iv and let cv be a program using the abstract operations on v , and let w represent the corresponding implementation data structure with initialisation satisfying iw and let cw be the same as cv but with any operation on v within cv replaced by the corresponding operation on w . Both v and w can be types that are restricted by data type invariants. Both cv and cw may use other variables in common that are not subject to a change of representation. The overall correctness criteria for data reification is that any program running using the implementation of the data type is a refinement of the corresponding program using




Fig. 1. An Aczel trace satisfying a specification with precondition p , postcondition q , rely condition r and guarantee condition g . If the initial state, σ_0 , is in p and all environment transitions (ϵ) satisfy r , then all program transitions (π) must satisfy g and the initial state σ_0 must be related to the final state σ_7 by the postcondition q , also a relation between states.

the abstract specification of the data type, where $v: [iv']$ is a specification command that establishes the postcondition iv , changing only variables in v .

$$(\text{var } v . v: [iv'] ; cv) \succeq (\text{var } w . w: [iw'] ; cw) . \quad (1)$$

Data reification is a technique that allows this refinement to be justified by showing each abstract operation is refined by the corresponding concrete operation. To do this a coupling invariant, I , is introduced relating the concrete and abstract representations. Commonly, the coupling invariant is in the form of a data type invariant on the concrete state plus a “retrieve” function that extracts the abstraction representation from a concrete representation that satisfies the data type invariant.

For shared-memory concurrent programs, the main change is that cv and hence cw can include concurrency. The approach we take to handling reasoning about concurrent programs is based on the use of rely and guarantee conditions [13, 14, 15, 8]. A rely condition of a thread T is a binary relation r between program states; it represents an assumption that every transition from a state σ_i to a state σ_{i+1} made by the environment of T (i.e. all the threads running in parallel with T) satisfies r , (i.e. $(\sigma_i, \sigma_{i+1}) \in r$). Complementing this T has a guarantee condition g , also a binary relation between states, and T ensures all program transitions it makes satisfy g , (i.e. $(\sigma_i, \sigma_{i+1}) \in g$). The guarantee of T must imply the rely conditions of all threads running in parallel with T . Our semantics uses Aczel traces [1, 3] that explicitly represent environment (ϵ) transitions as well as program (π) transitions (see Figure 1).

It was observed in [17] that data abstraction and reification can play an important role in formally developing concurrent programs. The contribution of this paper is to extend data reification to concurrent programs based on the rely-guarantee style. Our approach makes use of:

- program invariants that hold in every state and can be used to impose a coupling invariant between the abstract and concrete states [20] – see Sect. 3, and
- a data reification relation between commands defined in terms of a coupling invariant – see Sect. 4.

Sect. 5 uses these theories to show that the correctness condition (1) is valid and Sect. 6 applies our theory to an interesting example: the development of the non-trivial representation of equivalence relations due to Galler and Fischer. Our theory is supported by an extensive library of Isabelle/HOL theories [22]. The next section introduces our wide-spectrum language.

2 Wide-spectrum language

2.1 Language primitives

Our language consists of a complete lattice of commands with partial order, $c \succeq d$, meaning command c is refined (or implemented) by command d , so that non-deterministic choice ($c \vee d$) is the lattice join and strong conjunction ($c \wedge d$) is the lattice meet. The lattice is complete so that for a set of commands C , non-deterministic choice $\bigvee C$ and strong conjunction $\bigwedge C$ are defined as the least upper bound and greatest lower bound, respectively. The language includes binary operators for sequential composition ($c ; d$), parallel composition ($c \parallel d$), and weak conjunction ($c \text{ \textcircled{ \& } } d$), which behaves like strong conjunction (\wedge) unless either operand aborts, in which case the weak conjunction aborts.

Naming and syntactic precedence conventions. We use σ for program states (i.e. mappings from variable names to values), c and d for commands; p and I for sets of program states (with I reserved for invariants); g , q and r for binary relations between program states; e for expressions, and k for values. Subscripted versions of the above names follow the same convention. Unary operations and function application have higher precedence than binary operations. Non-deterministic choice (\vee) has the lowest precedence, and sequential composition ($;$) has the highest precedence, except framing ($:$) is higher. We use parentheses to resolve all other syntactic ambiguities.

A program state $\sigma \in \Sigma$ gives the values of the program variables. The language includes four primitive commands:

- τp is an instantaneous test that the current state σ satisfies p : if $\sigma \in p$ it is a no-op, otherwise it is infeasible;
- πr is an atomic program command that may perform a program transition from σ_0 to σ if $(\sigma_0, \sigma) \in r$, otherwise it is infeasible if $\sigma \notin \text{dom } r$;
- ϵr is an atomic environment command that may perform an environment transition from σ_0 to σ if $(\sigma_0, \sigma) \in r$, otherwise it is infeasible if $\sigma \notin \text{dom } r$;
- ζ is Dijkstra's abort command [4, 5] that irrecoverably fails immediately. It is the greatest command.

The command τ is the test that always succeeds (2). The assertion command, $\{p\}$, aborts if the current state is not in p , where $\bar{p} = \Sigma - p$, otherwise it is a no-op (3). The command αr allows either a program or an environment transition, provided it satisfies r (4). The abbreviations π and ϵ allow any program (5) or environment (6) transition, respectively, and α allows any transition, program or environment (7), where univ is the universal relation between program states. Note the bold fonts for τ , π , ϵ and α .

$$\tau \hat{=} \tau \Sigma \quad (2) \qquad \pi \hat{=} \pi \text{ univ} \quad (5)$$

$$\{p\} \hat{=} \tau \vee \tau \bar{p}; \zeta \quad (3) \qquad \epsilon \hat{=} \epsilon \text{ univ} \quad (6)$$

$$\alpha r \hat{=} \pi r \vee \epsilon r \quad (4) \qquad \alpha \hat{=} \alpha \text{ univ} \quad (7)$$

The basic commands satisfy the following refinement properties.

$$\tau p_1 \succeq \tau p_2 \quad \text{if } p_1 \supseteq p_2 \quad (8) \qquad \pi r_1 \succeq \pi r_2 \quad \text{if } r_1 \supseteq r_2 \quad (10)$$

$$\{p_1\} \succeq \{p_2\} \quad \text{if } p_1 \subseteq p_2 \quad (9) \qquad \epsilon r_1 \succeq \epsilon r_2 \quad \text{if } r_1 \supseteq r_2 \quad (11)$$

A command, a , is considered *atomic* if it is of the form $a = \pi g \vee \epsilon r$ for some relations g and r . That is, a can only make a single transition, which may be a program (π) transition in g or an environment (ϵ) in r . A test can be pulled out of a branch of a weak conjunction provided the other branch does not immediately abort, (i.e. d starts with an atomic command or d is a test).

$$\tau p ; c \pitchfork d = \tau p ; (c \pitchfork d) \quad \text{if } d \text{ is not immediately aborting} \quad (12)$$

2.2 Derived commands

Finite iteration, c^* , and possibly infinite iteration, c^ω , of a command c are defined as the least and greatest fixed points, respectively, of the function $(\lambda y . \tau \vee c ; y)$. A program guarantee command, $\text{guar}_\pi r$ for relation r , requires every program transition satisfies r but places no constraints on environment transitions (15). An environment guarantee command, $\text{guar}_\epsilon r$, requires every environment transition satisfies r (16). A rely command, $\text{rely } r$, assumes environment transitions satisfy r ; if one does not it aborts (17), in the same way that an assertion $\{p\}$ aborts if the initial state is not in p . The command term only performs a finite number of program transitions but does not constrain its environment (18). The relation id stands for the identity relation and id_v , is the identity function on a set of variables v , and \bar{v} is the set complement of v . The command $v : c$, restricts c so that its program transitions may only modify variables in the set v (19). Within the identity function and frames a variable u stands for the singleton set $\{u\}$ and a comma is used for union, so that for variables u and w , $\text{id}_{u,w} = \text{id}_{\{u\} \cup \{w\}} = \text{id}_{\{u,w\}}$. Similarly, $\text{id}_{\bar{u}} = \text{id}_{\overline{\{u\}}}$. The command idle can perform only a finite number of idling (no change) program transitions but does not constrain its environment (20). The command $\text{opt } r$ either performs a single program transition satisfying r or it can terminate immediately from states σ such that $(\sigma, \sigma) \in r$ (21). The atomic specification command, $\langle r \rangle$, achieves r via an (atomic) program transition and allows finite stuttering program transitions (that do not change the state) before and after the atomic transition (22); like $\text{opt } r$, the atomic transition satisfying r may be elided for states σ in which $(\sigma, \sigma) \in r$.

$$c^* \hat{=} \mu y . \tau \vee c ; y \quad (13) \quad \text{term} \hat{=} \alpha^* ; \epsilon^\omega \quad (18)$$

$$c^\omega \hat{=} \nu y . \tau \vee c ; y \quad (14) \quad v : c \hat{=} \text{guar}_\pi \text{id}_{\bar{v}} \pitchfork c \quad (19)$$

$$\text{guar}_\pi r \hat{=} (\pi r \vee \epsilon)^\omega \quad (15) \quad \text{idle} \hat{=} \emptyset : \text{term} \quad (20)$$

$$\text{guar}_\epsilon r \hat{=} (\pi \vee \epsilon r)^\omega \quad (16) \quad \text{opt } r \hat{=} \pi r \vee \tau \{ \sigma . (\sigma, \sigma) \in r \} \quad (21)$$

$$\text{rely } r \hat{=} (\alpha \vee \epsilon \bar{r} ; \not\downarrow)^\omega \quad (17) \quad \langle r \rangle \hat{=} \text{idle} ; \text{opt } r ; \text{idle} \quad (22)$$

The postcondition specification command, $[q]$, for a relation between states q , guarantees to terminate in a final state σ that is related to the initial state σ_0 by q (23). The command $\llbracket e \rrbracket_k$ succeeds if the expression e evaluates to the value k but becomes infeasible otherwise.³ An assignment command, $v := e$, is non-deterministic due to possible interference from concurrent threads modifying the values of the variables used within e . The notation $\sigma[v \mapsto k]$ stands for σ updated so that v maps to k . An assignment evaluates e to some value k , which is then atomically assigned to v (24); the idle at the

³ See [9] for the complete details of expressions.

end allows for hidden stuttering steps in the implementation. A conditional either evaluates b to *true* and executes c , or to *false* and executes d (25); the idle command at the end allows for (hidden) program branching transitions. A while loop executes c while b evaluates to *true* and terminates when b evaluates to *false* (26).

$$[q] \hat{=} \bigvee_{\sigma_0} \tau\{\sigma_0\}; \text{term}; \tau\{\sigma \cdot (\sigma_0, \sigma) \in q\} \quad (23)$$

$$v := e \hat{=} \bigvee_k \llbracket e \rrbracket_k; v: \text{opt}\{(\sigma_0, \sigma) \cdot \sigma = \sigma_0[v \mapsto k]\}; \text{idle} \quad (24)$$

$$\text{if } b \text{ then } c \text{ else } d \hat{=} (\llbracket b \rrbracket_{\text{true}}; c \vee \llbracket b \rrbracket_{\text{false}}; d); \text{idle} \quad (25)$$

$$\text{while } b \text{ do } c \hat{=} (\llbracket b \rrbracket_{\text{true}}; c)^\omega; \llbracket b \rrbracket_{\text{false}} \quad (26)$$

2.3 Local variable blocks

Local variable blocks are defined in terms of a more primitive operators akin to existential quantification of a variable over a command. The algebra of these operators is based on Tarski's cylindric algebra⁴ [10], which introduces an existential operator $\exists_v x$ for each variable v and variable and element x . An element x is *independent* of v if $x = \exists_v x$. A standard model of their algebra is sets of states, and for a set of states p , $\exists_v^S p$ is the set of states σ such that there exists a state $\sigma_p \in p$, such that σ and σ_p are equal except possibly for the value of v .

Our earlier work extended cylindric algebra to apply to commands for sequential programs [6] and concurrent programs [19], from which the properties used here are taken. We make use of two existential operators on commands:⁵

$\exists_v^C c$ that has a trace t if there exists a trace t_c of c such that the two traces are the same except for the value of v in each state,

$\downarrow_v^C c$ that has a trace t if there exists a trace t_c of c such that the two traces are the same except for the value of v in the final state; if t is infinite (i.e. there is no final state) then t must be a trace of c .

The following property, in which a is an atomic command and c is a command, allows an existential to be distributed over a sequential composition.

$$\exists_v^C (c; a^\omega) = \exists_v^C c; (\exists_v^C a)^\omega \quad \text{if } \downarrow_v^C a = \exists_v^C a \quad (27)$$

A local block introduces a local variable v (28). If v exists as a variable in the outer context of the local block, its value is unmodified by program transitions of the local block (i.e. $\text{guar}_\pi \text{id}_v$). The variable v is existentially quantified over the scope of the local block, and within that block, v cannot be modified by environment transitions (i.e. $\text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_v$). A variable block (29) introduces a local scope for v but includes idle commands before and after to represent hidden actions to allocate and deallocate v .

$$(\text{local } v \cdot c) \hat{=} \text{guar}_\pi \text{id}_v \cdot \exists_v^C (\text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_v \cdot c) \quad (28)$$

$$(\text{var } v \cdot c) \hat{=} \text{idle}; (\text{local } v \cdot c); \text{idle} \quad (29)$$

⁴ The name ‘‘cylindric’’ is appropriate for their model but not really appropriate for our model.

⁵ There is also first state existential operator, $\exists_v^C c$, but we do not need that here.

A command c is *independent* of a variable v if $c = \exists_v^C c$. The following properties follow from the theory in [19].

$$u : c = (\text{local } v . v, u : c) \quad \text{if } u \neq v \text{ and } c = \exists_v^C c \quad (30)$$

$$(\text{var } v . (\text{local } w . c)) = (\text{var } w . (\text{local } v . c)) \quad (31)$$

$$(\text{local } v . (v, u : c) ; d) = u : c ; (\text{local } v . d) \quad \text{if } u \neq v \text{ and } c = \exists_v^C c \quad (32)$$

$$(\text{local } v . c \text{ \textcircled{and} } d) = (\text{local } v . c) \text{ \textcircled{and} } d \quad \text{if } d = \exists_v^C d \quad (33)$$

$$(\text{local } v . c \text{ \textcircled{and} } (v, u : d)) = (\text{local } v . c) \text{ \textcircled{and} } u : d \quad \text{if } u \neq v \text{ and } d = \exists_v^C d \quad (34)$$

3 Invariants

Given a set of states p , we define $\backslash p$ and p' to be the relations between initial and final program states that satisfy p in their initial and final program states, respectively. A pair (σ_0, σ) is in relation $r_1 \Rightarrow r_2$, if it is not in r_1 or it is in r_2 . It is exclusively used here in the form $\backslash p \Rightarrow p'$, that is, the set of pairs (σ_0, σ) such that either $\sigma_0 \notin p$ or $\sigma \in p$.

$$\backslash p \hat{=} \{(\sigma_0, \sigma) \mid \sigma_0 \in p\} \quad (35) \quad r_1 \Rightarrow r_2 \hat{=} \bar{r}_1 \cup r_2 \quad (37)$$

$$p' \hat{=} \{(\sigma_0, \sigma) \mid \sigma \in p\} \quad (36)$$

The command $\text{inv } I$ can take an arbitrary number of atomic transitions, each of which establishes I in its final state, assuming the initial state satisfies I .

Definition 1 (inv). For a set of states I , $\text{inv } I \hat{=} \{I\} ; (\alpha I')^\omega$

An invariant can be introduced if it holds initially (38). An invariant maintains I on every transition (39).

$$\{I\} ; c \succeq \text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } c \quad (38)$$

$$\text{inv } I = \{I\} ; (\alpha(\backslash I \Rightarrow I'))^\omega \quad (39)$$

Lemma 1 (inv-distribute).

$$\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } \bigvee C = \bigvee_{c \in C} (\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } c) \quad \text{if } C \neq \emptyset \quad (40)$$

$$\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } (c \vee d) = (\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } c) \vee (\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } d) \quad (41)$$

$$\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } (c ; d) = (\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } c) ; (\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } d) \quad (42)$$

$$\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } (c \parallel d) = (\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } c) \parallel (\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } d) \quad (43)$$

$$\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } (c \text{ \textcircled{and} } d) = (\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } c) \text{ \textcircled{and} } (\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } d) \quad (44)$$

$$\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } c^* = (\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } c)^* \quad (45)$$

$$\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } c^\omega = (\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } c)^\omega \quad (46)$$

$$\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } \tau p = \{I\} ; \tau p \quad (47)$$

$$\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } \{p\} = \{I \cap p\} \quad (48)$$

$$\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } \pi r = \{I\} ; \pi(r \cap I') \quad (49)$$

$$\text{inv } I \text{ \textcircled{and} } \epsilon r = \{I\} ; \epsilon(r \cap I') \quad (50)$$

4 Data reification under coupling a coupling invariant

We say that a command d is a data reification of a command c under coupling invariant I , written $c \succeq_I d$, when c is reified by d under the assumption that the coupling invariant I is initially true and I is maintained by every atomic step.

Definition 2 (data-refines). For coupling invariant I and commands c and d ,

$$c \succeq_I d \hat{=} (\text{inv } I \text{ } \mathbb{m} \ c \succeq \ \text{inv } I \ \mathbb{m} \ d)$$

From the definition, data reification is a preorder, that is, it is reflexive and transitive, and $c \succeq_I d$ if $c \succeq d$. Reifying a composite command can be reduced to reifying its components.

Lemma 2 (reify-operators).

$$\bigvee C \succeq_I \bigvee D \quad \text{if } \forall d \in D . \exists c \in C . c \succeq_I d \quad (51)$$

$$c_1 \vee c_2 \succeq_I d_1 \vee d_2 \quad \text{if } c_1 \succeq_I d_1 \text{ and } c_2 \succeq_I d_2 \quad (52)$$

$$c_1 ; c_2 \succeq_I d_1 ; d_2 \quad \text{if } c_1 \succeq_I d_1 \text{ and } c_2 \succeq_I d_2 \quad (53)$$

$$c_1 \parallel c_2 \succeq_I d_1 \parallel d_2 \quad \text{if } c_1 \succeq_I d_1 \text{ and } c_2 \succeq_I d_2 \quad (54)$$

$$c_1 \mathbb{m} c_2 \succeq_I d_1 \mathbb{m} d_2 \quad \text{if } c_1 \succeq_I d_1 \text{ and } c_2 \succeq_I d_2 \quad (55)$$

$$c^* \succeq_I d^* \quad \text{if } c \succeq_I d \quad (56)$$

$$c^\omega \succeq_I d^\omega \quad \text{if } c \succeq_I d \quad (57)$$

Proof. In each case the definition \succeq_I is unfolded to make use of the invariant command, the invariant is distributed over the operator using (40–46), data reification of the component commands follows from the corresponding assumption, the distribution of the invariant is reversed, and the result is folded using the definition of \succeq_I . \square

Lemma 3 (reify-commands).

$$\tau p_1 \succeq_I \tau p_2 \quad \text{if } p_1 \supseteq I \cap p_2 \quad (58)$$

$$\pi r_1 \succeq_I \pi r_2 \quad \text{if } r_1 \supseteq \backslash I \cap r_2 \cap I' \quad (59)$$

$$\epsilon r_1 \succeq_I \epsilon r_2 \quad \text{if } r_1 \supseteq \backslash I \cap r_2 \cap I' \quad (60)$$

$$\{p_1\} \succeq_I \{p_2\} \quad \text{if } I \cap p_1 \subseteq p_2 \quad (61)$$

$$\text{guar}_\pi g_1 \succeq_I \text{guar}_\pi g_2 \quad \text{if } g_1 \supseteq \backslash I \cap g_2 \cap I' \quad (62)$$

$$\text{rely } r_1 \succeq_I \text{rely } r_2 \quad \text{if } \backslash I \cap r_1 \cap I' \subseteq r_2 \quad (63)$$

$$w : c \succeq_I \text{guar}_\pi g \ \mathbb{m} \ v, w : c \quad \text{if } \text{id}_v \supseteq \backslash I \cap g \cap I' \text{ and } v \neq w \quad (64)$$

$$\text{opt } q_1 \succeq_I \text{opt } q_2 \quad \text{if } q_1 \supseteq \backslash I \cap q_2 \cap I' \quad (65)$$

$$\{p\} ; [q_1] \succeq_I \{I \cap p\} ; [q_2] \quad \text{if } q_1 \supseteq \backslash I \cap \backslash p \cap q_2 \cap I' \quad (66)$$

Proof. For (58), expanding Definition 2 (data-refines), we must show, $\text{inv } I \ \mathbb{m} \ \tau p_1 \succeq \ \text{inv } I \ \mathbb{m} \ \tau p_2$, or combining invariant and test by (47), $\{I\} ; \tau p_1 \succeq \{I\} ; \tau p_2$, which follows by strengthening the test under the precondition, I , as $p_1 \supseteq I \cap p_2$.

We give the proof for (59), the proof for (60) is similar. Expanding Definition 2 (data-refines), we must show, $\text{inv } I \pitchfork \pi r_1 \succeq \text{inv } I \pitchfork \pi r_2$, or combining invariant and program transition by (49), $\{I\}; \pi(r_1 \cap I') \succeq \{I\}; \pi(r_2 \cap I')$, which follows by strengthening the relation under the context of the precondition because $r_1 \supseteq \forall I \cap r_2 \cap I'$.

For (61), by (48), $\text{inv } I \pitchfork \{p_1\} = \{I \cap p_1\} \succeq \{I \cap p_2\} = \text{inv } I \pitchfork \{p_2\}$, as the assumption implies $I \cap p_1 \subseteq I \cap p_2$.

For (62), by (52) and (59) using assumption $g_1 \supseteq \forall I \cap g_2 \cap I'$ for the program transition, $(\pi g_1 \vee \epsilon) \succeq_I (\pi g_2 \vee \epsilon)$, and hence by (57), $(\pi g_1 \vee \epsilon)^\omega \succeq_I (\pi g_2 \vee \epsilon)^\omega$, and the result follows by the definition of a guarantee (15).

For (63), $\bar{r}_1 \supseteq \forall I \cap \bar{r}_2 \cap I'$ is equivalent to the assumption $\forall I \cap r_1 \cap I' \subseteq r_2$:

$$\bar{r}_1 \supseteq \forall I \cap \bar{r}_2 \cap I' \Leftrightarrow r_1 \subseteq \overline{\forall I \cap \bar{r}_2 \cap I'} \Leftrightarrow r_1 \subseteq \forall I \cup r_2 \cup \bar{I}' \Leftrightarrow \forall I \cap r_1 \cap I' \subseteq r_2.$$

By (52), (53) and (60) using $\bar{r}_1 \supseteq \forall I \cap \bar{r}_2 \cap I'$ for the environment transition,

$$(\pi \vee \epsilon \vee \epsilon \in \bar{r}_1; \downarrow) \succeq_I (\pi \vee \epsilon \vee \epsilon \in \bar{r}_2; \downarrow)$$

and hence by (57), $(\pi \vee \epsilon \vee \epsilon \in \bar{r}_1; \downarrow)^\omega \succeq_I (\pi \vee \epsilon \vee \epsilon \in \bar{r}_2; \downarrow)^\omega$, and the result follows by the definition of a rely (17).

For (64), the definition of framing (19) is expanded to a guarantee, which is then split, $w : c = \text{guar}_\pi \text{id}_{\bar{w}} \pitchfork c = \text{guar}_\pi \text{id}_v \pitchfork \text{guar}_\pi \text{id}_{\bar{v}, \bar{w}} \pitchfork c = \text{guar}_\pi \text{id}_v \pitchfork v, w : c \succeq_I \text{guar}_\pi g \pitchfork v, w : c$ by (62) using the assumption $\text{id}_v \supseteq \forall I \cap g \cap I'$.

For (65), the proof follows from the definition of $\text{opt } q_1$ (21), (52), (59) and (58).

$$\text{opt } q_1 = \pi q_1 \vee \tau\{\sigma . (\sigma, \sigma) \in q_1\} \succeq_I \pi q_2 \vee \tau\{\sigma . (\sigma, \sigma) \in q_2\} = \text{opt } q_2$$

For the application of (58) one needs to show $\{\sigma . (\sigma, \sigma) \in q_1\} \supseteq I \cap \{\sigma . (\sigma, \sigma) \in q_2\}$, given the assumption, $q_1 \supseteq \forall I \cap q_2 \cap I'$.

$$\begin{aligned} \{\sigma . (\sigma, \sigma) \in q_1\} &\supseteq \{\sigma . (\sigma, \sigma) \in \forall I \cap q_2 \cap I'\} = \{\sigma . (\sigma, \sigma) \in q_2 \wedge \sigma \in I\} \\ &= I \cap \{\sigma . (\sigma, \sigma) \in q_2\} \end{aligned}$$

For (66), the result follows from the definition of a specification command (23), refining using the assumption $q_1 \supseteq \forall I \cap p \cap q_2 \cap I'$, reifying both the assertion (61) and the test (58), noting the initial state is assumed to be in $I \cap p$, and folding using the definition of a specification command (23).

$$\begin{aligned} \{p\}; [q_1] &= \{p\}; \bigvee_{\sigma_0} \tau\{\sigma_0\}; \text{term}; \tau\{\sigma . (\sigma_0, \sigma) \in q_1\} \\ &\succeq \{p\}; \bigvee_{\sigma_0} \tau\{\sigma_0\}; \text{term}; \tau\{\sigma . (\sigma_0, \sigma) \in \forall I \cap p \cap q_2 \cap I'\} \\ &\succeq_I \{I \cap p\}; \bigvee_{\sigma_0} \tau\{\sigma_0\}; \text{term}; \tau\{\sigma . (\sigma_0, \sigma) \in \forall I \cap p \cap q_2\} \\ &= \{I \cap p\}; \bigvee_{\sigma_0} \tau\{\sigma_0\}; \text{term}; \tau\{\sigma . (\sigma_0, \sigma) \in q_2\} \\ &= \{I \cap p\}; [q_2] \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4 (reify-rgspec). *If $I \cap p_1 \subseteq p_2$ and $\forall I \cap r_1 \cap I' \subseteq r_2$ and $g_1 \supseteq \forall I \cap g_2 \cap I'$ and $q_1 \supseteq \forall I \cap p_1 \cap q_2 \cap I'$ then*

$$\text{rely } r_1 \pitchfork \text{guar}_\pi g_1 \pitchfork \{p_1\}; [q_1] \succeq_I \text{rely } r_2 \pitchfork \text{guar}_\pi g_2 \pitchfork \{p_2\}; [q_2].$$

Proof. By (55), (63), (62), (66). \square

The notation e_σ stands for the value of e in state σ . If an expression e is single-reference under a rely condition r , evaluating e under interference satisfying r corresponds to evaluating e in one of the states during its execution, and hence the following property holds.⁶

$$\text{rely } r \text{ } \mathbb{[}e\mathbb{]}_k = \text{rely } r \text{ } \mathbb{[} \text{idle} ; \tau(\{\sigma . e_\sigma = k\}) ; \text{idle} . \quad (67)$$

Lemma 5 (reify-expr). *If e_1 is single reference under r_1 , e_2 is single reference under r_2 , and $\forall I \cap r_1 \cap I' \subseteq r_2$ and $\{\sigma . e_{1\sigma} = k1\} \supseteq I \cap \{\sigma . e_{2\sigma} = k2\}$ then,*

$$\text{rely } r_1 \text{ } \mathbb{[}e1\mathbb{]}_{k1} \succeq_I \text{rely } r_2 \text{ } \mathbb{[}e2\mathbb{]}_{k2}.$$

Proof. The proof uses (67), then reifies the rely (63) and the test (58).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rely } r_1 \text{ } \mathbb{[}e1\mathbb{]}_{k1} &= \text{rely } r_1 \text{ } \mathbb{[} \text{idle} ; \tau(\{\sigma . e_{1\sigma} = k1\}) ; \text{idle} \\ &\succeq_I \text{rely } r_2 \text{ } \mathbb{[} \text{idle} ; \tau(\{\sigma . e_{2\sigma} = k2\}) ; \text{idle} \\ &= \text{rely } r_2 \text{ } \mathbb{[}e2\mathbb{]}_{k2} \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma 6 (reify-conditional). *If b_1 and b_2 are boolean expressions that are single-reference under r_1 and r_2 , respectively, and $\forall I \cap r_1 \cap I' \subseteq r_2$ and $B_1 = \{\sigma . (b_1)_\sigma\}$ and $B_2 = \{\sigma . (b_2)_\sigma\}$, and $I \cap B_1 = I \cap B_2$, and both $c_1 \succeq_I d_1$ and $c_2 \succeq_I d_2$,*

$$\text{rely } r_1 \text{ } \mathbb{[} \text{if } b_1 \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2 \mathbb{]} \succeq_I \text{rely } r_2 \text{ } \mathbb{[} \text{if } b_2 \text{ then } d_1 \text{ else } d_2 \mathbb{]}$$

Proof. The proof uses the definition of a conditional (25), then Lemma 5 as $I \cap B_1 = I \cap B_2$, and (52) and (53).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rely } r_1 \text{ } \mathbb{[} \text{if } b_1 \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2 \mathbb{]} &= \text{rely } r_1 \text{ } \mathbb{[} (\mathbb{[}b_1\mathbb{]}\text{true} ; c_1 \vee \mathbb{[}b_1\mathbb{]}\text{false} ; c_2) ; \text{idle} \\ &\succeq_I \text{rely } r_2 \text{ } \mathbb{[} (\mathbb{[}b_2\mathbb{]}\text{true} ; d_1 \vee \mathbb{[}b_2\mathbb{]}\text{false} ; d_2) ; \text{idle} \\ &= \text{rely } r_2 \text{ } \mathbb{[} \text{if } b_2 \text{ then } d_1 \text{ else } d_2 \mathbb{]} \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma 7 (reify-while). *If b_1 and b_2 are boolean expressions that are single-reference under r_1 and r_2 , respectively, and $\forall I \cap r_1 \cap I' \subseteq r_2$ and $B_1 = \{\sigma . (b_1)_\sigma\}$ and $B_2 = \{\sigma . (b_2)_\sigma\}$, and $I \cap B_1 = I \cap B_2$, and $c_1 \succeq_I c_2$,*

$$\text{rely } r_1 \text{ } \mathbb{[} \text{while } b_1 \text{ do } c_1 \mathbb{]} \succeq_I \text{rely } r_2 \text{ } \mathbb{[} \text{while } b_2 \text{ do } c_2 \mathbb{]}$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that for Lemma 6 (reify-conditional). \square

5 Data refinement of a local variable block

The following lemma eliminates the abstract variable, v , except for ensuring v is not changed by program transitions. It is required to prove Theorem 1 (data-reification), our main theorem.

⁶ See [9] for the complete details of single-reference expressions and the definition of e_σ .

Lemma 8 (diminish-inv). *If $v \neq w$ and $\text{id}_{w,v} \subseteq (\wedge I \Rightarrow I')$ then*

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{local } v . \tau I ; \text{inv } I) \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_w \\ \succeq & \tau(\exists_v^S I) ; \text{guar}_\pi(\wedge(\exists_v^S I) \Rightarrow (\exists_v^S I)') \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_w \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \text{guar}_\pi \text{id}_v . \end{aligned}$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{local } v . \tau I ; \text{inv } I) \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_w \\ = & \text{using invariant property (39), distributing } \text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_w \text{ by (33) as independent of } v \\ & (\text{local } v . \tau I ; \alpha(\wedge I \Rightarrow I')^\omega \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_w) \\ = & \text{unfolding the definition of a local block (28), and merging environment guarantees} \\ & \text{guar}_\pi \text{id}_v \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \exists_v^C(\tau I ; \alpha(\wedge I \Rightarrow I')^\omega \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_{w,v}) \\ = & \text{rewriting the atomic step iteration} \\ & \text{guar}_\pi \text{id}_v \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \exists_v^C((\tau I ; (\text{guar}_\pi(\wedge I \Rightarrow I') \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \text{guar}_\epsilon(\wedge I \Rightarrow I'))) \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_{w,v}) \\ = & \text{distributing test, and merging environment guarantees} \\ & \text{guar}_\pi \text{id}_v \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \exists_v^C(\tau I ; (\text{guar}_\pi(\wedge I \Rightarrow I') \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \text{guar}_\epsilon((\wedge I \Rightarrow I') \cap \text{id}_{w,v}))) \\ \preceq & \text{refining guarantee and applying assumption } \text{id}_{v,w} \subseteq (\wedge I \Rightarrow I') \\ & \text{guar}_\pi \text{id}_v \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \exists_v^C(\tau I ; (\text{guar}_\pi(\wedge(\exists_v^S I) \Rightarrow I') \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_{w,v})) \\ = & \text{by (27) as } \perp_v^C(\pi(\wedge(\exists_v^S I) \Rightarrow I') \vee \epsilon \text{id}_{w,v}) = \pi(\wedge(\exists_v^S I) \Rightarrow (\exists_v^S I)') \vee \epsilon \text{id}_w \\ & \text{guar}_\pi \text{id}_v \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \exists_v^C(\tau I ; (\text{guar}_\pi(\wedge(\exists_v^S I) \Rightarrow (\exists_v^S I)') \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_w)) \\ = & \text{distributing test over non-aborting commands, and commuting } \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \\ & \exists_v^C(\tau I) ; \text{guar}_\pi(\wedge(\exists_v^S I) \Rightarrow (\exists_v^S I)') \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_w \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \text{guar}_\pi \text{id}_v \end{aligned}$$

Where, for the application of property (27), we use the fact that a weak conjunction of program and environment guarantees can be rewritten as the iteration of an atomic step: $\text{guar}_\pi g \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \text{guar}_\epsilon r = (\pi g \vee \epsilon r)^\omega$ for any g and r . \square

Our main theorem shows that a program using the abstract state is refined by the same program using the implementation state via the coupling invariant I .

Theorem 1 (data-reification). *Given disjoint sets of variables u, v and w , and coupling invariant I relating v and w , sets of (initial) states iv and iw , commands cv, cw and dw , if iv and cv are independent of w , and iw, cw and dw are independent of v , and if*

$$iw \cap I \subseteq iv \tag{68}$$

$$\{iw\} ; v, w, u : cv \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_{v,w} \succeq_I v, w, u : cw \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_{v,w} \tag{69}$$

$$\text{id}_{w,v} \subseteq (\wedge I \Rightarrow I') \tag{70}$$

$$iw \subseteq \exists_v^S I \tag{71}$$

$$\text{guar}_\pi(\wedge(\exists_v^S I) \Rightarrow (\exists_v^S I)') \mathbin{\text{\AA}} \{iw\} ; w, u : cw \succeq w, u : dw \tag{72}$$

hold then $(\text{var } v . v : [iv'] ; u, v : cv) \succeq (\text{var } w . w : [iw'] ; u, w : dw)$.

Given a coupling invariant I , $\exists_v^S I$ is the data-type invariant on the implementation variables w . Assumption (68) ensures the concrete initialisation correspond to an abstract initialisation; (69) corresponds to reifying the body of the block; (70) ensures the coupling invariant I is maintained if neither v nor w is modified; (71) ensures the initial state satisfies the data type invariant; and (72) eliminates the data type invariant.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (\text{var } v . v : [iw'] ; v, u : cv) \\
 = & \text{introduce local variable } w \text{ by (30) } w \neq v; iv \text{ and } cv \text{ are independent of } w \\
 & (\text{var } v . (\text{local } w . v, w : [iw'] ; v, w, u : cv)) \\
 = & \text{interchange variables } v \text{ and } w \text{ by (31)} \\
 & (\text{var } w . (\text{local } v . v, w : [iw'] ; v, w, u : cv)) \\
 \succeq & \text{refine initialization using (68) and } v, w : [iw'] ; \tau I = v, w : [iw'] ; \tau I ; \{iw\} \\
 & (\text{var } w . (\text{local } v . v, w : [iw'] ; \tau I ; \tau iw ; v, w, u : cv)) \\
 = & \text{restrict the scope of } v \text{ by (32) as } v \neq w \text{ and } iw \text{ is independent of } v \\
 & (\text{var } w . w : [iw'] ; (\text{local } v . \tau I ; \tau iw ; v, w, u : cv)) \\
 \succeq & \text{introduce coupling invariant } I \text{ by (38) as } \tau I = \tau I ; \{I\} \\
 & (\text{var } w . w : [iw'] ; (\text{local } v . \tau I ; (\text{inv } I \pitchfork \tau iw ; v, w, u : cv))) \\
 \succeq & \text{data refine using assumption (69)} \\
 & (\text{var } w . w : [iw'] ; (\text{local } v . \tau I ; (\text{inv } I \pitchfork \tau iw ; v, w, u : cw))) \\
 = & \text{by (12) assuming } \tau iw ; v, w, u : cw \text{ is not immediately aborting} \\
 & (\text{var } w . w : [iw'] ; (\text{local } v . \tau I ; \text{inv } I \pitchfork \tau iw ; v, w, u : cw)) \\
 = & \text{by (34) as } u, v, w : cw \text{ is independent of } v \text{ and } w : [iw'] \text{ establishes } \tau iw \\
 & (\text{var } w . w : [iw'] ; ((\text{local } v . \tau I ; \text{inv } I) \pitchfork w, u : cw)) \\
 = & \text{implicit guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_w \text{ from local block for } w \text{ into local block for } v \\
 & (\text{var } w . w : [iw'] ; ((\text{local } v . \tau I ; \text{inv } I) \pitchfork \text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_v \pitchfork w, u : cw)) \\
 = & \text{by Lemma 8 (diminish-inv) using (70) and } v \neq w \\
 & (\text{var } w . w : [iw'] ; (\tau(\exists_v^S I) ; \text{guar}_\pi(\exists_v^S I) \Rightarrow (\exists_v^S I)') \pitchfork \text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_w \pitchfork \text{guar}_\pi \text{id}_v \pitchfork w, u : cw)) \\
 = & \text{as } \text{guar}_\pi \text{id}_v \pitchfork w, u : cw = w, u : cw \text{ and (71)} \\
 & (\text{var } w . w : [iw'] ; (\text{guar}_\pi(\exists_v^S I) \Rightarrow (\exists_v^S I)') \pitchfork \text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_w \pitchfork w, u : cw)) \\
 = & \text{as } \text{guar}_\epsilon \text{id}_w \text{ is implicit for local variable } w \text{ and (72)} \\
 & (\text{var } w . w : [iw'] ; w, u : dw) \quad \square
 \end{aligned}$$

6 Example

We consider a concurrent implementation of the Galler-Fischer data structure for implementing an equivalence relation [7]. Our theory is developed in terms of sets of states

and relations between states but when presenting an example it is preferable to use predicates characterising both the sets of states and relations. We use the notation $\ulcorner pred \urcorner$ to denote the relation characterised by the predicate $pred$.

Specification. The abstract state for the specification is an equivalence relation $eq \subseteq X \times X$, for some finite set X , with eq initially the identity relation. All operations rely that their environment only grows the equivalence relation (via $equates$), i.e. $eq_0 \subseteq eq$, where a 0-subscripted variable refers to its initial value and an unsubscripted variable to its final value. The specification of the operation $test$ is non-deterministic to allow for the fact that concurrent $equates$ may take place while the test is executing: $test(x, y)$ must return $true$ if x and y are equivalent in the initial relation eq_0 , and may return $true$ if x and y are relation in the final equivalence relation eq . The operation $equate(x, y)$ ensures that x and y are in the equivalence relation after the operation. In order to allow for concurrent $test$ and $equates$, the equating of x and y must occur atomically, and hence an atomic specification command is used. The reflexive, transitive closure of a relation r is written r^* . Transitive closure is used in the atomic specification to ensure that for any u and z , if (u, x) and (y, z) are in eq_0 then (u, z) is in eq .

$$\begin{array}{ll}
t \leftarrow test(x : X, y : X) \hat{=} & clean_up(x : X) \hat{=} \\
\text{rely } \ulcorner eq_0 \subseteq eq \urcorner \pitchfork & \text{rely } \ulcorner eq_0 \subseteq eq \urcorner \pitchfork \\
t : [\ulcorner (x, y) \in eq_0 \Rightarrow t \urcorner \wedge (t \Rightarrow (x, y) \in eq) \urcorner] & \emptyset : \text{term} \\
equate(x : X, y : X) \hat{=} & \\
\text{rely } \ulcorner eq_0 \subseteq eq \urcorner \pitchfork & \\
eq : \langle \ulcorner eq = (eq_0 \cup \{(x, y), (y, x)\})^* \urcorner \rangle &
\end{array}$$

Collette and Jones [2] introduced the concept of an *evolution invariant* r , which corresponds to $\text{rely } r \pitchfork \text{guar}_{\pi} r$. For our example, $eq_0 \supseteq eq$ is an evolution invariant. Our concurrent rely-guarantee algebra supports evolution invariants [20].

Implementation. The Galler-Fischer implementation data structure is a forest of trees represented as a parent array $f \in X \rightarrow X$, with data type invariant that the only cycles are of the form $f[n] = n$. Initially f is the identity function. We define the relation that n is a descendant of m by,

$$n \leq_f m \hat{=} (n, m) \in f^*. \quad (73)$$

The data type invariant on f corresponds to requiring the relation (\leq_f) to be a partial order, that is, it is (a) reflexive, (b) transitive, and (c) anti-symmetric. Both (a) and (b) follow directly from the definition (because it uses reflexive, transitive closure). Property (c) is an additional constraint,

$$n \leq_f m \wedge m \leq_f n \Rightarrow n = m$$

which avoids any non-trivial cycles in the forest, i.e. the only cycles are of the form $f n = n$ for the root elements. We make use of the following auxiliary definitions on the forest representation: $n \equiv_f m$ states that n and m are equivalent within the forest f , that is, they have a common ancestor and hence are both within the same tree; $roots f$ gives

the set of all elements in X that are the root of a tree; and $root\ f\ n$ gives the unique root of the tree within f that n is an element of.

$$n \equiv_f m \hat{=} \exists k . n \leq_f k \wedge m \leq_f k \quad (74)$$

$$roots\ f \hat{=} \{n \in X . n = f\ n\} \quad (75)$$

$$root\ f\ n \hat{=} \text{if } n = f\ n \text{ then } n \text{ else } root\ f\ (f\ n) \quad (76)$$

Note that $n \leq_f m$ is a partial order, so $n \equiv_f m$ is not the same as $n \leq_f m \wedge m \leq_f n$, as the later implies $n = m$ while the former only says n and m are both in the same tree. From these definitions we can deduce the following properties.

$$(root\ f\ n = root\ f\ m) \Leftrightarrow (n \equiv_f m) \quad (77)$$

$$(n \leq_f root\ f\ m) \Rightarrow (n \equiv_f m) \quad (78)$$

The function, $retr$, retrieves the equivalence relation from the forest.

$$retr\ f \hat{=} \{(n, m) \in X \times X . n \equiv_f m\} \quad (79)$$

Our coupling invariant combines the retrieve function with the data type invariant.

$$I \hat{=} \ulcorner eq = retr\ f \wedge partial_order(\leq_f) \urcorner \quad (80)$$

For the variant functions, $distance\ f\ x\ y$ is the number of arcs on the path from x to y within f , assuming $x \leq_f y$. The variant functions are in the form of a lexicographically ordered pair, with the first component $\#(roots\ f)$ handling the case when there is interference that decreases the number of roots (via equates), and the second component then handles the case where the number of roots does not change.

```

rx : X ← root_of(x : X)
rx := x;
while rx ≠ f[rx] do variant(#(roots f), distance f rx (root f rx))
  rx := f[rx]

t : B ← test(x : X, y : X) var rx, ry : X;
(rx := x || ry := y);
while rx ≠ f[rx] ∨ ry ≠ f[ry] do
  variant(#(roots f), distance f rx (root f rx) + distance f ry (root f ry))
  (rx := root_of(rx) || ry := root_of(ry));
t := rx = ry

equate(x : X, y : X) var rx, ry : X; done : B;
(rx := x || ry := y || done := false);
while ¬done do variant(#(roots f), distance f rx (root f rx))
  (rx := root_of(rx) || ry := root_of(ry));
done := CAS(f[rx], rx, ry) — or the symmetric version
    
```

The implementation also introduces an operation $clean_up(x)$ that reduces the length of the path from x to its corresponding root, without changing the equivalence relation.

$$clean_up(x : X) \hat{=} rely \ulcorner eq_0 \subseteq eq \urcorner \pitchfork \emptyset : term \quad (81)$$

While multiple $test$ and $equate$ operations may run concurrently, we assume that there is only one $clean_up$ running at any one time.

Reifying clean_up. The first step in reifying the *clean_up* operation (81) is to add the implementation state, f , to its frame, so it becomes,

$$\text{rely } \ulcorner \text{eq}_0 \subseteq \text{eq} \urcorner \pitchfork f : \text{term}. \quad (82)$$

We then reify this with coupling invariant (80) above using (63) and (64) to give,

$$\text{rely } \ulcorner \text{retr}_{f_0} \subseteq \text{retr}_f \urcorner \pitchfork \text{guar}_{\pi} \ulcorner \text{retr}_{f_0} = \text{retr}_f \urcorner \pitchfork \text{eq}, f : \text{term}. \quad (83)$$

The proof obligations are straightforward. The rely condition allows, for example, modifying f_0 for which $f_0 n = m \wedge f_0 m = m$ to f with $f n = n \wedge f m = n$ but such a modification invalidates the assertion $n \notin \text{roots } f$ (as well as others). For the implementation of *clean_up* one needs a stronger rely condition (which implies $\text{retr}_{f_0} \subseteq \text{retr}_f$),

$$\text{rely } \ulcorner \text{roots}_{f_0} \supseteq \text{roots}_f \wedge (\forall n m . n \leq_{f_0} m \Rightarrow n \leq_f m) \urcorner. \quad (84)$$

A standard rule in rely-guarantee theory is that a rely condition can be weakened but here we need to strengthen the rely condition. One can only strengthen this rely condition if all concurrent operations on f guarantee this condition. Here, this stronger rely condition (84) is guaranteed both by our implementation of *test* (because it does not modify f) and *equate* (because it only ever adds to f). Note, however, our implementation of *clean_up* does not guarantee (84), which is why only a single *clean_up* at any one time is permitted.

The following gives an annotated version of the *clean_up* procedure. The assertion just before the while loop is its invariant. Variables x, fx and rx are local to *clean_up* and hence not subject to modification by other threads. The auxiliary variable f_0 stands for the initial value of f .

```

clean_up( $x : X$ ) var  $fx, rx : X$ ;
 $rx := \text{root\_of}(x)$ ;
 $\{ \text{root}_{f_0} x \leq_{f_0} rx \leq_f \text{root}_f x \wedge x \leq_f rx \}$ 
while  $x \neq rx$  do variant( $\#(\text{roots } f)$ ,  $\text{distance } f x rx$ )
 $\{ \text{root}_{f_0} x \leq_{f_0} rx \leq_f \text{root}_f x \wedge x <_f rx \}$ 
 $fx := f[x]$ ;
 $\{ \text{root}_{f_0} x \leq_{f_0} rx \leq_f \text{root}_f x \wedge x <_f fx \leq_f rx \}$ 
 $f[x] := rx$ ;
 $\{ \text{root}_{f_0} x \leq_{f_0} rx \leq_f \text{root}_f x \wedge fx \leq_f rx \}$ 
 $x := fx$ 
 $\{ \text{root}_{f_0} x \leq_{f_0} rx \leq_f \text{root}_f x \wedge x \leq_f rx \}$ 

```

One can show the assertions in the above program are stable under the strengthened rely. The guarantee of *clean_up*, that is, $\text{retr}_{f_0} = \text{retr}_f$, is trivially satisfied by all commands other than the assignment to $f[x]$ because they do not modify f . The assignment to $f[x]$ must satisfy the guarantee, that is, $\text{retr}_f = \text{retr}(f[x \mapsto rx])$, where $f[x \mapsto rx]$ is the same as f except it maps x to rx (instead of $f x$). Expanding the definition of *retr* (79), this corresponds to showing using (77),

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall n m . (n \equiv_f m) \Leftrightarrow (n \equiv_{f[x \mapsto rx]} m) \\ \equiv & \forall n m . (\text{root}_f n = \text{root}_f m) \Leftrightarrow (\text{root}(f[x \mapsto rx]) n = \text{root}(f[x \mapsto rx]) m) \end{aligned}$$

If the paths n and m to their roots do not contain x , the equivalence holds trivially. If the path from n to its root contains x , we have $root\ f\ n = root\ f\ x$ and $root\ (f[x \mapsto rx])\ n = root\ f\ rx = root\ f\ x$ from the precondition $rx \leq_f root\ f\ x$ using (78), and similarly if the path from m to its root contains x , and hence the equivalence is maintained.

7 Conclusion

Data reification is a powerful technique for separating the concerns of specifying a data structure (or type) in terms of an abstract representation from the details of the concrete representation used to implement that data structure efficiently. The rely-guarantee approach makes the task of reasoning about concurrent programs more tractable by providing a compositional approach that allows one to reason about a component of a program in relative isolation.

The approach we have taken is to extend a concurrent rely-guarantee algebra to handle data reification. Our earlier research on generalised invariants [20], and in particular their distribution properties, provides the basis for data reifying commands with respect to a coupling invariant. Our research on localisation [19] provides a foundation for the proof of Theorem 1 (data-reification) that justifies that a reification of a (hidden) data structure guarantees that any program using the implementation data structure is a refinement of the same program using the abstract specification of the data structure.

The approach of Liang, Feng and Fu [18] is also based on the rely-guarantee approach. It uses a simulation technique, RGSim, that focuses on comparing externally observable behaviours only.

References

1. Aczel, P.H.G.: On an inference rule for parallel composition (1983), private communication to Cliff Jones <http://homepages.cs.ncl.ac.uk/cliff.jones/publications/MSs/PHGA-traces.pdf>
2. Collette, P., Jones, C.B.: Enhancing the tractability of rely/guarantee specifications in the development of interfering operations. In: Plotkin, G., Stirling, C., Tofte, M. (eds.) *Proof, Language and Interaction*, chap. 10, pp. 277–307. MIT Press (2000)
3. Colvin, R.J., Hayes, I.J., Meinicke, L.A.: Designing a semantic model for a wide-spectrum language with concurrency. *Formal Aspects of Computing* **29**, 853–875 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00165-017-0416-4>
4. Dijkstra, E.W.: Guarded commands, nondeterminacy, and a formal derivation of programs. *CACM* **18**, 453–458 (1975)
5. Dijkstra, E.W.: *A Discipline of Programming*. Prentice-Hall (1976)
6. Dongol, B., Hayes, I.J., Meinicke, L.A., Struth, G.: Cylindric Kleene lattices for program construction. In: Hutton, G. (ed.) *Mathematics of Program Construction 2019*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 11825. Springer International Publishing, Cham (Oct 2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-33636-3_8
7. Galler, B.A., Fischer, M.J.: An improved equivalence algorithm. *Commun. ACM* **7**(5), 301–303 (May 1964). <https://doi.org/10.1145/364099.364331>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/364099.364331>

8. Hayes, I.J., Jones, C.B., Meinicke, L.A.: Specifying and reasoning about shared-variable concurrency. In: Bowen, J.P., Li, Q., Xu, Q. (eds.) *Theories of Programming and Formal Methods*. pp. 110–135. No. 14080 in LNCS, Springer (2023). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-40436-8_5
9. Hayes, I.J., Meinicke, L.A., Meiring, P.A.: Deriving laws for developing concurrent programs in a rely-guarantee style (2021). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2103.15292>, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.15292>
10. Henkin, L., Monk, J.D., Tarski, A.: *Cylindric Algebras, Part I, Studies in logic and the foundations of mathematics*, vol. 64. North-Holland Pub. Co. (1971)
11. Hoare, C.A.R.: Proof of correctness of data representations. *Acta Informatica* **1**, 271–281 (1972), also in *Programming Methodology*, D. Gries (ed) Springer-Verlag (1978)
12. Jones, C.B.: *Software Development: A Rigorous Approach*. Prentice Hall International (1980), <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=539771>
13. Jones, C.B.: *Development Methods for Computer Programs including a Notion of Interference*. Ph.D. thesis, Oxford University (June 1981), available as: Oxford University Computing Laboratory (now Computer Science) Technical Monograph PRG-25
14. Jones, C.B.: Specification and design of (parallel) programs. In: *Proceedings of IFIP'83*. pp. 321–332. North-Holland (1983)
15. Jones, C.B.: Tentative steps toward a development method for interfering programs. *ACM ToPLaS* **5**(4), 596–619 (1983). <https://doi.org/10.1145/69575.69577>
16. Jones, C.B.: *Systematic Software Development using VDM*. Prentice Hall International, second edn. (1990), <http://homepages.cs.ncl.ac.uk/cliff.jones/ftp-stuff/Jones1990.pdf>
17. Jones, C.B.: Splitting atoms safely. *Theoretical Computer Science* **375**(1–3), 109–119 (2007)
18. Liang, H., Feng, X., Fu, M.: Rely-guarantee-based simulation for compositional verification of concurrent program transformations. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems* **36**(1), 3:1–3:55 (2014)
19. Meinicke, L.A., Hayes, I.J.: Using cylindric algebra to support local variables in rely/guarantee concurrency. In: *2023 IEEE/ACM 11th International Conference on Formal Methods in Software Engineering (FormaliSE)*. pp. 108–119. IEEE (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1109/FormaliSE58978.2023.00019>
20. Meinicke, L.A., Hayes, I.J.: Reasoning about distributive laws in a concurrent refinement algebra (2024), arXiv:2403.13425 [cs.LO]
21. Milner, R.: An algebraic definition of simulation between programs. Tech. Rep. CS-205, Computer Science Dept, Stanford University (February 1971)
22. Nipkow, T., Paulson, L.C., Wenzel, M.: *Isabelle/HOL: A Proof Assistant for Higher-Order Logic*, LNCS, vol. 2283. Springer (2002)