

Complete Dynamic Logic of Communicating Hybrid Programs

MARVIN BRIEGER, LMU Munich, Germany

STEFAN MITSCH, DePaul University, USA

ANDRÉ PLATZER, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany

This article presents a relatively complete proof calculus for the dynamic logic of communicating hybrid programs dL_{CHP} . Beyond traditional hybrid systems mixing discrete and continuous dynamics, communicating hybrid programs feature parallel interactions of hybrid systems. This not only compounds the subtleties of hybrid and parallel systems but adds the truly simultaneous synchronized evolution of parallel hybrid dynamics as a new challenge. To enable compositional reasoning about communicating hybrid programs nevertheless, dL_{CHP} combines differential dynamic logic dL and assumption-commitment reasoning. To maintain the logical essence of dynamic logic axiomatizations, dL_{CHP} 's proof calculus presents a new modal logic view onto ac-reasoning. This modal view drives a decomposition of classical monolithic proof rules for parallel systems reasoning into new modular axioms, which yields better flexibility and simplifies soundness arguments. Adequacy of the proof calculus is shown by two completeness results: First, dL_{CHP} is complete relative to the logic of communication traces and differential equation properties. This result proves the new modular modal view sufficient for reasoning about parallel hybrid systems, and captures modular strategies for reasoning about concrete parallel hybrid systems. The second result proof-theoretically aligns dL_{CHP} and dL by proving that reasoning about parallel hybrid systems is exactly as hard as reasoning about hybrid systems, continuous systems, or discrete systems. This completeness result reveals the possibility of representational succinctness in parallel hybrid systems proofs.

CCS Concepts: • **Theory of computation** → **Timed and hybrid models; Proof theory; Modal and temporal logics; Process calculi; Programming logic.**

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Parallel hybrid systems, Parallel programs, hybrid systems, Differential dynamic logic, Assumption-commitment reasoning, CSP, Completeness

1 INTRODUCTION

Hybrid systems combine discrete and continuous dynamics following discrete jumps and differential equations. Parallel systems simultaneously run subsystems tied together by communication. Both system classes interlock dynamical behavior in a way that their sum becomes more complex than their pieces making each—the verification of hybrid [1, 2, 19, 39] and parallel systems [3, 12, 28, 36]—significant challenges. This article studies parallel interactions of hybrid systems, leading to the combined discrete, continuous, *and* parallel dynamics of parallel hybrid systems. The combination of hybrid and parallel dynamics poses genuinely new challenges including the simultaneous synchronization of subsystems in a global time. While different variants of parallel actions are considered in parallel program verification [7, 8], parallel hybrid systems require true simultaneous parallel composition, because not even interleaving is enough to represent the fact that hybrid systems composed in parallel truly evolve at the same shared time and that it would be counterfactual in classical mechanics to have a simultaneous parallel composition whose subsystems take a different amount of time from the initial state to the final state. The study of parallel hybrid systems safety is important, because cyber-physical systems (CPSs) naturally feature parallel hybrid systems stemming from separate subsystems.

This article follows the logic of multi-dynamical systems principle [45, 48] in order to tame the analytic complexity and disentangle the mixed effects of discrete, continuous, and parallel system dynamics, which would otherwise

Authors' addresses: Marvin Brieger, marvin.brieger@sosy.fwi.lmu.de, LMU Munich, Germany; Stefan Mitsch, DePaul University, Illinois, USA, smitsch@depaul.edu; André Platzer, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany, platzer@kit.edu.

be overwhelming. The article studies the *dynamic logic of communicating hybrid programs* dL_{CHP} [6], which extends differential dynamic logic dL for hybrid systems [39, 46, 48] with the ability to model and verify parallelism. *Communicating hybrid programs (CHPs)* are a compositional model for parallel interactions of cyber-physical systems (CPSs). Given programs α, β , e.g., modeling individual cars or robots, the parallel composition $\alpha \parallel \beta$ models their simultaneous evolution during which α and β may communicate via lossless instantaneous channels (others can be modeled). Every parallel program that contains a channel has to participate in communication along that channel, i.e., needs to agree with the other participants on a common value and time for each communication. For compositional verification of parallelism, dL_{CHP} blends the dynamic logic [16, 17, 52] setup of dL [39, 46, 48] with assumption-commitment (ac) reasoning [12, 34, 56]. The ac-box modality $[\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ introduced for this purpose complements the reachability modality $[\alpha]\psi$ stating that the promise ψ is true of all worlds reachable by program α . The assumption A limits all possible incoming communication while the commitment C is a promise about all outgoing communication. The main subject of this article is a modular, compositional, and sound Hilbert-type proof calculus for dL_{CHP} . We prove completeness and stress the modal logic perspective taken to achieve a graceful embedding of ac-reasoning into dynamic logic.

Sound and Compositional Calculus. Compositional reasoning reduces the proof of a composite system to the proof of its pieces. This truly reduces the complexity of the verification tasks, but only if proof rules reason solely based on specifications of the subsystems without needing knowledge of their internal implementation [12]. This article only refers to this only-by-specification style of compositional verification. dL_{CHP} allows genuine compositional reasoning about parallel systems. This is in stark contrast with Hybrid Hoare-logics (HHLs)¹ [14, 30, 55], which are non-compositional because they do not attempt to be [30], or because they always explicitly enumerate the exponentially many runs of all parallel interactions using an explicit interleaving operator [55] or encoding in the Duration Calculus [14]. This exhaustive unfolding [14, 55] simply moves the state space explosion to the base logic, thus, leaves no room for local abstractions only based on the relevant program behavior. Utilizing the compositionality of the denotational semantics of CHPs and ac-reasoning [34, 56], dL_{CHP} does not have to specify more observable behavior than strictly necessary for reasoning about parallel hybrid systems but can always specify enough to be complete. Unlike HHL, dL_{CHP} is closed under all operators, and unlike our previous work on dL_{CHP} [6], we present an axiomatization that can deal with the ac-diamond $\langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A,C\}}\psi$, the modal dual of the ac-box.

- (i) We present a Hilbert-type proof calculus for dL_{CHP} and prove its soundness. Using assumption-commitments, the calculus truly achieves only-by-specification compositional reasoning for parallel hybrid systems, which is imperative to disentangle their different dynamics in a way truly taming their complexity.

Modal Logic View. Ac-reasoning is the conceptual basis for compositional reasoning about parallelism in dL_{CHP} but had only been supported for discrete Hoare-logic previously [56, 57]. We develop a novel modal view of ac-reasoning enabling its graceful blending into dL_{CHP} 's dynamic logic setup. Graceful means that dL_{CHP} 's axioms reflect generalizations of the Pratt-Seegerberg axiom system [16, 52, 53] for dynamic logic whenever possible. The Hoare-style ac-specification $(A, C):\{\varphi\}\alpha\{\psi\}$ combines an ordinary Hoare-triple $\{\varphi\}\alpha\{\psi\}$ with an assumption A about the incoming communication and a commitment C about the outgoing communication. The logical cornerstone of dL_{CHP} 's development replaces this ad-hoc construct with a modal perspective: For the ac-box $[\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$, the pair (A, α) is a modal action: It denotes the worlds reachable by the transitions of program α whose incoming communication agrees with

¹Assume-guarantee reasoning as a generic concept embraces a wide variety of techniques. It has also been applied to Hybrid Hoare-logic [14] but must not be confused with assumption-commitment reasoning, which is the specific proof technique for message-passing concurrency that we use in dL_{CHP} .

assumption A. Commitment and postcondition (C, ψ) are promises, where C is evaluated in intermediate worlds corresponding to the communication of α and where ψ is the postcondition in final worlds.² It is the stringent application of this modal viewpoint to Pratt-Segerberg axioms that drives their generalization to ac-reasoning in dL_{CHP} .

- (ii) dL_{CHP} 's axiomatization develops a modal logic perspective onto ac-reasoning. It is the key behind its graceful blending into dynamic logic, thereby providing for ac-reasoning dynamic logic's flexibility of being closed under all logical operators. This development is also relevant for parallel systems independent of hybridness.

Sticking to stringency, dL_{CHP} develops a new modularization of parallel systems reasoning into axioms whose conceptual simplicity is superior to highly composite proof rules in Hoare-style ac-reasoning [56, 57]. This enables a modular separation of concerns in both reasoning and soundness proofs. The highlight of this development is the parallel injection axiom $[\alpha]\psi \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]\psi$, which is sound if β has no influence on the truth of ψ [6]. Despite its asymmetry, it surprisingly suffices to reason about the safety of parallel hybrid systems once combined with fundamental modal logic principles that enable the suitable combination of the insights from the injection of properties about successive projections onto the parallel subsystems. The completeness results reveal that parallel systems do not need complex highly composite proof rules but can be based on parallel injection and carefully generalized modal logic principles.

- (iii) The logical purity of dynamic logic compared to Hoare-logic gives rise to parallel injection and other carefully designed new axioms. These axioms are insightful due to their convincing simplicity, provide flexibility due to their modular separation of concerns, and in consequence simplify soundness arguments compared to highly composite proof rules in ac-reasoning. This also supports implementation in theorem prover microkernels [6].

Relative Completeness. The subtle dependency between discrete and continuous change in hybrid systems and between subprograms of parallel systems makes their completeness a nontrivial challenge. Complete compositional reasoning about parallel hybrid systems needs a proof calculus that can disentangle all these phenomena while they are additionally interlocked in the global evolution of time that all communication and computations need to agree upon to respect physical reality. Our completeness proof tackles this combining and extending ideas from dL [39, 43, 46], ac-reasoning [12, 57], and differential game logic dGL [44], while solving the technical challenge to reconcile the inherently different ingredients necessary for discrete, continuous, and communication dynamics, e.g., in expressiveness of the transition semantics of CHPs.

- (iv) dL_{CHP} 's axiomatization is proven complete relative to Ω -FOD, the first-order logic of communication traces and differential equations. This proves that the modal view onto parallel systems reasoning in dL_{CHP} successfully modularizes parallel systems reasoning without losing completeness. The proof itself indicates how to combine dL_{CHP} 's axioms in a modular and idiomatic way to obtain complete reasoning about parallel hybrid systems.
- (v) Building on top of item (iv), dL_{CHP} is proven complete relative to FOD, the first-order logic of differential equations. Now, the results ($\stackrel{\text{new}}{=}$) proof-theoretically fully align dL_{CHP} and dL , and show that reasoning about parallel hybrid systems is possible to the same extent as reasoning about differential equation properties:

$$dL_{\text{CHP}} \stackrel{\text{new}}{=} \Omega\text{-FOD} \stackrel{\text{new}}{=} \text{FOD} \stackrel{[39]}{=} dL \quad (\text{proof-theoretically})$$

Summary. The article presents dL_{CHP} , a *dynamic logic* for reasoning about parallel interactions of communicating hybrid systems. The core contribution is dL_{CHP} 's *compositional, sound, and complete* proof calculus based on a graceful embedding of ac-reasoning into Pratt-Segerberg's well-established proof system for dynamic logic. This development

²That is, dL_{CHP} is a two-dimensional multi-modal logic whose modalities denote two universes (sets of worlds). dL_{CHP} 's modal actions are assumption-program pairs, and commitment and postcondition are promises evaluated over the two different universes of intermediate and final worlds, respectively.

enables purely specification-based compositional reasoning but also intensifies the question whether the calculus is strong enough to prove all properties of parallel hybrid systems. Beyond previous work [6] this article gives a positive answer and proves completeness. To the best of our knowledge, dL_{CHP} is the first complete and compositional logic for parallel hybrid systems, and the first complete dynamic logic, i.e., covering liveness modalities, for ac-reasoning.

Outline. The article is structured follows: Section 2 introduces the dynamic logic of communicating hybrid programs dL_{CHP} , in particular, its syntax, semantics, and static semantics. Section 3 presents a Hilbert-style proof calculus for dL_{CHP} and proves its soundness. Section 4 contains the main result of this article and gives two complementary completeness results for the calculus in Section 3. Section 5 discusses related work, and Section 6 draws conclusions.

2 DYNAMIC LOGIC OF COMMUNICATING HYBRID PROGRAMS

This section presents dL_{CHP} , the dynamic logic of communicating hybrid programs (CHPs) [6] and introduces its syntax, semantics, and static semantics. CHPs are a compositional model of parallel interactions of cyber-physical systems. They extend hybrid programs [39] with communication and parallelism in the style of communicating sequential processes (CSP) [21]. For specifying communication behavior, dL_{CHP} embeds ac-reasoning [12, 34, 56, 57] into dL 's dynamic logic setup. A convoy of two cars safely adjusting their speed despite lossy communication [5] serves as running example.

2.1 Syntax

The syntax builds upon real variables $V_{\mathbb{R}}$ and trace $V_{\mathcal{T}}$ variables, and $V = V_{\mathbb{R}} \cup V_{\mathcal{T}}$ are all variables. Differential variables are included in $V_{\mathbb{R}}$, i.e., $x' \in V_{\mathbb{R}}$ for every unprimed $x \in V_{\mathbb{R}}$. For $z \in V_{\mathbb{M}}$, define $\text{type}(z) = \mathbb{M}$ to be the *type* of z . Channel names $\Omega = \mathbb{N}$ complete the signature. By convention, $x, y \in V_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $h \in V_{\mathcal{T}}$, and $\text{ch}, \text{dh} \in \Omega$, and $z \in V$ has an arbitrary type. Channel sets $Y, C \subseteq \Omega$ are always assumed to be (co)finite. Boolean variables can be modeled and are conventionally denoted \checkmark . Expression vectors \bar{e} are written with a bar. Two vectors are *compatible* if they have the same length and the same types per component. The variable vector \bar{z} is *fresh* if each of its components is a fresh variable.

CHPs model distributed hybrid systems, i.e., the subprograms α, β of the parallel program $\alpha \parallel \beta$ may not share state, but they synchronize in time and can interact by instantaneous communication along channels. The global time $\mu \in V_{\mathbb{R}}$ and its differential $\mu' \in V_{\mathbb{R}}$ have a special role being the only real variables that may be shared between parallel programs. By convention, $\bar{\mu} = (\mu, \mu')$. In parallel $\alpha \parallel \beta$, the subprograms α and β have to agree on the time μ of each joint communication, and the final states need to agree on the global time $\bar{\mu}$,³ where μ' needs consideration to determine its final value unambiguously. Used as a global clock, μ can model time-synchronous parallelism. Channels are *not* limited to unidirectional communication between exactly two processes, although this is a common use case. Instead, communication takes place whenever a program can agree with the environment on the value and time.

CHPs model hybrid systems over a real-valued state. Trace variables record the communication of CHPs and provide the interface to reason about it, but they are *not* part of what is being modeled. Therefore, apart from recorder variables, CHPs only operate on real variables. In particular, CHPs cannot read the recorded history. Integer terms for specifying trace properties are not explicitly included as in previous work [6], which simplifies concepts for the completeness proof, but is no restriction because integer arithmetic can be defined in dL , so in dL_{CHP} , anyway [46].

³Unlike in previous work on dL_{CHP} [6], the global time μ no longer silently evolves with every continuous evolution in CHPs. This renders the global passage of time a modeling problem but ultimately simplifies concepts as it abolishes implicit continuous behavior.

Definition 2.1 (Terms). The terms of dL_{CHP} are real terms $\text{Trm}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and trace terms $\text{Trm}_{\mathcal{T}}$ defined by the following grammar, where $c \in \mathbb{Q}$, and $\text{ch} \in \Omega$, and $\theta, \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{Q}[V_{\mathbb{R}}] \subset \text{Trm}_{\mathbb{R}}$ are polynomials in $V_{\mathbb{R}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Trm}_{\mathbb{R}} : \quad & \eta_1, \eta_2 ::= x \mid c \mid \eta_1 + \eta_2 \mid \eta_1 \cdot \eta_2 \mid (\theta)' \mid \text{chan}(te) \mid \text{val}(te) \mid \text{time}(te) \mid |te| \\ \text{Trm}_{\mathcal{T}} : \quad & te_1, te_2 ::= h \mid \epsilon \mid \langle \text{ch}, \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle \mid te_1 \cdot te_2 \mid te \downarrow Y \mid te[\eta] \end{aligned}$$

The terms combine real-arithmetic as in dL with abilities to specify communication traces, which are adapted from ac-reasoning [12, 57] to hybrid systems. In programs, only polynomials $\mathbb{Q}[V_{\mathbb{R}}] \subset \text{Trm}_{\mathbb{R}}$ in real variables $V_{\mathbb{R}}$ including differential terms $(\theta)'$ occur as the program state is purely real valued. By convention, $\theta \in \mathbb{Q}[V_{\mathbb{R}}]$. Real terms $\text{Trm}_{\mathbb{R}}$ are polynomials $\mathbb{Q}[V_{\mathbb{R}}]$ plus the operators $\text{chan}(te)$, $\text{val}(te)$, and $\text{time}(te)$ accessing the channel name, value, and time, respectively, of the last communication in the trace te , and $|te|$ denotes the length of te . If the trace te is empty, the operators $\text{val}(te)$, $\text{time}(te)$ and $\text{chan}(te)$ evaluate to 0 as default value.

Trace terms $\text{Trm}_{\mathcal{T}}$ are variables h , the empty trace ϵ , communication items $\langle \text{ch}, \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle$, concatenation of traces $te_1 \cdot te_2$, projection $te \downarrow Y$ onto channel set Y , and access $te[\eta]$ to the $[\eta]$ -th communication item in trace te , where $[\cdot]$ is rounding. If access $te[\eta]$ is out-of-bounds, it yields the empty trace ϵ . The item $\langle \text{ch}, \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle$ represents a communication event with value θ_1 at time θ_2 on channel ch . Value and time come from programs, thus are real polynomials $\theta_i \in \mathbb{Q}[V_{\mathbb{R}}]$. The projection $te \downarrow Y$ is obtained from te by removing all items whose channel name is not in Y . For example, $\text{val}(h \downarrow \text{ch})$ asks for the value of the last communication along channel ch recorded by h , and $\text{time}(h \downarrow \text{dh}) - \text{time}((h \downarrow \text{dh})[|h \downarrow \text{dh}| - 1])$ is the time difference between the last two dh -communications.

Programs (Def. 2.2) and formulas (Def. 2.6) have a mutually dependent syntax as programs occur in formulas via modalities and formulas as tests in programs. Their context-sensitive grammars presume notions of free variables $\text{FV}(\cdot)$ and bound variables $\text{BV}(\cdot)$, which are formally introduced later in Section 2.3.

Definition 2.2 (Programs). *Communicating hybrid programs* are defined by the grammar below, where $\theta \in \mathbb{Q}[V_{\mathbb{R}}]$ is a polynomial in $V_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\chi \in \text{FOL}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is a formula of first-order real-arithmetic, i.e., a first-order formula over $\mathbb{Q}[V_{\mathbb{R}}]$ -terms. In $\alpha \parallel \beta$, the subprograms must not share state, i.e., $\text{BV}(\alpha) \cap \text{BV}(\beta) \subseteq \{\bar{\mu}\} \cup V_{\mathcal{T}}$. Every program α has at most one recorder, which is denoted $h^\alpha \in V_{\mathcal{T}}$, i.e., $\text{BV}(\alpha) \cap V_{\mathcal{T}} \subseteq \{h^\alpha\}$. If α has no recorder, $h^\alpha \in V_{\mathcal{T}}$ is arbitrary but fixed.

$$\alpha, \beta ::= \underbrace{x := \theta \mid x := * \mid ?\chi \mid \{x' = \theta \ \& \ \chi\} \mid \alpha; \beta \mid \alpha \cup \beta \mid \alpha^*}_{\text{hybrid programs from dL}} \mid \underbrace{\text{ch}(h)! \theta \mid \text{ch}(h)?x \mid \alpha \parallel \beta}_{\text{CSP extension}}$$

CHPs combine hybrid programs from dL [39] with CSP-style [21] communication primitives and a parallel operator. Assignment $x := \theta$ updates x to θ , nondeterministic assignment $x := *$ sets x to any value, and the test $?\chi$ does nothing if χ is satisfied and aborts execution otherwise. Continuous evolution $x' = \theta \ \& \ \chi$ follows the differential equation $x' = \theta$ for any duration but only as long as the domain constraint χ is not violated. Terms θ and tests χ in programs are limited to $\mathbb{Q}[V_{\mathbb{R}}]$ -polynomials and first-order real arithmetic $\text{FOL}_{\mathbb{R}}$, respectively, as CHPs operate over a real-valued state. Sequential composition $\alpha; \beta$ first executes α and then β , nondeterministic choice $\alpha \cup \beta$ either executes α or β , and repetition α^* repeats α for zero or more times.

The send statement $\text{ch}(h)! \theta$ instantaneously communicates the value θ along the channel ch if at the current time μ , the environment can agree with θ on ch . However, a program in parallel only needs to agree on communication attempts on the channels that the program contains, i.e., these channels are the program's interface. Sending has no effect on the local state but aborts execution if communication is not possible. The receive statement $\text{ch}(h)?x$ writes any value into the variable x that the environment can communicate. For both communication primitives, the trace variable

h records the communication for later reasoning about the program. Parallel composition $\alpha \parallel \beta$ executes α and β truly simultaneously if they agree at the same times on the communication along their joint channels and on a common final time. Parallel programs cannot share state, because CHPs model distributed systems with parallel interactions via communication. This excludes the global time $\bar{\mu}$, on which the subprograms in return can never disagree.

Example 2.3 (Communication). Communication channels are not unidirectional and do not connect only two-processes. For example, the program $\text{ch!}\theta \parallel \text{ch?}x_1 \parallel \dots \parallel \text{ch?}x_l$ has runs where every x_i is assigned with the value of θ . This broadcast communication has useful applications such as the simultaneous announcement of a velocity threshold to all participants in a vehicle convoy. The program $\text{ch!}\theta_1 \parallel \text{ch!}\theta_2$ also has runs if the values of θ_1 and θ_2 agree.

Example 2.4 (Continuous parallel dynamics). First of all, parallel CHPs do *not* synchronize in time, e.g., the semantics of $x' = 1 \parallel y' = 4$ equals any sequential composition its subprograms because $\bar{\mu}$ is not bound by $x' = 1$ and $y' = 4$, so the subprogram agree on final time $\bar{\mu}$ no matter how long the runs of $x' = 1$ and $y' = 4$ are. Synchronous time needs explicit modeling, which, however, can be done following a generic pattern: Add $\mu' = 1$ to advance the global time μ to every continuous evolution while not binding $\bar{\mu}$ elsewhere. For example, in $(v := *; \{\mu' = 1, x' = v\})^* \parallel \{\mu' = 1, y' = 4\}$, the loop can repeat and change v arbitrarily often, but the parallel subprograms run for the same amount of time.

Analogous to the distinct history variable in Hoare-style ac-reasoning [25], every program α is assigned one trace variable h^α as the designated interface for reasoning about its communication. A unique recorder ensures that the total order of communication is observable, which is necessary for completeness. A globally distinct recorder, however, is not sufficient as modalities can refer to different execution stages relative to a joint origin history (see Remark 2.8). The notation h^α determines a fixed recorder for α even if $\text{BV}(\alpha) \cap V_{\mathcal{T}} = \emptyset$ avoiding special treatment of the no-recorder case.

Example 2.5 (Communicating cars [5]). Fig. 1 models a convoy of two cars safely adjusting their speed. From time to time, the leader changes its speed v_l in the range 0 to V and notifies this to the follower. This communication, however, is lossy ($\text{vel}(h)!v_l \cup \text{skip}$). As a safety mechanism, the follower measures its distance d to the leader at least every ϵ time units. This is modeled by receiving the leader's position on channel pos in dist . If the distance d fell below ϵV , the follower slows down in dist to avoid collision before the next measurement. Regularly, the follower adopts speed updates in velo , but crucially refuses if the last known distance d is unsafe ($\neg(d > \epsilon V)$). Even though the speed update is perfectly fine at the moment, an unsafe distance can cause a future collision if a future slow down of the leader gets lost (see Fig. 2). Then only a subsequent position measurement can reliably tell if it is safe to obey the leader's speed again.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{velo} \equiv \text{vel}(h)?v_{tar}; \text{if } (d > \epsilon V) \ v_f := v_{tar} \ \text{fi} & \text{comm} \equiv v_l := *; ?0 \leq v_l \leq V; (\text{vel}(h)!v_l \cup \text{skip}) \\
\text{dist} \equiv \text{pos}(h)?m; d := m - x_f; \text{if } (d \leq \epsilon V) \ \{v_f := *; ?0 \leq v_f < d/\epsilon\} \ \text{fi}; w := 0 & \text{upd} \equiv \text{pos}(h)!x_l \\
\text{plant}_f \equiv \{x'_f = v_f, w' = 1 \ \& \ w \leq \epsilon\} & \text{plant}_l \equiv \{x'_l = v_l\} \\
\text{follower} \equiv ((\text{velo} \cup \text{dist}); \text{plant}_f)^* & \text{leader} \equiv ((\text{comm} \cup \text{upd}); \text{plant}_l)^*
\end{array}$$

Fig. 1. Models of two moving cars (follower and leader) forming the convoy $\text{follower} \parallel \text{leader}$ by parallel composition. All continuous evolutions are assumed to contain $\mu' = 1$ modeling time-synchronous parallel behavior (Example 2.4). As usual $\text{if } (\varphi) \ \alpha \ \text{fi} \equiv ?\varphi; \alpha \cup ?\neg\varphi$.

Definition 2.6 (Formulas). The formulas of dL_{CHP} are defined by the grammar below for relations \sim , terms $e_1, e_2 \in \text{Trm}$ of equal sort, and $z \in V$. The relations \sim include equality $=$ on all sorts, greater-equals \geq on real and integer terms, and the prefix relation \leq on traces. The ac-formulas are unaffected by state change in α i.e., $\text{FV}(A, C) \cap (\text{BV}(\alpha) \cup \{\bar{\mu}\}) \subseteq V_{\mathcal{T}}$.

$$\varphi, \psi, A, C ::= e_1 \sim e_2 \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \wedge \psi \mid \forall z \varphi \mid [\alpha]\psi \mid [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \mid \langle \alpha \rangle \psi \mid \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A,C\}}\psi$$

The formulas of dL_{CHP} combine first-order dynamic logic [16] with ac-reasoning [34, 56] by adding ac-modalities. As usual, the box $[\alpha]\psi$ holds if the postcondition ψ holds in all states reachable by program α , and the diamond $\langle \alpha \rangle \psi$ holds if ψ holds in some state reachable by α . Let an (A, α) -run be an α -run whose incoming communication satisfies the assumption A . Then the ac-box $[\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ states that for all (A, α) -runs, the outgoing communication fulfills the commitment C and if a final state is reached, the postcondition ψ holds there. Dually, the ac-diamond $\langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ holds if there exists an (A, α) -run that either satisfies C or reaches a final state where ψ holds. Indeed, the dynamic modalities $[\alpha]\psi$ and $\langle \alpha \rangle \psi$ are special cases $[\alpha]_{\{\top, \top\}}\psi$ and $\langle \alpha \rangle_{\{\top, \perp\}}\psi$, respectively, of the ac-modalities.

From the included relations ($=$ on all types, \geq on real and integer terms, and the prefix relation \leq on trace terms), more can be defined. Other first-order connectives, e.g., \vee and $\exists z \varphi$, are definable as usual. The formulas \perp (falsity) and \top (truth) are definable. Where useful, we write $\forall z: \mathbb{M}$ with explicit type $\mathbb{M} = \text{type}(z)$ instead of $\forall z$ for emphasis.

Let $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket$ be a unifying notation for $[\alpha]$ and $\langle \alpha \rangle$. The realization that the assumption-program pair (A, α) induces the reachability relation of the modality $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ constitutes the cornerstone of our modal logic viewpoint onto ac-reasoning. In turn, commitment and postcondition (C, ψ) are both promises. However, it is also aptly to refer to (A, C) as the communication contract of $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket_{\{A,C\}}\psi$. For a formula χ and a program α , call (χ, α) *communicatively well-formed* if they obey $\text{FV}(\chi) \cap (\text{BV}(\alpha) \cup \{\bar{\mu}\}) \subseteq V_{\mathcal{T}}$. In particular, (A, α) and (C, α) are communicatively well-formed if $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ is a well-formed formula (Def. 2.6). The communication contract (A, C) of $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ must not depend on state variables $\text{BV}(\alpha) \cup \{\bar{\mu}\}$ of α because compositional reasoning needs specifications only based on the externally observable behavior [12]. The time of communication can be obtained in (A, C) by accessing the timestamp of the event, thus excluding the global time $\bar{\mu}$ from (A, C) is not a limitation.⁴ In turn, exclusion of $\bar{\mu}$ simplifies concepts in our proof calculus.

Example 2.7. Example 2.5 models a convoy consisting of a follower and a leader car. Now, the formula below specifies when to consider their parallel interaction safe. If they start with a distance $> d$, and if the follower has a speed $v_f \leq d/\epsilon$ that prevents it from colliding with the leader within the first ϵ time units, and if the leader does not drive backward initially ($v_l \geq 0$), then the cars do never collide ($x_f < x_l$) when run in parallel.

$$\epsilon \geq 0 \wedge w = 0 \wedge 0 \leq v_f \leq d/\epsilon \wedge v_f \leq v_l \wedge v_l \geq 0 \wedge x_f + d < x_l \rightarrow [\text{follower} \parallel \text{leader}] x_f < x_l$$

⁴The initial state of α can always be accessed in A and C by appropriate ghost variables.




Fig. 2. Qualitative plot of example positions x_f and x_l of the cars over time. First, speed update is accepted (\checkmark). The next update is lost ($- \rightarrow \times$). After reliably measuring the position (\dagger), the follower adjusts its speed. Crucially, it conservatively rejects the speed update (\checkmark) when a crash (ζ) with a slowing leader is possible since speed communication may fail ($- \rightarrow \times$) until the next reliable position measurement is expected, see dashed trajectory ($- - -$).

Remark 2.8 (Dynamic Histories). In Hoare-style ac-reasoning, a globally distinguished variable sufficiently represents the communication history [25]. Dynamic logic adds flexibility over Hoare-logic being closed under all logical operators. Axiomatic proof calculi use this advantage and axiomatize programs by expressing how they relate possible worlds symbolically, e.g., the formula $[\text{ch}(h)!\theta]\psi(h) \leftrightarrow \forall h_0 (h_0 = h \cdot \langle \text{ch}, \theta, \mu \rangle \rightarrow \psi(h_0))$ assigns the fresh name h_0 to the world reached by $\text{ch}(h)!\theta$ and relates it with the initial world h via $h_0 = h \cdot \langle \text{ch}, \theta, \mu \rangle$. If $\psi(h) \equiv [\text{dh}(h)!\theta]\varphi(h)$, the dh -communication takes place in the world h_0 , so that $\psi(h_0) \equiv [\text{dh}(h_0)!\theta]\varphi(h_0)$. This exemplifies the need for explicit renameable recorder variables, which enable the history to keep up with the flexible reasoning about multiple worlds via their symbolic relations that is inherent in dynamic logic and key to its modularity. Nevertheless, the restriction to one recorder variable per modality keeps track of the total order of communication events as necessary for completeness.

2.2 Semantics

A (*communication*) *event* $\langle \text{ch}, d, s \rangle \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ occurs on a channel ch , and carries a value d and a timestamp s . A *trace* is a finite sequence of events.⁵ The set of traces is denoted $\mathcal{T} = (\Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})^*$. For traces τ, τ_1, τ_2 and channels $Y \subseteq \Omega$, the trace $\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2$ is the *concatenation* of τ_1, τ_2 , and the *projection* $\tau \downarrow Y$ is obtained from τ by removing all events whose channel is not in Y . We write $\tau \downarrow \alpha$ for $\tau \downarrow \text{CN}(\alpha)$, where $\text{CN}(\alpha)$ are the channels occurring in α syntactically. A *recorded trace* $\tau = (h, \tau_0) \in V_{\mathcal{T}} \times \mathcal{T}$ declares, along with the trace τ_0 , the trace variable h that recorded it. Equivalently, a recorded trace is a map $\tau \in V_{\mathcal{T}} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ with $\tau(h_0) = \epsilon$ for all $h_0 \in V_{\mathcal{T}}$ but the fixed recorder $h \neq h_0$. Then concatenation and projection lift to recorded traces by point-wise application, where concatenation requires traces with equal recorder. Overloading the symbol $\epsilon \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\epsilon = (h, \epsilon) \in V_{\mathcal{T}} \times \mathcal{T}$ denote the empty (recorded) trace. For $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ and $d \in \mathbb{R}$, access $\tau[d]$ returns the $[d]$ -th item of τ , which is ϵ if $[d]$ is out-of-bounds. For $\tau = (h, \tau_0) \in V_{\mathcal{T}} \times \mathcal{T}$, define $\tau[d] = (h, \tau_0[d])$.

A *state* is a mapping $\nu : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \mathcal{T}$ from variables to values such that $\nu(z) \in \text{type}(z)$ for all $z \in V$. If $d \in \text{type}(z)$, the *update* ν_z^d is defined by $\nu_z^d(z) = d$ and $\nu_z^d = \nu$ on $\{z\}^c$. *State-trace concatenation* $\nu \cdot \tau$ with recorded trace $\tau = (h, \tau_0)$ is defined by $(\nu \cdot \tau)(h) = \nu(h) \cdot \tau_0$ and $\nu \cdot \tau = \nu$ on $\{h\}^c$. For $X \subseteq V_{\mathcal{T}}$, the *state projection* $\nu \downarrow_X Y$ applies to every trace variable, i.e., $(\nu \downarrow_X Y)(h) = \nu(h) \downarrow Y$ for all $h \in X \cap V_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\nu \downarrow_X Y = \nu$ elsewhere. If $X = V_{\mathcal{T}}$, write $\nu \downarrow Y$ for $\nu \downarrow_X Y$.

The semantics of terms (Def. 2.9) evaluates variables by the state, constants as themselves, and built-in operators evaluate by their semantic counterparts. The differential $(\theta)'$ describes the local rate of change of θ [46].

Definition 2.9 (Term semantics). The *valuation* $v[[e]] \in \mathbb{R} \cup \mathcal{T}$ of the term e in the state ν is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} v[[z]] &= \nu(z) \\ v[[\text{op}(e_1, \dots, e_k)]] &= \text{op}(v[[e_1]], \dots, v[[e_k]]) \quad \text{for built-in op} \in \{\cdot + \cdot, \cdot \downarrow Y, \dots\} \text{ including constants } c \in \mathbb{Q} \\ v[[(\theta)']] &= \sum_{x \in V_{\mathbb{R}}} \nu(x') \frac{\partial v[[\theta]]}{\partial x} \end{aligned}$$

Since programs and formulas are mutually dependent in their syntax, Def. 2.10 and Def. 2.12 define the semantics by a mutual recursion on their structure. The denotational semantics of CHPs [6] embeds dL's Kripke semantics [39] into a linear history semantics for communicating programs [56]. Additionally, parallel hybrid dynamics synchronize in the global time, i.e., joint communication needs to agree on the time μ and the final states on all shared real variables $\bar{\mu}$.

⁵The events are not necessarily assumed to be chronological, e.g., the program $\text{ch}(h)!\theta; \mu := \mu - 1; \text{ch}(h)!\theta$ produces non-chronological communication. However, models resulting from real-world applications commonly feature chronological communication.

The denotation $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket \in \mathcal{D}$ of a CHP α is drawn from a domain $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S} \times (V_{\mathcal{T}} \times \mathcal{T}) \times \mathcal{S}_{\perp})$ with $\mathcal{S}_{\perp} = \mathcal{S} \cup \{\perp\}$, where $\mathcal{P}(\cdot)$ is the powerset. Each run $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \mathcal{S} \times (V_{\mathcal{T}} \times \mathcal{T}) \times \mathcal{S}_{\perp}$ starts in an initial state v , emits communication τ , and either finally approaches a state $\omega \neq \perp$, or if $\omega = \perp$, the run is an *unfinished computation*. If unfinished, the run either can be continued or failed a test (including the domain constraint of continuous evolution) such that execution aborts. For a run (v, τ, ω) , call the concatenation $v \cdot \tau$ an *intermediate state*, and if $\omega \neq \perp$, call $\omega \cdot \tau$ a *final state*.

The linear order of communication events imposes two natural properties on the domain: Prefix-closedness comprises that if a program has the communication history τ , all of its prefixes $\tau' \leq \tau$ were already observable. Totality is that computation can start from every state even if it immediately aborts. To make this precise, we lift the prefix relation \leq on traces to trace-state pairs as follows: If $(\tau', \omega') = (\tau, \omega)$, or $\tau' \leq \tau$ and $\omega' = \perp$, then $(\tau', \omega') \leq (\tau, \omega)$. Now, define a denotation $D \in \mathcal{D}$ to be (1) prefix-closed and (2) total as follows: (1) If $(v, \tau, \omega) \in D$ and $(\tau', \omega') \leq (\tau, \omega)$, then $(v, \tau', \omega') \in D$. (2) For every state v , there is some $(v, \tau, \omega) \in D$. In particular, $(v, \epsilon, \perp) \in D$ for every v . Finally, we define the computational domain \mathcal{D} of CHPs exactly as the prefix-closed and total subsets of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S} \times (V_{\mathcal{T}} \times \mathcal{T}) \times \mathcal{S}_{\perp})$. On the domain \mathcal{D} , the subset relation \subseteq is a partial order with least element $\perp_{\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{S} \times \{\epsilon\} \times \{\perp\}$.

The semantics of composite programs is given by semantical operators on the denotations: For $D, M \in \mathcal{D}$, define *lowering* $D_{\perp} = \{(v, \tau, \perp) \mid (v, \tau, \omega) \in D\}$ and define *continuation* $D \triangleright M$ such that $(v, \tau, \omega) \in D \triangleright M$ if there are $(v, \tau_1, \kappa) \in D$ and $(\kappa, \tau_2, \omega) \in M$ with $\tau = \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2$. Lowering and continuation define (prefix-closed) sequential composition $D \hat{\circ} M = D_{\perp} \cup (D \triangleright M)$. Let $I_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S} \times \{\epsilon\} \times \mathcal{S}$. Then $I_{\mathcal{D}} = \perp_{\mathcal{D}} \cup I_{\mathcal{S}}$ is the neutral element of sequential composition. Notably, $\perp_{\mathcal{D}} = (I_{\mathcal{S}})_{\perp}$, i.e., $I_{\mathcal{S}}$ becomes neutral by making it prefix-closed. Semantical iteration D^n is inductively defined by $D^0 = I_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $D^{n+1} = D \hat{\circ} D^n$. Analogously, $\alpha^0 \equiv ?\top$ and $\alpha^{n+1} = \alpha; \alpha^n$ defines syntactical iteration, and indeed, $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^n = \llbracket \alpha^n \rrbracket$ for each n . For programs α, β and states $\omega_{\alpha}, \omega_{\beta} \in \mathcal{S}_{\perp}$, the *merged state* $\omega_{\alpha} \oplus \omega_{\beta}$ is \perp if at least ω_{α} or ω_{β} is \perp . Otherwise, define $\omega_{\alpha} \oplus \omega_{\beta} = \omega_{\alpha}$ on $\mathcal{B}V(\alpha)$, and define $\omega_{\alpha} \oplus \omega_{\beta} = \omega_{\beta}$ on $\mathcal{B}V(\alpha)^{\complement}$. Merging \oplus will be commutative if $\omega_{\alpha}, \omega_{\beta}$ are the final states of parallel programs because parallel programs do not share bound variables.

Definition 2.10 (Program semantics). The *semantics* $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket \in \mathcal{D}$ of a communicating hybrid program α with recorder $h = h^{\alpha}$ is defined below, where \vDash denotes the satisfaction relation (Def. 2.12):

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket x := \theta \rrbracket &= \perp_{\mathcal{D}} \cup \{(v, \epsilon, \omega) \mid \omega = v_x^d \text{ where } d = v[\llbracket \theta \rrbracket]\} \\
\llbracket x := * \rrbracket &= \perp_{\mathcal{D}} \cup \{(v, \epsilon, \omega) \mid \omega = v_x^d \text{ where } d \in \mathbb{R}\} \\
\llbracket ?\chi \rrbracket &= \perp_{\mathcal{D}} \cup \{(v, \epsilon, v) \mid v \vDash \chi\} \\
\llbracket x' = \theta \rrbracket &= \perp_{\mathcal{D}} \cup \{(v, \epsilon, \varphi(s)) \mid v = \varphi(0) \text{ on } \{x'\}^{\complement}, \text{ and } \varphi(\zeta) = \varphi(0) \text{ on } \{x, x'\}^{\complement}, \text{ and} \\
&\quad \varphi(\zeta) \vDash x' = \theta \text{ for all } \zeta \in [0, s] \text{ and a solution } \varphi : [0, s] \rightarrow \mathcal{S} \text{ with } \varphi(\zeta)(x') = \frac{d\varphi(t)(x)}{dt}(\zeta)\} \\
\llbracket \text{ch}(h)! \theta \rrbracket &= \{(v, (h, \tau), \omega) \mid (\tau, \omega) \leq \langle \text{ch}, d, v(\mu) \rangle \text{ where } d = v[\llbracket \theta \rrbracket]\} \\
\llbracket \text{ch}(h)?x \rrbracket &= \{(v, (h, \tau), \omega) \mid (\tau, \omega) \leq \langle \text{ch}, d, v_x^d(\mu) \rangle \text{ where } d \in \mathbb{R}\} \\
\llbracket \alpha \cup \beta \rrbracket &= \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket \cup \llbracket \beta \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \alpha; \beta \rrbracket &= \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket \hat{\circ} \llbracket \beta \rrbracket \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket_{\perp} \cup (\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket \triangleright \llbracket \beta \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \alpha^* \rrbracket &= \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^n = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \llbracket \alpha^n \rrbracket \quad \text{where } \alpha^0 \equiv ?\top \text{ and } \alpha^{n+1} = \alpha; \alpha^n
\end{aligned}$$

$$[[\alpha \parallel \beta]] = \left\{ (v, \tau, \omega_\alpha \oplus \omega_\beta) \left| \begin{array}{l} (v, \tau \downarrow \gamma, \omega_\gamma) \in [[\gamma]] \text{ for } \gamma \in \{\alpha, \beta\}, \text{ and} \\ \omega_\alpha = \omega_\beta \text{ on } \{\bar{\mu}\}, \text{ and } \tau \downarrow (\alpha \parallel \beta) = \tau \end{array} \right. \right\}$$

The denotation $[[\alpha]]$ is indeed prefix-closed and total for each program α , which can be shown by induction on the structure of α .⁶ As all programs sharing a channel need to agree on the communication along this channel, communication τ can be observed from the parallel $\alpha \parallel \beta$ if the subtraces $\tau \downarrow \gamma$, i.e., the communication in τ along channels of γ , can be observed from γ . The guard $\tau \downarrow (\alpha \parallel \beta) = \tau$ excludes non-causal communication on channels not belonging to either program. This implicit characterization of the trace τ via projections avoids its cumbersome construction by enumerating all possible interleavings of traces of the subprograms and importantly aligns with the coincidence properties (Section 2.3) mediating between the communication of α and $\alpha \parallel \beta$ in proving soundness of the parallel injection axiom. By $\omega_\alpha = \omega_\beta$ on $\{\bar{\mu}\}$, parallel computations need to agree on a common final time and the states ω_α and ω_β unambiguously determine the final value of $\bar{\mu}$.

Remark 2.11. The program $\mu' := 2; (\mu' = 1 \parallel \text{skip})$ does not terminate because $\mu' = 1$ sets μ' to 1 but remains 2 in skip, and $\mu' = 1 \parallel \text{skip}$ can only terminate starting from states where $\mu' = 1$. This is because parallel programs need to agree on μ and μ' to determine the final state unambiguously. To avoid empty models, the pattern for time-synchronization suggested in Example 2.4 requires that every parallel program contains at least a vacuous continuous evolution.

In semantics of formulas (Def. 2.12), the first-order constructs are standard, while the dynamic modalities adapt their semantics from dynamic logic [16] to communicating programs. The ac-box adapts its semantics from Hoare-style ac-reasoning [56, 57], and the ac-diamond is made the modal dual of the ac-box. Both dynamic modalities become special cases of the respective ac-modality.

Definition 2.12 (Formula semantics). The *satisfaction* $v \vDash \phi$ of a dL_{CHP} formula ϕ in state v is inductively defined below. For a set of states $U \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and any formula φ , write $U \vDash \varphi$ if $v \vDash \varphi$ for all $v \in U$. Trivially, $\emptyset \vDash \varphi$.

- (1) $v \vDash e_1 \sim e_2$ if $v[[e_1]] \sim v[[e_2]]$ where \sim is any relation symbol
- (2) $v \vDash \varphi \wedge \psi$ if $v \vDash \varphi$ and $v \vDash \psi$
- (3) $v \vDash \neg\varphi$ if $v \not\vDash \varphi$, i.e., it is not the case that $v \vDash \varphi$
- (4) $v \vDash \forall z \varphi$ if $v_z^d \vDash \varphi$ for all $d \in \text{type}(z)$
- (5) $v \vDash [\alpha]\psi$ if $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash \psi$ for all $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[\alpha]]$ with $\omega \neq \perp$
- (6) $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ if for all $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[\alpha]]$ the following conditions both hold:

$$\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash A \text{ implies } v \cdot \tau \vDash C \quad (\text{commit})$$

$$(\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau\} \vDash A \text{ and } \omega \neq \perp) \text{ implies } \omega \cdot \tau \vDash \psi \quad (\text{post})$$

- (7) $v \vDash \langle \alpha \rangle \psi$ if $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash \psi$ for some $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[\alpha]]$ with $\omega \neq \perp$
- (8) $v \vDash \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A,C\}} \psi$ if there is a $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[\alpha]]$ such that at least one of the following conditions holds:

$$\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash A \text{ and } v \cdot \tau \vDash C \quad (\text{commit})$$

$$(\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau\} \vDash A \text{ and } \omega \neq \perp) \text{ and } \omega \cdot \tau \vDash \psi \quad (\text{post})$$

⁶The only remarkable cases are sequential composition, which is prefix-closed thanks to the inclusion of $[[\alpha]]_\perp$, and parallel composition $\alpha \parallel \beta$, which is prefix-closed because projection is a congruence on the prefix relation such that $\tau' \leq \tau$ implies $\tau' \downarrow \gamma \leq \tau \downarrow \gamma$ for $\gamma \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$.

The explicit communication traces in the program semantics $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket$ in Def. 2.10 come in handy in the implicit definition of parallel communication by projections, but $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times (V_{\mathcal{T}} \times \mathcal{T}) \times \mathcal{S}_{\perp}$ is not a simple accessibility relation. To regain a modal logic viewpoint, consider the communicatively well-formed formula-program pairs \mathcal{A} as modal actions. Def. 2.13 lifts the program semantics to these actions. Then Remark 2.14 provides a traditional Kripke-frame as alternative semantical foundation of dL_{CHP} , which underpins dL_{CHP} 's modal logic nature.

Definition 2.13 (Semantics of modal actions). The semantics $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{\sim} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S} \times (V_{\mathcal{T}} \times \mathcal{T}) \times \mathcal{S}_{\perp})$ of modal actions \mathcal{A} is defined as follows, where $\sim \in \{<, \leq\}$:

$$\llbracket A, \alpha \rrbracket_{\sim} = \{(v, \tau, \omega) \mid (v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket \text{ and } \{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \sim \tau\} \vDash A\}$$

Remark 2.14 (Kripke semantics for dL_{CHP}). The Kripke frame $\langle \mathcal{S}, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{\text{I}}, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{\text{F}} \rangle$ provides an alternative basis for dL_{CHP} 's semantics. The states \mathcal{S} are the possible worlds, and there are two accessibility relations $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{\text{I}}$ and $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{\text{F}}$ denoting the reachable intermediate and final states, respectively. Both relations are mappings $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S})$ defined as follows:

$$\llbracket A, \alpha \rrbracket_{\text{I}} = \{(v, v \cdot \tau) \mid (v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket A, \alpha \rrbracket_{<}\} \quad \llbracket A, \alpha \rrbracket_{\text{F}} = \{(v, \omega \cdot \tau) \mid (v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket A, \alpha \rrbracket_{\leq} \text{ and } \omega \neq \perp\}$$

Then the semantics of the ac-box $[\alpha]_{\{A, C\}} \psi$ turns into: $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A, C\}} \psi$ iff $\kappa \vDash C$ for all $(v, \kappa) \in \llbracket A, \alpha \rrbracket_{\text{I}}$ and $\kappa \vDash \psi$ for all $(v, \kappa) \in \llbracket A, \alpha \rrbracket_{\text{F}}$. Notably, the two relations $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{\text{I}}$ and $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{\text{F}}$ correspond to the two promises of the ac-box. Overall, this suggests that dL_{CHP} is a multi-modal logic with a two-dimensional space of modal actions and two promises.

2.3 Static Semantics

The previous section gave the dynamic semantics of dL_{CHP} , which precisely captures the valuation of terms, truth of formulas, and transition behavior of CHPs. This section introduces dL_{CHP} 's static semantics, which determines free names, i.e., the variables and channels expressions and programs depend on, and bound names, i.e., the variables and channels written by programs. The coincidence properties given in this section are based on the static semantics and are an essential tool for our soundness arguments. Def. 2.15 gives a precise definition of the static semantics based on the dynamic semantics [6]. This precise notion is not computable but for implementation sound overapproximations can be computed along the syntactical structure of the expressions [5]. The static semantics of terms and formulas can be treated uniformly if formulas are considered truth-valued, i.e., $v \llbracket \phi \rrbracket = \mathbf{tt}$ if $v \vDash \phi$ and $v \llbracket \phi \rrbracket = \mathbf{ff}$ if $v \not\vDash \phi$.

Definition 2.15 (Static semantics). For term or formula e , and program α , *free variables* $\text{FV}(e)$ and $\text{FV}(\alpha)$, *bound variables* $\text{BV}(\alpha)$, *accessed channels* $\text{CN}_X(e)$ of the trace variables $X \subseteq V_{\mathcal{T}}$, and *written channels* $\text{CN}(\alpha)$ form the static semantics. If $X = V_{\mathcal{T}}$, write $\text{CN}(e)$ for $X = V_{\mathcal{T}}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FV}(e) &= \{z \in V \mid \exists v, \tilde{v} \text{ such that } v = \tilde{v} \text{ on } \{z\}^{\text{C}} \text{ and } v \llbracket e \rrbracket \neq \tilde{v} \llbracket e \rrbracket\} \\ \text{CN}_X(e) &= \{\text{ch} \in \Omega \mid \exists v, \tilde{v} \text{ such that } v \downarrow_X \{\text{ch}\}^{\text{C}} = \tilde{v} \downarrow_X \{\text{ch}\}^{\text{C}} \text{ and } v \llbracket e \rrbracket \neq \tilde{v} \llbracket e \rrbracket\} \\ \text{FV}(\alpha) &= \{z \in V \mid \exists v, \tilde{v}, \tau, \omega \text{ such that } v = \tilde{v} \text{ on } \{z\}^{\text{C}} \text{ and } (v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket, \\ &\quad \text{and there is no } (\tilde{v}, \tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\omega}) \in \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket \text{ such that } \tilde{\tau} = \tau \text{ and } \omega = \tilde{\omega} \text{ on } \{z\}^{\text{C}}\} \\ \text{BV}(\alpha) &= \{z \in V \mid \exists (v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket \text{ such that } \omega \neq \perp \text{ and } (\omega \cdot \tau)(z) \neq v(z)\} \\ \text{CN}(\alpha) &= \{\text{ch} \in \Omega \mid \exists (v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket \text{ such that } \tau \downarrow \{\text{ch}\} \neq \epsilon\} \end{aligned}$$

The set of names $V \cup \Omega$ are all variables and channels. Then define *free names* as $\text{FN}_X(\cdot) = \text{FV}(\cdot) \cup \text{CN}_X(\cdot)$, and *bound names* as $\text{BN}(\cdot) = \text{BV}(\cdot) \cup \text{CN}(\cdot)$. Further, define $\text{FV}(e_1, \dots, e_n) = \bigcup_{j=1}^n \text{FV}(e_j)$ and likewise for $\text{BV}(\cdot)$ and $\text{CN}(\cdot)$.

Based on the static semantics, the bound effect property (Lemma 2.16) and coincidence properties for terms and formulas (Lemma 2.17), and programs (Lemma 2.18) are given in the following. Proofs are in previous work [6].

LEMMA 2.16 (BOUND EFFECT PROPERTY). *The sets $\mathbf{BV}(\alpha)$ and $\mathbf{CN}(\alpha)$ are the smallest sets with the bound effect property for program α . That is, $v = \omega$ on $V_{\mathcal{T}}$, and $v = \omega \cdot \tau$ on $\mathbf{BV}(\alpha)^{\mathcal{C}}$ if $\omega \neq \perp$, and $\tau \downarrow \mathbf{CN}(\alpha)^{\mathcal{C}} = \epsilon$ for all $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[\alpha]]$.*

As usual, a variable is free in an expression if its value affects the evaluation, e.g., the trace variable h is free in $h \downarrow \text{ch} = \epsilon$. Accessed channels $\mathbf{CN}_X(e)$ enable a more precise analysis of trace variables as exploited by the following coincidence property (Lemma 2.17). For example, $h \downarrow \text{ch} = \epsilon$ does not depend on communication in $h \downarrow \text{ch}^{\mathcal{C}}$. This precision is crucially used in the soundness argument of the parallel injection axiom, which can drop a subprogram of a parallel composition if the surrounding formula does not depend on the subprogram's channels.

Refining previous work [6] accessed channels $\mathbf{CN}_X(e)$ specifically ask for the channels influencing the expression e via the trace variables X . For example, $te \equiv h \downarrow \text{ch} = \epsilon$ depends on ch -communication in h but not in h_0 , so $\mathbf{CN}_{\{h\}}(te) = \{\text{ch}\}$ but $\mathbf{CN}_{\{h_0\}}(te) = \emptyset$. This further increase in precision is necessary for completeness: The parallel injection axiom $[\alpha]\psi \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]\psi$ is sound if β has no influence on any channels ψ depends on. But under this side condition parallel injection cannot prove the valid formula $[\text{skip}]h_0 \downarrow \text{ch} = \epsilon \rightarrow [\text{skip} \parallel \text{ch}(h)!\theta]h_0 \downarrow \text{ch} = \epsilon$ because it considers all channels ψ depends on via any trace variable. The refinement $\mathbf{CN}_X(e)$ of accessed channels allows a refined coincidence property (Lemma 2.17), which in turn contributes to the soundness argument of a parallel injection axiom with a relaxed side condition (see Def. 3.1). While still sound this axiom now proves all instances necessary for completeness.

LEMMA 2.17 (COINCIDENCE FOR TERMS AND FORMULAS). *The sets $\mathbf{FV}(e)$ and $\mathbf{CN}(e)$ are the smallest sets with the coincidence property for term or formula e . That is, for $X \subseteq V_{\mathcal{T}}$, if $v \downarrow_X \mathbf{CN}_X(e) = \tilde{v} \downarrow_X \mathbf{CN}_X(e)$ on $\mathbf{FV}(e)$, then $v[[e]] = \tilde{v}[[e]]$. In particular, for formula ϕ , this implies $v \vDash \phi$ iff $\tilde{v} \vDash \phi$.*

In Lemma 2.17, the state $v \downarrow_X \mathbf{CN}_X(e)$ equals v except that for each trace variable $h \in X$ only the communication $v(h) \downarrow \mathbf{CN}_X(e)$ is kept that has influence on the evaluation of e via the trace variables X . Likewise, for $\tilde{v} \downarrow_X \mathbf{CN}_X(e)$.

LEMMA 2.18 (COINCIDENCE FOR PROGRAMS). *The set $\mathbf{FV}(\alpha)$ is the smallest set with the coincidence property for program α . That is, if $v = \tilde{v}$ on $X \supseteq \mathbf{FV}(\alpha)$ and $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[\alpha]]$, then a state $\tilde{\omega}$ exists such that $(\tilde{v}, \tau, \tilde{\omega}) \in [[\alpha]]$ and $\omega = \tilde{\omega}$ on X , and $(\omega = \perp \text{ iff } \tilde{\omega} = \perp)$.*

For a well-formed modality $[\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$, the pairs (A, α) and (C, α) are communicatively well-formed, i.e., the communication contract (A, C) cannot read what α writes (except for trace variables). This suggests the following coincidence property, which is a simple consequence of well-formedness, Lemma 2.16, and Lemma 2.17:

COROLLARY 2.19 (COMMUNICATIVE COINCIDENCE). *Let (χ, α) be communicatively well-formed. Then for every $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[\alpha]]$ with $\omega \neq \perp$, the states v and ω coincide on χ , i.e., $v = \omega$ on $\mathbf{FV}(\chi)$. In particular, $v \cdot \tau \vDash \chi$ iff $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash \chi$.*

Interpreting assumption-program pairs as modal actions (Def. 2.13) suggests the following useful coincidence property about modal actions as a whole, which is a simple consequence of Lemma 2.17 and Lemma 2.18.

COROLLARY 2.20 (COINCIDENCE FOR MODAL ACTIONS). *The set of free variables $\mathbf{FV}(A, \alpha)$ has the coincidence property for the assumption-program action (A, α) : If $\tilde{v} = v$ on $X \supseteq \mathbf{FV}(A, \alpha)$ and $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[A, \alpha]]_{\sim}$, then $(\tilde{v}, \tau, \tilde{\omega}) \in [[A, \alpha]]_{\sim}$ exists such that $\omega = \tilde{\omega}$ on X , and $(\omega = \perp \text{ iff } \tilde{\omega} = \perp)$.*

3 AXIOMATIZATION

Fig. 4 presents a Hilbert-style proof calculus for dL_{CHP} , which is sound and complete. Fig. 6 presents derivable axioms and rules. The calculus generalizes dL 's proof calculus for hybrid systems [39, 43] to handle communicating hybrid systems. Therefore, dL_{CHP} embeds ac-reasoning [34, 56] into the dynamic logic setup of dL . Our development puts value in reconciling these two bases of dL and ac-reasoning in a graceful way: This manifests itself in the clear modal logic understanding that ac-reasoning receives through our calculus and in a new modularization of reasoning about communication and parallelism. The modal logic viewpoint onto ac-reasoning, however, is not a by-product of our development, but actually drives it. Only the stringent thinking in modal logic terms paves the way for a seamless interplay of ac-reasoning and dynamic logic. Overall the axiom system is designed with the following thoughts in mind:

- (1) We consistently consider ac-reasoning as modal logic. Where applicable, axioms generalize the Pratt-Seegerberg [52, 53] proof system for dynamic logic with assumption-program pairs as modal actions and commitment-postcondition pairs as promises. Pratt-Seegerberg's axioms become special cases. The proof outline of classical derived rules transfers to a proof of the ac-version of the rule.
- (2) Each axiom modularly captures a small conceptual idea. Compared to Hoare-style ac-reasoning [56], the axioms put new emphasis on the logical essence of parallel systems reasoning. This leads to more modular soundness arguments and supports our efforts to develop minimalistic proof calculi for parallel hybrid systems [6], which together with uniform substitution constitute prover micro-kernels of small soundness-critical size.
- (3) The axioms are compositional and combine in idiomatic ways to facilitate reasoning about complex systems. Our completeness results show that this idiomatic reasoning strategy is enough. Thanks to the modularity of our axiomatization, in practice, unused parts of the complete reasoning strategy can be dropped.

The calculus (Fig. 4) is a first-order Hilbert-system based on the proof rules modus ponens **MP** and **V**-generalization. Additionally, we consider dL_{CHP} 's calculus contain a complete axiomatization of first-order logic (rule **FOL**), which, in particular, contains all instances of valid propositional formulas (rule **P**). If a formula ϕ can be proven in the calculus, write $\vdash \phi$. Where convenient, proofs are presented in sequent-style and use derivable proof rules for sequents [48], where a sequent $\Gamma \vdash \Delta$ abbreviates the formula $\bigwedge_{\varphi \in \Gamma} \varphi \rightarrow \bigvee_{\psi \in \Delta} \psi$.

Predominantly, each program statement is axiomatized by only one of the four modality types. Switching between dynamic and ac-reasoning, and safety and liveness fills the gap to the other modalities (Fig. 3), thus minimizes the need for axioms: Non-communicating atomic programs are sufficiently captured in boxes as axiom $[\epsilon]_{\text{AC}}$ can flatten an ac-box with these programs. Conversely, axiom $[\tau, \tau]$ transfers any axiom on ac-boxes to boxes. Axioms $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\text{AC}}$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle$ bridge safety and liveness modalities. Only repetition and parallelism have separate axioms for safety and liveness.

The following paragraph contains preliminaries. The paragraphs after that discuss the axiomatization in detail.




Fig. 3. The four modalities are related by duality $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\text{AC}}, \langle \cdot \rangle$, flattening $[\epsilon]_{\text{AC}}, \langle \epsilon \rangle_{\text{AC}}$, and embedding $[\tau, \tau], \langle \cdot \rangle_{\tau, \tau}$. The arrows are axiomatic (\longleftrightarrow) and derived ($\leftarrow - \rightarrow$) equivalences, and logical opposite (\longleftrightarrow).

Noninterference and Parallel Injection. Parallel injection $[\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ by axiom $[\parallel]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ [6] enables safety reasoning about parallel CHPs. It is sound if the program β that is injected into the safety contract $[\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ does not *interfere* (Def. 3.1) with the communication contract (A, C) and postcondition ψ , i.e., if β has no influence on the truth of (A, C) and ψ . On α , the program β has no influence due to the semantics of parallelism.

Definition 3.1 (Noninterference). Given an ac-box $[\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$, the program β *does not interfere* with its surrounding contract $[\alpha \parallel _]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ if the following conditions hold for all $\chi \in \{A, C, \psi\}$, where $h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}$ is the recorder of $\alpha \parallel \beta$:

$$\text{FV}(\chi) \cap \text{BV}(\beta) \subseteq \{\bar{\mu}\} \cup \{h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}\} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{CN}_{\{h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}\}}(\chi) \cap \text{CN}(\beta) \subseteq \text{CN}(\alpha) \quad (2)$$

Using the unifying notation (see Def. 2.15) $\text{FN}_X(\phi) = \text{FV}(\phi) \cup \text{CN}_X(\phi)$ for all *free names* of a formula ϕ and $\text{BN}(\alpha) = \text{BV}(\alpha) \cup \text{CN}(\alpha)$ for all *bound names* of a program α , (1) and (2) are equal to $\text{FN}_{\{h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}\}}(A, C, \psi) \cap \text{BN}(\beta) \subseteq \text{CN}(\alpha) \cup \{\bar{\mu}, h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}\}$.

Def. 3.1 ensures that β has no influence on the truth of $\chi \in \{A, C, \psi\}$ if injected in $[\alpha \parallel _]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$. Therefore, β must not write variables and channels χ depends on except if β 's behavior cannot disagree from α , which is the case for the global time $\bar{\mu}$. Further, β must not write channels accessed in the formula χ via the recorder $h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}$ of $\alpha \parallel \beta$ except if β 's communication cannot disagree from α , because on this communication, χ is already proven by premise $[\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$.

On channels which χ only depends on via trace variables different from $h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}$, the program β cannot influence χ as β only writes its unique recorder $h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}$. In this respect, Def. 3.1 is less restrictive than in previous work [6] such that the parallel injection axiom $[\parallel]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ proves more instances. This closes a subtle gap regarding ghost variables hindering completeness, e.g., $[\text{skip}]h_0 = \epsilon \rightarrow [\text{skip} \parallel \text{ch}(h)! \theta]h_0 = \epsilon$ derives by $[\parallel]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ but not under the more restrictive side condition $\text{CN}(\chi) \cap \text{CN}(\beta) \subseteq \text{CN}(\alpha)$ in previous work because $\text{CN}(h_0 = \epsilon) = \Omega$, i.e., $h_0 = \epsilon$ depends on all channels.

Atomic Hybrid Programs. Axioms $[:=]$, $[:*]$, and $[?]$ are as in dL. For continuous evolution, dL's complete axiomatization of differential equation properties [50] can be used since dL_{CHP} conservatively generalizes dL. The there and back axiom $[\&]$ [29] eliminates evolution domain constraints by checking them backwards along the differential equation.

Composite Hybrid Programs. Ac-composition $[_]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ and ac-choice $[\cup]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ are straight-forward generalizations from dL.⁷ Ac-iteration $[_]^*_{\mathcal{AC}}$ unrolls a loop once. The so-called *ac-kernel* $[\alpha^0]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ is provably equivalent to $C \wedge (A \rightarrow \psi)$ by $[\epsilon]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ and $[?]$. This reveals the commitment C as unconditional promise but also assumes A for ψ . Ac-induction $\text{I}_{\mathcal{AC}}$ carefully considers that assumption-program pairs are the modal actions: The induction step $\psi \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ needs a proof in all worlds reachable by (A, α^*) -runs, but no further commitment (T) . As a result, the ac-induction rule $\text{ind}_{\mathcal{AC}}$ is derivable using Gödel generalization $\text{G}_{\mathcal{AC}}$, which in turn enables derivation of the ac-loop rule $\text{loop}_{\mathcal{AC}}$.

Axiom C_A lifts convergence [29, 39] to repetition over assumption-program actions but only if the commitment is unsatisfiable (\perp) so that the ac-diamonds's postcondition is assessed instead. The ac-version $\langle _ \rangle_{\mathcal{AC}\perp}$ of the arrival axiom [44] is the derivable dual of ac-induction $\text{I}_{\mathcal{AC}}$. By ac-arrival $\langle _ \rangle_{\mathcal{AC}\perp}$, convergence C_A can prove commitment by iterating them along the simpler action (A, α) in the postcondition.

Communication Primitives. Ac-unfolding $[\text{ch!}]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ expands the communication-contract (A, C) into ac-kernels $[?T]_{\{A,C\}}$ before and after a single communication event. In contrast, axiom $[\epsilon]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ expands the ac-box for non-communicating programs. The send axiom $[\text{ch!}]$ collects communication in the recorder h and distinguishes the new world by the fresh

⁷The prefix-closed program semantics is for reasoning about non-terminating reactive systems [56] but further renders axiom $[_]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ an equivalence as proving the commitment of $[\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}[\beta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ from $[\alpha; \beta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ needs that all α -prefixes are in the semantics of $\alpha; \beta$.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
[:=] & [x := \theta]\psi(x) \leftrightarrow \psi(\theta) & [;]_{\mathcal{AC}} & [\alpha; \beta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \leftrightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}[\beta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \\
[*] & [x := *]\psi \leftrightarrow \forall x \psi & [\cup]_{\mathcal{AC}} & [\alpha \cup \beta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \leftrightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \wedge [\beta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \\
[?] & [?\chi]\psi \leftrightarrow (\chi \rightarrow \psi) & [*]_{\mathcal{AC}} & [\alpha^*]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \leftrightarrow [\alpha^0]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \wedge [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}[\alpha^*]_{\{A,C\}}\psi^a \\
[\]_{\mathcal{T},\mathcal{T}} & [\alpha]\psi \leftrightarrow [\alpha]_{\{\mathcal{T},\mathcal{T}\}}\psi & I_{\mathcal{AC}} & [\alpha^*]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \leftrightarrow [\alpha^0]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \wedge [\alpha^*]_{\{A,T\}}(\psi \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi)^a \\
\langle \cdot \rangle & \langle \alpha \rangle \psi \leftrightarrow \neg[\alpha]\neg\psi & [\geq]_{\mathcal{AC}} & h_0 = h^\alpha \downarrow Y \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{\mathcal{T}, h^\alpha \downarrow Y \geq h_0\}} h^\alpha \downarrow Y \geq h_0^{bc} \\
\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{AC}} & \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A,C\}}\psi \leftrightarrow \neg[\alpha]_{\{A \rightarrow C\}}\neg\psi & \square_{\mathcal{AC}I} & h_0 = h^\alpha \downarrow Y \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A, \square_{\leq}^Y A\}} \square_{\leq}^Y A \wedge ([\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \leftrightarrow [\alpha]_{\{\mathcal{T}, \square_{\leq}^Y A \rightarrow C\}}(\square_{\leq}^Y A \rightarrow \psi))^{bc}
\end{array}$$

$$[\epsilon]_{\mathcal{AC}} \quad [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \leftrightarrow C \wedge (A \rightarrow [\alpha]\psi) \quad (\text{CN}(\alpha) = \emptyset)^d$$

$$[\text{ch}!] \quad [\text{ch}(h)!\theta]\psi(h) \leftrightarrow \forall h_0 (h_0 = h \cdot \langle \text{ch}, \theta, \mu \rangle \rightarrow \psi(h_0))^b$$

$$[\text{ch}!]_{\mathcal{AC}} \quad [\text{ch}(h)!\theta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \leftrightarrow [?\mathcal{T}]_{\{A,C\}}[\text{ch}(h)!\theta][?\mathcal{T}]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$$

$$[\text{ch}?\mathcal{X}]_{\mathcal{AC}} \quad [\text{ch}(h)?x]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \leftrightarrow [x := *][\text{ch}(h)!x]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$$

$$\text{MP} \frac{\varphi \quad \varphi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi}$$

$$\text{G}_{\mathcal{AC}} \frac{C \wedge \psi}{[\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi}$$

$$W_A \quad [\alpha]_{\{\mathcal{T}, C \wedge B \rightarrow A\}} \top \wedge [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{B,C\}}\psi$$

$$K_{\mathcal{AC}} \quad [\alpha]_{\{A,C_1 \rightarrow C_2\}}(\psi_1 \rightarrow \psi_2) \rightarrow ([\alpha]_{\{A,C_1\}}\psi_1 \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C_2\}}\psi_2)$$

$$\forall \frac{\psi}{\forall z \psi}$$

$$[\&] \quad [x' = \theta \& \chi]\psi \leftrightarrow \forall g_0 = g [g' = 1, x' = \theta]([g' = -1, x' = -\theta](g \geq g_0 \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \psi)^b$$

$$C_A \quad [\alpha^*]_{\{A,T\}} \forall v > 0 (\varphi(v) \rightarrow \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A,\perp\}} \varphi(v-1)) \rightarrow \forall v (\varphi(v) \rightarrow \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A,\perp\}} \exists v \leq 0 \varphi(v))^b$$

$$[\llbracket _ \rrbracket]_{\mathcal{AC}} \quad [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \quad (\text{RN}_{\{h^\alpha \parallel \beta\}}(A, C, \psi) \cap \text{BN}(\beta) \subseteq \text{CN}(\alpha) \cup \{\bar{\mu}, h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}\}, \text{ also see Def. 3.1})^c$$

$$\langle \parallel \rangle_{\mathcal{AC}} \quad \exists h_0, h_{\alpha\beta}, \bar{y}_\alpha, \bar{y}_\beta, \bar{g}, \checkmark \left(h_0 = h^{\alpha \parallel \beta} \wedge h_{\alpha\beta} \downarrow (\alpha \parallel \beta) = h_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{\mathcal{T}, C_\alpha\}} \psi_\alpha \wedge \langle \beta \rangle_{\{\mathcal{T}, C_\beta\}} \psi_\beta \right) \rightarrow \langle \alpha \parallel \beta \rangle_{\{\mathcal{T}, C\}} \psi^{bc}$$

$$\square_{\leq}^Y A \equiv \forall h' (h_0 \leq h' \sim h^\alpha \downarrow Y \rightarrow A_{h'}^{\alpha}) \quad (Y \supseteq \text{CN}(A) \text{ and } \sim \in \{<, \leq\})$$

$$C_Y \equiv \neg\checkmark \wedge h^{\alpha \parallel \beta} = h_0 \cdot h_{\alpha\beta} \downarrow Y \wedge C_{h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}}^{h_0 \cdot h_{\alpha\beta}}$$

$$\psi_Y \equiv \checkmark \wedge h^{\alpha \parallel \beta} = h_0 \cdot h_{\alpha\beta} \downarrow Y \wedge \bar{y}_Y = \bar{x}_Y \wedge \bar{\mu} = \bar{g} \wedge ((\psi_{\bar{x}_\alpha}^{\bar{y}_\alpha})_{\bar{x}_\beta}^{\bar{y}_\beta})_{h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}}^{h_0 \cdot h_{\alpha\beta}} \quad (\text{where } \bar{x}_Y = \mathcal{V}(Y) \cap V_{\mathbb{R}} \text{ and } \bar{\mu} = (\mu, \mu'))$$

^aRemember that $[\alpha^0]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \equiv [?\mathcal{T}]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ since $\alpha^0 \equiv ?\mathcal{T}$, and note that $[?\mathcal{T}]_{\{A,C\}}\psi \leftrightarrow C \wedge (A \rightarrow \psi)$ by $[\epsilon]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ and $[?]$.

^bThe variables h_0, g and quantified variables are assumed to be fresh.

^cRemember that h^α denotes the unique recorder of program α (see Def. 2.2).

^dCare must be taken, e.g., when $[\epsilon]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ is applied from right to left, that resulting ac-boxes are well-formed.

Fig. 4. dL_{CHP} proof calculus

recorder h_0 . Receiving $\text{ch}(h)?x$ obtains some value and binds it to the variable x . The receive axiom $[\text{ch}?\mathcal{X}]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ equates this with testing whether the environment can agree on a non-deterministically chosen value for x by sending.

Parallel Composition. Proving safety of parallel composition can already be handled *completely* by the convincingly simple parallel injection axiom $[\llbracket _ \rrbracket]_{\mathcal{AC}}$. It injects an additional program into a safety contract if it does not interfere with the contract (Def. 3.1). Since parallel composition commutes, the program β can be injected to the right *and* to the left of α . A dL_{CHP} instance $[\llbracket _ \rrbracket]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ of the classical symmetric parallel proof rule with built-in mutual assumption weakening as in Hoare-style ac-reasoning [56] can be derived from our minimalistic axioms (see Fig. 5).

For completeness, history invariance $[\geq]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ and assumption closure $\square_{\mathcal{AC}I}$ prove properties of the communication history that are inherently global, thus, not the sum of properties of the subprograms (see Remark 3.2). Assumption

closure \Box_{ACI} internalizes that the assumption is actually a premise of the promises. The notation $\Box_{\leq}^Y A$ reminds that the assumption is made for all (strict) prefixes of α 's communication. Notably, $[\alpha]_{\{A, \Box_{\leq}^Y A\}} \Box_{\leq}^Y A$, i.e., the assumption holds in the promises, is what can be found in the literature [12, Rule 7.14] and is actually stronger than the implication \leftarrow of \leftrightarrow in \Box_{ACI} . Implication \rightarrow goes beyond the literature but importantly entails the dual of \Box_{ACI} for the ac-diamond. History invariance $[\geq]_{AC}$ [12, Rule 7.13] proves that all programs extend their initial history.

Together $[\alpha]_{\{A, \Box_{\leq}^Y A\}} \Box_{\leq}^Y A$ and $[\geq]_{AC}$ prove $[\alpha]_{\{A, T\}} A$ for every α . This allows to assume A in the premise $A \wedge I \rightarrow \psi$ of the loop_{AC} rule, which is necessary for completeness because the assumption A is guaranteed by the environment, but there needs not to be an invariant I that entails it as the assumption needs not hold in the local initial state.

Close to the semantics, $\langle \parallel \rangle_{AC}$ proves existence of a parallel run if there are runs of the subprograms either to intermediate states ($\surd = \perp$) or to final states ($\surd = T$), which match as follows: There is a history $h_{\alpha\beta}$ for $\alpha \parallel \beta$ whose γ -communication is observable from γ by $h^{\alpha \parallel \beta} = h_0 \cdot h_{\alpha\beta} \downarrow \gamma$, and a joint final time \bar{g} on which the subprograms agree by $\bar{\mu} = \bar{g}$. Redundantly, the postconditions ψ_γ prove ψ by presuming the reached state $\bar{\gamma}_\gamma$ of the respective other subprogram. Likewise, the history h is updated to the overall global history $h_0 \cdot h_{\alpha\beta}$. Axiom $\langle \parallel \rangle_{AC}$ only allows the vacuous assumption T but the derivable dual of \Box_{ACI} can shift the assumption to the promises beforehand.

Remark 3.2 (Global history properties). History invariance $[\geq]_{AC}$ sorts out alternative semantical models in which the initial communication of a subprogram in a parallel composition is shifted against the communication of the other subprogram [57]. Assumption closure \Box_{ACI} is necessary because the assumption can impose global properties on the communication history, which are inaccessible in each subprogram alone, e.g., if the assumption fixes the relative communication order on unconnected channels.

Modal Logic Principles. Axiom K_{AC} is the ac-version of modal modus ponens covering monotony of *both* promises. Assumptions are antitone as they refine the reachable worlds just like preconditions do, but obey the even stronger axiom W_A weakening the assumption by what is already guaranteed by commitment. This clearly indicates why the circular reasoning that would come with non-strictly prefixed assumptions in condition (commit) of Def. 2.12 is problematic: One could prove whatever assumption to be available by strengthening the commitment, which is easily proven using circularity and the assumption. The Gödel rule generalizes to ac-reasoning in rule G_{AC} by covering *both* promises. Modal duality $\langle \cdot \rangle$ and its ac-version $\langle \cdot \rangle_{AC}$ only affect the promises and not the assumption. Axiom $\Box_{T,T}$ mediates between dynamic and ac-reasoning.

From the fundamental axioms K_{AC} , G_{AC} , and W_A other basic principles of modal logic derive (see Fig. 6): Ac-monotonicity $M[\cdot]_{AC}$ combines K_{AC} for monotony of the promises and W_A for antitony of assumptions, and drops the box by G_{AC} . Distribution of conjunctive promises over ac-boxes by axiom $\Box_{AC \wedge}$

derives. That $\langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A, C\}} \psi$ either requires the commitment or the postcondition to hold is most apparent in the derivable axiom $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\vee}$. Axiom W_A overcomes axiom \Box_{WA} [6] weakening the assumption of parallel programs by mutual usage of their commitments. Ac-monotony $M(\cdot)_{AC}$ for ac-diamonds derives. Notably, assumptions become monotone in $M(\cdot)_{AC}$ because a run whose incoming communication satisfies the assumption A_1 also satisfies the weaker assumption A_2 .




Fig. 5. Axioms $\langle Ax \rangle$ are included in dL_{CHP} 's proof calculus. A filled background Ax denotes derived axioms. The dashed frame $\langle Ax \rangle$ labels axioms corresponding to a rule in Hoare-style ac-reasoning [56]. Arrows point to axioms for whose derivation they were used.

Theorem 3.3 shows that dL_{CHP} 's proof calculus (Fig. 4) is sound. This is an indispensable property of meaningful proof calculi for analyzing safety-critical cyber-physical systems. Corollary 3.4 establishes soundness of additional helpful axioms and proof rules (Fig. 6) by deriving them in the calculus. Soundness proofs are in Appendix A.

THEOREM 3.3 (SOUNDNESS). *The proof calculus presented in Fig. 4 is sound.*

COROLLARY 3.4 (DERIVED AXIOMS AND RULES). *The axioms and rules in Fig. 6 derive in dL_{CHP} 's proof calculus.*

To illustrate dL_{CHP} 's proof calculus in action, we revisit the convoy of cars example (Example 2.5). The safety contract for the convoy (Example 2.7) has a derivation (Fig. 8) explained in Example 3.5. The proof in Fig. 8 follows an idiomatic pattern for decomposing a safety contract $[\alpha \parallel \beta]\psi$ for a parallel CHP into safety contracts for the subprograms α, β : (1) Introduce verification conditions for the subprograms that are independent (Def. 3.1) of the other subprogram using monotony $M[\cdot]_{\mathcal{AC}}$. (2) Distribute these conditions by axiom $\llbracket _ \wedge _ \rrbracket_{\mathcal{AC}}$ according to the envisioned subproofs. (3) In each subproof, drop the subprogram not belonging to the verification conditions by the parallel injection axiom $\llbracket _ _ \rrbracket_{\mathcal{AC}}$.

While this is a canonical use of the interplay of $M[\cdot]_{\mathcal{AC}}$, $\llbracket _ \wedge _ \rrbracket_{\mathcal{AC}}$, and $\llbracket _ _ \rrbracket_{\mathcal{AC}}$ to prove parallel hybrid systems their individual responsibilities increase modularity, simplify soundness arguments, and can be used in other combinations as well. This already manifests in the verification conditions introduced in step (1): For completeness, it can be necessary to globalize the assumption by $\llbracket _ _ \rrbracket_{\mathcal{AC}}$ (cf. Remark 3.2) as done by the proof of Theorem 4.7. But in practice we can often do better and use mutual contribution of the commitments to the assumption of the other subprogram by $\llbracket _ _ \rrbracket_{\mathcal{WA}}$. Non-modular calculi [56] prove soundness of the latter strategy monolithically while in our modular setup the strategy derives as rule $\llbracket _ _ \rrbracket_{\mathcal{AC}}$ without any further semantical soundness arguments (cf. Fig. 5).

Example 3.5. Fig. 8 begins a derivation of the safety contract in Example 2.7 about the convoy of cars in Example 2.5. The proof implements the idiomatic strategy described above for the parallel composition $\text{convoy} \equiv \text{follower} \parallel \text{leader}$, where the verification conditions are in Fig. 7. The proof fixes the initial value of the recorder h and of the leader's position in ghost variables h_0, x_0 . By comparison of h_0 with h , out-of-bounds access in $\text{op}(h \downarrow \text{ch})$, where $\text{op} \in \{\text{val}, \text{time}\}$, can be distinguished from actual communication of the convoy along ch . Access with default $\text{op}_\theta(h \downarrow \text{ch})$ evaluates to θ if there was no actual ch communication yet. Formally, for context formula ϕ and $\text{op} \in \{\text{val}, \text{time}\}$, define:

$$\phi(\text{op}_\theta(h \downarrow \text{ch})) \equiv (h \downarrow \text{ch} = h_0 \downarrow \text{ch} \wedge \phi(\theta)) \vee (h \downarrow \text{ch} \neq h_0 \downarrow \text{ch} \wedge \phi(\text{op}(h \downarrow \text{ch})))$$

$$\begin{array}{l}
\langle \rangle_{\mathcal{T}, \perp} \quad \langle \alpha \rangle \psi \leftrightarrow \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{\mathcal{T}, \perp\}} \psi \qquad \llbracket _ \wedge _ \rrbracket_{\mathcal{AC}} \quad [\alpha]_{\{A, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2) \leftrightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A, C_1\}} \psi_1 \wedge [\alpha]_{\{A, C_2\}} \psi_2 \\
\langle \cdot \rangle_{\vee} \quad \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A, C\}} \psi \leftrightarrow \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A, C\}} \perp \vee \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} \psi \quad \langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{AC}, \perp} \quad \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, C\}} \psi \leftrightarrow \langle \alpha^0 \rangle_{\{A, C\}} \psi \vee \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} (\neg \psi \wedge \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A, C\}} \psi) \\
\langle \epsilon \rangle_{\mathcal{AC}} \quad \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A, C\}} \psi \leftrightarrow C \vee A \wedge \langle \alpha \rangle \psi \qquad \llbracket _ _ \rrbracket_{\mathcal{WA}} \quad [\alpha]_{\{\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{W}_A\}} \top \wedge [\alpha]_{\{A_1 \wedge A_2, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} \psi \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} \psi \\
M[\cdot]_{\mathcal{AC}} \quad \frac{A_2 \rightarrow A_1 \quad C_1 \rightarrow C_2 \quad \psi_1 \rightarrow \psi_2}{[\alpha]_{\{A_1, C_1\}} \psi_1 \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A_2, C_2\}} \psi_2} \quad M\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{AC}} \quad \frac{A_1 \rightarrow A_2 \quad C_1 \rightarrow C_2 \quad \psi_1 \rightarrow \psi_2}{\langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A_1, C_1\}} \psi_1 \rightarrow \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A_2, C_2\}} \psi_2} \\
\text{ind}_{\mathcal{AC}} \quad \frac{\psi \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A, C\}} \psi}{C \wedge \psi \rightarrow [\alpha^*]_{\{A, C\}} \psi} \quad \text{loop}_{\mathcal{AC}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash C \wedge I, \Delta \quad I \vdash [\alpha]_{\{A, C\}} I \quad A \wedge I \vdash \psi}{\Gamma \vdash [\alpha^*]_{\{A, C\}} \psi, \Delta} \\
\llbracket _ _ \rrbracket_{\mathcal{AC}} \quad \frac{\vdash \mathcal{W}_A \quad \Gamma \vdash [\alpha_1]_{\{A_1, C_1\}} \psi_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash [\alpha_2]_{\{A_2, C_2\}} \psi_2}{\Gamma \vdash [\alpha_1 \parallel \alpha_2]_{\{A, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2), \Delta} \quad (\text{FN}_{\{h, \alpha \parallel \beta\}}(A_j, C_j, \psi_j) \cap \text{BN}(\alpha_{3-j}) \subseteq \text{CN}(\alpha_j) \cup \{\bar{\mu}, h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}\} \text{ for } j = 1, 2)
\end{array}$$

Fig. 6. Derived axioms and proof rules, where $\mathcal{W}_A \equiv (A \wedge C_1 \rightarrow A_2) \wedge (A \wedge C_2 \rightarrow A_1)$

The verification conditions ψ_f and ψ_l in Fig. 7 establish that the follower always stays behind the last known position of the leader, while the leader never falls behind this last known position.

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi &\equiv \epsilon \geq 0 \wedge w = 0 \wedge 0 \leq v_f \leq d/\epsilon \wedge v_f \leq V \wedge v_l \geq 0 \wedge x_f + d < x_l && \text{(precondition convoy)} \\
\psi_f &\equiv x_f < \text{val}_{x_0}(h \downarrow \text{pos}) && \text{(postcondition follower)} \\
\psi_l &\equiv \text{val}_{x_0}(h \downarrow \text{pos}) \leq x_l && \text{(postcondition leader)} \\
A &\equiv C \equiv 0 \leq \text{val}_0(h \downarrow \text{vel}) \leq V && \text{(ac-formulas)}
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 7. Verification conditions used in Fig. 8, where the follower assumes A while the leader guarantees the commitment C.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\frac{*}{\vdash (C \wedge T \rightarrow A) \wedge T} \\
\text{GAC} \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash [\text{convoy}]_{\{T, C \wedge T \rightarrow A\}} T}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Fig. 13} \\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash [\text{follower}]_{\{A, T\}} \psi_f} \\
\text{Fig. 15} \\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash [\text{leader}]_{\{T, C\}} \psi_l} \\
\text{Fig. 13} \\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash [\text{convoy}]_{\{A, T\}} \psi_f} \\
\text{Fig. 15} \\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash [\text{convoy}]_{\{T, C\}} \psi_l}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[[]]AC} \\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash [\text{convoy}]_{\{A, C\}} (\psi_f \wedge \psi_l)} \\
\text{[[]]AC} \\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash [\text{convoy}]_{\{T, C\}} (\psi_f \wedge \psi_l)}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[[]]AC} \\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash [\text{convoy}]_{\{A, C\}} (\psi_f \wedge \psi_l)} \\
\text{[[]]AC, AR} \\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash [\text{convoy}]_{\{T, C\}} (\psi_f \wedge \psi_l)}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AR} \\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash [\text{convoy}]_{\{A, C\}} (\psi_f \wedge \psi_l)} \\
\text{WA} \\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash [\text{convoy}]_{\{T, C\}} (\psi_f \wedge \psi_l)}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{M[.]AC} + \triangleright_1 + \triangleright_2 \\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash [\text{convoy}]_{\{T, T\}} x_f < x_l} \\
\text{→R, FOL, [[]]T, T} \\
\frac{}{\vdash \varphi \rightarrow [\text{convoy}] x_f < x_l}
\end{array}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 8. Decomposition (Example 3.5) of the safety contract (Example 2.7) about a follower and a leader car (Example 2.5), where $\text{convoy} \equiv \text{follower} \parallel \text{leader}$ and $\Gamma \equiv h_0 = h, x_0 = x_l, \varphi$ with fresh ghost variables h_0, x_0 . The premises $\triangleright_1 \equiv C \rightarrow T$ and $\triangleright_2 \equiv \psi_f \wedge \psi_l \rightarrow x_f < x_l$ derive by first-order reasoning FOL, and $\rightarrow R$ and AR are derivable standard rules for sequent calculi [48].

4 COMPLETENESS

Theorem 3.3 shows that dL_{CHP} 's proof calculus is sound, i.e., can only prove valid formulas. This section is concerned with the converse question whether every valid dL_{CHP} formula is provable in the calculus. Since integer arithmetic is definable in dL_{CHP} 's subset dL [39, Theorem 2], Gödel's incompleteness theorem [15] stands in the way of a complete and effective axiomatization. The standard way to evaluate the deductive power of a proof calculus nevertheless is to prove completeness relative to an oracle logic [11, 18].

Completeness is already challenging for hybrid systems [40, 43]. The completeness of dL_{CHP} becomes even more challenging due to parallel interactions of hybrid systems that are subtly interlocked in synchronized communication and time. Further, dL_{CHP} is a modal logic for ac-reasoning, and modularly builds proof principles for parallel systems from modal logic fundamentals and the parallel injection axiom. This promising development, however, would be of deceptive insight if the modal logic perspective and modularity were only possible due to incompleteness. The central contribution of this article is a positive answer to the completeness question: We prove dL_{CHP} complete relative to two oracle logics including that parallel hybrid systems are proof-theoretically equivalent to hybrid systems. Neither parallelism nor ac-reasoning add to dL_{CHP} in a way making reasoning truly harder than for hybrid systems. The modal logic viewpoint onto ac-reasoning cannot only remain because of completeness but is ultimately justified.

Theorem 4.7 in Section 4.1 shows that dL_{CHP} is complete relative to the first-order logic of communication traces and differential equation properties Ω -FOD. This result importantly proves the adequacy of dL_{CHP} 's calculus to deconstruct every valid statement about CHPs into statements about communication traces and continuous change. This includes

that modal ac-reasoning and the parallel injection axiom are indeed enough for safety of parallel CHPs and that we correctly lifted induction and convergence from dynamic logic to ac-reasoning. For non-parallel program constructs, the proof successfully lifts standard reasoning [46] to ac-modalities. For parallel CHPs, the proof adds a complete and modular reasoning pattern. Thanks to modularity unnecessary parts of this pattern may be dropped while reasoning on concrete formulas making the pattern a practical reasoning strategy.

Theorem 4.9 in Section 4.2 shows that dL_{CHP} is even complete relative to the subset of Ω -FOD without communication traces, the first-order logic of differential equation properties [39] FOD. As a major consequence, dL_{CHP} proof-theoretically aligns with dL , which is complete relative to FOD as well [39, Theorem 3]. Intuitively speaking, parallel hybrid systems can be proven correct whenever hybrid systems and continuous systems can be proven correct. Further, completeness relative to discrete systems [43, Theorem 8] and relative decidability results carry over to dL_{CHP} [43, Theorem 11]. The proof of Theorem 4.9 modularly builds on top of Theorem 4.7 only proving equiexpressiveness of Ω -FOD and FOD (Proposition 4.8 in Section 4.2). This modular structure of Theorem 4.9 separates the rather technical encoding of traces as properties of continuous systems in Theorem 4.9 from the construction of sufficient invariants and variation for loops and verification conditions for parallel CHPs in Theorem 4.7.

The base logic FOD [39] is first-order real arithmetic $\text{FOL}_{\mathbb{R}}$, i.e., dL 's first-order fragment, plus differential equation properties, i.e., safety $[x' = \theta]\psi$ and liveness $\langle x' = \theta \rangle\psi$ constraints $\psi \in \text{FOL}_{\mathbb{R}}$ on differential equations. Ω -FOD is the first-order fragment of dL_{CHP} plus differential equation properties as for FOD. That is, Ω -FOD extends FOD with capabilities to specify communication such that sufficient verification conditions for the proof of Theorem 4.7 become expressible but without the need to encode traces in properties of differential equations. The ability of FOD to provide \mathbb{R} -Gödel encodings [39] is a central ingredient of both completeness results (see Appendix B). Theorem 4.7 uses \mathbb{R} -Gödel encodings to compress the real-valued part of transitions of unbounded repetitions into a single real number. Theorem 4.9 packs the unbounded traces into \mathbb{R} -Gödel encodings. Ω -FOD extends an oracle for discrete parallelism [57], which does not include FOD, but is also insufficient to deal with the real-valued part of the state.

4.1 Completeness Relative to Ω -FOD

This section proves that dL_{CHP} is complete relative to Ω -FOD. The proof of Theorem 4.7 only succeeds by a combination of strategies from dL [39, 43, 46] for expressiveness results, dGL [44] to obtain an induction order, and ac-reasoning [12, 57] to lift expressiveness to parallel programs. Analogous to dL [39], we first prove that Ω -FOD can express the now multi-typed transition relation of CHPs (Lemma 4.1), and then that Ω -FOD is expressible for dL_{CHP} (Lemma 4.2). This renders Ω -FOD expressive enough to state sufficient loop invariants and variants. For parallel CHPs, however, the parallel injection axiom $\llbracket _ \rrbracket_{\text{AC}}$ —and compositionality for parallelism in general—ask for a characterization of α 's transitions that is receptive for β 's local behavior in the parallel composition $\alpha \parallel \beta$. For receptiveness, Section 4.1.2 introduces state-variations expressible in Ω -FOD generalizing ideas from ac-reasoning [12, 57] to the hybrid setup. However, we achieve better modularity building on top of the transition relation of Lemma 4.1.

At the core of our proof of Theorem 4.7 is an effective and fully constructive reduction of any valid dL_{CHP} formula ϕ in dL_{CHP} 's calculus to Ω -FOD tautologies. Unlike dL 's original completeness proof [39, Theorem 3], our proof of Theorem 4.7 does not stick to the classical structure of Harel's completeness proof for dynamic logic [16, Theorem 3.1]: For a valid dL formula ϕ , extract safety $\varphi \rightarrow [\alpha]\psi$ and liveness $\varphi \rightarrow \langle \alpha \rangle\psi$ constraints by propositional recombination. Then conclude separately for safety and liveness by induction on the structure of the program α . This approach, however, is not well-behaved w.r.t. liveness of parallel CHPs because the premise of the parallel liveness axiom $\langle _ \rangle_{\text{AC}}$ inherently assumes existence of a joint history for the subprograms. Since the \exists quantifier does not distribute over

conjunctions, the premise does not easily split into liveness constraints on the subprograms. Instead, we embark on a strategy successfully applied for dGL [44] and dL's uniform substitution calculus [46] that uses a well-founded order on all formulas.

4.1.1 Expressiveness of Ω -FOD. Lemma 4.1 generalizes an expressiveness result from dL [46] and characterizes the transition semantics of CHPs in Ω -FOD. Unlike the rendition of hybrid programs in dL [39, Lemma 5], Lemma 4.1 characterizes transitions over a multi-typed state. As in dL, \mathbb{R} -Gödel encodings capture the real-valued part of the unboundedly many intermediate states of repetitions. However, a trace variable represents the ongoing communication. This requires a partition of the trace into subsequences for the individual loop passes, which can be done using another trace variable to denote the endpoints of the passes. The rendition is further complicated since CHPs have a prefix-closed semantics whose transitions can reach not only final but also intermediate states (Remark 2.14).

For each CHP α , Lemma 4.1 gives a Ω -FOD formula $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \checkmark)$ exactly satisfied by the α -runs from an initial state described by α 's variables \bar{z} to a reached state described by fresh variables \bar{v} . The boolean variable \checkmark tells whether \bar{v} is intermediate ($\checkmark = \perp$) or final ($\checkmark = \top$). Considering final states only, i.e., $\checkmark = \top$, the precise meaning of the rendition $\mathfrak{S}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \top)$ is $\langle \alpha \rangle \bar{v} = \bar{z}$ as in dL. The full rendition $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \checkmark)$ is captured by $\forall \bar{u} = \bar{z} \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{\top, \neg \checkmark \wedge \bar{v} = \bar{u}^{h_\alpha}\}} (\checkmark \wedge \bar{v} = \bar{z})$ using that the ac-diamond holds if either the commitment holds in an intermediate state or the postcondition in a final state. In intermediate states only communication is observable. Hence, $\bar{v} = \bar{u}^{h_\alpha}$ correctly compares the reached state \bar{v} with the initial state \bar{z} via the ghost variables \bar{u} except that the initial history h_u gets replaced with the current history h^α . The ghost variables hide variables bound by α from the commitment, which is necessary for well-formedness (Def. 2.6).

LEMMA 4.1 (RENDITION OF PROGRAMS). *Let α be a CHP with recorder $h = h^\alpha$ and let $\bar{z} = z_1, \dots, z_k$ be all variables of α including h . Moreover, let $\bar{v} = v_1, \dots, v_n$ and $\bar{u} = u_1, \dots, u_n$ be fresh variables compatible with \bar{z} , and let $h_u \in \bar{u}$ correspond to h , and let \checkmark be a fresh boolean variable. Then there is a Ω -FOD formula $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \checkmark)$ such that the following is valid:*

$$\mathfrak{S}_\alpha(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \checkmark) \leftrightarrow \forall \bar{u} = \bar{z} \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{\top, \neg \checkmark \wedge \bar{v} = \bar{u}^{h_\alpha}\}} (\checkmark \wedge \bar{v} = \bar{z})$$

PROOF. W.l.o.g. assume that μ, μ' are in \bar{z} by prefixing the program α with no-ops as follows $\mu := \mu; \mu' := \mu'; \alpha$. Fig. 9 gives an inductive definition of the formula $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \checkmark)$ along the structure of program α . Notably, the resulting definition of $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \checkmark)$ is indeed a Ω -FOD formula.

The formula $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \checkmark)$ is supposed to be satisfied in exactly those states, where the state \bar{v} is reachable by α from the state \bar{z} . The boolean variable \checkmark decides whether \bar{v} describes an intermediate or final state. Prefix-closedness goes down in the disjunctive structure of $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \checkmark)$ if α is sequential composition or an atomic program: Particularly, the initial state is an intermediate state, which is captured by if-then-else and $\bar{z} = \bar{v}$, i.e., the state has not changed yet, for atomic-programs. The ghost variables \bar{u} do not occur in the resulting Ω -FOD representation of $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \checkmark)$ because they are only required to ensure well-formedness of the ac-diamond. Now, detailed explanations are given for involved cases:

- (1) In case $\text{ch}(h)!\theta$ and $\text{ch}(h)?x$, the history h is extended with the new communication $\langle \text{ch}, \theta, \mu \rangle$ and $\langle \text{ch}, x, \mu \rangle$, respectively. In case $\text{ch}(h)?x$, the quantifiers $\exists y, \exists x$ express that some value is obtained from the environment. Since x only gets assigned its new value in the final state, y is fresh for the intermediate state after communication.
- (2) In case $\alpha; \beta$, if (\bar{z}, \bar{v}) is an unfinished α -computation, it has not reached a final state yet, so $\neg \checkmark$ holds and α 's run is to an intermediate state by \perp in $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \perp)$. Otherwise, if (\bar{z}, \bar{v}) is a computation of $\alpha; \beta$ beyond α , then there must be an final state \bar{w} reachable by α from which β continues as ensured by \top in $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha(\bar{w}, \bar{v}, \top)$.

- (3) In case α^* , a finite formula needs to capture unboundedly many multi-typed intermediate states. The real part of this sequence is compressed into a single real variable $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{R}}$ by \mathbb{R} -Gödel encoding (Ω -FOD by Lemma B.1). To deal with the different type of communication, the trace variable $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{T}}$ stores the overall communication history, and the trace variable I denotes the endpoints of the loop passes in $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{T}}$. Combining $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{T}}$, the vector $\mathcal{W}_i^{(n)}$ describes the i -th intermediate multi-typed state in a sequence of length n . The access $(\mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{R}})_i^{(n)}$ retrieves the i -th position of the \mathbb{R} -Gödel encoding and trace slicing $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{T}}[0, I[i - i]]$ obtains the history up to the i -th loop pass. By predicate $\text{nat}(\cdot)$ (Ω -FOD by Lemma B.3), the real variables n, i represent natural numbers. Existence $\exists \mathcal{W}^{(n)}$ of a multi-typed state sequence $\mathcal{W}^{(n)}$ of length n needs existence of a \mathbb{R} -Rödel encoding $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{R}}$, a history $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{T}}$, and a partition I of $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{T}}$ into n loop passes, i.e., $n = |I|$. By $1 \leq i < n - 1 \vee \checkmark$, all but the last iteration must reach a final state.
- (4) In case $\alpha \parallel \beta$, there is a (\bar{z}, \bar{v}) -run if α and β have runs from \bar{z} to individual states \bar{v}_{α} and \bar{v}_{β} , respectively. The formula Φ_{γ} encodes the requirements for these subruns to combine to a run of $\alpha \parallel \beta$. Since parallel programs need matching communication on joint channels, the rendition stipulates existence of the overall communication $h_{\alpha\beta}$ for $\alpha \parallel \beta$, which has to agree with the subprograms on their channels by $h_{\gamma} = h \cdot (h_{\alpha\beta} \downarrow \gamma)$ in Φ_{γ} . The overall history $h_v \in \bar{v}$ after execution is the history $h \in \bar{z}$ before plus the communication $h_{\alpha\beta}$ by $h_v = h \cdot h_{\alpha\beta}$. However, $h_{\alpha\beta}$ must not contain events not communicated by $\alpha \parallel \beta$, i.e., $h_{\alpha\beta} \downarrow (\alpha \parallel \beta) = h_{\alpha\beta}$. The reached state \bar{v}_{γ} of subprogram γ has to match the overall reached state \bar{v} on γ 's real variables by $\bar{v}_{\gamma}|_{\mathbb{R}} =_{\gamma} \bar{v}|_{\mathbb{R}}$ in Φ_{γ} . Both subprograms synchronize in time via $\bar{\mu}_{\alpha} = \bar{\mu}_{\beta}$, and match $\bar{\mu}$'s value in the final state \bar{v} by $\bar{v}_{\gamma}|_{\mathbb{R}} =_{\gamma} \bar{v}|_{\mathbb{R}}$. The (\bar{z}, \bar{v}) -run is to a final state iff both subruns $(\bar{z}, \bar{v}_{\gamma})$ are to final states, which is encoded in $\checkmark \leftrightarrow \checkmark_{\alpha} \wedge \checkmark_{\beta}$. \square

Using the Ω -FOD encoding of the transition semantics of CHPs (Lemma 4.1), Lemma 4.2 shows that every formula of dL_{CHP} is expressible in Ω -FOD.

LEMMA 4.2 (EXPRESSIVENESS). *The logic dL_{CHP} is expressible in Ω -FOD. That is, for every dL_{CHP} formula ϕ , there is a Ω -FOD formula $\phi^{\#}$ over the same free variables such that $\vDash \phi \leftrightarrow \phi^{\#}$.*

PROOF. The proof is by induction on the structure of ϕ . It generalizes a result for dL [39, Lemma 6] to ac -modalities. W.l.o.g. ϕ contains no dynamic modalities rewriting them into ac -modalities using the equivalences $[\alpha]\psi \leftrightarrow [\alpha]_{\{\text{T}, \text{T}\}}\psi$ and $\langle \alpha \rangle \psi \leftrightarrow \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{\text{T}, \perp\}}\psi$.

- (1) If ϕ is a Ω -FOD formula, then define $\phi^{\#} \equiv \phi$.
- (2) If $\phi \equiv \varphi \wedge \psi$, by IH, $\varphi^{\#}, \psi^{\#}$ exist such that $\vDash \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi^{\#}$ and $\vDash \psi \leftrightarrow \psi^{\#}$. Now, define $\phi^{\#} \equiv \varphi^{\#} \wedge \psi^{\#}$. Then $\vDash \phi \leftrightarrow \phi^{\#}$.
- (3) Other propositional connectives and quantifiers (\neg, \forall) are handled analogous to item 2.
- (4) If $\phi \equiv [\alpha]_{\{\text{A}, \text{C}\}}\psi$, then by IH, $\text{A}^{\#}, \text{C}^{\#}$, and $\psi^{\#}$ exist, which are equivalent to A, C , and ψ , respectively. To express α 's transition semantics in Ω -FOD, the rendition $\mathfrak{S}_{\alpha}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \checkmark)$ from Lemma 4.1 is used. The formula $\mathfrak{S}_{\alpha}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \checkmark)$ holds if the vectors \bar{z}, \bar{v} describe an α -run from a state \bar{z} to a state \bar{v} , where \checkmark tells whether \bar{v} is intermediate or final. Let h^{α} be the recorder of α and h_v corresponds to h^{α} in \bar{v} . To capture the assumption A between α 's initial history h^{α} and its reached history h_v , let $\text{A}_{\sim} \equiv \forall h^{\alpha} \leq h' \sim h_v \text{A}_h^{h'}$, where h' is fresh and $\sim \in \{<, \leq\}$. Then $\phi^{\#}$ is defined as follows, where $\forall \checkmark \phi(\checkmark)$ is short for $\phi(\perp) \wedge \phi(\text{T})$ with \perp and T being bottom and top:

$$\phi^{\#} \equiv \forall \bar{v} \forall \checkmark \left(\mathfrak{S}_{\alpha}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \checkmark) \rightarrow ((\text{A}^{\#})_{<} \rightarrow (\text{C}^{\#})_{h^{\alpha}}^{h_v}) \wedge (\checkmark \wedge (\text{A}^{\#})_{\leq} \rightarrow (\psi^{\#})_{\bar{v}}) \right) \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \mathcal{W}^{(n)} \phi &\equiv \exists \mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{R}} : \mathbb{R} \exists \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{T}} : \mathcal{T} \exists l : \mathcal{T} (n = |l| \wedge \phi) & \Phi_{\gamma} &\equiv \mathfrak{S}_{\gamma}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}_{\gamma}, \check{\gamma}) \wedge \bar{v}_{\gamma}|_{\mathbb{R}} =_{\gamma} \bar{v}|_{\mathbb{R}} \wedge h_{\gamma} = h \cdot (h_{\alpha\beta} \downarrow \gamma) \\ \mathcal{W}_i^{(n)} &\equiv ((\mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{R}})_i^{(n)}, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{T}}[0, l[i-1]]) & \phi(te[0, y]) &\equiv \exists h (|h| = \lfloor y \rfloor \wedge \forall 0 \leq k < \lfloor y \rfloor h[k] = te[k] \wedge \phi(h)) \end{aligned}$$

(a) Auxiliary expressions used in Fig. 9b below. The restriction $\bar{v}|_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the subvector of the expression \bar{v} containing exactly the real terms. Then the equality $\bar{v}_{\gamma}|_{\mathbb{R}} =_{\gamma} \bar{v}|_{\mathbb{R}}$ compares every real-valued component of \bar{v} , which corresponds to a variable in \bar{z} that occurs in γ or $\bar{\mu}$ with its correspondent in \bar{v}_{γ} . The variables h_{α} and h_{β} are the correspondents of $h \in \bar{z}$ in \bar{v}_{α} and \bar{v}_{β} , respectively. For a trace term te , the slice $te[0, y]$ is the subtrace of te from the 0-th up to the $\lfloor y \rfloor$ -th item (exclusive). The floor function $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is Ω -FOD definable as follows: $\phi(\lfloor x \rfloor) \equiv \exists n (\text{nat}(n) \wedge x-1 < n \leq x \wedge \phi(n))$, where $\text{nat}(\cdot)$ is FOD definable (Lemma B.3).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{S}_{x:=\theta}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \check{\gamma}) &\equiv \text{if } \neg\check{\gamma} \text{ then } \bar{v} = \bar{z} \text{ else } \bar{v} = \bar{z}_x^{\theta} \\ \mathfrak{S}_{x:=*}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \check{\gamma}) &\equiv \text{if } \neg\check{\gamma} \text{ then } \bar{v} = \bar{z} \text{ else } \exists x \bar{v} = \bar{z} \quad (\text{note that } x \in \bar{z}) \\ \mathfrak{S}_{?_{\chi}}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \check{\gamma}) &\equiv \text{if } \neg\check{\gamma} \text{ then } \bar{v} = \bar{z} \text{ else } (\chi \wedge \bar{v} = \bar{z}) \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\{x'=\theta\}}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \check{\gamma}) &\equiv \text{if } \neg\check{\gamma} \text{ then } \bar{v} = \bar{z} \text{ else } \langle x' = \theta \rangle \bar{v} = \bar{z} \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\{x'=\theta \& \chi\}}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \check{\gamma}) &\equiv \text{if } \neg\check{\gamma} \text{ then } \bar{v} = \bar{z} \text{ else } \exists g=0 \langle x' = \theta, g' = 1 \rangle (\bar{v} = \bar{z} \wedge [x' = -\theta, g = -1] (g \geq 0 \rightarrow \chi)) \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\text{ch}(h)!_{\theta}}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \check{\gamma}) &\equiv \text{if } \neg\check{\gamma} \text{ then } (\bar{v} = \bar{z} \vee \bar{v} = \bar{z}_h^{h \cdot \langle \text{ch}, \theta, \mu \rangle}) \text{ else } \bar{v} = \bar{z}_h^{h \cdot \langle \text{ch}, \theta, \mu \rangle} \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\text{ch}(h)?_x}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \check{\gamma}) &\equiv \text{if } \neg\check{\gamma} \text{ then } (\bar{v} = \bar{z} \vee \exists y \bar{v} = \bar{z}_h^{h \cdot \langle \text{ch}, y, \mu \rangle}) \text{ else } \exists x \bar{v} = \bar{z}_h^{h \cdot \langle \text{ch}, x, \mu \rangle} \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha \cup \beta}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \check{\gamma}) &\equiv \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \check{\gamma}) \vee \mathfrak{S}_{\beta}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \check{\gamma}) \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha, \beta}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \check{\gamma}) &\equiv \neg\check{\gamma} \wedge \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \perp) \vee \exists \bar{w} (\mathfrak{S}_{\alpha}(\bar{z}, \bar{w}, \top) \wedge \mathfrak{S}_{\beta}(\bar{w}, \bar{v}, \check{\gamma})) \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha^*}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \check{\gamma}) &\equiv \exists n \left(\text{nat}(n) \wedge \exists \mathcal{W}^{(n)} \left(\mathcal{W}_1^{(n)} = \bar{z} \wedge \mathcal{W}_n^{(n)} = \bar{v} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \wedge \forall i (\text{nat}(i) \wedge 1 \leq i < n \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha}(\mathcal{W}_i^{(n)}, \mathcal{W}_{i+1}^{(n)}, 1 \leq i < n-1 \vee \check{\gamma})) \right) \right) \\ \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha \parallel \beta}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \check{\gamma}) &\equiv \exists h_{\alpha\beta}, \bar{v}_{\alpha}, \bar{v}_{\beta}, \check{\alpha}, \check{\beta} \left(h_v = h \cdot h_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \Phi_{\alpha} \wedge \Phi_{\beta} \wedge \bar{\mu}_{\alpha} = \bar{\mu}_{\beta} \wedge h_{\alpha\beta} \downarrow (\alpha \parallel \beta) = h_{\alpha\beta} \wedge (\check{\gamma} \leftrightarrow \check{\alpha} \wedge \check{\beta}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

(b) Recursive definition of the rendition $\mathfrak{S}_{\alpha}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \check{\gamma})$. Let $h = h^{\alpha}$ be the recorder of α . The vectors \bar{v}_{α} and \bar{v}_{β} are fresh and compatible with \bar{z} . The vectors $\bar{\mu}_{\alpha}$ and $\bar{\mu}_{\beta}$ correspond to $\bar{\mu} \in \bar{z}$ in \bar{v}_{α} and \bar{v}_{β} , respectively, and the variable h_v corresponds to $h \in \bar{z}$ in \bar{v} . Auxiliary expressions are defined in Fig. 9a above, and if-then-else (if φ then ϕ_1 else ϕ_2) is short for $(\varphi \wedge \phi_1) \vee (\neg\varphi \wedge \phi_2)$. The nested modality in case $\{x' = \theta \& \chi\}$ can be avoided with appropriate care [46, Lemma 5].

Fig. 9. Encoding of the transition semantics of CHPs in Ω -FOD (Lemma 4.1)

The subformulas of the conjunction in equation (3) straightforwardly reflect (**commit**) and (**post**). Hence, for the commitment $C^{\#}$, only the history h^{α} gets updated while for the postcondition $\psi^{\#}$, the overall state \bar{z} is updated.

- (5) If $\phi \equiv \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A, C\}} \psi$, then $A^{\#}$, $C^{\#}$, and $\psi^{\#}$ exist by IH that are equivalent to A , C , and ψ , respectively. To express α 's transitions in Ω -FOD, use the rendition $\mathfrak{S}_{\alpha}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \check{\gamma})$ from Lemma 4.1 as in case $[\alpha]_{\{A, C\}} \psi$. Moreover, use A_{\sim} from case $[\alpha]_{\{A, C\}} \psi$ to capture the assumption. Then $\phi^{\#}$ is defined as follows, where $\exists \check{\gamma} \phi(\check{\gamma}) \equiv \phi(\perp) \vee \phi(\top)$:

$$\phi^{\#} \equiv \exists \bar{v} \exists \check{\gamma} \left(\mathfrak{S}_{\alpha}(\bar{z}, \bar{v}, \check{\gamma}) \wedge \left(((A^{\#})_{<} \wedge (C^{\#})_{h_{\alpha}}^{h_{\alpha}}) \vee (\check{\gamma} \wedge (A^{\#})_{\leq} \wedge (\psi^{\#})_{\bar{z}}^{\bar{v}}) \right) \right) \quad \square$$

4.1.2 *Expressiveness of Ω -FOD for state-variations.* Compositional reasoning about safety $\varphi \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta] \psi$ of parallel CHPs naturally asks for splitting the postcondition ψ into valid postconditions ψ_{α} and ψ_{β} of α and β , respectively, which entail ψ , i.e., $\psi_{\alpha} \wedge \psi_{\beta} \rightarrow \psi$ is valid. If the subprograms do not interfere with each other's postcondition (Def. 3.1), the parallel injection axiom $[[\perp]_{AC}]$ is complete because it can embed $[\alpha] \psi_{\alpha}$ and $[\beta] \psi_{\beta}$ to $[\alpha \parallel \beta] (\psi_{\alpha} \wedge \psi_{\beta})$. The challenge

is to find ψ_α and ψ_β . They need to capture sufficiently much of α 's and β 's behavior to entail ψ but also need to satisfy noninterference. The transition relation of α and β (Lemma 4.1), however, does not suffice for ψ_α and ψ_β , respectively, because $\alpha \parallel \beta$ merges into a joint final state, which generally is neither reachable by α nor β alone. Hence, $\psi_\alpha \wedge \psi_\beta$ would be rarely satisfiable in the final states of $\alpha \parallel \beta$ and consequently cannot entail ψ .⁸

To obtain appropriate specifications, we adapt an approach from Hoare-style ac-reasoning [57] to hybrid systems and dynamic logic. The idea is to widen the state set represented by ψ_γ to its neighborhood, including all states varying from γ 's reachable states on potential parallel computation. Then ψ_α and ψ_β also cover each other's final states such that their intersection contains the final states of $\alpha \parallel \beta$. Def. 4.3 introduces intermediate and final state-variations enabling convenient reasoning on the semantic level. This carries over to reasoning in the calculus by their expressibility in Ω -FOD (Lemma 4.4). By building Lemma 4.4 on top of the program rendition (Lemma 4.1), we achieve better modularity than Hoare-style ac-reasoning [57]. Throughout the section concepts are explained referring to final state-variations but similar arguments apply to intermediate state-variations. All proofs for this section are in Appendix C.

Definition 4.3 (Intermediate and final state-variations). The *intermediate state-variations* $\mathcal{I}_{Y,\varphi}(A, \alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and *final state-variations* $\mathcal{F}_{Y,\varphi}(A, \alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ of the action (A, α) w.r.t. a precondition φ and environmental channels Y are defined as follows, where $\bar{z} = \text{FV}(\varphi, A) \cup \text{V}(\alpha)$ are the local variables.

$$\mathcal{I}_{Y,\varphi}(A, \alpha) = \{v \cdot \tau_e \mid v \vDash \varphi \text{ and } \exists \tau, \omega : (v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket [A, \alpha] \rrbracket_{<} \text{ and } \tau_e \downarrow (\alpha \cup Y^{\mathbb{C}}) = \tau\}$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{Y,\varphi}(A, \alpha) = \{\omega_e \cdot \tau_e \mid \exists v : v \vDash \varphi \text{ and } \exists \tau, \omega : (v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket [A, \alpha] \rrbracket_{\leq} \text{ and } \omega_e = \omega \text{ on } \bar{z} \text{ and } \tau_e \downarrow (\alpha \cup Y^{\mathbb{C}}) = \tau\}$$

The state-variations of Def. 4.3 cover all variations of the reachable intermediate and final states of an action (A, α) on non-local variables and channels, i.e., stemming from potential computation in the environment. For an (A, α) -run $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket [A, \alpha] \rrbracket_{\leq}$ with $v \vDash \varphi$, the final state-variations $\mathcal{F}_{Y,\varphi}(A, \alpha)$ contain every state $\omega_e \cdot \tau_e$, where the variation ω_e equals ω on local variables \bar{z} and the variation τ_e equals τ on channels $\alpha \cup Y^{\mathbb{C}}$. The constraint $Y^{\mathbb{C}}$ whose purpose will be explained shortly restricts the receptiveness for environmental communication, i.e., limits the channels whose communication may interleave with τ . Consequently, $\mathcal{I}_{Y,\varphi}(A, \alpha)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{Y,\varphi}(A, \alpha)$ are monotone in Y .

LEMMA 4.4 (STATE-VARIATIONS IN Ω -FOD). *For (co)finite $Y \subseteq \Omega$, there are formulas $\Upsilon_{Y,\varphi,A,\alpha}$ (strongest commitment) and $\Psi_{Y,\varphi,A,\alpha}$ (strongest postcondition) characterizing the state-variations $\mathcal{I}_{Y,\varphi}(A, \alpha)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{Y,\varphi}(A, \alpha)$ (Def. 4.3), respectively. That is, $o \in \mathcal{I}_{Y,\varphi}(A, \alpha)$ iff $o \vDash \Upsilon_{Y,\varphi,A,\alpha}$, and $o \in \mathcal{F}_{Y,\varphi}(A, \alpha)$ iff $o \vDash \Psi_{Y,\varphi,A,\alpha}$ for every state o . By Lemma 4.1, the formulas are expressible in Ω -FOD. For a program β and $\Phi \in \{\Upsilon, \Psi\}$, write $\Phi_{\beta,\varphi,A,\alpha}$ for $\Phi_{\text{CN}(\beta),\varphi,A,\alpha}$. Further, $\text{FV}(\Phi_{Y,\varphi,A,\alpha}) \subseteq \text{FV}(\varphi, A) \cup \text{V}(\alpha)$ and $\text{CN}_{\{h^\alpha \parallel \beta\}}(\Phi_{Y,\varphi,A,\alpha}) \subseteq \text{CN}_{\{h^\alpha \parallel \beta\}}(\varphi, A) \cup \text{CN}(\alpha) \cup Y^{\mathbb{C}}$, where $h^\alpha \parallel \beta$ is the recorder of $\alpha \parallel \beta$.*

Lemma 4.5 proves that the strongest promises are indeed strong enough to entail any valid promise (item 1) but not so strong as to cease being valid promises themselves (item 2). Since satisfaction of C and ψ is only assumed for states reachable by α -runs in item 1, $\Psi_{Y,\varphi,A,\alpha}$ is only strong enough for ψ if $\Psi_{Y,\varphi,A,\alpha}$ exactly determines α 's communication ($Y = \emptyset$).⁹ If $Y \not\subseteq \text{CN}(\alpha)$, then $\Psi_{Y,\varphi,A,\alpha}$ contains states with communication parallel to α along environmental channels. Still $\Psi_{Y,\varphi,A,\alpha}$ is a valid promise (item 2) because those states are just not reachable by α , but importantly, $\Psi_{\beta,\varphi,A,\alpha}$ also becomes satisfied in all final states of $(\alpha \parallel \beta)$ -runs, i.e., $\Psi_{\beta,\varphi,A,\alpha}$ is receptive for communication on channels exclusive to β . In summary, Y adapts for how much environment the strongest postcondition $\Psi_{Y,\varphi,A,\alpha}$ shall account for.

⁸Let $\Phi_{\varphi,\alpha}$ denote all states reachable by an α -run from any state satisfying φ . Then $\varphi \rightarrow [\text{ch}(h)!0]\Phi_{\varphi,\text{ch}(h)!0}$ is valid, where $\varphi \equiv h \downarrow \text{dh} = \epsilon$, but $\varphi \rightarrow [\text{ch}(h)!0 \parallel \text{dh}(h)?x]\Phi_{\varphi,\text{ch}(h)!0}$ is not valid because no state captured by $\Phi_{\varphi,\text{ch}(h)!0}$ contains communication along channel dh . Nevertheless, noninterference suggests that $\varphi \rightarrow [\text{ch}(h)!0 \parallel \text{dh}(h)?x]\Phi_{\varphi,\text{ch}(h)!0}$ should be valid, too, because $\Phi_{\varphi,\text{ch}(h)!0}$ locally describes the behavior of $\text{ch}(h)!0$.

⁹For example, consider $\vDash \varphi \rightarrow [\text{dh}(h)!0]\psi$, where $\varphi \equiv \psi \equiv h \downarrow \text{ch} = \epsilon$. Then $\Psi_{\{\text{ch}\},\varphi,\tau,\text{dh}(h)!0}$ does not entail the postcondition ψ because $\Psi_{\{\text{ch}\},\varphi,\tau,\text{dh}(h)!0}$ captures reachable states, where channel ch is written during the $(\text{dh}(h)!0)$ -run after channel dh . But in these states ψ is not valid!

LEMMA 4.5 (CORRECT REACHABLE WORLDS CHARACTERIZATION). *The notions of intermediate and final state-variations (Def. 4.3) are correct, i.e., the strongest promises (Lemma 4.4) fulfill the following properties, where hiding $\forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}$ of variables $\bar{x} \supseteq (\mathbf{BV}(\alpha) \cap V_{\mathbb{R}}) \cup \{\bar{\mu}\}$ in the commitment with fresh and compatible variables \bar{y} ensures well-formedness of the ac-box (Def. 2.6):*

- (1) *If $\vDash \varphi \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$, then (i) $\vDash Y_{\emptyset,\varphi,A,\alpha} \rightarrow C$ and (ii) $\vDash \Psi_{\emptyset,\varphi,A,\alpha} \rightarrow \psi$*
- (2) *$\vDash \bar{y} = \bar{x} \wedge \varphi \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,\forall \bar{x}=\bar{y} Y_{Y,\bar{x} \wedge \varphi,A,\alpha}\}} \Psi_{Y,\bar{y}=\bar{x} \wedge \varphi,A,\alpha}$*

Lemma 4.5 resorts from reasoning about a valid promise to reasoning about the strongest promise. Then Lemma 4.6 enables to split the strongest promises into strongest promises for the subprograms. The intuition behind Lemma 4.6 is that if a state o satisfies $\Psi_{\beta,F_{\alpha},T,\alpha} \wedge \Psi_{\alpha,F_{\beta},T,\beta}$, then o is a variation (Def. 4.3) of a state reachable by α in the environment β and vice versa from states satisfying the local precondition F_{α} and F_{β} , respectively. Thus, lying at the intersection $\mathcal{F}_{\beta,F_{\alpha}}(T,\alpha) \cap \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,F_{\beta}}(T,\beta)$, the variation o already contains the computation result of each other's program. Further, by the constraint $\bar{\mu}_0 = \bar{\mu} \wedge h_0 \downarrow \bar{c}h_{\gamma} = h \downarrow \bar{c}h_{\gamma}$ in F_{α}, F_{β} both programs reached this result from the same global time and from compatible initial histories. Consequently, o is reachable by $\alpha \parallel \beta$ from an initial state resulting from merging the local initial states such that the global precondition F is satisfied. Global properties (see Remark 3.2) need separate consideration: History invariance $o \vDash h \downarrow \bar{c}h \geq h_0$ rejects certain inadmissible interleavings of α 's and β 's communication (cf. axiom $[\geq]_{AC}$) such that $o \vDash \Psi_{\emptyset,F,T,\alpha \parallel \beta}$. Finally, the assumption $o \vDash \square_{\leq}^{\bar{c}h} A$ yields $o \in \Psi_{\emptyset,F,A,\alpha \parallel \beta}$ (cf. axiom $[\sqcup A]_I$).

LEMMA 4.6 (DECOMPOSITION OF STRONGEST PROMISES). *Let $(A, \alpha \parallel \beta)$ be communicatively well-formed, let $h = h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}$ be the recorder of $\alpha \parallel \beta$, and let $\alpha^{\circ} = \beta$ and $\beta^{\circ} = \alpha$. For each $\gamma \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$ and formula φ_{γ} , let $FV(\varphi_{\gamma}) \cap V(\gamma^{\circ}) \subseteq \{\bar{\mu}, h\}$, and let $CN_{\{h\}}(\varphi_{\gamma}) \cap CN(\gamma^{\circ}) \subseteq CN(\gamma)$, and let $BV(\gamma) \cap V(\gamma^{\circ}) \subseteq \{\bar{\mu}, h\}$.*

Further, let $\bar{c}h_{\gamma} = CN_{\{h\}}(\varphi_{\gamma}) \cup CN(\gamma)$ and $\bar{c}h = \bar{c}h_{\alpha} \cup \bar{c}h_{\beta} \cup CN(A)$, and $\bar{\mu}_0, h_0$ be fresh variables. Then the following formulas splitting the strongest promises (see Lemma 4.4) about a parallel program are valid, where $F_{\gamma} \equiv \bar{\mu}_0 = \bar{\mu} \wedge \varphi_{\gamma} \wedge h_0 \downarrow \bar{c}h_{\gamma} = h \downarrow \bar{c}h_{\gamma}$, and $F \equiv \bar{\mu}_0 = \bar{\mu} \wedge \varphi_{\alpha} \wedge \varphi_{\beta} \wedge h_0 = h \downarrow \bar{c}h$, and $\square_{\leq}^{\bar{c}h} A \equiv \forall h' (h_0 \leq h' \sim h \downarrow \bar{c}h \rightarrow A_{h'}^{\bar{c}h})$, where h' is fresh.

$$\begin{aligned} &\vDash Y_{\beta,F_{\alpha},T,\alpha} \wedge Y_{\alpha,F_{\beta},T,\beta} \wedge h \downarrow \bar{c}h \geq h_0 \rightarrow (\square_{<}^{\bar{c}h} A \rightarrow Y_{\emptyset,F,A,\alpha \parallel \beta}) \\ &\vDash \Psi_{\beta,F_{\alpha},T,\alpha} \wedge \Psi_{\alpha,F_{\beta},T,\beta} \wedge h \downarrow \bar{c}h \geq h_0 \rightarrow (\square_{\leq}^{\bar{c}h} A \rightarrow \Psi_{\emptyset,F,A,\alpha \parallel \beta}), \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the program $\gamma^{\circ} \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$ does not interfere (Def. 3.1) with the strongest promises $Y_{\gamma^{\circ},F_{\alpha},T,\gamma}$ and $\Psi_{\gamma^{\circ},F_{\alpha},T,\gamma}$.

Different from well-formedness $BV(\alpha) \cap BV(\beta) \subseteq \{\bar{\mu}\} \cup V_{\mathcal{T}}$ (Def. 2.2), Lemma 4.6 requires the stronger separation $BV(\gamma) \cap V(\gamma^{\circ}) \subseteq \{\bar{\mu}, h\}$ for each γ , where the limitation from $V_{\mathcal{T}}$ to $\{h\}$ is no new restriction as $\alpha \parallel \beta$ has the unique recorder h . This is necessary so that γ does not interfere (Def. 3.1) with the strongest promises $Y_{\gamma^{\circ},F_{\alpha},T,\gamma}$ and $\Psi_{\gamma^{\circ},F_{\alpha},T,\gamma}$, thus, enables usage of the parallel injection axiom $[\sqcup]_{AC}$. Luckily this separation can be ensured by renaming the variables $BV(\gamma) \cap V(\gamma^{\circ}) \cap \{\bar{\mu}, h\}^C$ appropriately as done in the proof of Theorem 4.7.

4.1.3 Ω -FOD Completeness Theorem. This section proves Theorem 4.7, our first completeness result providing an effective and fully constructive reduction of any valid dL_{CHP} formula to Ω -FOD tautologies in dL_{CHP} 's proof calculus (Fig. 4). To denote that a formula ϕ derives in dL_{CHP} 's calculus from Ω -FOD tautologies, write $\vdash_{\Omega} \phi$. We assumed dL_{CHP} contains a complete axiomatization of first-order logic (Section 3). To make this precise, Theorem 4.7 uses the axioms

$\forall i$, $\forall \rightarrow$, and $\forall \forall$ and all propositional tautologies P , and derivable introduction of ghost variables iG and substitution $=R$:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \forall i & \forall z \psi(z) \rightarrow \psi(e) & \forall \rightarrow & \forall z (\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\forall z \varphi \rightarrow \forall z \psi) & \forall \forall & \psi \rightarrow \forall z \psi \quad (\text{where } z \notin \text{FV}(\psi)) \\ iG & \forall z_0 (z_0 = e \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow \psi & =R & z_0 = z \rightarrow (\psi(z_0) \rightarrow \psi(z)) \end{array}$$

THEOREM 4.7 (COMPLETENESS RELATIVE TO Ω -FOD). *dL_{CHP}'s proof calculus is complete relative to Ω -FOD, i.e., every valid dL_{CHP} formula ϕ can be derived in dL_{CHP}'s calculus (Fig. 4) from Ω -FOD tautologies. In short, if $\vDash \phi$, then $\vDash_{\Omega} \phi$.*

PROOF. The formula ϕ is assumed to contain only ac-modalities using the equivalences $[\alpha]\psi \leftrightarrow [\alpha]_{\{\top, \top\}}\psi$ (axiom $\square_{\top, \top}$) and $\langle \alpha \rangle \psi \leftrightarrow \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{\top, \perp\}}\psi$ (axiom $\langle \rangle_{\top, \perp}$). Further, the formula ϕ is assumed to be in conjunctive normal form with negations pushed inside over modalities and quantifiers using the provable equivalences $\neg[\alpha]_{\{A, C\}}\psi \leftrightarrow \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A, \neg C\}}\neg\psi$ and $\neg\langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A, C\}}\psi \leftrightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A, \neg C\}}\neg\psi$ (axiom $\langle \cdot \rangle_{AC}$, and monotonicity $M[\cdot]_{AC}$ to get rid of double negations), and $\neg\forall z \psi \leftrightarrow \exists z \neg\psi$ and $\neg\exists z \psi \leftrightarrow \forall z \neg\psi$. Unlike in dL's completeness proof [39], which encodes quantification over real variables as differential equation transitions, this proof handles quantifiers explicitly to cover quantification over non-real variables.

The proof is by induction along a well-founded partial order \sqsubset on dL_{CHP} formulas. The order \sqsubset is defined analogous to the order used in the completeness proof of differential game logic [44], which induces an order on all formulas by the lexicographic ordering of the overall structural complexity of the programs in the formula and the structural complexity of the formula itself. More precisely, define $\varphi \sqsubset \psi$ if ψ is *not* a Ω -FOD formula, *and* the overall structural complexity of programs in φ is lower than in ψ or the complexity of the programs in φ is the same than in ψ but the formula φ is structurally less complex than ψ in the usual sense. Consequently, if $\varphi \sqsubset \psi$, the formula φ might even have a more complex structure (e.g., more quantifiers) than ψ if all its programs are simpler. The order \sqsubset is well-founded because the Ω -FOD formulas are placed at its bottom and the complexity of programs can shrink only finitely often.

Now, let $\vDash \phi$. Then the proof is by well-founded induction along the order \sqsubset . Since negations are assumed to be pushed inside, any formula beginning with a negation is in Ω -FOD, so subject to the first case.

- (1) If ϕ contains no program, then ϕ is a Ω -FOD formula, thus derivable in \vDash_{Ω} .
- (2) $\phi \equiv \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$, then $\vDash_{\Omega} \phi_1$ and $\vDash_{\Omega} \phi_2$ by IH since $\vDash \phi_1$ and $\vDash \phi_2$, combining to $\vDash_{\Omega} \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ propositionally.
- (3) $\phi \equiv \forall z \psi$, or $\phi \equiv \exists z \psi$, or $\phi \equiv \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A, C\}}\psi$, where $\langle \alpha \rangle$ is a unifying notation for $[\alpha]$ and $\langle \alpha \rangle$, then obtain $\vDash_{\Omega} \perp \vee \phi$ via case 4, 5, or 6, respectively, which yields $\vDash_{\Omega} \phi$ by propositional reasoning.

In case $\phi \equiv \phi_1 \vee \phi_2$, w.l.o.g. assume $\phi_2 \equiv \forall z G$, or $\phi_2 \equiv \exists z G$, or $\phi_2 \equiv \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A, C\}}G$ by derivable associativity and commutativity, and the assumption that ϕ only contains ac-modalities. In the remainder, abbreviate $\neg\phi_1$ as F , so $\vDash \phi$ implies $\vDash F \rightarrow \phi_2$, and show that $F \rightarrow \phi_2$ derives in \vDash_{Ω} . Without further notice, the proof uses that $(F \rightarrow \lambda) \sqsubset (F \rightarrow \chi)$ if $\lambda \sqsubset \chi$ for any formula χ .

- (4) $\phi \equiv F \rightarrow \forall z G$, then $\vDash F_{z^0} \rightarrow \forall z G$ for a fresh variable z_0 . Hence, $\vDash F_{z^0} \rightarrow G$. Since $(F_{z^0} \rightarrow G) \sqsubset (F \rightarrow \forall z G)$, because G has less quantifiers than $\forall z G$, obtain $\vDash_{\Omega} F_{z^0} \rightarrow G$ by IH. By \forall -generalization, obtain $\vDash_{\Omega} \forall z (F_{z^0} \rightarrow G)$. Then $\vDash_{\Omega} \forall z F_{z^0} \rightarrow \forall z G$ by $\forall \rightarrow$, which yields $\vDash_{\Omega} F_{z^0} \rightarrow \forall z G$ by $\forall \forall$. By bound variable renaming, $\vDash_{\Omega} F \rightarrow \forall z G$.
- (5) $\phi \equiv F \rightarrow \exists z G$, then by Lemma 4.2, there are $F^{\#}$ and $G^{\#}$ in Ω -FOD such that $\vDash F \leftrightarrow F^{\#}$ and $\vDash G \leftrightarrow G^{\#}$. Hence, $\vDash_{\Omega} F^{\#} \rightarrow \exists z G^{\#}$ since $F^{\#} \rightarrow \exists z G^{\#}$ is a valid Ω -FOD formula. Moreover, the formulas $F \rightarrow F^{\#}$ and $G^{\#} \rightarrow G$ derive in \vDash_{Ω} if $F \in \Omega$ -FOD and $G \in \Omega$ -FOD, respectively, as they are valid. If $F \notin \Omega$ -FOD, then $(F \rightarrow F^{\#}) \sqsubset \phi$ such that $\vDash_{\Omega} F \rightarrow F^{\#}$ by IH. If $G \notin \Omega$ -FOD, then $(G^{\#} \rightarrow G) \sqsubset \phi$ such that $\vDash_{\Omega} G^{\#} \rightarrow G$ by IH. Since $\vDash_{\Omega} G^{\#} \rightarrow G$, by \forall -generalization, $\vDash_{\Omega} \forall z (G^{\#} \rightarrow G)$. Then $\vDash_{\Omega} \exists z G^{\#} \rightarrow \exists z G$ by the derivable dual of

$\forall \rightarrow$. The latter and $\iota_{\Omega} F^{\#} \rightarrow \exists z G^{\#}$ yield $\iota_{\Omega} F^{\#} \rightarrow \exists z G$ propositionally, and this combines with $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow F^{\#}$ to $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow \exists z G$ propositionally.

(6) $\phi \equiv F \rightarrow \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A,C\}} G$, then the proof is by an induction on the structure of modality and program $\langle \alpha \rangle$. Missing ac-diamond cases derive by their ac-box counterpart and duality $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{AC}}$ of ac-box and ac-diamond. For $F \rightarrow \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A,C\}} G$, the special case $F \rightarrow \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A,\perp\}} G$ is proven first and then used for the general case.

(a) $\vDash F \rightarrow [x := \theta]_{\{A,C\}} G$, then $\vDash F \rightarrow C \wedge (A \rightarrow G_x^{\theta})$ by $[\epsilon]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ and $[:=]$. Since there are less programs, obtain $(C \wedge (A \rightarrow G_x^{\theta})) \sqsubset [x := \theta]_{\{A,C\}} G$. Hence, $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow C \wedge (A \rightarrow G_x^{\theta})$ by IH. Hence, $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow [x := \theta]_{\{A,C\}} G$ using $[:=]$ and $[\epsilon]_{\mathcal{AC}}$.

(b) $\vDash F \rightarrow [x := *]_{\{A,C\}} G$, then $\vDash F \rightarrow C \wedge (A \rightarrow \forall x G)$ by $[\epsilon]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ and $[:*]$. Since there are less programs, obtain $(C \wedge (A \rightarrow \forall x G)) \sqsubset [x := \theta]_{\{A,C\}} G$. Hence, $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow C \wedge (A \rightarrow \forall x G)$ by IH. Hence, $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow [x := *]_{\{A,C\}} G$ by $[:*]$ and $[\epsilon]_{\mathcal{AC}}$.

(c) $\vDash F \rightarrow [?\chi]_{\{A,C\}} G$, then $\vDash F \rightarrow \phi_0$ by $[\epsilon]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ and $[?]$, where $\phi_0 \equiv C \wedge (A \rightarrow (\chi \rightarrow G))$. Since $\phi_0 \sqsubset [?\chi]_{\{A,C\}} G$, as ϕ_0 has less programs, $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow \phi_0$ by IH. Hence, $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow [?\chi]_{\{A,C\}} G$ using $[?]$ and $[\epsilon]_{\mathcal{AC}}$.

(d) $\vDash F \rightarrow [x' = \theta \ \& \ \chi]_{\{A,C\}} G$, then by $[\epsilon]_{\mathcal{AC}}$, $\vDash F \rightarrow (C \wedge (A \rightarrow [x' = \theta \ \& \ \chi]G))$. The differential equaiton $x' = \theta$ can be assumed to contain the clock $g' = 1$ as it can be always added as differential ghost [46]. Now, by $[\&]$, $F \rightarrow \phi_0$ is valid, where ϕ_0 is as follows:

$$\phi_0 \equiv C \wedge \left(A \rightarrow \forall g_0=g [x' = \theta]([x' = -\theta](g \geq g_0 \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow G) \right)$$

The nested modalities in ϕ_0 support better readability but can be eliminated with appropriate care [46, Lemma 5]. Hence, $\phi_0 \sqsubset [[x' = \theta \ \& \ \chi]_{\{A,C\}}]G$ because C , A , and ψ contain less programs than $[[x' = \theta \ \& \ \chi]_{\{A,C\}}]G$ and ϕ_0 only adds Ω -FOD formulas around C , A , and ψ . Therefore, $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow \phi_0$ by IH, which in turn implies $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow (C \wedge (A \rightarrow [x' = \theta \ \& \ \chi]G))$ by $[\&]$. Finally, $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow [x' = \theta \ \& \ \chi]_{\{A,C\}} G$ by $[\epsilon]_{\mathcal{AC}}$.

(e) $\vDash F \rightarrow [\alpha; \beta]_{\{A,C\}} G$, then by $[\cdot]_{\mathcal{AC}}$, $\vDash F \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} [\beta]_{\{A,C\}} G$. As the programs α and β are simpler than $\alpha; \beta$, obtain $[\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} [\beta]_{\{A,C\}} G \sqsubset [\alpha; \beta]_{\{A,C\}} G$. Hence, $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} [\beta]_{\{A,C\}} G$ by IH. Finally, $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow [\alpha; \beta]_{\{A,C\}} G$ by $[\cdot]_{\mathcal{AC}}$.

(f) $\vDash F \rightarrow [\alpha \cup \beta]_{\{A,C\}} G$, then $\vDash F \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} G \wedge [\beta]_{\{A,C\}} G$ using $[\cup]_{\mathcal{AC}}$. As the programs α and β are simpler than $\alpha \cup \beta$, obtain $([\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} G \wedge [\beta]_{\{A,C\}} G) \sqsubset [\alpha \cup \beta]_{\{A,C\}} G$. Hence, $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} G \wedge [\beta]_{\{A,C\}} G$ by IH. Finally, $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow [\alpha \cup \beta]_{\{A,C\}} G$ by axiom $[\cup]_{\mathcal{AC}}$.

(g) $\vDash F \rightarrow [\alpha^*]_{\{A,C\}} G$, then use $I \equiv ([\alpha^*]_{\{A,C\}} G)^{\#}$ as invariant for the rule $\text{loop}_{\mathcal{AC}}$. By (commit) and totality of the program semantics, i.e., $(v, \epsilon, \perp) \in [[\alpha^*]]$ for every state v , the commitment C holds in every state where $[\alpha^*]_{\{A,C\}} G$ holds. Hence, $F \rightarrow C \wedge I$ is valid. Since $I \in \Omega$ -FOD and C contains less programs than $[\alpha^*]_{\{A,C\}} G$, obtain $(C \wedge I) \sqsubset [\alpha^*]_{\{A,C\}} G$. Hence, the premise $F \rightarrow C \wedge I$ of $\text{loop}_{\mathcal{AC}}$ derives in ι_{Ω} by IH. By $[*]_{\mathcal{AC}}$, $\vDash I \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} [\alpha^*]_{\{A,C\}} G$ such that $\vDash I \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} I$. Since $I \in \Omega$ -FOD and α is simpler than its repetition α^* , obtain $(I \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} I) \sqsubset \phi$. Hence, the premise $I \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} I$ of $\text{loop}_{\mathcal{AC}}$ derives in ι_{Ω} by IH. By $[*]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ again, $\vDash I \rightarrow [\alpha^0]_{\{A,C\}} G$, thus, $\vDash A \wedge I \rightarrow G$ by $[\epsilon]_{\mathcal{AC}}$ and $[?]$ as $\alpha^0 \equiv ?T$. Since $I \in \Omega$ -FOD, and A and G have less programs than ϕ , obtain $(A \wedge I \rightarrow G) \sqsubset \phi$. Hence, the premise $A \wedge I \rightarrow G$ of $\text{loop}_{\mathcal{AC}}$ derives in ι_{Ω} by IH. In summary, all premises of $\text{loop}_{\mathcal{AC}}$ derive such that $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow [\alpha^*]_{\{A,C\}} G$ by $\text{loop}_{\mathcal{AC}}$.

(h) $\vDash F \rightarrow [\text{ch}(h)!\theta]_{\{A,C\}} G$, then $\vDash F \rightarrow [?T]_{\{A,C\}} [\text{ch}(h)!\theta][?T]_{\{A,C\}} G$ by $[\text{ch}!]_{\mathcal{AC}}$. Then by $[\text{ch}!]$,

$$\phi_0 \equiv F \rightarrow [?T]_{\{A,C\}} \forall h_0 (h_0 = h \cdot \langle \text{ch}, \theta, \mu \rangle \rightarrow ([?T]_{\{A,C\}} G)_h^{h_0})$$

is valid. By $[e]_{AC}$ and $[?]$, the ac-kernels $[?T]_{\{A,C\}} \cdot$ in ϕ_0 are equivalent to $C \wedge (A \rightarrow \cdot)$. Hence, w.l.o.g. ϕ_0 can be considered to contain less programs than ϕ such that $\phi_0 \sqsubset \phi$. Hence, $\iota_{\Omega} \phi_0$ by IH. Then $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow [?T]_{\{A,C\}} [\text{ch}(h)! \theta] [?T]_{\{A,C\}} G$ by $[\text{ch}!]$, and finally, $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow [\text{ch}(h)! \theta]_{\{A,C\}} G$ by $[\text{ch}!]_{AC}$.

- (i) $\vDash F \rightarrow [\text{ch}(h)?x]_{\{A,C\}} G$, then by $[?x]_{AC}$ and $[*]$, $\vDash F \rightarrow \forall x [\text{ch}(h)!x]_{\{A,C\}} G$, which implies $\vDash F_x^y \rightarrow \forall x [\text{ch}(h)!x]_{\{A,C\}} G$ for a fresh variable y . Since y is fresh, obtain $\vDash F_x^y \rightarrow [\text{ch}(h)!x]_{\{A,C\}} G$. By item 6h above, $\iota_{\Omega} F_x^y \rightarrow [\text{ch}(h)!x]_{\{A,C\}} G$, which yields $\iota_{\Omega} \forall x (F_x^y \rightarrow [\text{ch}(h)!x]_{\{A,C\}} G)$ by \forall -generalization. Then $\iota_{\Omega} \forall x F_x^y \rightarrow \forall x [\text{ch}(h)!x]_{\{A,C\}} G$ by $\forall \rightarrow$, so $\iota_{\Omega} F_x^y \rightarrow \forall x [\text{ch}(h)!x]_{\{A,C\}} G$ by $\forall \vee$. By bound variable renaming, $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow \forall x [\text{ch}(h)!x]_{\{A,C\}} G$. Finally, $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow [\text{ch}(h)?x]_{\{A,C\}} G$ derives by $[*]$ and $[?x]_{AC}$.
- (j) For $\vDash F \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{A,C\}} G$, Fig. 10 derives $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{A,C\}} G$, where Fig. 10a introduces abbreviations used. By well-formedness (Def. 2.2), $\mathbf{BV}(\alpha) \cap \mathbf{BV}(\beta) \subseteq \{\bar{\mu}\} \cup V_{\mathcal{T}}$, thus, $\mathbf{BV}(\alpha) \cap \mathbf{BV}(\beta) \subseteq \{\bar{\mu}, h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}\}$ as $h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}$ is the unique recorder of $\alpha \parallel \beta$. W.l.o.g. assume that $\mathbf{BV}(\gamma) \cap \mathbf{BV}(\gamma^{\circ}) \subseteq \{\bar{\mu}, h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}\}$ for each γ , where $\alpha^{\circ} = \beta$ and $\beta^{\circ} = \alpha$. Therefore, rename the real variables $\bar{x}_{\gamma} = \mathbf{FV}(\gamma) \cap \mathbf{BV}(\gamma^{\circ}) \cap \{\bar{\mu}, h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}\}^C$ with fresh and compatible variables \bar{y}_{γ} as follows: $\phi_0 \equiv \bar{y}_{\alpha} = \bar{x}_{\alpha} \wedge \bar{y}_{\beta} = \bar{x}_{\beta} \wedge F \rightarrow [\alpha_{\bar{x}_{\alpha}}^{\bar{y}_{\alpha}} \parallel \beta_{\bar{x}_{\beta}}^{\bar{y}_{\beta}}]_{\{A,C\}} G$. Since $\vDash \phi \leftrightarrow \phi_0$, obtain $\vDash \phi_0$. Then derive $\iota_{\Omega} \phi_0$ such that $\iota_{\Omega} \phi$ by substitution $=R$.

The overall idea is to split the promises C and G into promises for the subprograms α and β , which are not interfered (Def. 3.1) by the respective other subprogram, such that the parallel injection axiom $[\parallel]_{AC}$ becomes applicable. Using Lemma 4.6, the split is actually done on the strongest commitment $\Upsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ and postcondition $\Psi_{\alpha\beta}$, which are expressible in Ω -FOD (Lemma 4.4), into strongest commitments Υ_{α} and Υ_{β} , and postconditions Ψ_{α} and Ψ_{β} for the subprograms. Lemma 4.6 needs assumption closure $[\Box]_{AC}$ and history invariance $[\geq]_{AC}$ proving non-local properties of the communication history (see Remark 3.2).

Fig. 10b fixes the initial state in ghost variables and shadows it in the precondition F obtaining $F_{\alpha\beta}$. The formula $F_{\alpha\beta}$ can be split into preconditions F_{α} and F_{β} that do not mention variables of the respective other subprogram as required by Lemma 4.6 to ensure noninterference. Next, reasoning resorts to the strongest promises by Lemma 4.5, and assumption closure $[\Box]_{AC}$ shifts the assumption A into commitment and postcondition. Fig. 10c actually splits the promises using Lemma 4.6. History invariance is a by-product and is proven by axiom $[\geq]_{AC}$. Finally, Fig. 10d distributes the strongest promises to subproofs each dropping the subprogram not interfering with the promises at hand by the parallel injection axiom $[\parallel]_{AC}$. Importantly, noninterference is guaranteed by Lemma 4.6.

- (k) If $\vDash F \rightarrow \langle \alpha \parallel \beta \rangle_{\{A,C\}} G$, then $\vDash F \rightarrow (h_0 = h^{\alpha \parallel \beta} \rightarrow \langle \alpha \parallel \beta \rangle_{\{A,C\}} G)$ for a fresh variable h_0 . Hence, $\vDash F \rightarrow (h_0 = h^{\alpha \parallel \beta} \rightarrow \langle \alpha \parallel \beta \rangle_{\{T,C^A\}} G^A)$ by the derivable dual $h_0 = h^{\alpha \parallel \beta} \rightarrow (\langle \alpha \parallel \beta \rangle_{\{A,C\}} G \leftrightarrow \langle \alpha \parallel \beta \rangle_{\{T,C^A\}} G^A)$ of axiom $[\Box]_{AC}$, where $C^A \equiv \Box_{\geq}^{\Omega} A \wedge C$ and $G^A \equiv \Box_{\geq}^{\Omega} A \wedge G$ (see Fig. 4 for the definition of $\Box_{\geq}^{\Omega} A$). Then $F \rightarrow (h = h^{\alpha \parallel \beta} \rightarrow \phi_0)$ is valid by the semantics of the ac-diamond and of parallelism, where ϕ_0 is as follows with C_{γ}^A and G_{γ}^A being defined as in Fig. 4:

$$\phi_0 \equiv \exists h_0, h_{\alpha\beta}, \bar{y}_{\alpha}, \bar{y}_{\beta}, \bar{g}, \checkmark \left(h_0 = h \wedge h_{\alpha\beta} \downarrow (\alpha \parallel \beta) = h_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{T,C_{\alpha}^A\}} G_{\alpha}^A \wedge \langle \beta \rangle_{\{T,C_{\beta}^A\}} G_{\beta}^A \right)$$

Since α and β are simpler than $\alpha \parallel \beta$, and C_{γ}^A and G_{γ}^A only add Ω -FOD formulas around A , C , and G , obtain $(h_0 = h^{\alpha \parallel \beta} \rightarrow \phi_0) \sqsubset (h_0 = h^{\alpha \parallel \beta} \rightarrow \langle \alpha \parallel \beta \rangle_{\{A,C\}} G)$. Then $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow (h_0 = h^{\alpha \parallel \beta} \rightarrow \phi_0)$ by IH, so $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow (h_0 = h^{\alpha \parallel \beta} \rightarrow \langle \alpha \parallel \beta \rangle_{\{T,C^A\}} G^A)$ by axiom $\langle \parallel \rangle_{AC}$. By the derivable dual of $[\Box]_{AC}$, $\iota_{\Omega} F \rightarrow (h_0 = h^{\alpha \parallel \beta} \rightarrow \langle \alpha \parallel \beta \rangle_{\{A,C\}} G)$, so $F \rightarrow \langle \alpha \parallel \beta \rangle_{\{A,C\}} G$ by iG .

- (l) In the special case $\vDash F \rightarrow \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} G$ with unsatisfiable commitment \perp , deriveability $\vDash_{\Omega} F \rightarrow \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} G$ holds by an adoption of the reasoning for dL [39]: First, define $\varphi(v)$ as the variant required for the convergence axiom \mathbf{C}_A by combining the Ω -FOD representation $(\langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} G)^\#$ (Lemma 4.2) and the reachability rendition (Lemma 4.1) for program α . Since only runs to final states are relevant, the marker \checkmark is set to \top in the rendition and the formula is simplified accordingly.

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(n-1) \equiv \exists \bar{v} \left((A^\#)_{\leq} \wedge (G^\#)_{\bar{z}}^{\bar{v}} \wedge \text{nat}(n) \wedge \exists \mathcal{W}^{(n)} (\mathcal{W}_1^{(n)} = \bar{z} \wedge \mathcal{W}_n^{(n)} = \bar{v}) \right. \\ \left. \wedge \forall i (\text{nat}(i) \wedge 1 \leq i < n \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}_\alpha(\mathcal{W}_i^{(n)}, \mathcal{W}_{i+1}^{(n)}, \top)) \right) \end{aligned}$$

The variant $\varphi(v)$ expresses that if $\varphi(v)$ is satisfied in an initial state \bar{z} , where \bar{z} are the variables of $\langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} G$, a final state \bar{v} satisfying G is reachable by an (A, α) -run in v iterations. Moreover, observe that $\varphi(v) \sqsubset \phi$ since $\varphi(v) \in \Omega$ -FOD. Then the following formulas derive in \vDash_{Ω} :

- (i) $\phi_0 \equiv \exists v \varphi(v) \rightarrow \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} \exists v \leq 0 \varphi(v)$: If $\varphi(v)$ is satisfied for some v , by the definition of $\varphi(v)$, a final state \bar{v} satisfying G is reachable by an (A, α) -run in v iterations. Hence, this state is reachable in $v-1$ iterations after on (A, α) -run such that $\chi \equiv v > 0 \wedge \varphi(v) \rightarrow \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} \varphi(v-1)$ is valid. Since $\chi \sqsubset \phi$, because $\varphi(v) \in \Omega$ -FOD and α is simpler than its repetition α^* , obtain $\vDash_{\Omega} \chi$ by IH. Then $\vDash_{\Omega} [\alpha^*]_{\{A, \top\}} \forall v > 0 (\varphi(v) \rightarrow \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} \varphi(v-1))$ by \mathbf{V} -generalization and Gödel generalization \mathbf{G}_{AC} . Further, $\vDash_{\Omega} \forall v (\varphi(v) \rightarrow \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} \exists v \leq 0 \varphi(v))$ by convergence \mathbf{C}_A . Finally, $\vDash_{\Omega} \phi_0$ by first-order reasoning.
- (ii) $\phi_1 \equiv F \rightarrow \exists v \varphi(v)$: First, $F \rightarrow \exists v \varphi(v)$ is valid because $F \rightarrow \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} G$ is. Moreover, $\exists v \varphi(v) \sqsubset \phi$ since $\exists v \varphi(v) \in \Omega$ -FOD. Hence, $\vDash_{\Omega} F \rightarrow \exists v \varphi(v)$ by IH.
- (iii) $\phi_2 \equiv \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} \exists v \leq 0 \varphi(v) \rightarrow \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} G$ derives in \vDash_{Ω} from $\exists v \leq 0 \varphi(v) \rightarrow G$ by monotony $\mathbf{M}(\cdot)_{AC}$, and $\exists v \leq 0 \varphi(v) \rightarrow G$ derives as follows: First, $(\exists v \leq 0 \varphi(v) \rightarrow G) \sqsubset \phi$ since $\exists v \leq 0 \varphi(v) \in \Omega$ -FOD and G has less programs than ϕ . Moreover, $\exists v \leq 0 \varphi(v) \rightarrow G$ is valid because if $\exists v \leq 0 \varphi(v)$ holds, then $\varphi(v)$ is satisfied for some $v \leq 0$, and even $v = 0$ as $\varphi(v)$ only holds for natural numbers. Then $\varphi(0)$ implies G by the definition of $\varphi(v)$. Hence, $\vDash_{\Omega} \exists v \leq 0 \varphi(v) \rightarrow G$ by IH.

Now, combine $\vDash_{\Omega} \phi_0$ and $\vDash_{\Omega} \phi_1$ by \mathbf{MP} and propositional reasoning into $\vDash_{\Omega} F \rightarrow \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} \exists v \leq 0 \varphi(v)$. The latter and $\vDash_{\Omega} \phi_2$ combine into $\vDash_{\Omega} F \rightarrow \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} G$ by \mathbf{MP} and propositional reasoning again.

- (m) In the general case $\vDash F \rightarrow \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, C\}} G$, either $\vDash F \rightarrow \langle \alpha^0 \rangle_{\{A, C\}} G$ or $\vDash F \rightarrow \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} \phi_0$ by the derivable axiom $(\cdot)_{AC \perp}$ (Fig. 6), where $\phi_0 \equiv \neg G \vee \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A, C\}} G$. Since $\langle \alpha^0 \rangle_{\{A, C\}} G \sqsubset \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, C\}} G$, because $\alpha^0 \equiv \top$ is simpler than the repetition α^* , obtain $\vDash_{\Omega} F \rightarrow \langle \alpha^0 \rangle_{\{A, C\}} G$ by IH if $\vDash F \rightarrow \langle \alpha^0 \rangle_{\{A, C\}} G$. Otherwise, if $\vDash F \rightarrow \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} \phi_0$, then $\vDash_{\Omega} F \rightarrow \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} \phi_0$ derives by item 6l above. In summary, $\vDash_{\Omega} F \rightarrow \langle \alpha^0 \rangle_{\{A, C\}} G \vee \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} \phi_0$ by \mathbf{MP} and propositional reasoning, which yields $\vDash_{\Omega} F \rightarrow \langle \alpha^* \rangle_{\{A, C\}} G$ by axiom $(\cdot)_{AC \perp}$. \square

4.2 Completeness Relative to FOD

This section shows that dL_{CHP} is complete relative to FOD (Theorem 4.9). The proof modularly builds on top of dL_{CHP} 's completeness relative to Ω -FOD (Theorem 4.7) from Section 4.1. In particular, Proposition 4.8 proves that Ω -FOD and FOD are equiexpressive. Completeness of dL_{CHP} relative to FOD immediately follows from Theorem 4.7.

Equiexpressiveness of Ω -FOD and FOD (Proposition 4.8) resolves the challenge of dealing with the list-like structure of communication in FOD, which only supports first-order real arithmetic and differential equation properties. Proposition 4.8 also isolates this challenge from the actual reasoning about CHPs in Theorem 4.7, which yields a more modular proof structure. The translation $(\cdot)^\#$ in Proposition 4.8 from Ω -FOD to FOD encodes communication traces

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\Upsilon_\gamma \equiv \Upsilon_{\gamma^\circ, F_\gamma, T, \gamma} & F_0 \equiv F\{\bar{\mu}, \bar{x}_\alpha, \bar{x}_\beta, h \mapsto \bar{\mu}_0, \bar{y}_\alpha, \bar{y}_\beta, h_0\} \\
\Psi_\gamma \equiv \Psi_{\gamma^\circ, F_\gamma, T, \gamma} & F_\gamma \equiv F_0 \wedge \bar{\mu}_0 = \bar{\mu} \wedge \bar{y}_\gamma = \bar{x}_\gamma \wedge h \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma = h_0 \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma \\
\Upsilon_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \Upsilon_{0, F_{\alpha\beta}, \Lambda, \alpha \parallel \beta} & F_{\alpha\beta} \equiv F_0 \wedge \bar{\mu}_0 = \bar{\mu} \wedge \bar{y}_\alpha = \bar{x}_\alpha \wedge \bar{y}_\beta = \bar{x}_\beta \wedge h_0 = h \downarrow \bar{c}h \\
\Psi_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \Psi_{0, F_{\alpha\beta}, \Lambda, \alpha \parallel \beta} & \Lambda_{\sim} \equiv \Box_{\sim}^{\bar{c}h} \Lambda \forall h' (h_0 \leq h' \sim h \downarrow \bar{c}h \rightarrow \Lambda_h^{h'}) \quad (\text{cf. axiom } \boxed{\text{AC1}})
\end{array}$$

(a) Abbreviations used in Fig. 10b–10c, where $\gamma \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$ is either program and $h = h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}$ is the recorder of $\alpha \parallel \beta$. The formulas Υ_γ , Ψ_γ , $\Upsilon_{\alpha\beta}$, and $\Psi_{\alpha\beta}$ are strongest promises (Lemma 4.4). Then let $\bar{x}_\gamma = \vee(\gamma) \cap V_{\mathbb{R}}$ be γ 's real variables and let $\bar{x} = \bar{x}_\alpha \cup \bar{x}_\beta$. Let the ghost variables $\bar{\mu}_0, \bar{y}_\gamma, h_0$ be fresh and let $\bar{\mu}, \bar{y}_\gamma$ be compatible with $\bar{\mu}, \bar{x}_\gamma$. Further, $\bar{c}h_\gamma = \text{CN}_{\{h\}}(F_0) \cup \text{CN}(\gamma)$ and $\bar{c}h = \bar{c}h_\alpha \cup \bar{c}h_\beta$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{Fig. 10c} \\
\frac{\frac{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} (A_{<} \rightarrow \Upsilon_{\alpha\beta})} (A_{\leq} \rightarrow \Psi_{\alpha\beta})}{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{\Lambda, \Lambda_{<} \rightarrow \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\alpha\beta}} (A_{\leq} \rightarrow \Psi_{\alpha\beta})} \text{MP, } \mathcal{K}_{\text{AC}} \quad \frac{h_0 = h \downarrow \bar{c}h \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{\Lambda, \Lambda_{<}\}} A_{\leq}}{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{\Lambda, \Lambda_{<}\}} A_{\leq}} \text{P} \quad \boxed{\text{AC1}}}{\frac{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{\Lambda, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\alpha\beta}} \Psi_{\alpha\beta}}{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{\Lambda, C\}} G} \text{MP, } \mathcal{K}_{\text{AC}} \quad \frac{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{\Lambda, C\}} G}{F \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{\Lambda, C\}} G} \text{iG, =R}}{F \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{\Lambda, C\}} G} \text{M[}\cdot\text{]AC} + \triangleright_3 + \triangleright_4}
\end{array}$$

(b) By **iG** and **=R**, fix the initial state in fresh ghost variables. Since $\vDash F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{\Lambda, C\}} G$, because $\vDash F \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{\Lambda, C\}} G$, obtain that $\triangleright_1 \equiv \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y} \Upsilon_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow C$ and $\triangleright_2 \equiv \Psi_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow G$ are valid by Lemma 4.5. Further, C and G have less programs than ϕ , and $\Upsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\Psi_{\alpha\beta}$ are Ω -FOD formulas (Lemma 4.4), so $\triangleright_j \sqsubset \phi$ for $j = 1, 2$. Hence, $\iota_{\Omega} \triangleright_1$ and $\iota_{\Omega} \triangleright_2$ by IH. Assumption closure $\boxed{\text{AC1}}$ transfers the assumption to the promises. Premise $\triangleright_3 \equiv A \rightarrow T$ derives trivially, and $\triangleright_4 \equiv \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y} (A_{<} \rightarrow \Upsilon_{\alpha\beta}) \rightarrow (A_{<} \rightarrow \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y} \Upsilon_{\alpha\beta})$ derives by **V \vee** and **V \rightarrow** because \bar{x} is not free in $A_{<}$.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{Fig. 10d} \\
\frac{\frac{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y} \Upsilon_{\beta\beta}} (\Psi_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \Psi_{\beta\beta})}{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y} \Upsilon_{\beta\beta}} (\Psi_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \Psi_{\beta\beta}) \wedge [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} H} H} \text{MP, P} \quad \frac{h_0 = h \downarrow \bar{c}h \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, H\}} H}{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} H} H} \text{P, M[}\cdot\text{]AC} + \triangleright_3}{\frac{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y} \Upsilon_{\beta\beta}} (\Psi_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \Psi_{\beta\beta}) \wedge [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} H} H}{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y} \Upsilon_{\beta\beta}} (\Psi_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \Psi_{\beta\beta} \wedge H)} \boxed{\text{AC}\wedge} \quad \frac{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\alpha\beta}} (A_{<} \rightarrow \Psi_{\alpha\beta})}{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} (A_{<} \rightarrow \Upsilon_{\alpha\beta})} (A_{\leq} \rightarrow \Psi_{\alpha\beta})} \text{M[}\cdot\text{]AC} + \triangleright_1 + \triangleright_2}}{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y} \Upsilon_{\beta\beta}} (\Psi_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \Psi_{\beta\beta})} \text{[}\geq\text{]AC}
\end{array}$$

(c) The strongest promises $\Upsilon_{\alpha\beta}, \Psi_{\alpha\beta}$ are split into promises tailored to the subprograms, where $H \equiv h \downarrow \bar{c}h \geq h_0$. By Lemma 4.6, the premise $\triangleright_1 \equiv \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y} \Upsilon_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y} \Upsilon_{\beta\beta} \wedge \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y} H \rightarrow \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y} (A_{<} \rightarrow \Upsilon_{\alpha\beta})$ is valid. Since $A \sqsubset \phi$ and A is surrounded by Ω -FOD formulas in \triangleright_1 , obtain $\triangleright_1 \sqsubset \phi$, so $\iota_{\Omega} \triangleright_1$ by IH. The premise $\triangleright_2 \equiv \Psi_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \Psi_{\beta\beta} \wedge H \rightarrow (A_{\leq} \rightarrow \Psi_{\alpha\beta})$ is valid by Lemma 4.6, and again $\triangleright_2 \sqsubset \phi$, thus, $\iota_{\Omega} \triangleright_2$ by IH. Moreover, $\triangleright_3 \equiv H \rightarrow \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y} H$ by **V \vee** since \bar{x} is not free in H . Finally, history invariance $\text{[}\geq\text{]AC}$ proves H .

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{Lemma 4.5 + IH} \quad \text{Lemma 4.5 + IH} \\
\frac{F_{\alpha} \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\alpha}} \Psi_{\alpha}}{F_{\alpha} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\alpha}} \Psi_{\alpha}} \text{[}\parallel\text{]AC} \quad \frac{F_{\beta} \rightarrow [\beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\beta}} \Psi_{\beta}}{F_{\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\beta}} \Psi_{\beta}} \text{[}\parallel\text{]AC} \\
\frac{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\beta}} \Psi_{\beta}}{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\alpha}} \Psi_{\alpha} \wedge [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\beta}} \Psi_{\beta}} \text{MP, P} \quad \frac{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\beta}} \Psi_{\beta}}{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\beta}} \Psi_{\beta}} \text{MP, P} \\
\frac{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\alpha}} \Psi_{\alpha} \wedge [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\beta}} \Psi_{\beta}}{F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_{\alpha} \wedge \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y} \Upsilon_{\beta}} (\Psi_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \Psi_{\beta\beta})} \text{[}\parallel\text{]AC}\wedge
\end{array}$$

(d) Parallel injection $\text{[}\parallel\text{]AC}$ reduces contracts about $\alpha \parallel \beta$ to contracts about the subprograms, where $\text{[}\parallel\text{]AC}$ is applicable because Lemma 4.6 ensures that γ does not interfere (Def. 3.1) with Υ_{γ° and Ψ_{γ° , where $\alpha^\circ = \beta$ and $\beta^\circ = \alpha$. Since $(F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow F_\gamma) \sqsubset \phi$, because $F \sqsubset \phi$, and F_γ and $F_{\alpha\beta}$ only add Ω -FOD surroundings to F , obtain $\iota_{\Omega} F_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow F_\gamma$ by IH. The premises $F_\gamma \rightarrow [\gamma]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_\gamma} \Psi_\gamma$ derive by IH, because $F_\gamma \rightarrow [\gamma]_{\{T, \forall \bar{x}=\bar{y}\} \Upsilon_\gamma} \Psi_\gamma$ is valid by Lemma 4.5 and simpler than ϕ .

Fig. 10. Induction case $\phi \equiv F \rightarrow [\alpha \parallel \beta]_{\{\Lambda, C\}} G$ about safety of parallel CHPs in the completeness proof (Theorem 4.7)

into real variables by \mathbb{R} -Gödel encoding (Appendix B). Since it supposed to represent traces by \mathbb{R} -Gödel encoding, the translation $(\cdot)^\#$ cannot maintain the free trace variables. Instead, the trace variables of a formula ϕ become represented by fresh but fixed real variables in $\phi^\#$. To align the semantical evaluation with the change of free variables by the syntactical transformation $(\cdot)^\#$, the *FOD-dual state* $v_\phi^\#$ w.r.t. formula ϕ (Def. D.3 in Appendix D) evaluates each representant of a trace variable by the \mathbb{R} -Gödel encoding of the original trace.

PROPOSITION 4.8 (EQUIEXPRESSIVENESS OF Ω -FOD AND FOD). *For each Ω -FOD formula ϕ , there is effectively an equivalent FOD formula $\phi^\#$, i.e., $v \models \phi$ iff $v_\phi^\# \models \phi^\#$ for each state v . In particular, $\models \phi$ iff $\models \phi^\#$. The proof is in Appendix D.*

To prove relative completeness of dL_{CHP} , we use Proposition 4.8 to come up with the necessary oracle logic: The calculus \vdash_{FOD} combines dL_{CHP} 's calculus (Fig. 4) with an oracle rule proving the Ω -FOD formula ϕ if the FOD formula $\phi^\#$ obtained by equiexpressiveness (Proposition 4.8) is valid. This rule is sound by Proposition 4.8.

THEOREM 4.9 (CONTINUOUS COMPLETENESS). *dL_{CHP} is complete relative to FOD, i.e., each valid dL_{CHP} formula ϕ , can be proven in the calculus \vdash_{FOD} from FOD tautologies.*

PROOF. Let ϕ be a valid dL_{CHP} formula. By Theorem 4.7, there are Ω -FOD tautologies ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n from which ϕ derives in dL_{CHP} 's calculus (Fig. 4). These formulas derive from FOD formulas $\phi_1^\#, \dots, \phi_k^\#$ in \vdash_{FOD} , which are valid by equiexpressiveness (Proposition 4.8). In summary, this yields a derivation of ϕ in \vdash_{FOD} from FOD tautologies. \square

This concludes our second completeness result. While Theorem 4.7 provides a practical strategy to come up with sufficient verification conditions and reasoning patterns to prove properties of parallel hybrid systems, Theorem 4.9 establishes the full proof-theoretical alignment of dL_{CHP} with reasoning about hybrid systems.

5 RELATED WORK

For clarity, the discussion is structured in paragraphs:

Modeling. Unlike CHPs, Hybrid CSP (HCSP) [26] extends CSP [21] with *lazily* terminating continuous evolution, which ends deterministically only at the single point in time at which the evolution constraint is violated. That is why parallel HCSP programs only have common runs and agree on a common duration if they all leave their domain constraints simultaneously. Otherwise HCSP has empty behavior resulting in vacuous proofs. Instead of exploiting their compositional models as in dL_{CHP} , hybrid process algebras are verified non-compositionally by combinatorial translation to model checking [10, 33, 54]. Unlike dL_{CHP} , which can simply model a variety of communication patterns by CHPs, e.g., loss and delay of communication, and reason about them thanks to completeness, meta-level components [4, 13, 20, 27, 31, 32, 35] need to be designed from scratch for different communication models such as lossy communication.

Quantified differential dynamic logic QdL [41, 42] can express parallel dynamics of an *unbounded* number of distributed CPSs but only if they all have a *homogeneous* structure. By contrast, dL_{CHP} can model parallel interactions of entirely different subsystems and puts emphasis on the separation of the parallel components, where QdL models networks of parallel agents monolithically. Fundamentally different from dL_{CHP} 's execution model, parallelism $\alpha \cap \beta$ in concurrent dynamic logic (CDL) [38] continues execution in all states reachable by α and β without ever merging the states again, and the parallel programs cannot interact. In CDL with communication [37], programs can communicate but no continuous behavior nor a proof calculus for verification are supported, and even axioms self-evident in dynamic logic such as $[\alpha; \beta]\psi \leftrightarrow [\alpha][\beta]\psi$ become unsound in CDL [37, p. 34].

Hoare-logics. Hybrid Hoare-logic (HHL) for HCSP [30] inherits the modeling challenges of HCPS and is non-compositional [55]. Wang *et al.* [55] extend it with assume-guarantee reasoning (AGR) in a way that, unlike dL_{CHP} , becomes non-compositional again. Their parallel composition rule explicitly unrolls all interleavings in the postcondition for communication traces reflecting the structure of all subprograms. Similarly, Guelev *et al.* [14] encode the semantics of parallel composition in the postcondition using the extended duration calculus [9] as assertion language. Externalizing the complete observable behavior (and program structure) in this way is said to devalue the whole point of compositionality [12, Section 1.6.2] and merely postpones reasoning about the exponentially many interleavings. Assumptions and guarantees in HHL [55] cannot specify the communication history but fulfill the different purpose of reasoning about deadlock freedom.

HHL approaches lack completeness results [30, 55] or prove completeness [14] relative to the extended duration calculus. It remains open whether the proof theory of parallel interactions of hybrid systems aligns with that of hybrid systems as it does in dL_{CHP} . Moreover, completeness is not astonishing if a proof calculus externalizes the whole semantics of parallelism. The actual challenge solved by dL_{CHP} is the development of minimal proof principles that in the extreme case can capture all parallel behavior but usually flexibly adapt to the simpler parallel interaction patterns in practice. Further, dL_{CHP} solves the completeness challenge being a dynamic logic featuring liveness modalities in addition to safety in Hoare-logics. Unlike dL_{CHP} , which has a global flow of time to model physical reality, calculi for distributed real-time computation [22, 25] consider time-consuming discrete statements or do not impose time synchronization upon parallel programs [24]. Calculi for distributed real-time computation [22, 24, 25] and their completeness results [23] fundamentally lack support for continuous change. In contrast, dL_{CHP} proves completeness for the intertwined hybrid and parallel behavior in CHPs, which requires verification conditions that express a combination of discrete, continuous, and communication dynamics that is beyond real-time computation.

Differential dynamic logics. Unlike other dL approaches with components [27, 31, 35], dL_{CHP} has a parallel operator as first-class citizen that can be arbitrarily nested with other hybrid programs, rather than parallel composition of fixed-structure meta-level components. Time-synchronization by the parallel operator can be used to model a global time if need be, in contrast to explicit time requirements of component-based approaches [27, 31, 35]. Modeling of parallelism by nondeterministic choice additionally requires extra care to ensure execution periodicity [31]. In contrast to first-order constraints relating at most consecutive I/O events [27, 31, 35], dL_{CHP} can reason about invariants of the whole communication history. Orthogonally to our integrated reasoning about discrete, hybrid, and communication behavior, Kamburjan *et al.* [27] separates reasoning about communication from hybrid systems reasoning in entirely different programming languages. Meta-level approaches do not study completeness [27, 31, 35] but this may become possible via their encoding in dL_{CHP} with its completeness results.

In QdL, structural and dimensional change of distributed networks of agents are an additional source of incompleteness [42] besides discrete and continuous change in hybrid systems. Unlike, dL_{CHP} which is complete relative to properties of continuous systems, QdL is complete relative to properties of *quantified* continuous systems [42], i.e., systems with simultaneous change of unboundedly many continuous systems at once. Unlike dL_{CHP} 's uniform substitution calculus [6], in this article, dL_{CHP} 's calculus relies on schematic axioms to put the spotlight on the completeness results (Section 4). These completeness results are the major building blocks for completeness of the uniform substitution calculus but tackling both at once would make a comprehensible presentation of either result infeasible.

Automata. Different from the denotational semantics of CHPs, parallel composition of hybrid automata [4, 13, 20, 32], just like Hoare-style reasoning about HCSP [14, 55], always fall back to the combinatorial exponentiation of parallelism. Consequently, even AGR approaches [4, 13, 19, 32] for hybrid automata that mitigate the state space explosion for subautomata, eventually resort to large product automata later. In contrast, dL_{CHP} 's proof rule for parallel composition exploits the built-in compositionality of its semantics enabling verification of subprograms truly independently of their environment except via their local communication interface. Unlike ac-formulas in dL_{CHP} , which can capture change, rate, delay, or noise for arbitrary pairings of communication channels, overapproximation is limited to coarse abstractions by timed transition systems [13], components completely dropping knowledge about continuous behavior [20], or static global contracts [4]. Where dL_{CHP} inherits dL 's complete reasoning about differential equation invariants [51], automata approaches are often limited to linear continuous dynamics [13, 20].

6 CONCLUSION

This article studies completeness of the dynamic logic of communicating hybrid programs dL_{CHP} , which is for modeling and verification of parallel interactions of hybrid systems. These interactions go beyond the mere sum of hybrid and parallel systems because only their combination faces the challenge of true parallel synchronization in real time. Despite this complexity dL_{CHP} 's compositional proof calculus disentangles the subtly intertwined dynamics of parallel hybrid systems into atomic pieces of discrete, continuous, and communication behavior. The calculus supports *truly* compositional reasoning, i.e., the decomposition of parallel hybrid systems is along specifications of their external behavior only, which can always express enough to be complete but which are not cluttered with exponential parallel overhead when simple properties suffice. Therefore, dL_{CHP} embeds assumption-commitment (ac) reasoning into dynamic logic, and further replaces classical monolithic Hoare-style proof rules with far-reaching modularization of deductions about parallel systems that is driven by a stringent modal view onto ac-reasoning. At the core of this development is the parallel injection axiom, which proves properties of a parallel subprogram from its projection onto the subprogram alone. Classical proof rules for parallel systems derive, but their soundness simply follows from the soundness of dL_{CHP} 's small modular reasoning principles, simplifying side conditions that are notoriously subtle for parallel system verification.

The increased compositionality and modularity would be counterproductive if they were to miss phenomena in parallel hybrid systems. The two constructive completeness results show that this is not the case and prove adequacy of the calculus: First, completeness is proven relative to the first-order logic of communication traces and differential equations Ω -FOD. This shows that dL_{CHP} has all axioms and proof rules necessary to reduce valid dL_{CHP} formulas to properties of traces and differential equations. At the core of the proof is a complete reasoning pattern for safety of parallel hybrid systems. This pattern points out all steps that can be necessary but in stark contrast with classical monolithic reasoning can be reduced whenever shortcuts are sufficient. Further, completeness is proven relative to the first-order logic of differential equations FOD. This result proof-theoretically aligns dL_{CHP} with reasoning about hybrid systems in dL , which is complete relative to FOD as well. Consequently, properties of parallel hybrid systems can be verified whenever properties of hybrid systems, continuous, and discrete systems can be verified.

An interesting direction for future work considers the aspect that uniform substitution [6] gets rid of subtle soundness-critical side conditions, which otherwise cause overwhelming implementations of theorem provers. Uniform substitution is a subtle challenge on its own [46, 49], so needs its own careful presentation, but completeness of dL_{CHP} 's schematic calculus proven in this article is a major step toward its completeness.

APPENDIXES

A SOUNDNESS OF THE CALCULUS

This appendix proves soundness of dL_{CHP} 's proof calculus (Theorem 3.3) and its derived axioms (Corollary 3.4). Lemma A.1 is the central building block for proving soundness of the parallel injection axiom $[\llbracket _ \rrbracket]_{\text{AC}}$.

LEMMA A.1 (NONINTERFERENCE RETAINS SAFETY). *Let the program β not interfere with $[\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ (Def. 3.1). Moreover, let $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket [\alpha \parallel \beta] \rrbracket$, i.e., $(v, \tau \downarrow \alpha, \omega_\alpha) \in \llbracket [\alpha] \rrbracket$ and $(v, \tau \downarrow \beta, \omega_\beta) \in \llbracket [\beta] \rrbracket$ with $\omega = \omega_\alpha \oplus \omega_\beta$, and $\omega = \omega_\alpha = \omega_\beta$ on $\{\bar{\mu}\}$ if $\omega \neq \perp$, and $\tau \downarrow (\alpha \parallel \beta) = \tau$, i.e., τ only contains $(\alpha \parallel \beta)$ -communication. Then for $\lambda \in \{A, C\}$, the following holds:*

- (1) $v \cdot (\tau \downarrow \alpha) \vDash \lambda$ iff $v \cdot \tau \vDash \lambda$
- (2) $\omega \neq \perp$ implies $(\omega_\alpha \cdot (\tau \downarrow \alpha)) \vDash \psi$ iff $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash \psi$

PROOF. Let $h = h^{\alpha \parallel \beta}$ be the recorder of $\alpha \parallel \beta$. Hence, $\tau = (h, \tau_0)$ for some trace τ_0 . First, show that $\chi \in \{A, C, \psi\}$ only depends on α -communication $\tau \downarrow \alpha$, i.e., $(\tau \downarrow \alpha) \downarrow C = \tau \downarrow C$, where $C = \text{CN}_{\{h\}}(\chi)$. This holds if only a communication event $\rho = \langle \text{ch}, d, s \rangle$ in τ_0 , which is not removed by $\downarrow C$, is also not removed by $\downarrow \alpha$. So, let $\rho \downarrow C = \rho$. Then $\text{ch} \in C$. If $\text{ch} \notin \text{CN}(\beta)$, then $\text{ch} \in \text{CN}(\alpha)$ because ρ is emitted by $\alpha \parallel \beta$. Otherwise, if $\text{ch} \in \text{CN}(\beta)$, then $\text{ch} \in \text{CN}(\alpha)$ by noninterference (Def. 3.1). Hence, $\text{ch} \in \text{CN}(\alpha)$ such that ρ is not removed by $\downarrow \alpha$. Since $(\tau \downarrow \alpha) \downarrow C = \tau \downarrow C$, for $\kappa \in \{v, \omega_\alpha\}$, obtain

$$(\kappa \cdot (\tau \downarrow \alpha)) \downarrow C = (\kappa \downarrow C) \cdot ((\tau \downarrow \alpha) \downarrow C) = (\kappa \downarrow C) \cdot (\tau \downarrow C) = (\kappa \cdot \tau) \downarrow C. \quad (4)$$

Then item 1 holds by coincidence (Lemma 2.17) using equation (4). For item 2, assume $\omega \neq \perp$. Then $\omega_\alpha \neq \perp$ and $\omega_\beta \neq \perp$ by the definition of \oplus in Section 2.2. First, observe that $\omega_\alpha = \omega$ on $\text{BV}(\alpha)$ by the definition of \oplus , so $\omega_\alpha = \omega$ on $\text{BV}(\alpha) \cap \text{BV}(\beta)^{\text{C}}$. Second, $\omega_\alpha = v$ on $\text{BV}(\alpha)^{\text{C}}$ and $v = \omega_\beta$ on $\text{BV}(\beta)^{\text{C}}$ by the bound effect property (Lemma 2.16), and $\omega_\beta = \omega$ on $\text{BV}(\alpha)^{\text{C}}$ by the definition of \oplus , so chaining yields $\omega_\alpha = \omega$ on $\text{BV}(\alpha)^{\text{C}} \cap \text{BV}(\beta)^{\text{C}}$. Third, $\omega_\alpha = \omega$ on $\{\bar{\mu}\}$. Fourth, since $\omega_\alpha = v = \omega_\beta$ on $V_{\mathcal{T}}$ by the bound effect property, it is $\omega_\alpha = \omega_\alpha \oplus \omega_\beta = \omega$ on $V_{\mathcal{T}}$. In summary, $\omega_\alpha = \omega$ on

$$(\text{BV}(\alpha) \cap \text{BV}(\beta)^{\text{C}}) \cup (\text{BV}(\alpha)^{\text{C}} \cap \text{BV}(\beta)^{\text{C}}) \cup \{\bar{\mu}\} \cup V_{\mathcal{T}} = \text{BV}(\beta)^{\text{C}} \cup \{\bar{\mu}\} \cup V_{\mathcal{T}}. \quad (5)$$

Since β does not interfere with $[\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ (Def. 3.1), obtain $\text{FV}(\psi) \subseteq \text{BV}(\beta)^{\text{C}} \cup \{\bar{\mu}, h\}$. Hence, $\omega_\alpha = \omega$ on $\text{FV}(\psi)$ by equation (5). Therefore, $(\omega_\alpha \cdot (\tau \downarrow \alpha)) \downarrow C \stackrel{(4)}{=} (\omega_\alpha \cdot \tau) \downarrow C = (\omega \cdot \tau) \downarrow C$ on $\text{FV}(\psi)$. Finally, item 2 holds by coincidence. \square

THEOREM 3.3. We prove soundness of the novel ac-axioms and rules. Since dL_{CHP} is a conservative extension of dL [5, Proposition 1], we can soundly use the dL proof calculus for reasoning about dL formulas in dL_{CHP} . Hence, we point to the literature for soundness of the axioms and rules adopted from dL [39, 46, 48].

$[\llbracket _ \rrbracket]_{\text{AC}}$: One implication uses that the commitment holds trivially and the other that the assumption is trivially enabled.

$\langle \cdot \rangle_{\text{AC}}$: The axiom is a simple consequence of the semantics of ac-box and ac-diamond.

$[\llbracket _ \rrbracket]_{\text{AC}}$: Let $v \vDash h_0 = h^\alpha \downarrow Y$, where $Y \supseteq \text{CN}(A)$, and $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket [\alpha] \rrbracket$. Further, let $h = h^\alpha$ be α 's recorder. Then for $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A, \square_{\leq}^Y A\}} \square_{\leq}^Y A$ and for $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A, C\}} \psi \leftrightarrow [\alpha]_{\{\top, \square_{\leq}^Y A \rightarrow C\}} (\square_{\leq}^Y A \rightarrow \psi)$ it suffices that $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \sim \tau\} \vDash A$ iff $v \cdot \tau \vDash \square_{\leq}^Y A$ for all $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket [\alpha] \rrbracket$, where $\sim \in \{<, \leq\}$, to transfer the assumption using the semantics of (**commit**) and (**post**). Note that if $\omega \neq \perp$, then even $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash \square_{\leq}^Y A$ by Corollary 2.19. Now, $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \sim \tau\} \vDash A$, iff $v_h^{(v \cdot \tau')(h)} \vDash A$ for all $\tau' \sim \tau$, iff $v_h^{\tau'} \vDash A$ for all τ' with $v(h) \leq \tau' \sim v(h) \cdot \tau(h)$, iff, by coincidence as $Y \supseteq \text{CN}(A)$, $v_h^{\tau'} \vDash A$ for all τ' with $v(h) \downarrow Y \leq \tau' \sim (v \cdot \tau)(h) \downarrow Y$, iff, by substitution, $v_h^{\tau'} \vDash A_h^{h'}$ for each τ' with $v(h) \downarrow Y \leq \tau' \sim (v \cdot \tau)(h) \downarrow Y$, iff, using $v(h_0) = v(h) \downarrow Y$, yields $v_h^{\tau'} \vDash A_h^{h'}$ for each τ' with $v(h_0) \leq \tau' \sim (v \cdot \tau)(h) \downarrow Y$, iff $v \cdot \tau \vDash \forall h' (h_0 \leq h' \sim h \downarrow Y \rightarrow A_h^{h'})$.

[ϵ]_{AC}: Let $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$. Then $v \vDash C$ by (**commit**) since $(v, \epsilon, \perp) \in [[\alpha]]$ by totality and prefix-closedness. Now, let $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[\alpha]]$, and assume $\omega \neq \perp$ and $v \vDash A$. Then $\tau = \epsilon$ because $\text{CN}(\alpha) = \emptyset$. Hence, the precondition $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau\} \vDash A$ of (**post**) holds, which implies $\omega \vDash \psi$. Conversely, let $v \vDash C \wedge (A \rightarrow [\alpha]\psi)$ and $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[\alpha]]$. Then $\tau = \epsilon$ by $\text{CN}(\alpha) = \epsilon$. Hence, (**commit**) holds since $v \vDash C$ by precondition. For (**post**), assume $\omega \neq \perp$ and $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau\} \vDash A$, which contains $v \vDash A$. Then $v \vDash A \rightarrow [\alpha]\psi$ implies $\omega \vDash \psi$.

W_A: Let $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{T, C \wedge B \rightarrow A\}}T$ and $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$. First, observe that for every $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[\alpha]]$, the weak assumption $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash B$ implies $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash A$. This is proven by induction on the structure of τ :

(1) $\tau = \epsilon$, then $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash A$ holds trivially since $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} = \emptyset$.

(2) $\tau = \tau_0 \cdot \rho$ with $|\rho| = 1$, then assume $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash B$. Hence, $v \cdot \tau_0 \vDash B$ and $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau_0\} \vDash B$, where the latter implies $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau_0\} \vDash A$ by IH. Since $(v, \tau_0, \perp) \in [[\alpha]]$ by prefix-closedness and $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$, obtain $v \cdot \tau_0 \vDash C$. This, and $v \cdot \tau_0 \vDash B$, and $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{T, C \wedge B \rightarrow A\}}T$ together imply $v \cdot \tau_0 \vDash A$. Thus, $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau_0\} \vDash A$ extends to $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash A$.

To prove $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{B,C\}}\psi$, let $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[\alpha]]$. For (**commit**), assume $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash B$, which implies $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash A$. Hence, $v \cdot \tau \vDash C$ by $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$. For (**post**), assume $\omega \neq \perp$ and $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau\} \vDash B$, which implies $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash A$. Then $v \cdot \tau \vDash C$ by $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ again. Since $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau\} \vDash B$ contains $v \cdot \tau \vDash B$, obtain $v \cdot \tau \vDash A$ by $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{T, C \wedge B \rightarrow A\}}T$. In summary, $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau\} \vDash A$. Finally, $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ implies $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash \psi$.

[α]_{AC} Let $v \vDash [\alpha; \beta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$. To show $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}[\beta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$, let $(v, \tau_1, \kappa) \in [[\alpha]]$. For (**commit**), assume $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau_1\} \vDash A$ and observe that $(v, \tau_1, \perp) \in [[\alpha]]_{\perp} \subseteq [[\alpha; \beta]]$. Then $v \cdot \tau_1 \vDash C$ by $v \vDash [\alpha; \beta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$. For (**post**), assume $\kappa \neq \perp$ and $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau_1\} \vDash A$. Then $\kappa \cdot \tau_1 \vDash [\beta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ is to be shown. Therefore, w.l.o.g. let $(\kappa \cdot \tau_1, \tau_2, \omega \cdot \tau_1) \in [[\beta]]$. Generality is preserved because for all $(\kappa \cdot \tau_1, \tau_2, \tilde{\omega}) \in [[\beta]]$, it is $\kappa \cdot \tau_1 = \tilde{\omega}$ on $V_{\mathcal{F}}$ by the bound effect property (Lemma 2.16), so there is a state ω such that $\tilde{\omega} = \omega \cdot \tau$. Further, $(\kappa, \tau_2, \omega) \in [[\beta]]$ by coincidence (Lemma 2.18).

(1) For (**commit**), assume $\{\kappa \cdot \tau_1 \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau_2\} \vDash A$. Then $\{v \cdot \tau_1 \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau_2\} \vDash A$ by communicative coincidence (Corollary 2.19), which implies $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2\} \vDash A$ by assumption $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau_1\} \vDash A$. Hence, $v \cdot \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 \vDash C$ because $(v, \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2, \omega) \in [[\alpha]] \triangleright [[\beta]] \subseteq [[\alpha; \beta]]$. Finally, $\kappa \cdot \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 \vDash C$, using Corollary 2.19 again.

(2) For (**post**), assume $\omega \neq \perp$ and $\{\kappa \cdot \tau_1 \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau_2\} \vDash A$. Then $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2\} \vDash A$ using $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau_1\} \vDash A$ and Corollary 2.19. Since $(v, \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2, \omega) \in [[\alpha; \beta]]$, we obtain $\omega \cdot \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 \vDash \psi$ by assumption.

Conversely, let $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}}[\beta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ and $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[\alpha; \beta]]$. If $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[\alpha]]_{\perp}$, (**commit**) holds by the assumption, and (**post**) holds trivially because $\omega = \perp$. Otherwise, if $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[\alpha]] \triangleright [[\beta]]$, runs $(v, \tau_1, \kappa) \in [[\alpha]]$ and $(\kappa, \tau_2, \omega) \in [[\beta]]$ with $\tau = \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2$ exist, and by coincidence, $(\kappa \cdot \tau_1, \tau_2, \omega \cdot \tau_1) \in [[\beta]]$. Now, (**commit**) and (**post**) are proven separately:

(1) For (**commit**), assume $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash A$. If $\tau_2 = \epsilon$, (**commit**) holds because $(v, \tau, \perp) \in [[\alpha]]_{\perp}$. If $\tau_2 \neq \epsilon$, then $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau_1\} \vDash A$. Hence, $\kappa \cdot \tau_1 \vDash [\beta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ by (**post**). By Corollary 2.19, $\{\kappa \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2\} \vDash A$, which implies $\{\kappa \cdot \tau_1 \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau_2\} \vDash A$. By $\kappa \cdot \tau_1 \vDash [\beta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ and $(\kappa, \tau_2, \omega) \in [[\beta]]$, obtain $\kappa \cdot \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 \vDash C$. Using Corollary 2.19 again, $v \cdot \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 \vDash C$.

(2) For (**post**), assume $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau\} \vDash A$ and $\omega \neq \perp$. Then $\kappa \cdot \tau_1 \vDash [\beta]_{\{A,C\}}\psi$ as above. Finally, $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash \psi$ because $\{\kappa \cdot \tau_1 \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau_2\} \vDash A$ by Corollary 2.19.

[\cup]_{AC}: The axiom follows directly from the semantics $[[\alpha \cup \beta]] = [[\alpha]] \cup [[\beta]]$ of choice.

[*]_{AC} Since $\llbracket \alpha^* \rrbracket = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \llbracket \alpha^n \rrbracket$, the formula $[\alpha^*]_{\{A,C\}} \psi \leftrightarrow [\alpha^0]_{\{A,C\}} \psi \wedge [\alpha; \alpha^*]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$ is valid. From this formula, the axiom **[*]_{AC}** follows by axiom **[;]_{AC}**.

I_{AC}: Let $v \vDash [\alpha^*]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$. Then $v \vDash [\alpha^0]_{\{A,C\}} \psi \wedge [\alpha; \alpha^*]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$ by axioms **[*]_{AC}** and **[;]_{AC}**. Since $\llbracket \alpha; \alpha^* \rrbracket = \llbracket \alpha^*; \alpha \rrbracket$,¹⁰ $v \vDash [\alpha^*]_{\{A,C\}} [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$ by axiom **[;]_{AC}**. Finally, $v \vDash [\alpha^*]_{\{A,T\}} (\psi \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} \psi)$ by rule **M[·]_{AC}**. Conversely, let $v \vDash [\alpha^0]_{\{A,C\}} \psi \wedge [\alpha^*]_{\{A,T\}} (\psi \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} \psi)$. For proving $v \vDash [\alpha^*]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$, let $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket \alpha^* \rrbracket$. Then $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket \alpha^n \rrbracket$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, prove **(commit)** and **(post)** by induction on n :

(1) $n = 0$, then **(commit)** and **(post)** by $v \vDash [\alpha^0]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$.

(2) $n > 0$, then $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket \alpha^n \rrbracket = \llbracket \alpha; \alpha^{n-1} \rrbracket$. By associativity of sequential composition, $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket \alpha^n \rrbracket = \llbracket \alpha^{n-1}; \alpha \rrbracket = \llbracket \alpha^{n-1} \rrbracket \perp \cup \llbracket \alpha^{n-1} \rrbracket \triangleright \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket$. In case $\llbracket \alpha^{n-1} \rrbracket \perp \subseteq \llbracket \alpha^{n-1} \rrbracket$, **(commit)** and **(post)** hold by IH. Otherwise, if $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket \alpha^{n-1} \rrbracket \triangleright \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket$, there are $(v, \tau_1, \kappa) \in \llbracket \alpha^{n-1} \rrbracket$ and $(\kappa, \tau_2, \omega) \in \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket$ with $\tau = \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2$. Further, $(\kappa \cdot \tau_1, \tau_2, \omega \cdot \tau_1) \in \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket$ by coincidence (Lemma 2.18).

(a) If $\tau_2 = \epsilon$, **(commit)** holds by IH since $(v, \tau, \perp) \in \llbracket \alpha^{n-1} \rrbracket$. If $\tau_2 \neq \epsilon$, assume $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash A$, which implies $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau_1\} \vDash A$. Hence, $\kappa \cdot \tau_1 \vDash \psi$ by IH. Moreover, $\kappa \cdot \tau_1 \vDash \psi \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$ by $v \vDash [\alpha^*]_{\{A,T\}} (\psi \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} \psi)$ since $\llbracket \alpha^{n-1} \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket \alpha^* \rrbracket$. Therefore, $\kappa \cdot \tau_1 \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$. By Corollary 2.19 and assumption $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash A$, obtain $\{\kappa \cdot \tau_1 \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau_2\} \vDash A$. Thus, $\kappa \cdot \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 \vDash C$, which implies $v \cdot \tau \vDash C$ by Corollary 2.19 again.

(b) For **(post)**, assume $\omega \neq \perp$ and $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau\} \vDash A$. Then $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau_1\} \vDash A$ and $\{v \cdot \tau_1 \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau_2\} \vDash A$. As in case **(commit)**, obtain $\kappa \cdot \tau_1 \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$. Now, Corollary 2.19 implies $\{\kappa \cdot \tau_1 \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau_2\} \vDash A$ such that $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash \psi$.

[|·|]_{AC}: Let $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$ and $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket \alpha \parallel \beta \rrbracket$. Then $(v, \tau \downarrow \alpha, \omega_\alpha) \in \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket$ with $\omega = \omega_\alpha \oplus \omega_\beta$ for some $\omega_\beta \in \mathcal{S}_\perp$. For **(commit)**, assume $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash A$. Observe that if $\tau'_\alpha < \tau \downarrow \alpha$, then $\tau' < \tau$ exists such that $\tau'_\alpha = \tau' \downarrow \alpha$. Thus, $(v, \tau', \perp) \in \llbracket \alpha \parallel \beta \rrbracket$ and $(v, \tau'_\alpha, \perp) \in \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket$ by prefix-closedness. Since β does not interfere with $[\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$ (Def. 3.1), obtain $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau \downarrow \alpha\} \vDash A$ by Lemma A.1. Hence, $v \cdot (\tau \downarrow \alpha) \vDash C$ by $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$, which implies $v \cdot \tau \vDash C$ using Lemma A.1 again. For **(post)**, assume $\omega \neq \perp$ and $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau\} \vDash A$. Then $\omega_\alpha \neq \perp$ by the definition of \oplus in Section 2.2. Moreover, $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau \downarrow \alpha\} \vDash A$ by Lemma A.1 as above. Hence, $\omega_\alpha \cdot (\tau \downarrow \alpha) \vDash \psi$ by $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$. Finally, $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash \psi$ by Lemma A.1.

[ch!]_{AC}: The proof uses that $[?T]_{\{A,C\}} \phi \leftrightarrow C \wedge (A \rightarrow \phi)$ is valid for every ϕ by axiom **[ε]_{AC}** and axiom **[?]**.

Let $v \vDash [\text{ch}(h)! \theta]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$. For $v \vDash [?T]_{\{A,C\}} [\text{ch}(h)! \theta] [?T]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$, prove $v \vDash C \wedge (A \rightarrow [\text{ch}(h)! \theta] [?T]_{\{A,C\}} \psi)$. First, $v \vDash C$ since $(v, \epsilon, \perp) \in \llbracket [\text{ch}(h)! \theta] \rrbracket$. Moreover, assume $v \vDash A$ and let $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket [\text{ch}(h)! \theta] \rrbracket$ with $\omega \neq \perp$. Hence, $v \cdot \tau \vDash C$ by $v \vDash [\text{ch}(h)! \theta]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$, which transfers to $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash C$ by Corollary 2.19. Moreover, assume $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash A$, which implies $v \cdot \tau \vDash A$ by Corollary 2.19 again. The latter and $v \vDash A$ result in $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau\} \vDash A$. Hence, $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash \psi$ by $v \vDash [\text{ch}(h)! \theta]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$. In summary, $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash C \wedge (A \rightarrow \psi)$ such that $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash [?T]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$.

Conversely, let $v \vDash [?T]_{\{A,C\}} [\text{ch}(h)! \theta] [?T]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$. To prove $v \vDash [\text{ch}(h)! \theta]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$, let $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket [\text{ch}(h)! \theta] \rrbracket$. For **(commit)**, let $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash A$. If $\tau = \epsilon$, then $v \vDash C$ because $v \vDash [?T]_{\{A,C\}} \top$. Otherwise, if $\tau \neq \epsilon$, then $v \vDash A$ such that $v \vDash [\text{ch}(h)! \theta] [?T]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$ because $v \vDash A \rightarrow [\text{ch}(h)! \theta] [?T]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$. W.l.o.g. $\omega \neq \perp$ since $\text{ch}(h)! \theta$ can terminate from every v . Hence, $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash [?T]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$ such that $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash C$. By Corollary 2.19, obtain $v \cdot \tau \vDash C$. For **(post)**, assume $\omega \neq \perp$ and $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau\} \vDash A$. As in case **(commit)**, $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash [?T]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$ such that $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash A \rightarrow \psi$. Since $v \cdot \tau \vDash A$ by assumption, which implies $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash A$ by Corollary 2.19, obtain $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash \psi$.

¹⁰This fact can be formally proven by an induction using the fact that sequential composition is associative.

[ch!]: Let $v \vDash \forall h_0 (h_0 = h \cdot \langle \text{ch}, \theta, \mu \rangle \rightarrow \psi(h_0))$ and $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket [\text{ch}(h)! \theta] \rrbracket$ with $\omega \neq \perp$. Instantiating $\forall h_0$ with $\tau_0 = v \llbracket [h \cdot \langle \text{ch}, \theta, \mu \rangle] \rrbracket$ to $\kappa = v_{h_0}^{\tau_0}$ yields $\kappa \vDash h_0 = h \cdot \langle \text{ch}, \theta, \mu \rangle$. Therefore, $\kappa \vDash \psi(h_0)$. By substitution, $\kappa_{h_0}^{\llbracket [h_0] \rrbracket} \vDash \psi(h)$. Since $h_0 \notin \text{FV}(\theta)$ as $\theta \in \mathbb{Q}[\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{R}}]$, by coincidence (Lemma 2.17), $\kappa \llbracket [h_0] \rrbracket = \kappa \llbracket [h \cdot \langle \text{ch}, \theta, \mu \rangle] \rrbracket = v \llbracket [h \cdot \langle \text{ch}, \theta, \mu \rangle] \rrbracket = \tau_0$. Therefore, $\kappa_{h_0}^{\tau_0} \vDash \psi(h)$, which implies $v_{h_0}^{\tau_0} \vDash \psi(h)$ by coincidence because h_0 is fresh, thus, $h_0 \notin \text{FV}(\psi(h))$. Since $\tau = \langle h, \text{ch}, v \llbracket [\theta] \rrbracket, v(\mu) \rangle$, obtain $v \cdot \tau = v_{h_0}^{\tau_0}$. Finally, $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash \psi(h)$ because $\omega = v$.

Conversely, let $v \vDash [\text{ch}(h)! \theta] \psi(h)$. For proving the quantifier $\forall h_0$, let $\tau_0 \in \mathcal{T}$, and assume $v_{h_0}^{\tau_0} \vDash h_0 = h \cdot \langle \text{ch}, \theta, \mu \rangle$. Now, observe that $(v, \tau, v) \in \llbracket [\text{ch}(h)! \theta] \rrbracket$ with $\tau = \langle h, \text{ch}, v \llbracket [\theta] \rrbracket, v(\mu) \rangle$ such that $v \cdot \tau \vDash \psi(h)$. Since $v \cdot \tau = v_{h_0}^{\tau_0}$ and $v \llbracket [h \cdot \langle \text{ch}, \theta, \mu \rangle] \rrbracket = v \llbracket [h_0] \rrbracket = \tau_0$, we obtain $v_{h_0}^{\tau_0} \vDash \psi(h_0)$ by substitution.

[ch?]_{AC}: First, observe that $\llbracket [\text{ch}(h)?x] \rrbracket = \llbracket [x := *] \rrbracket \triangleright \llbracket [\text{ch}(h)!x] \rrbracket$.

Now, let $v \vDash [\text{ch}(h)?x]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$ and w.l.o.g. $(v, \epsilon, \kappa) \in \llbracket [x := *] \rrbracket$ with $\kappa \neq \perp$. To prove $\kappa \vDash [\text{ch}(h)!x]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$, let $(\kappa, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket [\text{ch}(h)!x] \rrbracket$. Then $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket [x := *] \rrbracket \triangleright \llbracket [\text{ch}(h)!x] \rrbracket = \llbracket [\text{ch}(h)?x] \rrbracket$. For **(commit)**, assume $\{\kappa \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash A$. Since $[\text{ch}(h)?x]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$ is well-formed, $(\chi, x := *)$ is well-formed for $\chi \in \{A, C\}$. Hence, $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash A$ by Corollary 2.19, so $v \cdot \tau \vDash C$ by $v \vDash [\text{ch}(h)?x]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$. By Corollary 2.19, $\kappa \cdot \tau \vDash C$. For **(post)**, assume $\omega \neq \perp$ and $\{\kappa \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau\} \vDash A$. As for **(commit)**, $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau\} \vDash A$. By $v \vDash [\text{ch}(h)?x]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$ again, $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash \psi$.

Conversely, let $v \vDash [x := *] \llbracket [\text{ch}(h)!x]_{\{A,C\}} \psi \rrbracket$. To prove $v \vDash [\text{ch}(h)?x]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$, let $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket [\text{ch}(h)?x] \rrbracket$, so $(v, \epsilon, \kappa) \in \llbracket [x := *] \rrbracket$ and $(\kappa, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket [\text{ch}(h)!x] \rrbracket$ exist. Then $\kappa \vDash [\text{ch}(h)!x]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$. For **(commit)**, assume $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash A$. By Corollary 2.19, $\{\kappa \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash A$. Hence, $\kappa \cdot \tau \vDash C$ by $\kappa \vDash [\text{ch}(h)!x]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$, so $v \cdot \tau \vDash C$ by Corollary 2.19. For **(post)**, assume $\omega \neq \perp$ and $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau\} \vDash A$. By Corollary 2.19, $\{\kappa \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau\} \vDash A$. Finally, $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash \psi$ by $\kappa \vDash [\text{ch}(h)!x]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$.

G_{AC}: If $C \wedge \psi$ is valid, **(commit)** and **(post)** for $v \vDash [\alpha]_{\{A,C\}} \psi$ hold trivially in any state v .

[≥]_{AC}: Let $v \vDash h_0 = h \downarrow Y$ and $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket [\alpha] \rrbracket$. Since α has the recorder h , obtain $\tau(h_0) = \epsilon$. For **(commit)**, $v \cdot \tau \vDash h \downarrow Y \geq h_0$ because $(v \cdot \tau)(h) \downarrow Y \geq v(h) \downarrow Y = v(h_0) = (v \cdot \tau)(h_0)$. For **(post)**, assume $\omega \neq \perp$. By the bound effect property (Lemma 2.16), $v \vDash h_0 = h \downarrow Y$ implies $\omega \vDash h_0 = h \downarrow Y$. Then $(\omega \cdot \tau)(h) \downarrow Y \geq \omega(h) \downarrow Y = \omega(h_0) = (\omega \cdot \tau)(h_0)$ such that $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash h \downarrow Y \geq h_0$.

[||]_{AC}: Let $\tilde{v} \vDash \exists \bar{z}, \checkmark \phi$, where $\bar{z} \equiv h_0, h_{\alpha\beta}, \bar{y}_\alpha, \bar{y}_\beta, \bar{g}$ and $\phi \equiv h_0 = h \wedge h_{\alpha\beta} \downarrow (\alpha \parallel \beta) = h_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{T, C_\alpha\}} \psi_\alpha \wedge \langle \beta \rangle_{\{T, C_\beta\}} \psi_\beta$ with $h \equiv h^\alpha \parallel \beta$ being the recorder of $\alpha \parallel \beta$. Then $v \vDash \phi$, where $v = (\tilde{v}_{\bar{z}}^{\bar{d}})^{\bar{b}}$ for some \bar{d}, \bar{b} . Hence, $(v, \tau_\gamma, \omega_\gamma) \in \llbracket [\gamma] \rrbracket$ exists such that either $v \cdot \tau_\gamma \vDash C_\gamma$ for both γ if $\bar{b} = \text{ff}$ or $\omega_\gamma \cdot \tau_\gamma \vDash \psi_\gamma$ for both γ if $\bar{b} = \text{tt}$. Now, let $\tau = v(h_{\alpha\beta})$ be a candidate for the $(\alpha \parallel \beta)$ -communication. If $\bar{b} = \text{tt}$, obtain $v \cdot \tau_\gamma \vDash h = h_0 \cdot h_{\alpha\beta} \downarrow \gamma$ from $\omega \cdot \tau_\gamma \vDash \psi_\gamma$ by the bound effect property (Lemma 2.16). Hence, $v(h) \cdot \tau_\gamma(h) = v(h_0) \cdot \tau \downarrow \gamma$ in any case, so $\tau_\gamma = \tau \downarrow \gamma$ using $v \vDash h_0 = h$. Moreover, $\tau \downarrow (\alpha \parallel \beta) = \tau$ by $v \vDash h_{\alpha\beta} \downarrow (\alpha \parallel \beta) = h_{\alpha\beta}$. In case $\bar{b} = \text{tt}$, the states ω_γ synchronize in global time by $\omega_\gamma \cdot \tau_\gamma \vDash \bar{\mu} = \bar{g}$. In summary, $(v, \tau, \omega_\alpha \oplus \omega_\beta) \in \llbracket [\alpha \parallel \beta] \rrbracket$ for any \bar{b} .

For $\tilde{v} \vDash \langle \alpha \parallel \beta \rangle_{\{T, C\}} \psi$, by coincidence (Lemma 2.17), $v \vDash \langle \alpha \parallel \beta \rangle_{\{T, C\}} \psi$ suffices as \bar{z}, \checkmark are fresh. Since τ_γ is recorded by h , obtain $(v \cdot \tau_\gamma)_h^{v(h_0) \cdot v(h_{\alpha\beta})} = v \cdot \tau$ using $v \vDash h_0 = h$. If $\bar{b} = \text{ff}$, prove **(commit)**: Then $v \cdot \tau_\gamma \vDash C_h^{h_0 \cdot h_{\alpha\beta}}$ implies $(v \cdot \tau_\gamma)_h^{v(h_0) \cdot v(h_{\alpha\beta})} \vDash C$ by substitution, so $v \cdot \tau \vDash C$. Otherwise, if $\bar{b} = \text{tt}$, prove **(post)**: Since $\omega_\gamma \cdot \tau_\gamma \vDash ((\psi_{\bar{x}_\alpha}^{\bar{y}_\alpha})^{\bar{y}_\beta})_h^{h_0 \cdot h_{\alpha\beta}}$, by substitution, $((\omega_\gamma \cdot \tau_\gamma)_{\bar{x}_\alpha}^{\bar{d}_\alpha})_{\bar{x}_\beta}^{\bar{d}_\beta} \vDash \psi_h^{h_0 \cdot h_{\alpha\beta}}$, where $\bar{d}_\alpha = (\omega_\gamma \cdot \tau_\gamma)(\bar{y}_\alpha)$ and $\bar{d}_\beta = (\omega_\gamma \cdot \tau_\gamma)(\bar{y}_\beta)$. By $\omega_\gamma \cdot \tau_\gamma \vDash \bar{y}_\gamma = \bar{x}_\gamma$ for any γ , this simplifies to $(\omega_\gamma \cdot \tau_\gamma)_{\bar{x}_\gamma}^{\bar{d}_\gamma} \vDash \psi_h^{h_0 \cdot h_{\alpha\beta}}$, where $\alpha^\circ = \beta$ and $\beta^\circ = \alpha$. Again by $\omega_\gamma \cdot \tau_\gamma \vDash \bar{y}_\gamma = \bar{x}_\gamma$ for both γ , obtain $\bar{d}_\gamma^\circ = (\omega_\gamma \cdot \tau_\gamma)(\bar{y}_\gamma^\circ) \stackrel{\text{BEP}}{=} v(\bar{y}_\gamma^\circ) \stackrel{\text{BEP}}{=} \omega_\gamma^\circ(\bar{y}_\gamma^\circ) = \omega_\gamma^\circ(\bar{x}_\gamma^\circ)$, where $\stackrel{\text{BEP}}{=}$ uses the bound effect property (Lemma 2.16).

□

B \mathbb{R} -GÖDEL AND OTHER ENCODINGS

This section presents results about \mathbb{R} -Gödel encodings and the FOD-encoding of natural numbers from the literature:

LEMMA B.1 (\mathbb{R} -GÖDEL ENCODING [39, LEMMA 4]). *The predicate $at(Z, n, j, z)$ over real variables Z, n, j, z , which holds iff Z represents a Gödel encoding of a sequence of n real numbers such that z is the number at position j is definable in FOD. Given a formula $\phi(z)$, write $\phi(Z_j^{(n)})$ to abbreviate $\exists z (at(Z, n, j, z) \wedge \phi(z))$.*

LEMMA B.2 (INFINITE \mathbb{R} -GÖDEL ENCODING [47, COROLLARY A.2]). *The predicate $at(Z, \infty, j, z)$ over real variables Z, j, z , which holds iff Z represents a Gödel encoding of an ω -infinite sequence of real numbers such that z is the number at position j is definable in FOD. Given a formula $\phi(z)$, write $\phi(Z_j^{(\infty)})$ to abbreviate $\exists z (at(Z, \infty, j, z) \wedge \phi(z))$.*

LEMMA B.3 (NATURAL NUMBERS IN FOD [39, THEOREM 2]). *The predicate $\text{nat}(\cdot)$ characterizing if a real variable x contains a natural number, i.e., $v \vDash \text{nat}(x)$ iff $v(x) \in \mathbb{N}$, is definable in FOD.*

C INTERMEDIATE AND FINAL STATE-VARIATIONS IN Ω -FOD

This appendix reports proofs for Section 4.1.2 about strongest promises, which are used for complete safety reasoning about parallel CHPs. Correctness (Lemma 4.5) and decomposition (Lemma 4.6) internally argue semantically about state-variations (Def. 4.3). These results transfer to the strongest promises by expressibility (Lemma 4.4).

PROOF OF LEMMA 4.4. Let $\bar{z} = \text{FV}(\varphi, A) \cup \text{V}(\alpha)$ and $h = h^\alpha$ be the recorder of α . Moreover, \bar{v} is fresh and compatible with \bar{z} , and h_v, h_0, h_α , and h_e are fresh. Further, let $\bar{\text{ch}} = \text{CN}_{\{h\}}(\varphi, A) \cup \text{CN}(\alpha) \cup Y^{\mathbb{C}}$. Then the formula $\Upsilon_{Y, \varphi, A, \alpha}$ below characterizes the set of intermediate state-variations $\bar{\mathcal{I}}_{Y, \varphi}(A, \alpha)$, i.e., $o \vDash \Upsilon_{Y, \varphi, A, \alpha}$ iff $o \in \bar{\mathcal{I}}_{Y, \varphi}(A, \alpha)$, and the formula $\Psi_{Y, \varphi, A, \alpha}$ characterizes the set of final state-variations $\mathcal{F}_{Y, \varphi}(A, \alpha)$, i.e., $o \vDash \Psi_{Y, \varphi, A, \alpha}$ iff $o \in \mathcal{F}_{Y, \varphi}(A, \alpha)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_{Y, \varphi, A, \alpha} &\equiv \forall h_v = (h \downarrow \bar{\text{ch}}) \exists h (\varphi \wedge \forall h_0 = h \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A, \forall h_\alpha (h = h_0 \cdot h_\alpha \rightarrow \exists h_e (h_v = h_0 \cdot h_e \wedge h_e \downarrow (\alpha \cup Y^{\mathbb{C}}) = h_\alpha)\}} \perp) \\ \Psi_{Y, \varphi, A, \alpha} &\equiv \forall \bar{v} = (\bar{z}_h^{\downarrow \bar{\text{ch}}}) \exists \bar{z} (\varphi \wedge \forall h_0 = h \langle \alpha \rangle_{\{A, \perp\}} (\forall h_\alpha (h = h_0 \cdot h_\alpha \rightarrow \exists h_e (\bar{v} = \bar{z}_h^{h_0 \cdot h_e} \wedge h_e \downarrow (\alpha \cup Y^{\mathbb{C}}) = h_\alpha))) \end{aligned}$$

The formulas closely mirror Def. 4.3 using an ac-diamond for the existence requirement of an (A, α) -run, and utilize that commitment and postcondition of ac-modalities reflect the intermediate and final states of (A, α) , respectively, matching that $\Upsilon_{Y, \varphi, A, \alpha}$ and $\Psi_{Y, \varphi, A, \alpha}$ characterize intermediate and final states. To obtain α 's communication τ and its variation τ_e on the environment (see Def. 4.3) in trace variables h_α and h_e , respectively, the ghost variable h_0 stores the initial history such that h_α and h_e can be obtained as suffix of the overall history h and as suffix of the overall history variation h_v , respectively. Since $\Upsilon_{Y, \varphi, A, \alpha}$ and $\Psi_{Y, \varphi, A, \alpha}$ describe reachable states, the ghost variables h_v and \bar{v} remember $h \downarrow \bar{\text{ch}}$ and $\bar{z}_h^{\downarrow \bar{\text{ch}}}$, respectively, for their comparison with the state reached by (A, α) , which potentially writes h and \bar{z} . The projection $\downarrow \bar{\text{ch}}$ ensures by definition of $\bar{\text{ch}}$ that $\text{CN}_{\{h\}}(\Phi_{Y, \varphi, A, \alpha}) \subseteq \text{CN}_{\{h\}}(A, \varphi) \cup \text{CN}(\alpha) \cup Y^{\mathbb{C}}$ as promised by the lemma, but is no restriction of the characterization because $\text{CN}(\alpha) \cup Y^{\mathbb{C}} \subseteq \bar{\text{ch}}$, so that $h_e \downarrow (\alpha \cup Y^{\mathbb{C}}) = h_\alpha$ is not evaluated on a projection to small to guarantee $\tau_e \downarrow (\alpha \cup Y^{\mathbb{C}}) = \tau$ in Def. 4.3. □

PROOF OF LEMMA 4.5. Throughout the proof let $\bar{z} = \text{FV}(\varphi, A) \cup \text{V}(\alpha)$.

- (1) Let $\vDash \varphi \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A, C\}} \psi$. For (i), assume $o \vDash \Upsilon_{\emptyset, \varphi, A, \alpha}$. Then by Lemma 4.4 and Def. 4.3, there are v, τ_e with $o = v \cdot \tau_e$ satisfying the following properties: $v \vDash \varphi$ and there is a run $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[A, \alpha]]_<$ with $\tau_e \downarrow (\alpha \cup \emptyset^{\mathbb{C}}) = \tau$. Hence, $\tau_e = \tau$. Then $v \cdot \tau \vDash C$ since $\vDash \varphi \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A, C\}} \psi$, which implies $o \vDash C$.

For (ii), assume $o \vDash \Psi_{\emptyset, \varphi, A, \alpha}$. By Lemma 4.4 and Def. 4.3, there are ω_e, τ_e with $o = \omega_e \cdot \tau_e$ satisfying the following properties: there is a state v such that $v \vDash \varphi$ and there is a run $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[A, \alpha]]_{\leq}$ with $\omega_e = \omega$ on \bar{z} , and $\tau_e \downarrow (\alpha \cup \emptyset^{\mathcal{C}}) = \tau$. Hence, $\tau_e = \tau$. Now, define a state $\tilde{v} = v$ on \bar{z} and $\tilde{v} = \omega_e$ on $\bar{z}^{\mathcal{C}}$. By definition, $\tilde{v} = v$ on $\text{FV}(\varphi, A, \alpha)$. Therefore, $\tilde{v} \vDash \varphi$ by coincidence (Lemma 2.17) and there is $(\tilde{v}, \tau, \tilde{\omega}) \in [[A, \alpha]]_{\leq}$ with $\tilde{\omega} = \omega$ on \bar{z} by coincidence again (Corollary 2.20). Then $\tilde{\omega} \cdot \tau = \omega \cdot \tau = \omega_e \cdot \tau_e$ on \bar{z} and $\tilde{\omega} \cdot \tau \stackrel{\text{BEP}}{=} \tilde{v} \cdot \tau = \omega_e \cdot \tau = \omega_e \cdot \tau_e$ on $\bar{z}^{\mathcal{C}}$, thus, $\tilde{\omega} \cdot \tau = \omega_e \cdot \tau_e$ everywhere. Finally, $\tilde{\omega} \cdot \tau \vDash \psi$ since $\vDash \varphi \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A, C\}} \psi$, which implies $\omega_e \cdot \tau_e \vDash \psi$ by $\tilde{\omega} \cdot \tau = \omega_e \cdot \tau_e$.

- (2) Let $v \vDash \bar{y} = \bar{x} \wedge \varphi$ and $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[\alpha]]$. For (commit), assume $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' < \tau\} \vDash A$, i.e., $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[A, \alpha]]_{<}$. Since τ is α -communication, obtain $\tau \downarrow (\alpha \cup Y^{\mathcal{C}}) = \tau$. Hence, $v \cdot \tau \in \mathcal{I}_{Y, \varphi}(A, \alpha)$ by Def. 4.3, which implies $v \cdot \tau \vDash Y_{Y, \varphi, A, \alpha}$ by Lemma 4.4. Since $v \vDash \bar{y} = \bar{x}$, obtain $v \vDash \forall \bar{x} = \bar{y} Y_{Y, \varphi, A, \alpha}$. For (post), assume $\omega \neq \perp$ and $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \leq \tau\} \vDash A$, i.e., $(v, \tau, \omega) \in [[A, \alpha]]_{\leq}$. Again $\tau \downarrow (\alpha \cup Y^{\mathcal{C}}) = \tau$. Moreover, trivially, $\omega = \omega$ on \bar{z} . Hence, $\omega \cdot \tau \in \mathcal{F}_{Y, \varphi}(A, \alpha)$ by Def. 4.3, which implies $\omega \cdot \tau \vDash \Psi_{Y, \varphi, A, \alpha}$ by Lemma 4.4. \square

The proof of Lemma 4.6 is prepared by Lemma C.1 and C.2 dealing with history invariance (cf. axiom $[\geq]_{AC}$) and assumption closure (cf. axiom $[\Box]_{AC}$), respectively. History invariance ensures that parallel programs γ simultaneously extend an initial history h_0 , which is not already ensured if each program extends its local initial history $h_0 \downarrow \gamma$ (see Remark 3.2). Lemma C.1 generally proves this for arbitrarily many parallel programs.

LEMMA C.1 (HISTORY INVARIANCE). *Let h be the common recorder of programs γ_j and h_0 be fresh. For initial states v_j and channels $C_j \supseteq \text{CN}(\gamma_j)$, let (PRE) $v_j \vDash h_0 \downarrow C_j = h \downarrow C_j$. Moreover, let $(v_j, \tau_j, \omega_j) \in [[\gamma_j]]$ be runs for each j , and let τ_{e_j} be a variation of τ_j such that (COM) $\tau_j = \tau_{e_j} \downarrow C_j$. Further, for a state o , let at least one of the following conditions hold:*

- (1) for all j , (VAR) $o = v_j \cdot \tau_{e_j}$, or
- (2) for all j , (VAR) $o = \omega_{e_j} \cdot \tau_{e_j}$ for some variation ω_{e_j} of ω_j such that (STA) $\omega_{e_j} = \omega_j$ on $\{h_0, h\}$ (i.e., $\omega_j \neq \perp$)

Then if in state o the initial history h_0 is extended on all channels $Y \supseteq \bigcup_j \text{CN}(\gamma_j)$ simultaneously, i.e., if $o \vDash h \downarrow Y \geq h_0$ holds, there is a suffix τ_h of $o(h)$, i.e., $o(h) = \rho_h \cdot \tau_h$ for some ρ_h , that contains the communication of of all γ_j exactly, i.e., $\tau_h \downarrow \gamma_j = \tau_j(h)$ for all j , and $o(h) \downarrow Y = o(h_0) \cdot (\tau_h \downarrow Y)$.¹³

PROOF. First, fix some j . By (COM), τ_{e_j} inherits the recorder h from τ_j , so $\tau_{e_j}(h_0) = \epsilon$. If item 1 holds, then $v_j(h) \downarrow \gamma_j \stackrel{\text{PRE}}{=} v_j(h_0) \downarrow \gamma_j \stackrel{\text{VAR}}{=} o(h_0) \downarrow \gamma_j$ using $C_j \supseteq \text{CN}(\gamma_j)$. Otherwise, if only item 2 holds, obtain $\omega_j(h) \downarrow \gamma_j = \omega_j(h_0) \downarrow \gamma_j$ from (PRE) by the bound effect property (Lemma 2.16). Hence, $\omega_j(h) \downarrow \gamma_j = \omega_j(h_0) \downarrow \gamma_j \stackrel{\text{STA}}{=} \omega_{e_j}(h_0) \downarrow \gamma_j \stackrel{\text{VAR}}{=} o(h_0) \downarrow \gamma_j$. In summary, $(\star) \kappa_j(h) \downarrow \gamma_j = o(h_0) \downarrow \gamma_j$, where $\kappa_j = v_j$ if item 1 holds and $\kappa_j = \omega_j$ otherwise.

Since $\tau_j \stackrel{\text{COM}}{=} \tau_{e_j} \downarrow C_j$ and $C_j \supseteq \text{CN}(\gamma_j)$, obtain $(\star\star) \tau_j = \tau_j \downarrow \gamma_j = \tau_{e_j} \downarrow \gamma_j$. Then the following holds for $(\kappa_{e_j}, \kappa_j) = (v_j, v_j)$ if item 1 holds, and for $(\kappa_{e_j}, \kappa_j) = (\omega_{e_j}, \omega_j)$ otherwise, where (STA) only applies to $\kappa_{e_j}(u) = \omega_{e_j}(h)$:

$$o(h) \downarrow \gamma_j \stackrel{\text{VAR}}{=} \kappa_{e_j}(h) \downarrow \gamma_j \cdot \tau_{e_j}(h) \downarrow \gamma_j \stackrel{\text{STA}}{=} \kappa_j(h) \downarrow \gamma_j \cdot \tau_{e_j}(h) \downarrow \gamma_j \stackrel{\star\star}{=} \kappa_j(h) \downarrow \gamma_j \cdot \tau_j(h) \stackrel{\star}{=} o(h_0) \downarrow \gamma_j \cdot \tau_j(h) \quad (6)$$

Now, let $o \vDash h \downarrow Y \geq h_0$. Then $\tilde{\tau}$ exists such that $o(h) \downarrow Y = o(h_0) \cdot \tilde{\tau}$. Since $Y \supseteq \text{CN}(\gamma_j)$, obtain $o(h) \downarrow \gamma_j = o(h_0) \downarrow \gamma_j \cdot \tilde{\tau} \downarrow \gamma_j$. Hence, $\tilde{\tau} \downarrow \gamma_j = \tau_j(h)$ by equation (6). Finally, choose τ_h as the shortest suffix of $o(h)$ such that $\tau_h \downarrow Y = \tilde{\tau}$. Hence, $\tau_h \downarrow \gamma_j = \tilde{\tau} \downarrow \gamma_j = \tau_j(h)$ as $Y \supseteq \text{CN}(\gamma_j)$ and $o(h) \downarrow Y = o(h_0) \cdot (\tau_h \downarrow Y)$. \square

¹³The fact that each $\gamma \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$ independently extends the initial history, i.e., that $o(h) \downarrow \gamma$ has suffix $\tau_\gamma(h)$, alone does not imply existence of a suffix τ_h of $o(h)$ such that $\tau_h \downarrow \gamma = \tau_\gamma(h)$ for each γ . Considering channel names only, a simple counterexample is $o(h) = \langle \text{ch} \rangle \cdot \langle \text{dh} \rangle \cdot \langle \text{dh} \rangle$, and $\tau_\alpha(h) = \langle \text{ch} \rangle$, and $\tau_\beta(h) = \langle \text{dh} \rangle$. The problem is that $\langle \text{ch} \rangle$ is placed before the first $\langle \text{dh} \rangle$, i.e., $\tau_\alpha(h)$ interleaves with β 's initial communication (cf. Remark 3.2).

Assumption closure $\llbracket \text{AC} \rrbracket$ makes the assumption available in the promises of an ac-box for proving global properties of the communication history (Remark 3.2). By Lemma C.2, assumption closure distributes with the strongest promises.

LEMMA C.2 (ASSUMPTION CLOSURE FOR STATE-VARIATIONS). *Let (A, α) be communicatively well-formed, let $h = h^\alpha$ be the recorder of program α , and let h_0 be a fresh variable. Moreover, let $\bar{c}h \supseteq \text{CN}(A)$ and $\square_{\bar{c}h}^{\text{ch}} A \equiv \forall h' (h_0 \leq h' \sim h \downarrow \bar{c}h \rightarrow A_{h'}^{h'})$, where h' is fresh. For $(\mathcal{V}, \sim) \in \{(I, <), (\mathcal{F}, \leq)\}$, if $o \in \mathcal{V}_{\emptyset, F}(T, \alpha)$ and $o \vDash \square_{\bar{c}h}^{\text{ch}} A$, then $o \in \mathcal{V}_{\emptyset, F}(A, \alpha)$, where $F \equiv h_0 = h \downarrow \bar{c}h \wedge \varphi$ for some φ and \mathcal{V} parameterizes the kind of state-variation (Lemma 4.4).*

PROOF. Let $(\mathcal{V}, \sim) \in \{(I, <), (\mathcal{F}, \leq)\}$, and let $\bar{z} = \text{FV}(F, A) \cup \text{V}(\alpha)$ and let $\bar{c}h = \text{CN}(F, A, \alpha)$. Then let $o \in \Phi_{\emptyset, F, T, \alpha}$ and $o \vDash \square_{\bar{c}h}^{\text{ch}} A$. By Def. 4.3, there are v, τ_e such that (PRE) $v \vDash F$ and there is a run $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket$ such that $\tau_e = \tau_e \downarrow (\alpha \cup \emptyset^{\text{C}}) = \tau$. Further, if $\mathcal{V} \equiv I$, then $o = v \cdot \tau_e = v \cdot \tau$, and if $\mathcal{V} \equiv \mathcal{F}$, there is a ω_e such that $o = \omega_e \cdot \tau_e = \omega_e \cdot \tau$ and $\omega_e = \omega$ on \bar{z} . Now, prove $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \sim \tau\} \vDash A$. Therefore, let $\tau' \sim \tau$ and define $\bar{\tau} = (v \cdot \tau')(h)$. In case $\mathcal{V} \equiv \mathcal{F}$, obtain $o = \omega \cdot \tau$ on $\{h_0, h\}$ from $o = \omega_e \cdot \tau$ since $\omega_e = \omega$ on \bar{z} . Hence, $o = v \cdot \tau$ on $\{h_0, h\}$ by the bound effect property (Lemma 2.16). Therefore, for any \mathcal{V} , obtain $o(h) = (v \cdot \tau)(h)$ and $o(h_0) = v(h_0)$, so $o(h_0) = v(h_0) \stackrel{\text{PRE}}{=} v(h) \downarrow \bar{c}h$. Then $o(h_0) \leq \bar{\tau} \downarrow \bar{c}h \sim o(h) \downarrow \bar{c}h$ by $o(h_0) = v(h) \downarrow \bar{c}h \leq \bar{\tau} \downarrow \bar{c}h \sim (v \cdot \tau)(h) \downarrow \bar{c}h = o(h) \downarrow \bar{c}h$.

Hence, $o \vDash \square_{\bar{c}h}^{\text{ch}} A$ implies $o_{h'}^{\bar{\tau}} \vDash A_{h'}^{h'}$, which implies $o_{h'}^{\bar{\tau}} \vDash A$ by substitution. Observe that $v = o$ on $\text{FV}(A) \cap \{h\}^{\text{C}}$: If $\mathcal{V} \equiv I$, then $v = o$ on $\text{FV}(A) \cap \{h\}^{\text{C}}$ because $o = v$ on $\{h\}^{\text{C}}$. If $\mathcal{V} \equiv \mathcal{F}$, then $v = \omega$ on $\text{BV}(\alpha)^{\text{C}}$ by the bound effect property, and $\omega = \omega_e = o$ on $\bar{z} \cap \{h\}^{\text{C}}$, thus, $v = o$ on $\text{BV}(\alpha)^{\text{C}} \cap \bar{z} \cap \{h\}^{\text{C}}$. Since $\text{FV}(A) \subseteq \text{BV}(\alpha)^{\text{C}} \cup \{h\}$, because (A, α) is communicatively well-formed, obtain $v = o$ on $\text{FV}(A) \cap \{h\}^{\text{C}}$ as $\text{FV}(A) \subseteq \bar{z}$. Hence, $v_{h'}^{\bar{\tau}} = o_{h'}^{\bar{\tau}}$ on $\text{FV}(A)$ for any \mathcal{V} . Further, $v_{h'}^{\bar{\tau}} \downarrow A = (v \cdot \tau') \downarrow A$ since $\bar{c}h \supseteq \text{CN}(A)$, so $o_{h'}^{\bar{\tau}} \downarrow A = (v \cdot \tau') \downarrow A$. Therefore, by coincidence (Lemma 2.17), $v \cdot \tau' \vDash A$. Since $\bar{\tau}$ is arbitrary, obtain $\{v \cdot \tau' \mid \tau' \sim \tau\} \vDash A$. Then $(v, \tau, \omega) \in \llbracket A, \alpha \rrbracket_{\sim}$ such that by Def. 4.3, $o \vDash \Phi_{\emptyset, F, A, \alpha}$. \square

Now, 4.6 is proven using Lemma C.1 and Lemma C.2:

PROOF OF LEMMA 4.6. The proof argues semantically about state-variations (Def. 4.3), which transfers to the strongest promises by expressibility (Lemma 4.4). Throughout the proof γ ranges over $\{\alpha, \beta\}$. Let $\bar{z}_\gamma = \text{FV}(F_\gamma) \cup \text{V}(\gamma)$. Other symbols are define in the premises of Lemma 4.6. Usage of the bound effect property (Lemma 2.16) is marked with $\stackrel{\text{BEP}}{=}$, and equality of final states by the coincidence property for programs (Lemma 2.18) with $\stackrel{\text{COI}}{=}$.

Let $(\mathcal{V}, \sim, \Phi) \in \{(I, <, \Upsilon), (\mathcal{F}, \leq, \Psi)\}$ to parameterize the proof in the kind of state-variation. Then for a state o , let $o \vDash \Phi_{\gamma^\circ, F_\gamma, T, \gamma}$, and $o \vDash h \downarrow \bar{c}h \geq h_0$, and $o \vDash \square_{\bar{c}h}^{\text{ch}} A$. From $o \vDash \Phi_{\gamma^\circ, F_\gamma, T, \gamma}$ obtain $o \in \mathcal{V}_{\gamma^\circ, F_\gamma}(T, \gamma)$ by Lemma 4.4. The remaining proof shows $o \in \mathcal{V}_{\emptyset, F}(T, \alpha)$. Since $o \vDash \square_{\bar{c}h}^{\text{ch}} A$, obtain $o \in \mathcal{V}_{\emptyset, F}(A, \alpha \parallel \beta)$ by Lemma C.2. Finally, $o \vDash \Phi_{\emptyset, F, A, \alpha \parallel \beta}$ by Lemma 4.4. Now, unfold $o \in \mathcal{V}_{\gamma^\circ, F_\gamma}(T, \gamma)$ using Def. 4.3:

- For $\mathcal{V} \equiv I$, there are $v_\gamma, \tau_{e\gamma}$ with (VAR) $o = v_\gamma \cdot \tau_{e\gamma}$ and (PRE) $v_\gamma \vDash F_\gamma$, and there is a run $(v_\gamma, \tau_\gamma, \omega_\gamma) \in \llbracket \gamma \rrbracket$ such that (COM) $\tau_{e\gamma} \downarrow (\gamma \cup (\gamma^\circ)^{\text{C}}) = \tau_\gamma$ and w.l.o.g. $\omega_\gamma = \perp$ by prefix-closedness. By (COM), $\tau_{e\gamma}$ has the recorder h of τ_γ .
- For $\mathcal{V} \equiv \mathcal{F}$, there are $\omega_{e\gamma}, \tau_{e\gamma}$ with (VAR) $o = \omega_{e\gamma} \cdot \tau_{e\gamma}$. Moreover, there is a v_γ such that (PRE) $v_\gamma \vDash F_\gamma$ and a run $(v_\gamma, \tau_\gamma, \omega_\gamma) \in \llbracket \gamma \rrbracket$ with $\omega_\gamma \neq \perp$ such that (STA) $\omega_{e\gamma} = \omega_\gamma$ on \bar{z}_γ , and (COM) $\tau_{e\gamma} \downarrow (\gamma \cup (\gamma^\circ)^{\text{C}}) = \tau_\gamma$. By (COM), $\tau_{e\gamma}$ has the recorder h of τ_γ . Further, (\star) $\omega_\gamma = o$ on $\bar{z}_\gamma \cap \{h\}^{\text{C}}$ because $\omega_\gamma \stackrel{\text{STA}}{=} \omega_{e\gamma} = \omega_{e\gamma} \cdot \tau_{e\gamma} \stackrel{\text{VAR}}{=} o$ on $\bar{z}_\gamma \cap \{h\}^{\text{C}}$. Then the programs start at the same time, i.e., $v_\alpha(\bar{\mu}) = v_\beta(\bar{\mu})$ and $v_\alpha(\bar{\mu}_0) = v_\beta(\bar{\mu}_0)$, because $v_\gamma(\bar{\mu}) \stackrel{\text{PRE}}{=} v_\gamma(\bar{\mu}_0) \stackrel{\text{BEP}}{=} \omega_\gamma(\bar{\mu}_0) \stackrel{\star}{=} o(\bar{\mu}_0)$.

The remaining proof shows $o \in \mathcal{V}_{\emptyset, F}(T, \alpha \parallel \beta)$ via Def. 4.3, by constructing an initial state v and a $(\alpha \parallel \beta)$ -run starting from v that reaches o . By $o \in \mathcal{V}_{\gamma^\circ, F_\gamma}(T, \gamma)$, the state o is a variation of states reachable by α and β from initial

states v_α and v_β , respectively. Intuitively, as o is at the intersection of α 's and β 's variations, it also a variation for $\alpha \parallel \beta$, where $o \vDash h \downarrow \bar{c}h \geq h_0$ necessarily rejects certain inadmissible interleavings of α 's and β 's communication (see Remark 3.2). Therefore, construct v by merging v_α , v_β , and o such that o becomes directly reachable from v by $\alpha \parallel \beta$: Using $o \vDash h \downarrow \bar{c}h \geq h_0$ and Lemma C.1, choose τ_h as the shortest suffix of $o(h)$ containing α 's and β 's communication exactly, i.e., $\tau_h \downarrow \gamma = \tau_\gamma(h)$. Then let ρ_h be the remaining prefix, i.e., $o(h) = \rho_h \cdot \tau_h$. Since $o(h) \downarrow \bar{c}h = o(h_0) \cdot (\tau_h \downarrow \bar{c}h)$ by Lemma C.1, obtain $o(h_0) = \rho_h \downarrow \bar{c}h$. Finally, define $v(h) = \rho_h$ and $v(h_0) = o(h_0)$, and for each $z \in \{h, h_0\}^{\mathbb{C}}$, define v on the local variables \bar{z}_γ by the local state v_γ and by o elsewhere as follows:

$$v(z) = \begin{cases} v_\alpha(z) & \text{if } z \in \bar{z}_\alpha & (\text{note that } \bar{\mu}, \bar{\mu}_0 \in \bar{z}_\alpha) \\ v_\beta(z) & \text{if } z \in \bar{z}_\alpha^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \bar{z}_\beta \\ o(z) & \text{if } z \in \bar{z}_\alpha^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \bar{z}_\beta^{\mathbb{C}} \end{cases}$$

Now, collect some facts about the communication traces: Every event in $\tau_{e\gamma} \downarrow (\varphi_\gamma \cup \gamma)$ is in $\tau_{e\gamma} \downarrow (\gamma \cup (\gamma^\circ)^{\mathbb{C}})$ by premise $\text{CN}_{\{h\}}(\varphi_\gamma) \subseteq \text{CN}(\gamma) \cup \text{CN}(\gamma^\circ)^{\mathbb{C}}$ and every event in $\tau_{e\gamma} \downarrow (\gamma \cup (\gamma^\circ)^{\mathbb{C}})$ is γ -communication by (COM), so the event is in $\tau_{e\gamma} \downarrow (\varphi_\gamma \cup \gamma)$. Hence, $\tau_{e\gamma} \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma = \tau_\gamma$ by $\tau_{e\gamma} \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma = \tau_{e\gamma} \downarrow (\varphi_\gamma \cup \gamma) = \tau_{e\gamma} \downarrow (\gamma \cup (\gamma^\circ)^{\mathbb{C}}) \stackrel{\text{COM}}{=} \tau_\gamma$. Since $o(h)$ has the suffix τ_h and by (VAR) the suffix $\tau_{e\gamma}(h)$, and $\tau_{e\gamma} \downarrow (\alpha^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \beta^{\mathbb{C}}) = \epsilon$ by (COM), every possible $(\alpha^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \beta^{\mathbb{C}})$ -communication in suffix τ_h lies before both $\tau_{e\gamma}$ in $o(h)$. But since τ_h is the shortest trace with $\tau_h \downarrow \gamma = \tau_\gamma(h)$ and $\tau_{e\gamma} \downarrow \gamma = \tau_\gamma$ by (COM), consequently, ($\star\star$) there is no $(\alpha^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \beta^{\mathbb{C}})$ -communication in τ_h at all. Then every event in $\tau_h \downarrow (\gamma \cup (\gamma^\circ)^{\mathbb{C}}) = \tau_h \downarrow (\gamma \cup (\alpha^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \beta^{\mathbb{C}}))$, is γ -communication by $\tau_h \downarrow (\gamma \cup (\gamma^\circ)^{\mathbb{C}}) = \tau_\gamma(h)$, so the event is in $\tau_h \downarrow (\varphi_\gamma \cup \gamma)$, and again by premise $\text{CN}_{\{h\}}(\varphi_\gamma) \subseteq \text{CN}(\gamma) \cup \text{CN}(\gamma^\circ)^{\mathbb{C}}$, every event in $\tau_h \downarrow (\varphi_\gamma \cup \gamma)$ is in $\tau_h \downarrow (\gamma \cup (\gamma^\circ)^{\mathbb{C}})$. Hence, ($\star\star\star$) $\tau_{e\gamma}(h) \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma = \tau_h \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma$ because $\tau_h \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma = \tau_h \downarrow (\varphi_\gamma \cup \gamma) = \tau_h \downarrow (\gamma \cup (\gamma^\circ)^{\mathbb{C}}) \stackrel{\text{COM}}{=} \tau_\gamma \stackrel{\star\star}{=} \tau_{e\gamma} \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma$.

For later usage of coincidence properties, the following shows $v \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma = v_\gamma \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma$ on $\bar{z}_\gamma \supseteq \text{FV}(F_\gamma, \gamma)$:

- For $\mathcal{V} \equiv \mathcal{I}$, first, prove $v = v_\gamma$ on $\bar{z}_\gamma \cap \{h\}^{\mathbb{C}}$, which implies $v \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma = v_\gamma \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma$ on $\bar{z}_\gamma \cap \{h\}^{\mathbb{C}}$. On $\bar{z}_\alpha \cap \{h\}^{\mathbb{C}}$, obtain $v = v_\alpha$ by definition. On $\bar{z}_\alpha^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \bar{z}_\beta \cap \{h\}^{\mathbb{C}}$, obtain $v = v_\beta$. Finally, on $\bar{z}_\alpha \cap \bar{z}_\beta \cap \{h\}^{\mathbb{C}}$, obtain $v = v_\alpha = o = v_\beta$. Since $\tau_h \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma = \tau_{e\gamma}(h) \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma$ by ($\star\star\star$), the following yields $v(h) \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma = v_\gamma(h) \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma$:

$$(v(h) \cdot \tau_h) \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma = (\rho_h \cdot \tau_h) \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma \stackrel{\text{VAR}}{=} o(h) \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma \stackrel{\text{STA}}{=} (v_\gamma \cdot \tau_{e\gamma})(h) \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma$$

- For $\mathcal{V} \equiv \mathcal{F}$, first, show that $v = v_\gamma$ on $\bar{z}_\gamma \cap \{h, h_0\}^{\mathbb{C}}$, which implies $v \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma = v_\gamma \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma$ on $\bar{z}_\gamma \cap \{h, h_0\}^{\mathbb{C}}$. On $\bar{z}_\alpha \cap \{h, h_0\}^{\mathbb{C}}$, obtain $v = v_\alpha$ by definition. Likewise, by definition, $v = v_\beta$ on $\bar{z}_\alpha^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \bar{z}_\beta \cap \{h, h_0\}^{\mathbb{C}}$. Then show $v = v_\beta$ on $\bar{z}_\alpha \cap \bar{z}_\beta \cap \{h, h_0\}^{\mathbb{C}}$. Since the programs start at the same time, obtain $v(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\mu}_0) = v_\alpha(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\mu}_0) = v_\beta(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\mu}_0)$. On $\{h, h_0\}^{\mathbb{C}}$, it remains to show $v = v_\beta$ on $\bar{z}_\alpha \cap \bar{z}_\beta \cap X$, where $X = \{h, h_0, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\mu}_0\}^{\mathbb{C}}$. Since $\text{FV}(\varphi_\gamma) \cap \text{V}(\gamma^\circ) \subseteq \{\bar{\mu}, h\}$ by precondition, obtain $\text{FV}(\varphi_\gamma) \cap X \subseteq \text{V}(\gamma^\circ)^{\mathbb{C}} \cap X \subseteq \text{BV}(\gamma^\circ)^{\mathbb{C}} \cap X$. Further, $\bar{z}_\gamma \cap X = (\text{FV}(F_\gamma) \cup \text{V}(\gamma)) \cap X = (\text{FV}(\varphi_\gamma) \cup \text{V}(\gamma)) \cap X$. Hence, the variables

$$\bar{z}_\alpha \cap \bar{z}_\beta \cap X = \bigcap_{\gamma} (\text{FV}(\varphi_\gamma) \cup \text{V}(\gamma)) \cap X \subseteq \text{BV}(\alpha)^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \text{BV}(\beta)^{\mathbb{C}} \cap X,$$

are not bound by either program. Thus, on $\bar{z}_\alpha \cap \bar{z}_\beta \cap X$, one obtains $v = v_\alpha \stackrel{\text{BEP}}{=} \omega_\alpha \stackrel{\star}{=} o \stackrel{\star}{=} \omega_\beta \stackrel{\text{BEP}}{=} v_\beta$.

Then $v(h) \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma = v_\gamma(h) \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma$ by the following because $\tau_{e\gamma}(h) \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma = \tau_h \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma$ by ($\star\star\star$):

$$v(h) \cdot \tau_h = \rho_h \cdot \tau_h = o(h) \stackrel{\text{VAR}}{=} (\omega_{e\gamma} \cdot \tau_{e\gamma})(h) \stackrel{\text{STA}}{=} (\omega_\gamma \cdot \tau_{e\gamma})(h) \stackrel{\text{BEP}}{=} (v_\gamma \cdot \tau_{e\gamma})(h) \quad (7)$$

Finally, $v(h_0) \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma = o(h_0) \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma \stackrel{\star}{=} \omega_\gamma(h_0) \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma \stackrel{\text{BEP}}{=} v_\gamma(h_0) \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma$.

Since $v \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma = v_\gamma \downarrow \bar{c}h_\gamma$ on $\bar{z}_\gamma \supseteq \text{FV}(F_\gamma, \gamma)$, by (PRE) and coincidence (Lemma 2.17), $v \vDash F_\gamma$, so $v \vDash \bar{\mu}_0 = \bar{\mu} \wedge \varphi_\alpha \wedge \varphi_\beta$. Further, $v(h) \downarrow \bar{c}h = \rho_h \downarrow \bar{c}h = o(h_0) = v(h_0)$ such that $v \vDash h_0 = h \downarrow \bar{c}h$. In summary, $v \vDash F$.

Next, a $(\alpha \parallel \beta)$ -run is constructed: Therefore, let $\tau = (h, \tau_h \downarrow (\alpha \parallel \beta))$ be the joint communication obtained by limiting the global communication to $\alpha \parallel \beta$. Indeed, $\tau \downarrow (\alpha \parallel \beta) = \tau$ and $\tau \downarrow \gamma = (h, \tau_h \downarrow \gamma) = (h, \tau_\gamma(h)) = \tau_\gamma$. For $\mathcal{V} \equiv \mathcal{I}$, obtain $(v, \tau, \perp) \in [[\alpha \parallel \beta]]$ since there are γ -runs $(v, \tau_\gamma, \perp) \in [[\gamma]]$. For $\mathcal{V} \equiv \mathcal{F}$, by coincidence (Lemma 2.18), there are γ -runs $(v, \tau_\gamma, \tilde{\omega}_\gamma) \in [[\gamma]]$ with $\tilde{\omega}_\gamma \neq \perp$ and $\tilde{\omega}_\gamma = \omega_\gamma$ on $\bar{z}_\gamma \cap V_{\text{RUN}}$ since $v = v_\gamma$ on $\bar{z}_\gamma \cap V_{\text{RUN}} \supseteq \text{FV}(\gamma)$. Moreover, $\tilde{\omega}_\alpha(\bar{\mu}) \stackrel{\text{COI}}{=} \omega_\alpha(\bar{\mu}) \stackrel{\star}{=} o(\bar{\mu}) \stackrel{\star}{=} \omega_\beta(\bar{\mu}) \stackrel{\text{COI}}{=} \tilde{\omega}_\beta(\bar{\mu})$. In summary, $(v, \tau, \tilde{\omega}_\alpha \oplus \tilde{\omega}_\beta) \in [[\alpha \parallel \beta]]$.

Now, prove that the constructed runs indeed reach the state o :

- For $\mathcal{V} \equiv \mathcal{I}$, prove $o \in \mathcal{I}_{0,F}(A, \alpha \parallel \beta)$. Therefore, first, prove $o = v \cdot \tau_e$ with $\tau_e = (h, \tau_h)$, and second, prove $v \cdot \tau_e \in \mathcal{I}_{0,F}(A, \alpha \parallel \beta)$. For $o = v \cdot \tau_e$, on $\{h\}^{\mathbb{C}}$, it suffices to prove $v = o$. On $(\bar{z}_\alpha \cup \bar{z}_\beta) \cap \{h, h_0\}^{\mathbb{C}}$, obtain $v = v_\gamma = o$ for some γ , and on $(\bar{z}_\alpha \cup \bar{z}_\beta)^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \{h, h_0\}^{\mathbb{C}}$, obtain $v = o$. Further, for h_0 , obtain $v(h_0) = v(h_0)$. Finally, for h , obtain $(v \cdot \tau_e)(h) = \rho_h \cdot \tau_h = o(h)$. Second, for $v \cdot \tau_e \in \mathcal{I}_{0,F}(A, \alpha \parallel \beta)$, recap that there is v such that $v \vDash F$, and there is $(v, \tau, \perp) \in [[A, \alpha \parallel \beta]]_{<}$. Then $\tau_e \downarrow ((\alpha \parallel \beta) \cup \emptyset^{\mathbb{C}}) = \tau_e = (h, \tau_h) \stackrel{\star\star}{=} (h, \tau_h \downarrow (\alpha \parallel \beta)) = \tau$. In summary, $v \cdot \tau_e \in \mathcal{I}_{0,F}(A, \alpha \parallel \beta)$.
- For $\mathcal{V} \equiv \mathcal{F}$, let $\omega_e = \tilde{\omega}_\alpha \oplus \tilde{\omega}_\beta$ and $\tau_e = (h, \tau_h)$. Remember that $v \vDash F$. Moreover, $\tau_e \downarrow ((\alpha \parallel \beta) \cup \emptyset^{\mathbb{C}}) = \tau$ as for $\mathcal{V} \equiv \mathcal{I}$. Hence, $\omega_e \cdot \tau_e \in \mathcal{F}_{0,F}(A, \alpha \parallel \beta)$ such that $o \in \mathcal{F}_{0,F}(A, \alpha \parallel \beta)$ if only $o = \omega_e \cdot \tau_e$, which is shown in the following: On $X = \{h, h_0\}^{\mathbb{C}}$, proving $\tilde{\omega}_\alpha \oplus \tilde{\omega}_\beta = o$ suffices as τ_e has the recorder $h \notin X$: On α 's bound variables $X \cap \text{BV}(\alpha)$ and on the variables $X \cap \text{BV}(\alpha)^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \text{BV}(\beta)$ exclusively bound by β , obtain $(\tilde{\omega}_\alpha \oplus \tilde{\omega}_\beta) = \tilde{\omega}_\gamma \stackrel{\text{COI}}{=} \omega_\gamma \stackrel{\star}{=} o$ for $\gamma \equiv \alpha$ and $\gamma \equiv \beta$, respectively, because $\text{BV}(\gamma) \subseteq \bar{z}_\gamma$. On $X_0 = X \cap (\text{BV}(\alpha)^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \text{BV}(\beta)^{\mathbb{C}})$, where variables are not bound by either program, obtain $(\tilde{\omega}_\alpha \oplus \tilde{\omega}_\beta) = \tilde{\omega}_\beta \stackrel{\text{BEP}}{=} v$. Further, on $X_0 \cap \bar{z}_\alpha^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \bar{z}_\beta^{\mathbb{C}}$, the state v directly equals o , and on $X_0 \cap (\bar{z}_\alpha^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \bar{z}_\beta^{\mathbb{C}})^{\mathbb{C}} = X_0 \cap (\bar{z}_\alpha \cup \bar{z}_\beta)$, the state v either equals v_α or v_β . Hence, $v = v_\gamma \stackrel{\text{BEP}}{=} \omega_\gamma \stackrel{\star}{=} o$ for some γ . In summary, $(\tilde{\omega}_\alpha \oplus \tilde{\omega}_\beta) = o$ on X_0 .
On h , for either $\gamma \equiv \alpha$ or $\gamma \equiv \beta$,

$$((\tilde{\omega}_\alpha \oplus \tilde{\omega}_\beta) \cdot \tau_e)(h) = \tilde{\omega}_\gamma(h) \cdot \tau_e(h) \stackrel{\text{BEP}}{=} v(h) \cdot \tau_e(h) = \rho_h \cdot \tau_h = o(h).$$

Finally, on h_0 , obtain $((\tilde{\omega}_\alpha \oplus \tilde{\omega}_\beta) \cdot \tau_e)(h_0) = \tilde{\omega}_\beta(h_0) \stackrel{\text{BEP}}{=} v(h_0) = o(h_0)$.

It remains to prove that γ° does not interfere with the strongest promise $\Phi_{\gamma^\circ, F_\gamma, \tau, \gamma}$ for both γ . By Lemma 4.4, $\text{FV}(\Phi_{\gamma^\circ, F_\gamma, \tau, \gamma}) \subseteq \text{FV}(F_\gamma) \cup \text{V}(\gamma) = \text{FV}(\varphi_\gamma) \cup \{h, h_0, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\mu}_0\} \cup \text{V}(\gamma)$ and $\text{CN}_{\{h\}}(\Phi_{\gamma^\circ, F_\gamma, \tau, \gamma}) \subseteq \text{CN}_{\{h\}}(F_\gamma) \cup \text{CN}(\gamma) \cup \text{CN}(\gamma^\circ)^{\mathbb{C}}$, where $\text{CN}_{\{h\}}(F_\gamma) = \text{CN}_{\{h\}}(\varphi_\gamma) \cup \bar{c}h_\gamma = \text{CN}_{\{h\}}(\varphi_\gamma) \cup \text{CN}(\gamma)$ by premise. Since $\text{FV}(\varphi_\gamma) \cap \text{V}(\gamma^\circ) \subseteq \{\bar{\mu}, h\}$ and $\text{BV}(\gamma^\circ) \cap \text{V}(\gamma) \subseteq \{\bar{\mu}, h\}$ by premise, and $h_0, \bar{\mu}_0$ are fresh, obtain $\text{FV}(\Phi_{\gamma^\circ, F_\gamma, \tau, \gamma}) \cap \text{BV}(\gamma^\circ) \subseteq \{\bar{\mu}, h\}$. Further, since $\text{CN}_{\{h\}}(\varphi_\gamma) \cap \text{CN}(\gamma^\circ) \subseteq \text{CN}(\gamma)$ by premise, obtain $\text{CN}(F_\gamma) \cap \text{CN}(\gamma^\circ) \subseteq \text{CN}(\gamma)$. In summary, γ° does not interfere with the strongest promise $\Phi_{\gamma^\circ, F_\gamma, \tau, \gamma}$ \square

D EFFECTIVE TRANSLATION FROM Ω -FOD TO FOD

This appendix reports details for Section 4.2, dL_{CHP} 's completeness relative to FOD. In particular, Ω -FOD and FOD are proven to be equiexpressive (Proposition 4.8). First, Lemma D.1 shows that every Ω -FOD formula can be translated into an equivalent but simpler Ω -FOD formula. Then Lemma D.4 translates these simplified Ω -FOD formulas to FOD using \mathbb{R} -Gödel encodings for the communication traces. Proposition 4.8 is an immediate corollary of Lemma D.1 and D.4.

$$\begin{aligned} (\otimes (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n))^\# &\equiv \otimes (\varphi_1^\#, \dots, \varphi_n^\#) \quad (\text{for } \otimes \in \{\neg, \wedge, \forall z\}) \\ (te_1 \leq te_2)^\# &\equiv (|te_1| \leq |te_2|)^\# \wedge \forall k (0 \leq k < |te_1| \rightarrow te_1[k] = te_2[k])^\# \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$((e_1 \sim e_2)(\text{op}(te)))^\# \equiv \exists h \left((h = te)^\# \wedge ((e_1 \sim e_2)(\text{op}(h)))^\# \right) \quad (\text{for built-in op on trace term } te \notin V_{\mathcal{T}}) \quad (9)$$

$$((e_1 \sim e_2)(te[\eta]))^\# \equiv \exists h \exists k \left((h = te)^\# \wedge (k = \eta)^\# \wedge ((e_1 \sim e_2)(h[k]))^\# \right) \quad (\text{if } te \notin V_{\mathcal{T}} \text{ or } \eta \notin V_{\mathbb{R}}) \quad (10)$$

$$(e_1 \sim e_2)^\# \equiv (e_1 \sim e_2)^b \quad (\text{if (8) - (10) are not applicable})$$

$$((e_1 \sim e_2)(te_1 \cdot te_2))^b \equiv \exists h, h_1, h_2 \left((h_1 = te_1)^b \wedge (h_2 = te_2)^b \wedge (h = h_1 \cdot h_2)^\dagger \wedge ((e_1 \sim e_2)(h))^b \right) \quad (11)$$

$$(e_1 \sim e_2)^b \equiv (e_1 \sim e_2)^{\ddagger} \quad (\text{if (11) is not applicable})$$

(a) Simplification of prefixing \leq , operators $\text{op}(te) \in \{\text{chan}(te), \text{val}(te), \text{time}(te), |te|, te \downarrow Y\}$, trace access $te[\eta]$, and concatenations $te_1 \cdot te_2$, where e_i is a real or trace term and $\sim \in \{\leq, =\}$

$$(h = h_1 \cdot h_2)^\dagger \equiv |h| = |h_1| + |h_2| \wedge \forall 0 \leq j < |h_1| \ h[h[j]] = h_1[h[j]] \wedge \forall 0 \leq j < |h_2| \ (h[j + |h_1|] = h_2[h[j]])^\# \quad (12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (h_0 \downarrow Y = h)^\ddagger \equiv (h = h_0 \downarrow Y)^\ddagger &\equiv \exists I \left(|I| = |h| \wedge \forall 0 \leq i < |I| \ I[i] < I[k] \right. \\ &\quad \wedge \forall 0 \leq k < |I| \ (h[k] = h_0[I[k]] \wedge \text{chan}(h_0[I[k]]) \in Y)^\# \\ &\quad \left. \wedge \forall 0 \leq k < |h_0| \ ((\forall 0 \leq i < |I| \ I[i] \neq k) \rightarrow (\text{chan}(h_0[k]) \notin Y)^\#) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

$$(e_1 \sim e_2)^\ddagger \equiv (e_1 \sim e_2) \quad (\text{if (13) is not applicable}) \quad (14)$$

(b) Reexpress concatenations and projections in terms of trace access

Fig. 11. Recursive construction of a trace-simple Ω -FOD formula $\phi^\#$ that is equivalent to the Ω -FOD formula ϕ

The simplified Ω -FOD formulas mediating between Lemma D.1 and D.4 are chosen such that the encoding of communication traces by \mathbb{R} -Gödel encodings becomes straightforward. Let a trace term be simple if it is generated by the grammar $te_1, te_2 ::= h \mid \epsilon \mid \langle ch, \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle \mid h[k]$, where h, k are variables. A Ω -FOD formula ϕ is called *trace-simple* if every comparison $te_1 \sim te_2$ of traces in ϕ is an equality, i.e., $\sim \equiv =$, over simple trace terms te_i , and if the operators $\text{chan}(\cdot)$, $\text{time}(\cdot)$, $\text{val}(\cdot)$, and $|\cdot|$ are only applied to trace variables.

LEMMA D.1 (Ω -FOD AND TRACE-SIMPLE Ω -FOD ARE EQUIEXPRESSIVE). *For every Ω -FOD formula ϕ , there is effectively an equivalent trace-simple Ω -FOD formula $\phi^\#$, i.e., $\models \phi \leftrightarrow \phi^\#$, over the same free variables.*

PROOF. The formula $\phi^\#$ is recursively defined in Fig. 11. The recursion $(\cdot)^\#$ in Fig. 11a reexpresses the prefix relation \leq using trace access (equation (8)), and factors non-variable trace and real terms out of operators (equation (9)) and trace access (equation (10)). The recursion $(\cdot)^b$ simplifies concatenations into two-variable concatenations (equation (11)) such that only trace terms generated by the following grammar are left: $h \mid \epsilon \mid \langle ch, \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle \mid h_1 \cdot h_2 \mid h[k] \mid h \downarrow Y$.

In Fig. 11b, $(\cdot)^\dagger$ and $(\cdot)^\ddagger$ reexpresses the remaining concatenations (equation (12)) and projections (equation (13)) using trace access. Notably, the mutual recursive application of $(\cdot)^\#$ for simplifying newly added trace access terminates as it does not add new concatenations and projections. Equation (13) uses the trace variable I to denote the positions of h_0 whose channel name is in Y . The ad-hoc usage of the element relation in equation (13) can be unrolled into a (finite) trace-simple formula because Y is (co)finite, e.g., $\text{chan}(te) \in \{\text{ch}, \text{dh}\}^C$ unrolls into $\neg(\text{chan}(te) = \text{ch}) \wedge \neg(\text{chan}(te) \neq \text{dh})$. \square

Communication traces are finite sequences of events and each event has a channel name, a value, and a timestamp, i.e., they are finite sequences of real-valued triples. In FOD, these sequences are encoded using \mathbb{R} -Gödel encodings (Def. D.2). In fact, it is convenient to use \mathbb{R} -encodings of ω -infinite sequences (Lemma B.2) together with explicit range checks. The events are packed into a nested \mathbb{R} -Gödel encoding.

Definition D.2 (\mathbb{R} -Gödel encoding of traces). The \mathbb{R} -Gödel encoding of a communication trace is a ω -infinite \mathbb{R} -Gödel encoding (Lemma B.2) whose positions are finite \mathbb{R} -Gödel encodings (Lemma B.1) of fixed length 3 of the channel, value, and time of the events. Outside the bounds of the encoded trace, the ω -sequence can contain arbitrary values. We write $Z_{k,j}^{(\infty,3)}$ to abbreviate access $(Z_k^{(\infty)})_j^{(3)}$ to the j -th component of the k -th communication event encoded in Z .

The base logic Ω -FOD has trace variables besides the real variables in FOD. Lemma D.4 represents the trace variables of a Ω -FOD formula ϕ using fresh real variables interpreted as \mathbb{R} -Gödel encoding of traces (Def. D.2). The mapping $(\cdot)^\dagger : V_{\mathcal{T}} \rightarrow V_{\mathbb{R}}$ provides a fresh but fixed real variable as representant for each trace variable, and $(\cdot)^\ddagger : V_{\mathcal{T}} \rightarrow V_{\mathbb{R}}$ denotes the original length of the trace by another fixed fresh real variable. Consequently, the free variables of the FOD encoding $\phi^\#$ and the free variables of the original Ω -FOD formula ϕ do not match. To align the semantical evaluation of the FOD encoding $\phi^\#$ with its syntactical transformation, we introduce FOD-dual states, which evaluate the representant h^\dagger of every trace variable h with the \mathbb{R} -Gödel trace encoding of the original trace:

Definition D.3 (FOD-dual state). For a state v , the FOD-dual state $v_\phi^\#$ w.r.t. a Ω -FOD formula ϕ equals v except that $v_\phi^\#$ evaluates the representants h^\dagger, h^\ddagger of each free trace variable h of ϕ as follows: $v_\phi^\#(h^\ddagger) = |v(h)|$ and $v_\phi^\#(h^\dagger)$ is the \mathbb{R} -Gödel encoding (Def. D.2) of the trace $v(h)$.

LEMMA D.4 (TRACE-SIMPLE Ω -FOD AND FOD ARE EQUIEXPRESSIVE). *For every trace-simple Ω -FOD formula ϕ , there is effectively an equivalent FOD formula $\phi^\#$, i.e., $v \models \phi$ iff $v_\phi^\# \models \phi^\#$ for every state v . In particular, $\models \phi$ iff $\models \phi^\#$. If ϕ has the mixed-type free variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \cup \{h_1, \dots, h_m\}$, then $\phi^\#$ has the purely real free variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \cup \{h_1^\dagger, h_1^\ddagger, \dots, h_m^\dagger, h_m^\ddagger\}$.*

PROOF. The formula $\phi^\#$ is defined by the structural recursion in Fig. 12. Fig. 12a contains the cases on formulas except for equality $te_1 = te_2$ on trace terms, which is in Fig. 12c. Other cases on terms are in Fig. 12b. The translation $(\cdot)^\#$ uniformly replaces trace variables with real representants. The representant h^\dagger of every trace variable h is interpreted as \mathbb{R} -Gödel trace encoding (Def. D.2) of h , and h^\ddagger tells the length of the encoding. For soundness, each trace length variable h^\ddagger crucially needs to be (indirectly) characterized as a natural number by $\text{nat}(\cdot)$ (FOD by Lemma B.3). To ensure this, define $\phi^\#$ to be the result of applying the $(\cdot)^\#$ -recursion of Fig. 12 to $\forall \bar{h}_0 (\bar{h}_0 = \bar{h} \rightarrow \phi_{\bar{h}}^{\bar{h}_0})$ instead of ϕ , where \bar{h} are the free trace variables of ϕ and \bar{h}_0 is fresh and compatible with \bar{h} . Further, assume that default evaluation is explicitly unrolled for operations $\text{op}(h) \in \{\text{chan}(\cdot), \text{val}(\cdot), \text{time}(\cdot)\}$ on traces in ϕ . Therefore, replace each $\text{op}(h)$ in ϕ once as follows: $\phi(\text{op}(h)) \equiv |h| > 0 \wedge \phi(\text{op}(h)) \vee |h| \leq 0 \wedge \phi(0)$ before applying the $(\cdot)^\#$ -recursion. To reduce the number of cases in Fig. 12c, equations $te_1 = te_2$ are normalized into the form $h = te$. Then $(\cdot)^\#$ boils the remaining equalities down to constraints on the length of the traces and comparison of the \mathbb{R} -Gödel encodings.

By the construction of $\phi^\#$, obtain $v \models \phi$ iff $v_\phi^\# \models \phi^\#$ for every state v . For $\models \phi$ iff $\models \phi^\#$, consider each implication separately: If $\models \phi^\#$, then $\models \phi$ because $v_\phi^\# \models \phi^\#$ implies $v \models \phi$ for every v . Conversely, let $\models \phi$ and v be arbitrary. If the value $v(h^\ddagger)$ of any length representant h^\ddagger of a free trace variable h of ϕ violates its domain, i.e., $v \not\models \text{nat}(h^\ddagger)$, then v satisfies $\phi^\#$ trivially because v necessarily falsifies some predicate $\text{nat}(\cdot)$. Hence, assume that v respects domains. Then construct a state v^{-1} from v by unpacking each \mathbb{R} -Gödel encoding $v(h^\dagger)$ into the corresponding trace variable h , where $v(h^\ddagger) \in \mathbb{N}$ tells the length to decode. Since $v^{-1} \models \phi$, obtain $(v^{-1})_\phi^\# \models \phi^\#$. Further, $(v^{-1})_\phi^\# = v^{-1}$ because $(v^{-1})_\phi^\#$

$$\begin{array}{ll}
& x^\# \equiv x \\
& c^\# \equiv c \\
(\eta_1 \sim \eta_2)^\# \equiv \eta_1^\# \sim \eta_2^\# & (\eta_1 \bowtie \eta_2)^\# \equiv \eta_1^\# \bowtie \eta_2^\# \\
(te_1 = te_2)^\# \equiv \text{see Fig. 12c} & (\text{chan}(h))^\# \equiv (h^\dagger)_{h^\ddagger-1,1}^{(\infty,3)} \\
(\neg\varphi)^\# \equiv \neg\varphi^\# & (\text{val}(h))^\# \equiv (h^\dagger)_{h^\ddagger-1,2}^{(\infty,3)} \\
(\varphi \wedge \psi)^\# \equiv \varphi^\# \wedge \psi^\# & (\text{time}(h))^\# \equiv (h^\dagger)_{h^\ddagger-1,3}^{(\infty,3)} \\
(\forall x \varphi)^\# \equiv \forall x \varphi^\# & (|h|)^\# \equiv h^\ddagger \\
(\forall h \varphi)^\# \equiv \forall h^\dagger \forall h^\ddagger (\text{nat}(h^\ddagger) \rightarrow \varphi^\#) &
\end{array}$$

(a) Recursion for formulas, where $\sim \in \{=, \leq\}$ (b) Recursion for terms, where $c \in \mathbb{Q}$ is a real constant

$$\begin{array}{l}
(te_1 = te_2)^\# \equiv \exists h^\dagger \exists h^\ddagger (\text{nat}(h^\ddagger) \wedge (h = te_1)^b \wedge (h = te_2)^b) \quad (\text{where } h \text{ is fresh}) \\
(h = h_0)^b \equiv h^\ddagger = h_0^\ddagger \wedge \forall 0 \leq k < h^\ddagger (\text{nat}(k) \rightarrow (h^\dagger)_k^{(\infty)} = (h_0^\dagger)_k^{(\infty)}) \\
(h = \epsilon)^b \equiv h^\ddagger = 0 \\
(h = \langle \text{ch}, \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle)^b \equiv h^\ddagger = 1 \wedge (h^\dagger)_{0,1}^{(\infty,3)} = \text{ch} \wedge (h^\dagger)_{0,2}^{(\infty,3)} = \theta_1 \wedge (h^\dagger)_{0,3}^{(\infty,3)} = \theta_2 \\
(h = h_0[k])^b \equiv ((h^\ddagger = 1 \wedge 0 \leq k^\dagger < h_0^\ddagger) \wedge (h^\dagger)_0^{(\infty)} = (h^\dagger)_{[k]}^{(\infty)}) \vee (h^\ddagger = 0 \wedge \neg(0 \leq k^\dagger < h_0^\ddagger))
\end{array}$$

(c) Recursion for equality $te_1 = te_2$ on trace terms, where rounding $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is defined by $\phi(\lfloor n \rfloor) \equiv \exists n (\text{nat}(n) \wedge k-1 < n \leq k \wedge \phi(n))$

Fig. 12. Recursive construction of a FOD formula $\phi^\#$ that is equivalent to the trace-simple Ω -FOD formula ϕ

only re-encodes the traces just decoded from ν into ν^{-1} . Since $\nu^{-1} = \nu$ on $\text{FV}(\phi^\#)$, because $\text{FV}(\phi^\#) \subseteq V_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\nu^{-1} = \nu$ on $V_{\mathcal{T}}^C$, obtain $\nu \vDash \phi^\#$ by coincidence (Lemma 2.17). \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was funded in part by the Deutsche Forschungs-gemeinschaft (DFG) – 378803395 (ConVeY), an Alexander von Humboldt Professorship, and by the AFOSR under grant number FA9550-16-1-0288.

REFERENCES

- [1] Rajeev Alur. 2011. Formal verification of hybrid systems. In *Proc. 11th Intl. Conf. Embedded Software (EMSOFT)*, Samarjit Chakraborty, Ahmed Jerraya, Sanjoy K. Baruah, and Sebastian Fischmeister (Eds.). ACM Press, 273–278. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2038642.2038685>
- [2] Rajeev Alur, Costas Courcoubetis, Thomas A. Henzinger, and Pei-Hsin Ho. 1993. Hybrid Automata: An Algorithmic Approach to the Specification and Verification of Hybrid Systems. In *Proc. 1th and 2nd Intl. Workshop Hybrid Systems (HS) (LNCS, Vol. 736)*, Robert L. Grossman, Anil Nerode, Anders P. Ravn, and Hans Rischel (Eds.). Springer, 209–229. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-84882-745-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-57318-6_{3}\{0\}
[3] Krzysztof R. Apt, Frank S. de Boer, and Ernst-Rüdiger Olderog. 2010. <i>Verification of Sequential and Concurrent Programs</i> (3rd ed.). Springer. <a href=)
- [4] Luca Benvenuti, Davide Bresolin, Pieter Collins, Alberto Ferrari, Luca Geretti, and Tiziano Villa. 2014. Assume-guarantee verification of nonlinear hybrid systems with ARIADNE. *Intl. J. Robust Nonlinear Control* 24 (2014), 699–724. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rnc.2914>
- [5] Marvin Brieger, Stefan Mitsch, and André Platzer. 2023. Dynamic Logic of Communicating Hybrid Programs. *CoRR* abs/2302.14546 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.14546> arXiv:<https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.14546>
- [6] Marvin Brieger, Stefan Mitsch, and André Platzer. 2023. Uniform Substitution for Dynamic Logic with Communicating Hybrid Programs. In *Automated Deduction - CADE 29 - 29th International Conference on Automated Deduction, Rome, Italy, July 1-4, 2023, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 14132)*, Brigitte Pientka and Cesare Tinelli (Eds.). Springer, 96–115. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-38499-8_6

- [7] Stephen D. Brookes. 1996. Full Abstraction for a Shared-Variable Parallel Language. *Inf. Comput.* 127, 2 (1996), 145–163.
- [8] Stephen D. Brookes. 2002. Traces, Pomsets, Fairness and Full Abstraction for Communicating Processes. In *CONCUR*. 466–482.
- [9] Zhou Chaochen, Anders P. Ravn, and Michael R. Hansen. 1992. An Extended Duration Calculus for Hybrid Real-Time Systems. In *Hybrid Systems (LNCS, Vol. 736)*, Robert L. Grossman, Anil Nerode, Anders P. Ravn, and Hans Rischel (Eds.). Springer, 36–59. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-57318-6_23
- [10] Xinyu Cong, Huiqun Yu, and Xin Xu. 2013. Verification of Hybrid Chi Model for Cyber-physical Systems Using PHAVer. In *Proc. 7th Intl. Conf. Innovative Mobile and Internet Services in Ubiquitous Computing, (IMIS)*, Leonard Barolli, Il-sun You, Fatos Xhafa, Fang-Yie Leu, and Hsing-Chung Chen (Eds.). IEEE Computer Society, 122–128. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IMIS.2013.29>
- [11] Stephen A. Cook. 1978. Soundness and Completeness of an Axiom System for Program Verification. *SIAM J. Comput.* 7, 1 (1978), 70–90. <https://doi.org/10.1137/0207005>
- [12] Willem P. de Roever, Frank S. de Boer, Ulrich Hannemann, Jozef J. M. Hooman, Yassine Lakhnech, Mannes Poel, and Job Zwiers. 2001. *Concurrency Verification: Introduction to Compositional and Noncompositional Methods*. Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science, Vol. 54. Cambridge University Press.
- [13] Goran Frehse, Zhi Han, and Bruce H. Krogh. 2004. Assume-guarantee reasoning for hybrid I/O-automata by over-approximation of continuous interaction. In *Proc. 43rd IEEE Conf. Decision and Control (CDC)*, IEEE, 479–484. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CDC.2004.1428676>
- [14] Dimitar P. Guelev, Shuling Wang, and Naijun Zhan. 2017. Compositional Hoare-Style Reasoning About Hybrid CSP in the Duration Calculus. In *Proc. 3rd Intl. Symp. Dependable Software Engineering. Theories, Tools, and Applications (SETTA) (LNCS, Vol. 10606)*, Kim Guldstrand Larsen, Oleg Sokolsky, and Ji Wang (Eds.). Springer, 110–127. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69483-2_7
- [15] Kurt Gödel. 1931. Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I. *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik* 38 (1931), 173–198. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01700692>
- [16] David Harel. 1979. *First-Order Dynamic Logic*. LNCS, Vol. 68. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-09237-4>
- [17] David Harel, Dexter Kozen, and Jerzy Tiuryn. 2000. *Dynamic Logic*. MIT Press, Cambridge. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/2516.001.0001>
- [18] David Harel, Albert R. Meyer, and Vaughan R. Pratt. 1977. Computability and Completeness in Logics of Programs (Preliminary Report). In *Proc. 9th Annual ACM Symp. Theory of Computing*, John E. Hopcroft, Emily P. Friedman, and Michael A. Harrison (Eds.). ACM, 261–268. <https://doi.org/10.1145/800105.803416>
- [19] Thomas A. Henzinger. 1996. The Theory of Hybrid Automata. In *Proc. 11th IEEE Symp. Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*. IEEE, 278–292. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.1996.561342>
- [20] Thomas A. Henzinger, Marius Minea, and Vinayak S. Prabhu. 2001. Assume-Guarantee Reasoning for Hierarchical Hybrid Systems. In *Proc. 4th Intl. Workshop Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control (HSCC) (LNCS, Vol. 2034)*, Maria Domenica Di Benedetto and Alberto L. Sangiovanni-Vincentelli (Eds.). Springer, 275–290. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45351-2_24
- [21] C. A. R. Hoare. 1978. Communicating Sequential Processes. *Commun. ACM* 21, 8 (1978), 666–677. <https://doi.org/10.1145/359576.359585>
- [22] Jozef Hooman. 1987. A Compositional Proof Theory for Real-Time Distributed Message Passing. In *PARLE, Parallel Architectures and Languages Europe, Volume II: Parallel Languages, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, June 15-19, 1987, Proceedings (LNCS, Vol. 259)*, J. W. de Bakker, A. J. Nijman, and Philip C. Treleaven (Eds.). Springer, 315–332. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-17945-3_18
- [23] Jozef Hooman. 1991. *Specification and Compositional Verification of Real-Time Systems*. LNCS, Vol. 558. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-54947-1>
- [24] Jozef Hooman. 1992. A Compositional Approach to the Design of Hybrid Systems. In *Hybrid Systems (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 736)*, Robert L. Grossman, Anil Nerode, Anders P. Ravn, and Hans Rischel (Eds.). Springer, 121–148. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-57318-6_27
- [25] Jozef J. M. Hooman and Willem P. de Roever. 1992. An introduction to compositional methods for concurrency and their application to real-time. *Sādhanā* 17, 1 (1992), 29–73. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02811338>
- [26] He Jifeng. 1994. *A classical mind: essays in honour of C. A. R. Hoare*. Prentice Hall International, Chapter From CSP to Hybrid Systems, 171–189.
- [27] Eduard Kamburjan, Rudolf Schlatte, Einar Broch Johnsen, and Silvia Lizeth Tapia Tarifa. 2020. Designing Distributed Control with Hybrid Active Objects. In *Proc. 9th Intl. Symp. Leveraging Applications of Formal Methods : Tools and Trends (ISoLA) (LNCS, Vol. 12479)*, Tiziana Margaria and Bernhard Steffen (Eds.). Springer, 88–108. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-83723-5_7
- [28] Gary Levin and David Gries. 1981. A Proof Technique for Communicating Sequential Processes. *Acta Informatica* 15, 3 (1981), 281–302. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00289266>
- [29] LICS 2012. *Logic in Computer Science (LICS), 2012 27th Annual IEEE Symposium on*. IEEE, Los Alamitos.
- [30] Jiang Liu, Jidong Lv, Zhao Quan, Naijun Zhan, Hengjun Zhao, Chaochen Zhou, and Liang Zou. 2010. A Calculus for Hybrid CSP. In *Proc. 8th Asian Symp. Programming Languages and Systems (APLAS) (LNCS, Vol. 6461)*, Kazunori Ueda (Ed.). Springer, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-17164-2_1
- [31] Simon Lunel, Stefan Mitsch, Benoît Boyer, and Jean-Pierre Talpin. 2019. Parallel Composition and Modular Verification of Computer Controlled Systems in Differential Dynamic Logic. In *Proc. 3rd World Congr. Formal Methods - The Next 30 Years (FM) (LNCS, Vol. 11800)*, Maurice H. ter Beek, Annabelle McIver, and José N. Oliveira (Eds.). Springer, 354–370. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30942-8_22
- [32] Nancy A. Lynch, Roberto Segala, and Frits W. Vaandrager. 2003. Hybrid I/O automata. *Information and Computation* 185, 1 (2003), 105–157. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0890-5401\(03\)00067-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0890-5401(03)00067-1)

- [33] Ka L. Man, Michel A. Reniers, and Pieter J. L. Cuijpers. 2005. Case Studies in The Hybrid Process Algebra HyPA. *Int. J. Softw. Eng. Knowl. Eng.* 15, 2 (2005), 299–306. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218194005002385>
- [34] Jayadev Misra and K. Mani Chandy. 1981. Proofs of Networks of Processes. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 7, 4 (1981), 417–426. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.1981.230844>
- [35] Andreas Müller, Stefan Mitsch, Werner Retschitzegger, Wieland Schwinger, and André Platzer. 2018. Tactical Contract Composition for Hybrid System Component Verification. *STTT* 20, 6 (2018), 615–643. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10009-018-0502-9> Special issue for selected papers from FASE'17.
- [36] Susan S. Owicki and David Gries. 1976. An Axiomatic Proof Technique for Parallel Programs I. *Acta Informatica* 6 (1976), 319–340. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00268134>
- [37] David Peleg. 1987. Communication in Concurrent Dynamic Logic. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 35, 1 (1987), 23–58. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000\(87\)90035-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000(87)90035-3)
- [38] David Peleg. 1987. Concurrent dynamic logic. *J. ACM* 34, 2 (1987), 450–479. <https://doi.org/10.1145/23005.23008>
- [39] André Platzer. 2008. Differential Dynamic Logic for Hybrid Systems. *J. Autom. Reas.* 41, 2 (2008), 143–189. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10817-008-9103-8>
- [40] André Platzer. 2010. Differential-algebraic Dynamic Logic for Differential-algebraic Programs. *J. Log. Comput.* 20, 1 (2010), 309–352. <https://doi.org/10.1093/logcom/exn070>
- [41] André Platzer. 2010. Quantified Differential Dynamic Logic for Distributed Hybrid Systems. In *CSL (LNCS, Vol. 6247)*, Anuj Dawar and Helmut Veith (Eds.). Springer, 469–483. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15205-4_36
- [42] André Platzer. 2012. A Complete Axiomatization of Quantified Differential Dynamic Logic for Distributed Hybrid Systems. *Log. Meth. Comput. Sci.* 8, 4:17 (2012), 1–44. [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-8\(4:17\)2012](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-8(4:17)2012) Special issue for selected papers from CSL'10.
- [43] André Platzer. 2012. The Complete Proof Theory of Hybrid Systems, See [29], 541–550. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2012.64>
- [44] André Platzer. 2015. Differential Game Logic. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.* 17, 1 (2015), 1:1–1:51. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2817824>
- [45] André Platzer. 2016. Logic & Proofs for Cyber-Physical Systems. In *IJCAR (LNCS, Vol. 9706)*, Nicola Olivetti and Ashish Tiwari (Eds.). Springer, Cham, 15–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-40229-1_3
- [46] André Platzer. 2017. A Complete Uniform Substitution Calculus for Differential Dynamic Logic. *J. Autom. Reas.* 59, 2 (2017), 219–265. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10817-016-9385-1>
- [47] André Platzer. 2017. Differential Hybrid Games. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.* 18, 3 (2017), 19:1–19:44. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3091123>
- [48] André Platzer. 2018. *Logical Foundations of Cyber-Physical Systems*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63588-0>
- [49] André Platzer. 2019. Uniform Substitution At One Fell Swoop. In *CADE (LNCS, Vol. 11716)*, Pascal Fontaine (Ed.). Springer, 425–441. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-29436-6_25
- [50] André Platzer and Yong Kiam Tan. 2018. Differential Equation Axiomatization: The Impressive Power of Differential Ghosts. In *LICS*, Anuj Dawar and Erich Grädel (Eds.). ACM, New York, 819–828. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3209108.3209147>
- [51] André Platzer and Yong Kiam Tan. 2020. Differential Equation Invariance Axiomatization. *J. ACM* 67, 1 (2020), 6:1–6:66. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3380825>
- [52] Vaughan R. Pratt. 1976. Semantical Considerations on Floyd-Hoare Logic. In *17th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Houston, Texas, USA, 25-27 October 1976*. IEEE Computer Society, 109–121. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1976.27>
- [53] Krister Segerberg. 1982. A completeness theorem in the modal logic of programs. *Banach Center Publications* 9 (1982), 31–46.
- [54] Hosung Song, Kevin J. Compton, and William C. Rounds. 2005. SPHIN: A model checker for reconfigurable hybrid systems based on SPIN. In *Proc. 5th Intl. Workshop Automated Verification of Critical Systems (AVoCS) (ENTCS, Vol. 145)*, Ranko Lazic and Rajagopal Nagarajan (Eds.). Elsevier, 167–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcs.2005.10.011>
- [55] Shuling Wang, Naijun Zhan, and Dimitar P. Guelev. 2012. An Assume/Guarantee Based Compositional Calculus for Hybrid CSP. In *Proc. 9th Conf. Theory and Applications of Models of Computation (TAMC) (LNCS, Vol. 7287)*, Manindra Agrawal, S. Barry Cooper, and Angsheng Li (Eds.). Springer, 72–83. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-29952-0_13
- [56] Job Zwiers, Arie de Bruin, and Willem P. de Roever. 1983. A Proof System for Partial Correctness of Dynamic Networks of Processes (Extended Abstract). In *Proc. Carnegie Mellon Workshop Logics of Programs 1983 (LNCS, Vol. 164)*, Edmund M. Clarke and Dexter Kozen (Eds.). Springer, 513–527. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-12896-4_384
- [57] Job Zwiers, Willem P. de Roever, and Peter van Emde Boas. 1985. Compositionality and Concurrent Networks: Soundness and Completeness of a Proofsystem. In *Proc. 12th Intl. Coll. Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP) (LNCS, Vol. 194)*, Wilfried Brauer (Ed.). Springer, 509–519. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0015776>

ELECTRONIC APPENDIXES

The electronic appendixes make use of standard rules for sequent calculi [48] if proofs are presented in sequent style.

A DERIVED AXIOMS AND RULES

PROOF OF COROLLARY 3.4. This supplements the proof of Corollary 3.4 in Appendix A with additional explicit derivations. Ac-monotony $M[\cdot]_{AC}$ derives as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{P}{A_2 \rightarrow A_1} \quad \frac{G_{AC}}{C_2 \wedge A_2 \rightarrow A_1}}{[\alpha]_{\{T, C_2 \wedge A_2 \rightarrow A_1\}} T} \quad \frac{\frac{P}{C_1 \rightarrow C_2} \quad \frac{P}{\psi_1 \rightarrow \psi_2}}{(C_1 \rightarrow C_2) \wedge (\psi_1 \rightarrow \psi_2)} \quad \frac{G_{AC}}{[\alpha]_{\{A_1, C_1 \rightarrow C_2\}} (\psi_1 \rightarrow \psi_2)} \quad \frac{K_{AC}}{[\alpha]_{\{A_1, C_1\}} \psi_1 \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A_1, C_2\}} \psi_2}}{[\alpha]_{\{A_1, C_1\}} \psi_1 \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{T, C_2 \wedge A_2 \rightarrow A_1\}} T} \quad \frac{MP, P}{[\alpha]_{\{A_1, C_1\}} \psi_1 \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A_1, C_2\}} \psi_2} \quad \frac{W_A}{[\alpha]_{\{A_1, C_1\}} \psi_1 \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A_2, C_2\}} \psi_2}$$

The axiom $\boxed{W_A}$ derives as follows, where $W_A \equiv (A \wedge C_1 \rightarrow A_2) \wedge (A \wedge C_2 \rightarrow A_1)$:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{P}{W_A \vdash C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge A \rightarrow A_1 \wedge A_2} \quad *}{[\alpha]_{\{T, W_A\}} T \vdash [\alpha]_{\{T, C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge A \rightarrow A_1 \wedge A_2\}} T} \quad \frac{\frac{P}{[\alpha]_{\{A_1 \wedge A_2, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} \psi \vdash [\alpha]_{\{A_1 \wedge A_2, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} \psi} \quad *}{[\alpha]_{\{A_1 \wedge A_2, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} \psi \vdash [\alpha]_{\{T, C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge A \rightarrow A_1 \wedge A_2\}} T \wedge [\alpha]_{\{A_1 \wedge A_2, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} \psi} \quad \frac{M[\cdot]_{AC}}{[\alpha]_{\{T, W_A\}} T, [\alpha]_{\{A_1 \wedge A_2, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} \psi \vdash [\alpha]_{\{T, C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge A \rightarrow A_1 \wedge A_2\}} T \wedge [\alpha]_{\{A_1 \wedge A_2, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} \psi} \quad \frac{AR}{[\alpha]_{\{T, W_A\}} T, [\alpha]_{\{A_1 \wedge A_2, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} \psi \vdash [\alpha]_{\{A, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} \psi} \quad \frac{W_A}{[\alpha]_{\{T, W_A\}} T, [\alpha]_{\{A_1 \wedge A_2, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} \psi \vdash [\alpha]_{\{A, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} \psi} \quad \frac{\rightarrow R, \wedge L}{\vdash [\alpha]_{\{T, W_A\}} T \wedge [\alpha]_{\{A_1 \wedge A_2, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} \psi \rightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} \psi}$$

The proof rule $\boxed{\boxed{\boxed{\cdot}}}_{AC}$ derives as follows, where for both applications of axiom $\boxed{\boxed{\cdot}}_{AC}$ the side condition is fulfilled due to the side condition of the rule, and $W_A \equiv (A \wedge C_1 \rightarrow A_2) \wedge (A \wedge C_2 \rightarrow A_1)$:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{G_{AC}}{\vdash W_A} \quad \frac{M[\cdot]_{AC}}{\Gamma \vdash [\alpha_1 \parallel \alpha_2]_{\{T, W_A\}} T, \Delta}}{\Gamma \vdash [\alpha_1 \parallel \alpha_2]_{\{T, W_A\}} T, \Delta} \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{M[\cdot]_{AC}}{\Gamma \vdash [\alpha_1 \parallel \alpha_2]_{\{A_1, C_1\}} \psi_1, \Delta} \quad \frac{M[\cdot]_{AC}}{\Gamma \vdash [\alpha_1 \parallel \alpha_2]_{\{A_2, C_2\}} \psi_2, \Delta}}{\Gamma \vdash [\alpha_1 \parallel \alpha_2]_{\{A_1 \wedge A_2, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} \psi_1 \wedge [\alpha_1 \parallel \alpha_2]_{\{A_1 \wedge A_2, C_2\}} \psi_2, \Delta} \quad \frac{M[\cdot]_{AC}}{\Gamma \vdash [\alpha_1 \parallel \alpha_2]_{\{A_1 \wedge A_2, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} \psi_1 \wedge [\alpha_1 \parallel \alpha_2]_{\{A_1 \wedge A_2, C_2\}} \psi_2, \Delta} \quad \frac{AR}{\Gamma \vdash [\alpha_1 \parallel \alpha_2]_{\{A_1 \wedge A_2, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2), \Delta}}{\Gamma \vdash [\alpha_1 \parallel \alpha_2]_{\{A_1 \wedge A_2, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2), \Delta} \quad \frac{\boxed{\boxed{\cdot}}_{AC} \wedge}{\Gamma \vdash [\alpha_1 \parallel \alpha_2]_{\{A, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2), \Delta} \quad \frac{\boxed{W_A}}{\Gamma \vdash [\alpha_1 \parallel \alpha_2]_{\{A, C_1 \wedge C_2\}} (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2), \Delta}$$

□

B DETAILS OF THE EXAMPLE

This appendix provides derivations of the open premises of Example 3.5. The proof rule FOL denotes first-order reasoning. For $ch \in \{\text{vel}, \text{pos}\}$, let $\text{since}_\mu(h \downarrow ch) \equiv \mu - \text{time}_{\mu_0}(h \downarrow ch)$, i.e., the time elapsed since last communication along ch recorded by h , and let $\text{till}_\mu(h \downarrow ch) \equiv \epsilon - \text{since}_\mu(h \downarrow ch)$, i.e., the time till the next communication along ch .

| | |
|--|---|
| $*$ | |
| $F, H, d > \epsilon V, t \geq 0, \forall 0 \leq s \leq t \ w + s \leq \epsilon \vdash F(h_0, v_{tar}, x_f + t \cdot v_{tar}, w + t)$ | |
| $F, H, d > \epsilon V, t \geq 0, \forall 0 \leq s \leq t \ w + s \leq \epsilon \vdash [x_f := x_f + t \cdot v_{tar}; w := w + t]F(h_0, v_{tar}, x_f, w)$ | [!] _{AC} , [:=] |
| $F, H, d > \epsilon V \vdash \forall t \geq 0 \ ((\forall 0 \leq s \leq t \ w + s \leq \epsilon) \rightarrow [x_f := x_f + t \cdot v_{tar}; w := w + t]F(h_0, v_{tar}))$ | VR, \rightarrow R |
| $F, H, d > \epsilon V \vdash [\text{plant}_f(v_{tar})]F(h_0, v_{tar})$ | ['] |
| $F, H, d > \epsilon V \vdash [v_f := v_{tar}][\text{plant}_f(v_f)]F(h_0, v_f)$ | [:=] ▷ Fig. 13b |
| $F, H \vdash [\text{if}(d > \epsilon V) v_f := v_{tar} \ \text{fi}][\text{plant}_f]F(h_0)$ | [if] |
| $F \vdash [\text{vel}(h)?v_{tar}]_{\{A,T\}}[\text{if}(d > \epsilon V) v_f := v_{tar} \ \text{fi}][\text{plant}_f]F(h)$ | [?x] _{AC} R |
| $F \vdash [\text{vel}(h)?v_{tar}]_{\{A,T\}}[\text{if}(d > \epsilon V) v_f := v_{tar} \ \text{fi}]_{\{A,T\}}[\text{plant}_f]F$ | M[·] _{AC} , [!] _{T,T} |
| $F \vdash [\text{velo}]_{\{A,T\}}[\text{plant}_f]F$ | [!] _{AC} ▷ Fig. 14a |
| $F \vdash [\text{velo}]_{\{A,T\}}[\text{plant}_f]F \wedge [\text{dist}]_{\{A,T\}}[\text{plant}_f]F$ | AR |
| $\text{by } [!]AC, M[·]AC, [!]T,T, [U]AC$ | |
| $F \vdash [(\text{velo} \cup \text{dist}); \text{plant}_f]_{\{A,T\}}F$ | |
| $\mu_0 = \mu, \Gamma \vdash [\text{follower}^*]_{\{A,T\}}x_f < \text{val}_{x_0}(h \downarrow \text{pos})$ | loop _{AC} |
| $\Gamma \vdash [\text{follower}^*]_{\{A,T\}}x_f < \text{val}_{x_0}(h \downarrow \text{pos})$ | FOL |

(a) Note that $M[·]_{AC}$ and $[!]_{T,T}$ drop the assumption

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| $*$ | |
| $F, H, d \leq \epsilon V, t \geq 0, \forall 0 \leq s \leq t \ w + s \leq \epsilon \vdash F(h_0, x_f + t \cdot v_f, w + t)$ | |
| $F, H, d \leq \epsilon V, t \geq 0, \forall 0 \leq s \leq t \ w + s \leq \epsilon \vdash [x_f := x_f + t \cdot v_f; w := w + t]F(h_0, x_f, w)$ | [!] _{AC} , [:=] |
| $F, H, d \leq \epsilon V \vdash \forall t \geq 0 \ ((\forall 0 \leq s \leq t \ w + s \leq \epsilon) \rightarrow [x_f := x_f + t \cdot v_f; w := w + t]F(h_0))$ | VR, \rightarrow R |
| $F, H, d \leq \epsilon V \vdash [\text{plant}_f]F(h_0)$ | ['] |

(b)

$$\Gamma \equiv h_0 = h, x_0 = x_I, \varphi$$

$$F \equiv 0 \leq v_f \leq d/\epsilon \wedge v_f \leq V \wedge x_f + \text{till}_\mu(h \downarrow \text{pos})d/\epsilon < \text{val}_{x_0}(h \downarrow \text{pos}) \wedge w = \text{since}_\mu(h \downarrow \text{pos}) \leq \epsilon$$

$$H \equiv h_0 = h \cdot \langle \text{vel}, v_{tar}, \mu \rangle, A(h_0)$$

Fig. 13. Derivation of the subproof about the follower in Fig. 8

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| $*$ | $F, H, D, 0 \leq v_0 < d/\epsilon, w = 0, t \geq 0, \forall 0 \leq s \leq t \ w + s \leq \epsilon \vdash F(h_0, v_0, x_f + t \cdot v_0, w + t)$ | |
| | $F, H, D, 0 \leq v_0 < d/\epsilon, w = 0, t \geq 0, \forall 0 \leq s \leq t \ w + s \leq \epsilon \vdash [x_f := x_f + t \cdot v_0; w := w + t]F(h_0, v_0, x_f, w)$ | [i], [:=] |
| | $F, H, D, 0 \leq v_0 < d/\epsilon, w = 0 \vdash \forall t \geq 0 \ ((\forall 0 \leq s \leq t \ w + s \leq \epsilon) \rightarrow [x_f := x_f + t \cdot v_0; w := w + t]F(h_0, v_0))$ | VR, \rightarrow R |
| | $F, H, D, 0 \leq v_0 < d/\epsilon, w = 0 \vdash [\text{plant}_f(v_0)]F(h_0, v_0)$ | ['] |
| | $F, H, D \vdash [?0 \leq v_0 < d/\epsilon][w := 0][\text{plant}_f(v_0)]F(h_0, v_0)$ | [?], \rightarrow R, [:=] |
| | $F, H, D \vdash \forall v_f [?0 \leq v_f < d/\epsilon][w := 0][\text{plant}_f(v_f)]F(h_0, v_f)$ | VR |
| | $F, H, D \vdash [v_f := *; ?0 \leq v_f < d/\epsilon][w := 0][\text{plant}_f]F(h_0)$ | [i], [*] ▷ Fig. 14b |
| | $F, H, d = m - x_f \vdash [\text{if}(d \leq \epsilon V) \{v_f := *; ?0 \leq v_f < d/\epsilon\} \text{fi}; w := 0][\text{plant}_f]F(h_0)$ | [i], [if] |
| | $F, H \vdash [d := m - x_f; \text{if}(d \leq \epsilon V) \{v_f := *; ?0 \leq v_f < d/\epsilon\} \text{fi}; w := 0][\text{plant}_f]F(h_0)$ | [i], [:=] |
| | $F \vdash [\text{pos}(h)?m]_{\{A(h), T\}} [d := m - x_f; \text{if}(d \leq \epsilon V) \{v_f := *; ?0 \leq v_f < d/\epsilon\} \text{fi}; w := 0][\text{plant}_f]F(h)$ | [?x] \mathcal{A}^R |
| | $F \vdash [\text{pos}(h)?m]_{\{A, T\}} [d := m - x_f; \text{if}(d \leq \epsilon V) \{v_f := *; ?0 \leq v_f < d/\epsilon\} \text{fi}; w := 0]_{\{A, T\}} [\text{plant}_f]F$ | $M[\cdot]_{\mathcal{A}}, [\cdot]_{T, T}$ |
| | $F \vdash [\text{dist}]_{\{A, T\}} [\text{plant}_f]F$ | [i] \mathcal{A} |

(a)

| | | |
|-----|--|---------------------|
| $*$ | $F, H, D, 0 \leq v_0 < d/\epsilon, w = 0, t \geq 0, \forall 0 \leq s \leq t \ w + s \leq \epsilon \vdash F(h_0, x_f + t \cdot v_0, w + t)$ | |
| | $F, H, D, 0 \leq v_0 < d/\epsilon, w = 0, t \geq 0, \forall 0 \leq s \leq t \ w + s \leq \epsilon \vdash [x_f := x_f + t \cdot v_f; w := w + t]F(h_0, x_f, w)$ | [i], [:=] |
| | $F, H, D, 0 \leq v_0 < d/\epsilon, w = 0 \vdash \forall t \geq 0 \ ((\forall 0 \leq s \leq t \ w + s \leq \epsilon) \rightarrow [x_f := x_f + t \cdot v_f; w := w + t]F(h_0))$ | VR, \rightarrow R |
| | $F, H, d = m - x_f, d > \epsilon V, w = 0 \vdash [\text{plant}_f]F(h_0)$ | ['] |
| | $F, H, d = m - x_f, d > \epsilon V \vdash [w := 0][\text{plant}_f]F(h_0)$ | [:=] |

(b)

$$\begin{aligned}
F &\equiv 0 \leq v_f \leq d/\epsilon \wedge v_f \leq V \wedge x_f + \text{till}_\mu(h \downarrow \text{pos})d/\epsilon < \text{val}_{x_0}(h \downarrow \text{pos}) \wedge w = \text{since}_\mu(h \downarrow \text{pos}) \leq \epsilon \\
H &\equiv h_0 = h \cdot \langle \text{pos}, m, \mu \rangle, A(h_0) \\
D &\equiv d = m - x_f, d \leq \epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 14

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| $*$ | $L, 0 \leq v_0 \leq V, h_0 = h \cdot \langle \text{vel}, v_0, \mu \rangle, t \geq 0 \vdash L(h_0, x_l + t \cdot v_0)$ | |
| | $L, 0 \leq v_0 \leq V, h_0 = h \cdot \langle \text{vel}, v_0, \mu \rangle \vdash \forall t \geq 0 [x_l := x_l + t \cdot v_0] L(h_0, x_l)$ | VR, [:=] |
| | $L, 0 \leq v_0 \leq V, h_0 = h \cdot \langle \text{vel}, v_0, \mu \rangle \vdash [\text{plant}_l(v_0)] L(h_0)$ | ['] |
| | $L, 0 \leq v_0 \leq V, h_0 = h \cdot \langle \text{vel}, v_0, \mu \rangle \vdash [\text{plant}_l(v_0)]_{\{T, C(h_0)\}} L(h_0)$ | ▷ by FOL [ε] _{AC} , AR |
| | $L, 0 \leq v_0 \leq V \vdash [\text{vel}(h)!v_0]_{\{T, C(h)\}} [\text{plant}_l(v_0)]_{\{T, C(h)\}} L(h)$ | ▷ Fig. 15b [!θ] _{AC} ^R |
| | $L, 0 \leq v_0 \leq V \vdash [\text{vel}(h)!v_0 \cup \text{skip}]_{\{T, C\}} [\text{plant}_l(v_0)]_{\{T, C\}} L$ | [∪] _{AC} |
| | $L \vdash [?0 \leq v_0 \leq V][\text{vel}(h)!v_0 \cup \text{skip}]_{\{T, C\}} [\text{plant}_l(v_0)]_{\{T, C\}} L$ | [?], → ^R |
| | $L \vdash [v_l := *; ?0 \leq v_l \leq V][\text{vel}(h)!v_l \cup \text{skip}]_{\{T, C\}} [\text{plant}_l(v_l)]_{\{T, C\}} L$ | ▷ by FOL [;], [*], VR |
| | $L \vdash [v_l := *; ?0 \leq v_l \leq V]_{\{T, C\}} [\text{vel}(h)!v_l \cup \text{skip}]_{\{T, C\}} [\text{plant}_l]_{\{T, C\}} L$ | [ε] _{AC} , AR |
| | $L \vdash [\text{comm}]_{\{T, C\}} [\text{plant}_l]_{\{T, C\}} L$ | ▷ Fig. 15c [;] _{AC} |
| | $L \vdash [\text{comm}]_{\{T, C\}} [\text{plant}_l]_{\{T, C\}} L \wedge [\text{upd}]_{\{T, C\}} [\text{plant}_l]_{\{T, C\}} L$ | AR |
| | $L \vdash [(\text{comm} \cup \text{upd}); \text{plant}_l]_{\{T, C\}} L$ | [;] _{AC} , [∪] _{AC} |
| | $\Gamma \vdash [\text{leader}^*]_{\{T, C\}} \text{val}_{x_0}(h \downarrow \text{pos}) \leq x_l$ | loop _{AC} |

(a) The proof uses that $[\alpha]_{\{A, C\}} [\beta]_{\{A, C\}} \psi \leftrightarrow [\alpha]_{\{A, C\}} [\beta] \psi$ derives if β is sufficiently simple.

| | | |
|-----|---|---------------------------------|
| $*$ | $L, 0 \leq v_0 \leq V, t \geq 0 \vdash L(x_l + t \cdot v_0)$ | |
| | $L, 0 \leq v_0 \leq V \vdash \forall t \geq 0 [x_l := x_l + t \cdot v_0] L(x_l)$ | VR, [:=] |
| | $L, 0 \leq v_0 \leq V \vdash [\text{plant}_l(v_0)] L$ | ['] |
| | $L, 0 \leq v_0 \leq V, \vdash [\text{plant}_l(v_0)]_{\{T, C\}} L$ | ▷ by FOL [ε] _{AC} , AR |
| | $L, 0 \leq v_0 \leq V, \vdash [\text{skip}] [\text{plant}_l(v_0)]_{\{T, C\}} L$ | ▷ by FOL [ε] _{AC} , AR |
| | $L, 0 \leq v_0 \leq V \vdash [\text{skip}]_{\{T, C(h)\}} [\text{plant}_l(v_0)]_{\{T, C(h)\}} L$ | |

(b)

| | | |
|-----|--|---------------------------------|
| $*$ | $L, h_0 = h \cdot \langle \text{pos}, x_l, \mu \rangle, t \geq 0 \vdash L(h_0, x_l + t \cdot v_l)$ | |
| | $L, h_0 = h \cdot \langle \text{pos}, x_l, \mu \rangle \vdash \forall t \geq 0 [x_l := x_l + t \cdot v_l] L(h_0, x_l)$ | VR, [:=] |
| | $L, h_0 = h \cdot \langle \text{pos}, x_l, \mu \rangle \vdash [\text{plant}_l] L(h_0)$ | ['] |
| | $L, h_0 = h \cdot \langle \text{pos}, x_l, \mu \rangle \vdash [\text{plant}_l]_{\{T, C(h_0)\}} L(h_0)$ | ▷ by FOL [ε] _{AC} , AR |
| | $L \vdash [\text{pos}(h)!x_l]_{\{T, C(h)\}} [\text{plant}_l]_{\{T, C(h)\}} L(h)$ | [!θ] _{AC} ^R |

(c)

$$\Gamma \equiv h_0 = h, x_0 = x_l, \varphi$$

$$L \equiv \text{val}_{x_0}(h \downarrow \text{pos}) \leq x_l \wedge C$$

Fig. 15. Derivation of the subproof about the leader in Fig. 8

This figure "acm-jdslogo.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2408.05012v1>