

Enhancing Inductive Entailment Proofs in Separation Logic with Lemma Synthesis

Quang Loc Le *

Teesside University, UK

Abstract. This paper presents an approach to lemma synthesis to support advanced inductive entailment procedures based on separation logic. We first propose a mechanism where lemmas are automatically proven and systematically applied. Our lemmas may include *universal* guard and/or *unknown* predicate. While the former is critical for expressivity, the latter is essential for supporting relationships between multiple predicates. We further introduce lemma synthesis to support (i) automated inductive reasoning together with frame inference and (ii) theorem exploration. For (i) we automatically discover and prove auxiliary lemmas during an inductive proof; and for (ii) we automatically generate a useful set of lemmas to relate user-defined or system-generated predicates. We have implemented our proposed approach into an existing verification system and tested its capability in inductive reasoning and theorem exploration. The experimental results show that the enhanced system can automatically synthesize useful lemmas to facilitate reasoning on a broad range of non-trivial inductive proofs.

Keywords: Lemma Synthesis, Induction Proving, Theorem Exploration, Separation Logic, User-Defined Predicate.

1 Introduction

Separation logic (SL) [20,36] has been well established for reasoning about heap-based programs. Frame rule in SL enables modular (compositional) reasoning in the presence of the heap and is essential for scalability [22,43,10]. In the last decade, a large number of proof systems for SL have been studied [4,7,10,18,11,27]. Generally speaking, the key challenges of these systems are to support bi-abduction (automated frame inference [4,11] and logical abduction [10,24,42]), and automated induction proving [7] in SL fragments with inductive predicates. While the use of general inductive predicates attains expressive power, a powerful entailment procedure supporting the inductive predicates needs to meet the following two main challenges.

Induction Reasoning. Entailment checks involving inductive predicates normally require induction. For an indirect solution, existing works employed lemmas that are consequences of induction. These lemmas were either hardwired for a set of predefined predicates (i.e. lists [4]), or automatically generated (for normalization of shape analysis [24], or for some predefined classes of predicates [17]). While these lemma approaches

* This work was done in part when the author was a PhD student in National University of Singapore.

can handle induction reasoning for some specific predicates, they could not support induction in general proofs. Brotherston et. al. make an important step towards automating general induction reasoning in SL with cyclic entailment proofs [7,9]. Recently, authors in [12] managed induction by a framework with historical proofs. However, these proof systems [7,12] did not consider frame inference. Thus, they provide limited support for the frame rule as well as *modular* verification.

Completeness. Past works introduce decision procedures for SL decidable fragments including hardwired lists [4,5,14,31], or even user-defined predicates with some syntactic restrictions [18]. However, the SL fragment with (arbitrary) user-defined predicates (and arithmetic constraints) is, in general, undecidable. Entailment procedures for this general fragment typically trade off completeness for expressiveness [7,11,16,27]. To enhance the completeness of program verification, there have been efforts of exploring relations between predicates via *user-supplied* lemmas [4,7,9,16,22,30]. While such a static approach puts creative control back into the users' hands, it is not fully automatic and is infeasible to support inductive proofs relying on auxiliary lemmas of dynamically synthesized predicates (like those in [8,24]).

In this work, we propose an approach to lemma synthesis for advanced inductive proofs in a SL fragment with user-defined predicates and Presburger arithmetic. Our technical starting point is an entailment procedure for user-defined predicates (i.e. those procedures in the spirit of [11]) combined with second-order bi-abduction [24]. We extend this proof system with a new mechanism where lemmas are automatically generated, proven and systematically applied. Finally, we apply lemma synthesis into theorem exploration.

Frame inference has been studied in SL entailment procedures like [4,11,32]. Intuitively, these systems prove validity of an entailment $\Delta_a \vdash \Delta_c$ by unfolding user-defined predicates, subtracting heap predicates until halting at sequents with *empty* heap (i.e. the *emp* predicate in SL) in the consequent, such that $\Delta_f \vdash \text{emp} \wedge \pi_r$, and then, conclude the entailment is valid with the frame Δ_f , denoted by $\Delta_a \vdash \Delta_c \rightsquigarrow \Delta_f$. However, these systems did not provide a direct solution for general induction proofs. We tackle this challenging of frame inference for inductive entailment proofs via the new lemma synthesis. Our key insight is that the entailment check $\Delta_a \vdash \Delta_c \rightsquigarrow \Delta_f$ is semantically equivalent to the check $\Delta_a \vdash \Delta_c * \Delta_f \rightsquigarrow \text{emp}$. To infer frame for inductive entailment checks like the former, we will prove the latter check inductively while inferring frame Δ_f abductively. Concretely, we assume frame as an unknown predicate U , construct the conjecture $\text{lemma } l_1: \Delta_a \rightarrow \Delta_c * U$, and finally inductively prove this lemma and abductively infer a definition of the predicate U . The benefit of the use of lemma synthesis in our approach is twofold. First, our proposed approach is easily integrated into existing proof systems with lemma mechanism i.e. [30,16]. Second, the synthesized lemmas (i.e. l_1) are accumulated for reuse in future.

Lemmas in our system may include universally quantified guards and unknown predicates. We will use the notation $\Delta[\bar{v}]$ to stand for a formula with free variables \bar{v} . Our lemmas with universal guards¹ have the form $\forall \bar{v} \cdot H(\bar{v}) \wedge G(\bar{v}) \rightarrow B(\bar{v})$ whereas universal guard G and body B may include unknown predicates whose definitions need to be inferred. While guards over universal variables make our mechanism very ex-

¹ We will refer lemma with universal guard as universal lemma.

pressive, unknown predicates enable us to synthesize generic lemmas i.e. those with weak(est) guards and strong(est) bodies. The meaning of lemmas is interpreted in classic semantics [20] i.e. for the lemma above $\forall \bar{v} \cdot H(\bar{v}) \wedge G(\bar{v}) \models B(\bar{v})$; the LHS exactly entails the RHS (with empty heap in residue). Our lemma proving is based on the principle of cyclic proof [7,9], and can support induction proving. For universal lemma synthesis, given the entailment check $\exists \bar{e} \cdot \Delta_a \wedge G(\bar{e}) \vdash \Delta_c$, our system would generate the lemma $\text{lemma } l_2: \forall \bar{e} \cdot \Delta_a \wedge P(\bar{e}) \rightarrow \Delta_c$, whereas P is a newly-inferred predicate.

Our predicate inference mechanism is based on the principle of second-order bi-abduction (SOBD), for shape domain [24] and for pure (non-shape) domains [42], which is an extension of bi-abduction [10] to user-defined predicates. A SOBD entailment procedure takes two SL formulas Δ_{ante} and Δ_{conseq} as inputs. It infers missing hypotheses $\mathcal{R}?$ and residual frame $\Delta_{frame}?$. $\mathcal{R}?$ is a set of Horn clause-based constraints over unknown variables of Δ_{ante} and Δ_{conseq} . These constraints have the form of logical implication i.e. $\Delta_L \Rightarrow \Delta_R$. The set $\mathcal{R}?$ can be solved to obtain definitions of the unknown predicates by the algorithms in [24,42].

In inductive reasoning, theory exploration is a technique for automatically generating and proving useful lemmas for sets of given functions, constants and datatypes [13,23,28]. In our context, theory exploration is meant for discovering useful lemmas for a set of given user-defined predicates. In SL, this technique was indeed presented [4,17]. Like [17] and unlike [4], our approach is automation-based. Different from these, our technique is capable of generating lemmas with newly-inferred user-defined predicates i.e. those that are synthesized while proving the lemmas.

The novelty of our proof system is the lemma synthesis with predicate inference. Our primary contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose a new mechanism where universal lemmas are soundly synthesized and systematically applied.
- We synthesize lemmas to support inductive proofs together with frame inference and theorem exploration.
- We have implemented the proposal in an entailment procedure, called S , and integrated S into a modular verification. Our experiments on sophisticated inductive proofs show that our approach is promising for advancing state-of-the-art in automated verification of heap-manipulating programs.

2 Motivation and Overview

2.1 Entailment Procedure using Universal Lemma Synthesis

We extend an entailment procedure with basic inference rules (i.e. [7,11]) to inference capability with the second-order bi-abduction (SOBD) mechanism [24] and a new lemma mechanism. This lemma mechanism enhances the inference rules with a set of external and proven lemmas L . These lemmas can be initially supplied by users as well as additionally and dynamically synthesized while the entailment is proven. The enhanced entailment procedure is formalized as follows: $\Delta_{ante} \vdash_L \Delta_{conseq} \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}, \Delta_{frame})$ such that: $L \wedge \mathcal{R} \wedge \Delta_{ante} \models \Delta_{conseq} * \Delta_{frame}$. Consequently, inference rules of the starting system are using the augmented lemmas L in the new system as the following:

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{\Delta_{l_1} \vdash \Delta_{r_1} \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}_1, \Delta_{R_1}) \quad \dots \quad \Delta_{l_i} \vdash \Delta_{r_i} \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}_i, \Delta_{R_i})}{\Delta_1 \vdash \Delta_2 \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}, \Delta_R)} \\ \implies \frac{\Delta_{l_1} \vdash_L \Delta_{r_1} \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}_1, \Delta_{R_1}) \quad \dots \quad \Delta_{l_i} \vdash_L \Delta_{r_i} \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}_i, \Delta_{R_i})}{\Delta_1 \vdash_L \Delta_2 \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}, \Delta_R)} \end{array}$$

For a standard proof system for SL with inductive predicates, please refer to [11]. (A summary is presented in App. A.) We shall propose $\boxed{\text{LAPP}}$ and $\boxed{\text{LAPP}-\forall}$ rules for lemma application (Sec. 4), $\boxed{\text{LSYN}}$ rule for lemma synthesis, $\boxed{\text{R*}}$ rule for heap split, and $\boxed{\text{AU}}$, $\boxed{\text{AF}}$, $\boxed{\text{AU}-\text{P}}$, $\boxed{\text{AF}-\text{P}}$ rules for predicate inference (Sec. 5).

To illustrate how our proof system can support induction reasoning together with complex frame inference, consider the following entailment check VC_0

$\text{ll_last}(t, t') * \text{ll}(y) \vdash_{\emptyset} t' \mapsto_{c_1}(q)$

$\text{pred ll}(\text{root}) \equiv \text{emp} \wedge \text{root} = \text{null} \vee \exists q. \text{root} \mapsto_{c_1}(q) * \text{ll}(q)$
 $\text{pred ll_last}(\text{root}, s) \equiv \text{root} \mapsto_{c_1}(\text{null}) \wedge \text{root} = s \vee \exists q. \text{root} \mapsto_{c_1}(q) * \text{ll_last}(q, s);$
 whereas $\text{struct } c_1\{c_1 * \text{next};\}$. VC_0 is a verification condition generated to verify memory safety of programs that access the last element (i.e. `g_list_append` in `glist.c` of GLIB library [1] - see App. C.2). In the predicate definitions above, we use basic SL notations to express heaps, e.g. empty predicate (i.e. `emp`), points-to predicate (i.e. $\text{root} \mapsto_{c_1}(p)$ asserts a concrete heap cell bound with an allocated data type c_1 , pointed-to by the variable `root` and linked with downstream pointer p via the field `next`).

To infer frame for this inductive entailment check, we assume the frame be a unknown predicate, i.e. $\text{U}_2(t, t', q, y)$, and form the following conjecture:

$$\text{lemma } c: \text{ll_last}(t, t') * \text{ll}(y) \rightarrow t' \mapsto_{c_1}(q) * \text{U}_2(t, t', q, y)$$

Then, we prove its validity and infer a set of relational assumptions as:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1: * \text{ll}(y) \wedge t' = t \wedge q = \text{null} &\Rightarrow \text{U}_2(t, t', q, y) \\ \sigma_2: t \mapsto_{c_1}(q_1) * \text{U}_2(q_1, t', q_2, y) &\Rightarrow \text{U}_2(t, t', q_2, y) \end{aligned}$$

From σ_1 and σ_2 , we synthesize the following definition for U_2

$$\text{U}_2(\text{root}, t', q, y) \equiv \text{ll}(y) \wedge \text{root} = t' \wedge q = \text{null} \vee \exists q_1. \text{root} \mapsto_{c_1}(q_1) * \text{U}_2(q_1, t', q, y);$$

Finally, using theorem exploration presented in Sec 6 (and App. B), we generate the following two-way *separating* lemmas² to normalize the predicate U_2 :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{lemma } \text{conseq}_0: \text{U}_2(\text{root}, t', q, y) &\leftrightarrow \text{U}_3(\text{root}, t') * \text{ll}(y) \wedge q = \text{null} \\ \text{U}_3(\text{root}, t') &\equiv \text{emp} \wedge \text{root} = t' \vee \exists q_1. \text{root} \mapsto_{c_1}(q_1) * \text{U}_3(q_1, t'); \end{aligned}$$

To sum up, our system successfully proves and derives $\text{U}_3(t, t') * \text{ll}(y) \wedge q = \text{null}$ as frame of VC_0 . We present an example for universal lemma synthesis in App. C.1.

2.2 Modular Verification with Lemma Synthesis

```
1 void check(struct c2* a)
2 { while(a->val==1)a=a->next;
3   while(a->val==2)a=a->next;
4   assert a->val==3;
5   return; }
```

Fig. 1. Code of method check.

In modular verification of heap-based programs, specifications of recursive methods and loop invariants normally relate to recursive predicates; consequently, compositionally verifying these specifications requires both induction reasoning and frame inference. Our proposed approach brings the best support for such verification.

² We refer $A \leftrightarrow B$ as two-way lemma, a short form of two reverse lemmas: $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow A$.

Consider the code fragment in Fig. 1. This code fragment checks whether list segment pointed by a is decomposed into three regions: a list segment of 1 values (the `while` loop at line 2), a list segment of 2 values (the `while` loop at line 3), and a 3-value node (the assertion at line 4). We assume that the method `check` (`while` loop at line 2, line 3) has been supplied with the s_1 (s_2 , and s_3 resp.) specification as:

(s_1) `requires ls1(a,p1)*ls2(p1,p2)*p2→c2(3,null) ensures true;`
 (s_2) `requires ls1(a,p3)*p3→c2(v1,p4)∧v1≠1 ensures ls1(a,p3)*p3→c2(v1,p4)∧a'=p3;`
 (s_3) `requires ls2(a,p5)*p5→c2(v2,p6)∧v2≠2 ensures ls2(a,p5)*p5→c2(v2,p6)∧a'=p5;`

whereas a' is value of a after the loop; the data structure and the predicates `ls1`, `ls2` are defined as: `struct c2{int val; struct c2* next; }`

`pred ls1(root,s)≡emp∧root=s` `pred ls2(root,s)≡emp∧root=s`
`∨ ∃ q. root→c2(1,q)*ls1(q,s);` `∨ ∃ q. root→c2(2,q)*ls2(q,s);`

As a (bottom-up) modular verification, the loops are verified prior to the verification of the method `check`; and the correctness of a method is reduced to the validity of appropriate verification conditions generated. Our system generates verification conditions to ensure absence of memory errors (no null dereference, no double free and no memory leak), validity of functional calls/loops via compositional pre-/post- conditions and post-conditions holding. For illustrating the proposed approach, we briefly discuss the reasoning on the verification condition (VC_1) that was generated before the loop at line 2 (to prove that the current context can imply the loop invariant):

$$ls1(a,p_1)*ls2(p_1,p_2)*p_2 \mapsto c_2(3, \text{null}) \vdash_{\emptyset} ls1(a,p_3)*p_3 \mapsto c_2(v_1,p_4) \wedge v_1 \neq 1$$

(The lemma store $L=\emptyset$ means there are no user-supplied lemmas.) VC_1 requires both induction reasoning (for the `ls1` a, p_1 predicate) and frame inference to prove safety of the rest of the program. Hence, this entailment is beyond the capability of most existing SL verification systems (like [30,7,11,27,32]).

Instead of instantiating and deducing a frame like [4,11], we assume frame as an unknown predicate and infer this predicate via abduction. This inference was implemented in the proposed inference rule `[LSYN]`. Concretely, the proof of VC_1 is as follows:

$$\frac{\text{lemsyn}(\Delta_a, \Delta_c, \emptyset) \rightsquigarrow (\text{lemma } l_3: \Delta_l \rightarrow \Delta_r * U(\text{root}, p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4, v_1), \text{true})}{\begin{array}{l} ls1(a,p_1)*ls2(p_1,p_2)*p_2 \mapsto c_2(3, \text{null}) \vdash_{\emptyset} \Delta_l[a/\text{root}] \rightsquigarrow \text{emp} \wedge \text{true} \\ \hline ls1(a,p_1)*ls2(p_1,p_2)*p_2 \mapsto c_2(3, \text{null}) \\ \vdash_{\emptyset} ls1(a,p_3)*p_3 \mapsto c_2(v_1,p_4) * U(\bar{v}) \wedge v_1 \neq 1 \rightsquigarrow (\text{true}, U(\bar{v})) \end{array}}$$

whereas $U(\bar{w}) \equiv U(a\#, p_1, p_2, p_3\#, p_4, v_1)$. The lemma l_3 was synthesized as

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{lemma } l_3: ls1(\text{root}, p_1) * ls2(p_1, p_2) * p_2 \mapsto c_2(3, \text{null}) \\ \rightarrow ls1(\text{root}, p_3) * p_3 \mapsto c_2(v_1, p_4) * U(\text{root}, p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4, v_1) \wedge v_1 \neq 1 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{pred } U(a, p_1, p_2, p_3, \text{root}, v_1) \equiv \text{root} = \text{null} \wedge a = p_1 \wedge p_1 = p_2 \wedge a = p_3 \wedge v_1 = 3 \\ \vee \text{root} \mapsto c_2(v'_1, v'_4) * U(a, p_1, p_2, p_3, v'_4, v'_1) \wedge a = p_1 \wedge a = p_3 \wedge v_1 = 2 \wedge v'_1 \neq 1 \end{array}$$

The proof derived for the lemma l_3 will be presented in detail in Sec 5.2.

For automation, we integrated the proposed proof system into S2 [24], a specification inference system. Simultaneously, we enhanced S2 beyond the shape domain. We show how the proposed lemma synthesis was integrated into a modular verification with incremental specification inference over shape and size properties in App. C.3.

3 Preliminaries

A Fragment of Separation Logic. The syntax of the fragment is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &::= \Delta \mid \Phi_1 \vee \Phi_2 & \Delta &::= \exists \bar{v}. (\kappa \wedge \pi) & \kappa &::= \text{emp} \mid r \mapsto c(\bar{t}) \mid P(\bar{t}) \mid U(\bar{t}) \mid \kappa_1 * \kappa_2 \\ \pi &::= \pi \wedge \phi \mid \phi \mid p(\bar{t}) & \phi &::= \alpha \mid i \mid \exists v. \phi \mid \forall v. \phi \mid \neg \phi \mid \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \mid \phi_1 \vee \phi_2 \\ \text{pred } P(\bar{v}) &\equiv \Phi(\bar{v}) & c &\in \text{Data Types} & t_i, v, r &\in \text{Var} & \bar{t} \equiv t_1, \dots, t_n \end{aligned}$$

A formula Φ can be a disjunctive formula ($\Phi_1 \vee \Phi_2$). A conjunctive formula Δ is conjoined by spatial formula κ and pure formula π . All free variables are implicitly universally quantified at the outermost level. `null` is a special heap location. In the predicate $r \mapsto c(\bar{t})$, r is a root variable. For abduction reasoning, our fragment also includes *unknown predicates*, spatial ($U(\bar{t})$) and pure ($p(\bar{t})$) second-order variables, whose definitions need to be inferred [24,42]. Pure formulas are constraints over (in)equality α (on pointers), and Presburger arithmetic i . Note that $v_1 \neq v_2$ and $v \neq \text{null}$ are short forms for $\neg(v_1 = v_2)$ and $\neg(v = \text{null})$, respectively. We occasionally use a sequence (i.e. \bar{t}) to denote a set when it is not ambiguous. We omit π when it is `true`. A formula without any user-defined predicate instances is referred as a base formula.

User-Defined (\mathcal{UD}) Predicate. A \mathcal{UD} predicate P is defined as $\text{pred } P(\bar{v}) \equiv \bigvee_{i=1}^n (\exists \bar{w}_i. \Delta_i)$; whereas P is predicate name. \bar{v} is a set of formal parameters. $\bigvee_{i=1}^n \exists \bar{w}_i. \Delta_i$ is a predicate definition. $\exists \bar{w}_i. \Delta_i$ ($i \in 1 \dots n$) is a branch of the disjunction. In each branch, we require that variables which are not in formal parameters must be existentially quantified.

Definition 1 (Root Parameter) *Given \mathcal{UD} predicate P : $P(\bar{v}) \equiv \bigvee_{i=1}^n (\exists \bar{w}_i. \Delta_i)$, a parameter $r \in \bar{v}$ is a **root** if for any base formula $\kappa \wedge \pi$ derived by unfolding the predicate instance $P(\bar{v})$, r is either a root of a points-to predicate ($r \mapsto _$ occurs in κ) or $r = \text{null}$.*

We syntactically detect root parameters as follows. A formal parameter $r \in \bar{v}$ is a **root** if any branch $\kappa_i \wedge \pi_i$, $i \in \{1 \dots n\}$, one of the following four conditions holds: (i) r is a root variable of a points-to predicate ($r \mapsto _$ occurs in κ_i); (ii) r equals to `null`: $\pi_i \implies r = \text{null}$; (iii) r equals to another root parameter: $\pi_i \implies r = s$, where $s \in \bar{v}$; or (iv) r is a root parameter of another \mathcal{UD} predicate. Without loss of generality, we will write $P(r, \bar{v})$ to indicate that r is a root parameter. A predicate with multiple root parameters will be considered to transform into multiple predicates with single root parameter in Sec. 6. *Unfolding.* The function $\text{unfold}(\Delta, j)$ unfolds once the j^{th} \mathcal{UD} predicate instance, i.e. $P^j(\bar{v}^j)$, of the formula Δ . The steps are formalized as follows:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} P^j(\bar{v}) \equiv \bigvee_{i=1}^n (\exists \bar{w}_i. \kappa_i \wedge \pi_i) \quad \text{fresh } \bar{w}'_i \quad \rho_i = [\bar{w}'_i / \bar{w}_i] \quad \kappa'_i = \kappa_i[\rho_i] \quad \pi'_i = \pi_i[\rho_i] \\ \rho_0 = [\bar{t}^j / \bar{v}] \quad \kappa''_i = \kappa'_i[\rho_0] \quad \pi''_i = \pi'_i[\rho_0] \end{array}}{\text{unfold}(\exists \bar{w}_0. P^j(\bar{t}^j) * \kappa_0 \wedge \pi_0, j) \rightsquigarrow \bigvee_{i=1}^n (\exists \bar{w}_0 \cup \bar{w}'_i. \kappa_0 * \kappa''_i \wedge \pi_0 \wedge \pi''_i)}$$

First, the function looks up the definition of P , refreshes the existential quantifiers. Second, formal parameters are substituted by the actual parameters. Finally, substituted

definition is combined (and normalized) with residual formula as in the RHS of \leadsto . We will refer to recursive predicate instances of unfolded heap formula κ_i as *descendant* predicate instances (of the j^{th} UD predicate instance).

4 Lemma Mechanism

Lemma Formalism. In general, lemmas in our system are formalized as:

$$\text{lemma id: } \forall \bar{v}. \exists \bar{w}_1. R_l * \Delta_l(\bar{v}) \rightarrow \exists \bar{w}_2. R_r * \Delta_r(\bar{v}).$$

Our lemmas are used to relate two reachable heap regions starting from a same root pointer of the root predicates R_l and R_r . A root predicate is a points-to or a UD predicate. Without loss of generality, we require that the root pointer of a root predicate is explicitly denoted with the preserved name `root`. For frame inference, LHS and RHS must capture the same heaps (i.e. $\forall \bar{v}. \exists \bar{w}_1. R_l * \Delta_l(\bar{v}) \vdash_L \exists \bar{w}_2. R_r * \Delta_r(\bar{v}) \leadsto (-, \text{emp} \wedge \pi)$). We occasionally use `id` to indicate the lemma.

Lemma Application. During proof search, proven lemmas are considered as external inference rules. We assume that free variables of a lemma are renamed to avoid clashing before the lemma is applied. The application of a lemma `id` is formalized as follows.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \text{[LAPP]} \\ (\text{lemma id } R_l * \kappa_l \wedge G \rightarrow \Delta_r) \in L \quad \Delta_1 \vdash_L \kappa_l[\rho] \wedge G[\rho] \leadsto (\mathcal{R}_1, \Phi_{r_1}) \\ \rho = \text{match}(R_l, R_1) \quad \Phi_{r_1} * \Delta_r[\rho] \vdash_L \Delta_2 \leadsto (\mathcal{R}_2, \Phi_R) \end{array}}{R_1 * \Delta_1 \vdash_L \Delta_2 \leadsto (\mathcal{R}_1 \wedge \mathcal{R}_2, \Phi_R)}$$

The lemma `id` is applied into the above entailment through three steps. First, we match the predicate R_1 of the antecedent with root predicate R_l . (We note that R_l must contain a root pointer.) R_l and R_1 are matched and unified by a partial function `match`. If the matching is successful, `match` produces substitutions as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{match}(\text{root} \mapsto c(\bar{t}), x \mapsto c(\bar{w})) &= [\bar{w}/\bar{t}] \circ [x/\text{root}] \\ \text{match}(P(\text{root}, \bar{t}), P(x, \bar{w})) &= [\bar{w}/\bar{t}] \circ [x/\text{root}] \end{aligned}$$

Second, we prove guard and identify *cut* of the antecedent in the first line. Last, we combine the residue of the antecedent with RHS of the lemma before continuously proving the consequent (of the entailment) in the second line.

Universal Lemma Application. The universal guard $\forall G$ is equivalent to *infinite* conjunction $\bigwedge_\rho G[\rho]$. $\forall G$ makes the lemmas with universal guard more expressive. However, it also prevents applying these lemmas into entailments with instantiated (existential) guards as the second step of the above lemma application rule could not be established (i.e. $\exists x \Delta \not\vdash \forall x \Delta$). While mechanism in [30] was based on “delayed guard”, we now propose *guard instantiation*, a sound solution for universal lemma application. In order to apply a universal lemma into an entailment with instantiated (existential) guard, we present a technique that dynamically and intelligently instantiates universal guard (of the lemma) before really deploying this lemma. Concretely, our technique will substitute universal guard by a *finite* set of its instances. The soundness of this technique is based on the following theorem.

Theorem 1 (Lemma Instantiation). Let Δ_{ante} and Δ_{conseq} be antecedent and consequent of an entailment check. Let L be a set of universal lemmas and let L' be a

set of instantiated lemmas obtained by substituting each $\forall \bar{v}G(\bar{v})$ in a universal guard by a finite conjunction of its instantiations. If $\Delta_{ante} \vdash_{L'} \Delta_{conseq}$ is valid then so is $\Delta_{ante} \vdash_L \Delta_{conseq}$.

Proof. Semantically, a guard with universal variables $\forall \bar{v}G(\bar{v})$ implies a conjunction of its instantiations. As such universal guard $\forall \bar{v}G(\bar{v})$ is on the left-hand side of lemmas, a proof system with inference rules L' implies the corresponding proof system with inference rules L . Thus, if $\Delta_{ante} \vdash_{L'} \Delta_{conseq}$ is valid then so is $\Delta_{ante} \vdash_L \Delta_{conseq}$. \square

Inspired by quantifier instantiation in Simplify [15], we symbolically select “relevant” instantiations over universal variables of a guard by looking up substitutions over the universal variables such that the instantiated lemma suffices to prove the validity of a given entailment. The substitutions are selected through shape predicate matching [11] (the corresponding action used in [16] is subtracting.). The application of lemmas with universal variables is formalized as:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \text{[ENT-LAPP-}\forall\text{]} \\ (\text{lemma id } \forall \bar{v} \cdot R_l * \Delta_l \wedge G(\bar{v}) \rightarrow \Delta_r) \in L \quad \rho = \rho_m \circ \text{ins}(\bar{v}) \quad \Delta_1 \vdash_L \Delta_l[\rho] \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}_1, \Phi_{r_1}) \\ \rho_m = \text{match}(R_l, R_1) \quad \Phi_{r_1} * \Delta_r[\rho] \vdash_L \Delta_2 \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}_2, \Phi_{r_2}) \quad \Phi_{r_2} \vdash_L G(\bar{v})[\rho] \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}_3, \Phi_R) \end{array}}{R_1 * \Delta_1 \vdash_L \Delta_2 \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}_1 \wedge \mathcal{R}_2 \wedge \mathcal{R}_3, \Phi_R)}$$

In the rule above, after head matching, we rename universal variables and obtain the substitution by the function `ins`. This substitution helps to instantiate quantified variables in both universal guard of the lemma and existential guard of the antecedent.

Symbolic “relevant” instantiations are selected during the course of the left entailment at line 2 and are captured in the residue Φ_{r_2} . Finally, “relevant” instantiations are used to prove the instantiated guard of the right entailment at line 2. We implement the selection of the symbolic “relevant” instantiations via by instantiation mechanism in [11]. We summarize the mechanism in App. A.

5 Automated Inductive Entailment Procedure

In Fig. 5, we propose new six inference rules; [R*] is for cutting heaps; [LSYN] is for dynamically generating and proving auxiliary lemmas; and the rest is for generating relational assumptions while checking entailment. [R*] rule, a revision (with frame inference) of the Monotonicity rule [20], helps to generate smaller sub-goals, and then to generate more reusable lemmas. In this rule, FV returns free variables of a formula. Two necessary conditions to apply the rule [LSYN] are: (i) root predicates of the antecedent (LHS) and the consequent (RHS), R_a and R_c , must share a same root pointer; (ii) R_r must be a defined predicate instance i.e. $P(x, \bar{w})$. Here, $\nabla(\bar{w}, \pi)$ is an auxiliary function that existentially quantifies in π all free variables that are not in the set \bar{w} . We present the `lemsyn` procedure in the subsection 5.1.

In [AU] and [AF] rules, $R(r, \bar{t})$ is either $r \mapsto c(\bar{t})$ or known (defined) $P(r, \bar{t})$, or unknown predicate $U'(r, \bar{t}, \bar{w}\#)$. We use $\#$ notation in unknown predicates to guide abduction and proof search. We only abduce on pointers without $\#$ -annotated. $U_{\#}(\bar{w}, \bar{t}')$ is another unknown predicate generated to capture downstream heaps. After abducted pointers will be annotated with $\#$ to avoid double abduction. New unknown predicate $U_{\#}$ is only generated if at least one parameter is not annotated with $\#$ (i.e. $\bar{w} \cup \bar{t}' \neq \emptyset$). To avoid

$\frac{\frac{FV(\Delta_{c_1}) \cap FV(\Delta_{c_2}) = \{\} \quad \Delta_a \vdash_L \Delta_{c_1} \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}_1, \Phi_{f_1}) \quad \Phi_{f_1} \vdash_L \Delta_{c_2} \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}_2, \Phi_{f_2})}{\Delta_a \vdash_L \Delta_{c_1} * \Delta_{c_2} \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}_1 \wedge \mathcal{R}_2, \Phi_{f_2})} \quad \frac{[\mathbf{R*}]}{\text{lemsyn}(\mathbf{R}_l * \kappa_a \wedge \pi_a, \mathbf{R}_c * \Delta_c, L) \rightsquigarrow (\text{lemma 1: } \forall \bar{v} \forall \bar{e} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a * \kappa_a \wedge \nabla(\bar{v}, \pi_a) \wedge \mathbf{P}(\bar{v}, \bar{e}) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_c * \Delta_c * \mathbf{U}(\bar{v}), \mathcal{R})} \quad \frac{[\mathbf{LSYN}]}{\rho_m = \text{match}(\mathbf{R}_l, \mathbf{R}_a) \quad \rho_i = \text{ins}(\bar{e}) \quad \rho = \rho_m \circ \rho_i \quad (\mathbf{R}_a * \kappa_a \wedge \pi_a)[\rho_i] \vdash_L (\mathbf{R}_a * \kappa_a \wedge \nabla(\bar{v}, \pi_a) \wedge \mathbf{P}(\bar{v}, \bar{e}))[\rho] \rightsquigarrow (\text{true}, \text{emp} \wedge \pi_{f_1})}$
$\frac{\forall \bar{v} \exists \bar{e} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a * \kappa_a \wedge \pi_a \vdash_L \mathbf{R}_c * \Delta_c \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}, \mathbf{U}(\bar{v})[\rho])}{\frac{\frac{\sigma \equiv \mathbf{U}(r, \bar{w}, \bar{z}\#) \Rightarrow \mathbf{R}(r, \bar{t}) * \mathbf{U}_f(\bar{w}, \bar{t}', \bar{z}\#, r\#) \wedge \nabla(\bar{w} \cup \{r\}, \pi_1)}{\bar{t}' = \bar{t} \setminus (\bar{w} \cup \bar{z} \cup \{r\}) \quad \mathbf{U}_f(\bar{w}, \bar{t}', \bar{z}\#, r\#) * \kappa_1 \wedge \pi_1 \vdash_L \kappa_2 \wedge \pi_2 \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}, \Delta_f)} \quad \frac{[\mathbf{AU}]}{\sigma \equiv \mathbf{U}(r, \bar{w}, \bar{z}\#) \Rightarrow \mathbf{R}(r, \bar{t}) * \mathbf{U}_f(\bar{w}, \bar{t}', \bar{z}\#, r\#) \wedge \nabla(\bar{w} \cup \{r\}, \pi_1) \Rightarrow \mathbf{U}(r, \bar{w}, \bar{z}\#)} \quad \frac{[\mathbf{AF}]}{\bar{t}' = \bar{t} \setminus (\bar{w} \cup \bar{z} \cup \{t\}) \quad \kappa_1 \wedge \pi_1 \vdash_L \mathbf{U}_f(\bar{w}, \bar{t}', \bar{z}\#, r\#) * \kappa_2 \wedge \pi_2 \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}, \Delta_f)} \quad \frac{[\mathbf{AU-P}]}{\pi \equiv \forall (FV(\pi_1) \cup FV(\pi_2) \setminus \bar{w}) \neg \pi_1 \vee \pi_2 \quad \pi \neq \text{false} \quad \sigma \equiv \mathbf{P}(\bar{w}) \Rightarrow \pi}{\frac{[\mathbf{AF-P}]}{\pi = \mathbf{XPure}(\kappa_1) \wedge \pi_1 \quad \pi \Rightarrow \pi_2 \quad \sigma \equiv \nabla(\bar{w}, \pi) \Rightarrow \mathbf{P}(\bar{w})}} \quad \frac{[\mathbf{AF-P}]}{\kappa_1 \wedge \pi_1 \vdash_L \text{emp} \wedge \mathbf{P}(\bar{w}) \wedge \pi_2 \rightsquigarrow (\sigma, \kappa_1 \wedge \pi_1)}$

Fig. 2. Inference Rules for Lemma Synthesis with Predicate Inference.

conflict between abduction rules and other (unfolding, subtraction) during proof search, all root pointers in a heap formula must be annotated with # in unknown predicates. For examples, in our system while the formula $x \mapsto c_1(y) * \mathbf{U}_1(x\#, y)$ is valid, the formula $x \mapsto c_1(y) * \mathbf{U}_1(x, y)$ is invalid. For the check $x \mapsto c_1(\text{null}) \vdash_L x \mapsto c_1(y) * \mathbf{U}_1(x\#, y)$, our proof search will apply subtraction the heap pointed by x rather than abduction. We illustrate the $[\mathbf{AF}]$ rule with the following example:

$$\frac{\text{XPure} \quad \text{emp} \wedge \text{true} \vdash_L \text{emp} \wedge \text{true} \rightsquigarrow (\text{true}, \text{emp} \wedge \text{true})}{\frac{\text{AF} \quad y \mapsto c_1(\text{null}) \vdash_L \mathbf{U}_{2a}(y, x\#) \rightsquigarrow (\sigma_1: y \mapsto c_1(\text{null}) \wedge \text{true} \Rightarrow \mathbf{U}_2(y, x\#), \text{emp} \wedge \text{true})}{\text{AF} \quad x \mapsto c_1(y) * y \mapsto c_1(\text{null}) \vdash_L \mathbf{U}_2(x, y) \rightsquigarrow (\sigma_1 \wedge (x \mapsto c_1(y) * \mathbf{U}_{2a}(y, x\#) \Rightarrow \mathbf{U}_2(x, y)), \text{emp} \wedge \text{true})}}$$

In the second application of $[\mathbf{AF}]$ rule, no new unknown predicate was introduced as there was no pointers without #-annotated.

$[\mathbf{AU-P}]$ and $[\mathbf{AF-P}]$ rules abduce on pure and applied on consequent which has empty heap. \mathbf{XPure} procedure soundly transforms a heap formula into a pure formula [11].

5.1 Lemma Synthesis - lemsyn Procedure

Given the entailment check $\forall \bar{v} \exists \bar{e} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a * \kappa_a \wedge \pi_a \vdash_L \mathbf{R}_c * \Delta_r * \Delta_c$, our lemsyn procedure synthesizes the lemma $\forall \bar{v} \forall \bar{e} \cdot \mathbf{R}_a * \kappa_a \wedge \nabla(\bar{v}, \pi_a) \wedge \mathbf{P}(\bar{v}, \bar{e}) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_c * \Delta_r * \mathbf{U}(\bar{v})$ through three steps: conjecture construction, lemma proving and predicate synthesis.

Conjecture Construction. At this step, lemsyn enriches the original check with either pure unknown predicate $\mathbf{P}(\bar{v}, \bar{e})$ (for universal lemma) or shape unknown predicate $\mathbf{U}(\bar{v})$

(for frame inference). While the former is only added if there exist existential variables in LHS, the latter is only added if the sets of universal variables over pointers of LHS and RHS are not identical. We note that in the former, to prepare for universal guard inference, we need to existentially quantifies the pure formula; in the latter, Δ_r is a minimum closure of connected heaps of R_c . The unknown predicate is generated with parameters that are union of free variables of LHS and RHS. Among these, pointer-based parameters are annotated with $\#$ following the principle that instantiation (and subtraction) are done before abduction. The detail is as follows: (i) all intersection variables of LHS and RHS are $\#$ -annotated; (ii) roots pointers of RHS are $\#$ -annotated; (iii) remaining pointers are not $\#$ -annotated.

Lemma Proving. Our lemma proving, `lemprove` procedure, is based on the principle of cyclic proof [7,9]. Two steps of this proof technique are: back-link form (i.e. linking current sequents to a historical sequent); and *global trace condition* checking. We implement these steps via lemma application. The procedure `lemprove` is formalized as:

$$\frac{\frac{\bigvee_{i=1}^n \Delta_i \equiv \text{unfold}(\Delta_l, j) \quad \Delta_i \vdash_{L \cup \{\text{link}\}} \Delta_r \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}_i, \text{emp} \wedge \pi_i)}{(\text{lemma link: } \Delta_l \rightarrow \Delta_r, L) \rightsquigarrow \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \mathcal{R}_i}}{\text{[LEM-PROVE]}}$$

To prove the conjecture `link`, `lemprove` looks up a j^{th} UD predicate instance in Δ_l to apply `[LU]` rule. For a successful proving, any disjunct Δ_i obtained from the unfolding of Δ_l must imply Δ_r with *empty* heap in the residue. This unfolded predicate instance is a progressing point. Induction hypothesis is encoded by the lemma `link`; induction on such predicate instance is performed as an application on this lemma into a descendant predicate instance of the unfolded predicate instance. We denote such application is *cyclic lemma application*. We note that the lemma synthesis may be nested; it means our system would speculate additional lemmas while proving a lemma.

In cyclic term [7,9], the initial lemma is a *bud*, entailment check which applied cyclic lemma application is *companion* of the bud above, and proof that are removed all cyclic lemma applications is a pre-proof. A path in a pre-proof is a sequence of sequent occurrences (entailment checks) derived by applying inference rules. For soundness, a pre-proof must be a cyclic proof; it must satisfy the global trace condition i.e. for every infinite path there is infinitely many progressing points. We state the condition that a proof derived by our system is indeed a cyclic proof in the following lemma.

Lemma 1 (Soundness). *If all descendant predicate instances of the unfolded j^{th} UD predicate instance have involved in a cyclic lemma application, then $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \mathcal{R}_i \wedge \Delta_l \models \Delta_r$.*

Proof. A path in the proof is infinite if it includes the descendant predicate instances (of the j^{th} UD predicate instances) as these predicate instances may unfolded infinitely. If every the descendant predicate instances has involved in a cyclic lemma application, it has infinitely progressing points and thus the global trace condition is satisfied. Then our proof is a cyclic proof. \square

Predicate Synthesis. If the conjecture `link` contains unknown predicates, we infer by SOBD a conjunction set of relational constraints $\mathcal{R} = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \mathcal{R}_i$ (over the unknown predicates) such that $\mathcal{R} \wedge \Delta_l \models \Delta_r$. After that we deploy those algorithms in [24,33]




Fig. 3. Derivation tree for proving of lemma 1₄.

to solve the set \mathcal{R} and obtain definitions for the predicates. Due to the nested lemma synthesis, a predicate is synthesis at the scope it has been introduced. After that its corresponding relational assumptions are canceled, i.e. not forwarded to outer scope.

Two-way Lemmas. For each lemma synthesized, we always consider to generate its reverse lemma. For each pair of such *two-way* lemmas, one with unknown predicates will be inferred (and proven); another is substituted with the newly-inferred predicates prior to proven. For the former, we choose the conjecture with more case splits i.e. more UD predicates in the LHS. We hope that proving such conjecture will generate more subgoals and thus more relational assumptions would be generated. The more assumptions our system generates, the more meaningful predicate definitions is synthesized.

5.2 Motivating Example Revisit

Our system started proving 1₃ by unfolding predicate $\text{ls1}(a, p_1)$ (like $\underline{\text{LU}}$) as follows.

$$\frac{\text{ls2}(a, p_2) * p_2 \mapsto c_2(3, \text{null}) \quad \vdash_{\{l_3\}} \text{ls1}(a, p_3) * p_3 \mapsto c_2(v_1, p_4) * \text{U}(\bar{v}_1) \wedge v_1 \neq 1 \quad \begin{array}{c} a \mapsto c_2(1, a_1) * \text{ls1}(a_1, p_1) * \text{ls2}(p_1, p_2) * \\ p_2 \mapsto c_2(3, \text{null}) \vdash_{\{l_3\}} \Delta_c \end{array}}{\text{ls1}(a, p_1) * \text{ls2}(p_1, p_2) * p_2 \mapsto c_2(3, \text{null}) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{ls1}(a, p_3) * p_3 \mapsto c_2(v_1, p_4) * \text{U}(\bar{v}) \wedge v_1 \neq 1}$$

whereas $\Delta_c \equiv \text{ls1}(a, p_3) * p_3 \mapsto c_2(v_1, p_4) * \text{U}(a\#, p_1, p_2, p_3\#, p_4, v_1) \wedge v_1 \neq 1$, and $\bar{v} \equiv \{a\#, p_1, p_2, p_3\#, p_4, v_1\}$, $\bar{v}_1 \equiv \{a\#, a, p_2, p_3\#, p_4, v_1\}$. (In all tree derivations below, we discard the $\underline{\text{XPURE}}$ rule on top for simplicity.)

Base Case. Proof of the left subgoal was derived as:

$$\text{LSYN} \frac{\text{emp} \wedge \text{true} \vdash_{\{l_3; l_4\}} \text{emp} \wedge \text{true} \leadsto (\text{true}, \text{emp} \wedge \text{true})}{\text{ls2}(a, p_2) * p_2 \mapsto c_2(3, \text{null}) \vdash_{\{l_3\}} a \mapsto c_2(v_1, p_4) * \text{U}(\bar{v}_2) \wedge v_1 \neq 1} \mathcal{R} \\
\text{RU} \frac{}{\text{ls2}(a, p_2) * p_2 \mapsto c_2(3, \text{null}) \vdash_{\{l_3\}} \text{ls1}(a, p_3) * p_3 \mapsto c_2(v_1, p_4) * \text{U}(\bar{v}_1) \wedge v_1 \neq 1 \leadsto (\mathcal{R}_1, \text{emp} \wedge \dots)}$$

whereas $\bar{v}_2 \equiv \{a\#, a, p_2, a\#, p_4, v_1\}$, and the nested conjecture 1₄ was constructed as:

$$\text{lemma } 1_4 : \text{ls2}(a, p_2) * p_2 \mapsto c_2(3, \text{null}) \rightarrow a \mapsto c_2(v_1, p_4) * \text{U}(\bar{v}_2) \wedge v_1 \neq 1$$

Proof of the conjecture 1₄ was derived as in Fig. 3, whereas $(\bar{v}_3) \equiv (a\#, a, a, a\#, p_4, v_1)$,

$(\bar{v}_4) \equiv (a\#, a, p_2, a\#, p'_4, v'_1)$, $(\bar{v}_5) \equiv (a\#, a, p_2, a\#, p_4\#, v_1, p'_4, v'_1)$. Inferred assumptions are:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_1: p_4 = \text{null} \wedge v_1 = 3 &\Rightarrow U(a, a, a, a, p_4, v_1) \\ \sigma_2: p_4 \mapsto c_2(v'_1, p'_4) * U_1(a, a, p_2, a, p_4, v_1, p'_4, v'_1) \wedge v'_1 \neq 1 \wedge v_1 = 2 &\Rightarrow U(a, a, p_2, a, p_4, v_1) \\ \sigma_3: U(a, a, p_2, a, p'_4, v'_1) \wedge v'_1 \neq 1 \wedge v_1 = 2 &\Rightarrow U_1(a, a, p_2, a, p_4, v_1, p'_4, v'_1)\end{aligned}$$

Since U_1 was introduced at this scope, before return to outer scope, U_1 has been synthesized as $\text{pred } U_1(a, a, p_2, a, p_4, v_1, \text{root}, v'_1) \equiv \exists p_4. U(a, a, p_2, a, \text{root}, v'_1) \wedge v'_1 \neq 1 \wedge v_1 = 2$. The set assumptions forwarded to outer scope is: $\mathcal{R}_1 \equiv \sigma_1 \wedge \sigma_2$.

Induction Case. Proof of the right subgoal was derived as:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{AF} \frac{\text{emp} \wedge v_1 \neq 1 \vdash_{\{l_3\}} \text{emp} \wedge v_1 \neq 1 \rightsquigarrow (\sigma_4, \text{emp} \wedge \dots)}{U(\bar{v}_7) \wedge v_1 \neq 1 \vdash_{\{l_3\}} U(\bar{v}_1) \wedge v_1 \neq 1 \rightsquigarrow (\sigma_4, \text{emp} \wedge \dots)} \\ \text{M} \frac{}{\text{ls1}(a_1, p'_3) * p'_3 \mapsto c_2(v'_1, p'_4) * U(\bar{v}_6) \wedge v'_1 \neq 1 \vdash_{\{l_3\}} \text{ls1}(a_1, p_3) * p_3 \mapsto c_2(v_1, p_4) * U(\bar{v}) \wedge v_1 \neq 1} \\ \text{LAPP} \frac{}{\text{ls1}(a_1, p_1) * \text{ls2}(p_1, p_2) * p_2 \mapsto c_2(3, \text{null}) \vdash_{\{l_3\}} \text{ls1}(a_1, p_3) * p_3 \mapsto c_2(v_1, p_4) * U(\bar{v}) \wedge v_1 \neq 1} \\ \text{M} \frac{}{a \mapsto c_2(1, a_1) * \text{ls1}(a_1, p_1) * \text{ls2}(p_1, p_2) * p_2 \mapsto c_2(3, \text{null})} \\ \text{RU} \frac{\vdash_{\{l_3\}} a \mapsto c_2(1, a_1) * \text{ls1}(a_1, p_3) * p_3 \mapsto c_2(v_1, p_4) * U(\bar{v}) \wedge v_1 \neq 1}{a \mapsto c_2(1, a_1) * \text{ls1}(a_1, p_1) * \text{ls2}(p_1, p_2) * p_2 \mapsto c_2(3, \text{null}) \vdash_{\{l_3\}} \Delta_c \rightsquigarrow (\sigma_4, \text{emp} \wedge \dots)}\end{array}$$

whereas $(\bar{v}_6) \equiv (a_1\#, p_1, p_2, p_3\#, p'_4, v'_1)$, $(\bar{v}_7) \equiv (a_1\#, p_1, p_2, p_3\#, p_4, v_1)$, and the inferred assumption is: $\sigma_4: U(a_1, p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4, v_1) \wedge v_1 \neq 1 \Rightarrow U(a, p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4, v_1)$. Now, the predicate U is synthesized from the set of assumptions $\sigma_1 \wedge \sigma_2 \wedge \sigma_4$.

5.3 Soundness

Lemma 2. The rules $[\mathbf{R}_*]$ and $[\mathbf{LSYN}]$ in Fig. 5 preserve soundness.

Our $[\mathbf{R}_*]$ rule is derived from the Monotonicity rule showing that spatial conjunction is monotone with respect to implication [20]:

$$\frac{\Delta_{a_1} \models \Delta_{c_1} \quad \Delta_{a_2} \models \Delta_{c_2}}{\Delta_{a_1} * \Delta_{a_2} \models \Delta_{c_1} * \Delta_{c_2}}$$

The soundness of $[\mathbf{LSYN}]$ is derived from the meaning of frame, i.e. $\Delta_a \vdash \Delta_c \rightsquigarrow \Delta_{\text{frame}}$ holds iff $\Delta_a \models \Delta_c * \Delta_{\text{frame}}$, and the design of our lemma mechanism, i.e. lemma 1: $\Delta_l \rightarrow \Delta_r$ is valid iff $\Delta_l \vdash \Delta_r \rightsquigarrow \text{emp}$ holds.

Soundness of abduction rules. Since we only apply proven lemmas, it is sound to assume that lemma store is empty (no user-supplied lemmas) and discard this lemma store in our soundness proofs. We introduce the notation $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)$ to denote a set of predicate definitions $\Gamma = \{U_1(\bar{v}_1) \equiv \Phi_1, \dots, U_n(\bar{v}_n) \equiv \Phi_n\}$ satisfying the set of assumptions \mathcal{R} . That is, for all assumptions $\Delta_l \Rightarrow \Delta_r \in \mathcal{R}$, (i) Γ contains a predicate definition for each unknown predicate appearing in Δ_l and Δ_r ; (ii) by interpreting all unknown predicates according to Γ , then it is provable that Δ_l implies Δ_r , written as $\Gamma : \Delta_l \vdash \Delta_r$.

Lemma 3. Given the entailment judgement $\Delta_a \vdash \Delta_c \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}, \Delta_f)$, if there exists Γ such that $\mathcal{R}(\Gamma)$, then the entailment $\Gamma : \Delta_a \vdash \Delta_c * \Delta_f$ holds.

Abduction soundness requires that if all the relational assumptions generated are satisfiable, then the entailment is valid.

6 Theorem Exploration

We present a mechanism to explore relations for UD predicates by using lemma synthesis. The mechanism is applied for some sets of either statically user-supplied or dynamically analyser-synthesized predicates. The key idea is that instead of requiring designers of proof systems to write lemmas for a specific UD predicate (like in [4]), we provide for them a mechanism to design lemmas for a general class of UD predicates. And based on the design, our system will automatically generate specific and on-demand lemmas for a specific UD predicate. In this section, we demonstrate this mechanism through three such classes. Concretely, our system processes each UD predicate in four steps. First, it syntactically classifies the predicate into a predefined class. Second, it follows structure of the class to generate *heap-only* conjectures (with quantifiers). Third, it enriches the heap-only conjectures with unknown predicates for expressive constraint inference. Last, it invokes the `lemprove` procedure to prove these conjectures, infer definitions for the unknown predicates and synthesize the lemmas. Especially, whenever a universal lemma $L \rightarrow R$ is proven, its reverse (the lemma $R \rightarrow L$) is also examined. Proven lemmas will be applied to enhance upcoming inductive proofs.

In the next subsection and App. B, we present theorem exploration in three classes of UD predicates. In each class, we present step 1 and step 2; steps 3 and 4 are identical to the `lemsyn` procedure in Sec. 5.1.

6.1 Generating Equivalence Lemmas

Step 1. Intuitively, given a set S of UD predicates and another UD predicate P (which is not in S), we look up all predicates in S which are equivalent to P . This exploration is applied to any new (either supplied or synthesized) UD predicate P .

Step 2. Heap-only conjecture to explore equivalent relation of two predicates (e.g. $P(x, \bar{v})$ and $Q(x, \bar{w})$) is generated as: $\exists \bar{t}_1 \cdot P(\text{root}, \bar{v}) \rightarrow \exists \bar{t}_2 \cdot Q(\text{root}, \bar{w})$, whereas $\bar{t}_1 = \bar{v} \setminus \bar{w}$ and $\bar{t}_2 = \bar{w} \setminus \bar{v}$. The shared root parameter x has been identified by examining all permutations of root parameters of the two predicates. For example, with `lln` and `lsegn` in Sec. 2, our system examines conjecture: lemma $\text{eq}_1 \exists p \cdot \text{lsegn}(\text{root}, p, m) \rightarrow \text{lln}(\text{root}, n)$. At step 3, the unknown predicate U is added to infer constraints over *leaf* variables p , m , and n as: lemma $\text{eq}_1 \exists p \cdot \text{lsegn}(\text{root}, p, m) \wedge U_1(p, m, n) \rightarrow \text{lln}(\text{root}, n)$. At step 4, the conjecture eq_1 is proven and a definition of U_1 is inferred as: $U_1(p, m, n) \equiv p = \text{null} \wedge m = n$. For the equivalence, our system also generates and proves the reverse lemma of eq_1 as: lemma $\text{eq}_r \text{lln}(\text{root}, n) \rightarrow \exists p \cdot \text{lsegn}(\text{root}, p, m) \wedge p = \text{null} \wedge m = n$.

This technique can be applied to match a newly-inferred definition synthesized by shape analyses (i.e. [8,24]) with existing predicates of a supplied library of predefined predicates. For specification inference, we eagerly substitute a newly-inferred predicate in specifications by its equivalent-matching predicate from the library. This makes inferred specifications more understandable. Furthermore this also helps to avoid induction proving on proof obligations generated from these specifications.

7 Implementation and Experiments

We have implemented the proposed ideas into an entailment procedure, called S^3 , starting from SLEEK entailment procedure [11]. S invokes Z3 [26] to discharge satisfiability

³ S was initially implemented for the SLCOMP competition [38].

Ent.	Proven	Cyclic _{SL}	S	#syn
1	$\text{lseg}(x,t) * \text{lseg}(t, \text{null}) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{lseg}(x, \text{null})$	0.03	0.06	1
2	$\text{lseg}(x,t) * t \mapsto c_1(y) * \text{lseg}(y, \text{null}) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{lseg}(x, \text{null})$	0.03	0.08	1
3	$\text{lseg}(x,t) * \text{lseg}(t,y) * y \mapsto c_1(\text{null}) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{lseg}(x, \text{null})$	0.03	0.11	2
4	$\text{lseg}(x,t) * \text{lseg}(t,y) * \text{bt}(y) \wedge y \neq \text{null} \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{lseg}(x,y) * \text{bt}(y)$	TO	0.21	2
5	$\text{lseg}(x,t) * \text{lseg}(t,y) * \text{lseg}(y,z) \wedge y \neq z \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{lseg}(x,y) * \text{lseg}(y,z)$	3.00	0.57	1
6	$x \mapsto c_1(y) * \text{rlseg}(y,z) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{rlseg}(x,z)$	0.02	0.10	1
7	$\text{nlseg}(x,z) * z \mapsto c_1(y) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{nlseg}(x,y)$	0.02	0.04	1
8	$\text{nlseg}(x,z) * \text{nlseg}(z,y) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{nlseg}(x,y)$	0.03	0.06	1
9	$\text{glseg}(x,z) * z \mapsto c_1(y) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{glseg}(x,y)$	0.02	0.04	1
10	$\text{glseg}(x,z) * \text{glseg}(z,y) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{glseg}(x,y)$	0.02	0.04	1
11	$\text{dlseg}(u,v,x,y) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{glseg}_2(u,v)$	0.07	0.04	1
12	$\text{dlseg}(w,v,x,z) * \text{dlseg}(u,w,z,y) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{dlseg}(u,v,x,y)$	0.04	0.11	1
13	$\text{listo}(x,z) * \text{listo}(z, \text{null}) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{liste}(x, \text{null})$	0.06	0.06	2
14	$\text{liste}(x,z) * \text{liste}(z, \text{null}) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{liste}(x, \text{null})$	0.18	0.12	3
15	$\text{listo}(x,z) * \text{liste}(z,y) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{listo}(x,y)$	4.33	0.88	3
16	$\text{binPath}(x,z) * \text{binPath}(z,y) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{binPath}(x,y)$	0.03	0.06	1
17	$\text{binPath}(x,y) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{binTreeSeg}(x,y)$	0.12	0.08	1
18	$\text{binTreeSeg}(x,z) * \text{binTreeSeg}(z,y) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{binTreeSeg}(x,y)$	0.20	0.66	1
19	$\text{binTreeSeg}(x,y) * \text{binTree}(y) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{binTree}(x)$	0.06	0.03	1
20	$\text{sortll}(x, \text{min}) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{ll}(x)$	X	0.05	1
21	$\text{sortlln}(x, \text{min}, \text{size}) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{lln}(x, \text{size})$	X	0.12	1
22	$\text{sortlln}(x, \text{min}, \text{size}) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{sortll}(x, \text{min})$	X	0.08	1
23	$\text{lsegn}(x,y, \text{sz}_1) * \text{lsegn}(x,z, \text{sz}_2) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{lsegn}(x,z, \text{sz}_1 + \text{sz}_2)$	X	0.12	1
24	$\text{lsegn}(x,y, \text{size}_1) * \text{lsn}(x, \text{size}_2) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{lsn}(x, \text{size}_1 + \text{size}_2)$	X	0.10	1
25	$\text{lseg}(x, \text{tl}) * \text{tl} \mapsto c_1(y) * \text{lseg1}(y, \text{ty}) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{lseg1}(x, \text{ty})$	X	0.10	1
26	$\text{avl}(x, \text{size}, \text{height}, \text{bal}) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{btn}(x, \text{size})$	X	0.08	1
27	$\text{tll}(x, \text{ll}, \text{lr}, \text{size}) \vdash_{\emptyset} \text{btn}(x, \text{size})$	X	0.07	1

Table 1. Entailment Checking with Auxiliary Lemma Synthesis

ity over pure formulas. We have also integrated S into S2 [24] and extended the new system to support a modular verification with partially supplied specification and incremental specification inference. In the following, we experiment S and the enhanced S2 in entailment and program verification problems. The experiments were performed on a machine with the Intel i7-960 (3.2GHz) processor and 16GB of RAM.

Entailment Check. In Table 1, we evaluate Cyclic_{SL} and S on inductive entailment problems without user-supplied lemmas (i.e. $L = \emptyset$). Ent 1-19 are shape-only problems; they were taken from Smallfoot [4] (Ent 1-5), and Cyclic_{SL} [7,9] (Ent 6-19). Ent 20-27 are shape-numerical problems. We used sortll for a sorted list with smallest value min, and tll for a binary tree whose nodes point to their parents and leaves are linked as a singly-linked list [18,24]. Time is in second. TO (X) denotes timeout (30s) (not-yet-support, resp.). The last column #syn shows the number of lemmas our generated to prove the entailment check. The experimental results show that S can handle a wider range of inductive entailment problems. The experiments also demonstrate the efficiency of our implementation; for 18 problems which both tools successfully verified, while it took Cyclic_{SL} 8.29 seconds, it took S only 3.14 seconds.

Modular Verification for Memory Safety. We enhance S2 to automatically verify a wide range of programs with a higher level of correctness and scalability. In more detail, it automatically verifies those programs in [30] (e.g. bubble_sort, append method of

list with tail - like ll_{last} predicate in App. C.2) without any user-supplied lemma. By generating consequence parallel separating lemmas, it also successfully infers shape specifications of methods which manipulate the last element of a singly-linked list (i.e. `g_slist_concat` in `gslist.c`) and a doubly-linked list (i.e. `g_list_append` in `glist.c`) of GLIB library [1] (See App. C.2). By generating equivalence lemmas, matching a newly-inferred \mathcal{UD} predicate with predefined predicates in S2 is now extended beyond shape-only domain.

We evaluated the enhanced S2 on the cross-platform C library Glib open source [1].

	LOC	#Pr	#Lo	wo.		w.	
				#✓	sec.	#✓	sec.
<code>gslist.c</code>	698	34	18	41	2.19	47	2.30
<code>glist.c</code>	784	32	19	39	3.20	46	3.39
<code>gtree.c</code>	1204	32	8	36	3.46	36	3.48
<code>gnode.c</code>	1128	38	27	52	7.52	53	7.58

Fig. 4. Experiments on Glib Programs
 number of procedures/ loops and time (in second) for which the enhanced S2 can verify memory safety without (wo.) and with (w.) the lemma synthesis component. With the lemma synthesis, the number of procedures/loops was successfully verified increases from 168 (81%) to 182 (88%) with the overhead of 0.38 seconds.

We experimented on heap-manipulating files, i.e. singly-/doubly-linked lists (`gslist.c/glist.c`), balanced binary trees (`gtree.c`) and N-ary trees (`gnode.c`). In Fig.4 we list for each file the number of lines of code (excluding comments) LOC, number of procedures (while/for loops) #Pr (#Lo). #✓ and sec. show the

8 Related Work and Conclusion

Entailment Procedure in SL. Past works in SL mainly focus on developing decision procedures for a decidable fragment combining linked lists (and trees) with only equality and inequality constraints [4,14,31,32,29]. Smallfoot [3,4], provided strong semantic foundations and proof system with frame inference capability for the above fragment. Some optimization on segment feature for the fragment with linked list was presented in [14,31,32,29]. Recently, Iosif et. al. extended decidable fragment to restricted \mathcal{UD} predicates [18]. [40] presented a comprehensive summary on computational complexity of deciding entailment in SL with \mathcal{UD} predicates. Our work, like [11,34], targets on an undecidable SL fragment including (arbitrary) \mathcal{UD} predicates and numerical constraints. Like [11,34], we trade completeness for expressiveness. Beyond the focus of [11,34], we provide inductive reasoning in SL using lemma synthesis.

Lemma Mechanism in SL. Lemma is widely used to enhance the reasoning of heap-manipulating programs. For examples, lemmas are used as alternative unfoldings beyond predicates’ definitions [30,9], external inference rules [16], or intelligent generalization to support inductive reasoning [7]. Unfortunately, these systems require user to supply those additional lemmas that might be needed for a proof. In our work, we propose to automatically generate lemmas either dynamically for inductive reasoning or statically for theorem exploration.

Induction Reasoning. For a manual and indirect solution for inductive reasoning in SL, Smallfoot [4] presented subtraction rules that are consequent from a set of lemmas of lists and trees. Brotherston et. al. proposed a *top-down* approach to automate inductive proofs using cycle proof [6]. To avoid infinite circular proof search, the cyclic

technique stops expanding whenever current sequent is a repetition of a similar proof pattern detected from historical proof tree. Cyclic proof was successfully implemented in first-order logic [9], and separation logic [7]. Circularity rule, a similar mechanism to cyclic, was also introduced in matching logic [37]. [12] managed induction by a framework with historical proofs. Our proposal extends these systems with frame inference and gives better support for modular verification of heap-manipulating programs.

Auxiliary Lemma Generation. In inductive theorem reasoning, auxiliary lemmas are generated (and proven) either *top-down* to support inductive proofs (e.g. IsaPlanner [19], Zeno [39] and extension of CVC4 [35]) or *bottom-up* to discover theorem (e.g. IsaCosy [23] and HipSpec [13]) and [28]. The center of these techniques are heuristics to generate useful lemmas for sets of given functions, constants and datatypes. Typically, while the top-down proposals (i.e. [39]) suggest new lemmas by replacing some common sub-term in a stuck goal by a variable, the bottom-up proposals (i.e. [13]) generate lemmas to compute equivalence functions for functional programs. In our work, we introduce both top-down and bottom-up approaches into an entailment procedure in SL. To support inductive entailment proofs dynamically, we generate auxiliary conjectures with unknown predicates to infer either universal guard or frame. To support theorem discovery, we synthesize equivalence, split/join/reverse and separating conjectures. This mechanism can be extended to other heuristics to enhance proofs of a wider class of \mathbb{U} predicates.

9 Conclusion

Lemmas have been widely used to enhance the capability of program verification systems. However, existing reasoning systems of heap-manipulating programs via separation logic rely on user to supply additional lemmas that might be needed for a proof. In this paper, we have presented a mechanism for applying, proving and synthesizing lemma in a SL entailment procedure. We have shown an implementation that has a higher level of automation and completeness for benchmarks taken from inductive theorem proving and software verification sources. Our evaluation indicates that inductive proofs benefit from both bottom-up and top-down lemmas generated by our new approach. It also shows that synthesized lemmas are relevant and helpful to proving a conjecture. Future work includes extending the incremental inference mechanism to other pure domains, e.g. bag/set domain.

References

1. Glib-2.38.2. <https://developer.gnome.org/glib/>, 2013. [Online; accessed 30-May-2015].
2. Aws Albargouthi, Josh Berdine, Byron Cook, and Zachary Kincaid. Spatial interpolants. In *ESOP*, pages 634–660. 2015.
3. J. Berdine, C. Calcagno, and P. W. O’Hearn. A Decidable Fragment of Separation Logic. In *FSTTCS ’04*. Springer-Verlag, December 2004.
4. J. Berdine, C. Calcagno, and P. W. O’Hearn. Symbolic Execution with Separation Logic. In *APLAS*, volume 3780, pages 52–68, November 2005.
5. A. Bouajjani, C. Dragoi, C. Enea, and M. Sighireanu. Accurate invariant checking for programs manipulating lists and arrays with infinite data. In *ATVA*, pages 167–182. 2012.

6. J. Brotherston. Cyclic proofs for first-order logic with inductive definitions. In *Proceedings of TABLEAUX-14*, volume 3702 of *LNAI*, pages 78–92. Springer-Verlag, 2005.
7. J. Brotherston, D. Distefano, and R. L. Petersen. Automated cyclic entailment proofs in separation logic. In *CADE*, pages 131–146, 2011.
8. J. Brotherston and N. Gorogiannis. Cyclic abduction of inductively defined safety and termination preconditions. In *SAS '14*, number 8723 in *LNCS*, pages 68–84, 2014.
9. J. Brotherston, N. Gorogiannis, and R. L. Petersen. A generic cyclic theorem prover. In *Proceedings of APLAS-10*, *LNCS*, pages 350–367. Springer, 2012.
10. Cristiano Calcagno, Dino Distefano, Peter W. O’Hearn, and Hongseok Yang. Compositional shape analysis by means of bi-abduction. In *POPL*, pages 289–300, 2009.
11. W.N. Chin, C. David, H.H. Nguyen, and S. Qin. Automated verification of shape, size and bag properties via user-defined predicates in separation logic. *SCP*, 77(9):1006–1036, 2012.
12. Duc-Hiep Chu, Joxan Jaffar, and Minh-Thai Trinh. Automatic induction proofs of data-structures in imperative programs. *PLDI’15*, 2015.
13. Koen Claessen, Moa Johansson, Dan Rosn, and Nicholas Smallbone. Automating inductive proofs using theory exploration. In *CADE ’24*, volume 7898, pages 392–406. 2013.
14. B. Cook, C. Haase, J. Ouaknine, M. Parkinson, and J. Worrell. Tractable reasoning in a fragment of separation logic. In *CONCUR*, volume 6901, pages 235–249. 2011.
15. David Detlefs, Greg Nelson, and James B. Saxe. Simplify: A theorem prover for program checking. *J. ACM*, 52(3):365–473, May 2005.
16. Dino Distefano and Matthew J. Parkinson. Jstar: Towards practical verification for java. In *OOPSLA ’08*, pages 213–226, New York, NY, USA, 2008. ACM.
17. Constantin Enea, Mihaela Sighireanu, and Zhilin Wu. On automated lemma generation for separation logic with inductive definitions. *ATVA*, 2015. To appear.
18. R. Iosif, A. Rogalewicz, and J. Simáček. The tree width of separation logic with recursive definitions. In *CADE*, pages 21–38, 2013.
19. Andrew Ireland and Alan Bundy. Productive use of failure in inductive proof. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 16(1-2):79–111, 1996.
20. S. Ishtiaq and P.W. O’Hearn. BI as an assertion language for mutable data structures. In *ACM POPL*, pages 14–26, London, January 2001.
21. Shachar Itzhaky, Nikolaj Björner, Thomas Reps, Mooly Sagiv, and Aditya Thakur. Property-directed shape analysis. In *CAV*, pages 35–51. 2014.
22. B. Jacobs, J. Smans, P. Philippaerts, F. Vogels, W. Penninckx, and F. Piessens. Verifast: A powerful, sound, predictable, fast verifier for c and java. In *NFM*, pages 41–55. 2011.
23. Moa Johansson, Lucas Dixon, and Alan Bundy. Conjecture synthesis for inductive theories. *J. Autom. Reason.*, 47(3):251–289, October 2011.
24. Quang Loc Le, Cristian Gherghina, Shengchao Qin, and Wei-Ngan Chin. Shape analysis via second-order bi-abduction. In *CAV*, volume 8559, pages 52–68. 2014.
25. Quang Loc Le, Jun Sun, and Wei-Ngan Chin. Satisfiability modulo heap-based programs. In *CAV 2016*, July 2016.
26. Leonardo M. and Nikolaj B. Z3: An Efficient SMT Solver. In *TACAS*, 2008.
27. Parthasarathy Madhusudan, Xiaokang Qiu, and Andrei Stefanescu. Recursive proofs for inductive tree data-structures. In *POPL*, pages 123–136, New York, NY, USA, 2012. ACM.
28. Roy McCasland, Alan Bundy, and Autexier Serge. Automated discovery of inductive theorems. *Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric*, 10(23), 2007.
29. JuanAntonio Navarro Prez and Andrey Rybalchenko. Separation logic modulo theories. In *APLAS*, volume 8301, pages 90–106. 2013.
30. H. H. Nguyen and W.-N. Chin. Enhancing program verification with lemmas. In *CAV*, pages 355–369, 2008.
31. Juan Antonio Navarro Pérez and Andrey Rybalchenko. Separation logic + superposition calculus = heap theorem prover. In *PLDI*, pages 556–566, 2011.

32. R. Piskac, T. Wies, and D. Zufferey. Automating separation logic using smt. In Natasha Sharygina and Helmut Veith, editors, *CAV*, volume 8044, pages 773–789. 2013.
33. C. Popeea and W.-N. Chin. Inferring disjunctive postconditions. In *ASIAN*, pages 331–345, 2006.
34. X. Qiu, P. Garg, A. Ștefănescu, and P. Madhusudan. Natural proofs for structure, data, and separation. In *PLDI*, pages 231–242, New York, NY, USA, 2013. ACM.
35. Andrew Reynolds and Viktor Kuncak. Induction for smt solvers. In *VMCAI*, volume 8931, pages 80–98. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2015.
36. J. Reynolds. Separation Logic: A Logic for Shared Mutable Data Structures. In *IEEE LICS*, pages 55–74, 2002.
37. Grigore Rosu and Andrei Stefanescu. Checking reachability using matching logic. In *OOP-SLA '12*, pages 555–574, New York, NY, USA, 2012. ACM.
38. Mihaela Sighireanu and David R. Cok. Report on SL-COMP 2014. <http://www.liafa.univ-paris-diderot.fr/slcomp14/>, 2014. [Online; accessed Jun-2015].
39. William Sonnex, Sophia Drossopoulou, and Susan Eisenbach. Zeno: An automated prover for properties of recursive data structures. In *TACAS*, pages 407–421. 2012.
40. Antonopoulos Timos, Gorogiannis Nikos, Haase Christoph, Kanovich Max, and Ouaknine Joël. Foundations for decision problems in separation logic with general inductive predicates. In *FoSSaCS 2014*, pages 411–425, 2014.
41. Antoine Toubhans, Bor-YuhEvan Chang, and Xavier Rival. Reduced product combination of abstract domains for shapes. In *VMCAI*, pages 375–395. 2013.
42. M.-T. Trinh, Q.-L. Le, C. David, and W.-N. Chin. Bi-abduction with pure properties for specification inference. In *APLAS*, pages 107–123. 2013.
43. H. Yang, O. Lee, J. Berdine, C. Calcagno, B. Cook, D. Distefano, and P. W. O’Hearn. Scalable shape analysis for systems code. In *CAV*, pages 385–398, 2008.

A Separation Entailment Procedure

$\frac{[INC1]}{x \mapsto c(\bar{v}) * \Delta_1 \vdash_L \Delta_2 \wedge x = \text{null} \rightsquigarrow (\emptyset, \kappa)}$	$\frac{[INC2]}{\Delta_1 \wedge x = \text{null} \vdash_L x \mapsto c(\bar{v}) * \Delta_2 \rightsquigarrow (\emptyset, \kappa)}$
$\frac{[M]}{\frac{\rho = [\bar{v}/\bar{w}] \quad \pi_{eq} = \text{freeEQ}(\rho)}{\Delta_1 \wedge \pi_{eq} \vdash_L \Delta_2[\bar{v}/\bar{w}] \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}, \Phi_f)}}{x \mapsto c(\bar{v}) * \Delta_1 \vdash_L x \mapsto c(\bar{w}) * \Delta_2 \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}, \Phi_f)}$	$\frac{[PRED-M]}{\frac{\rho = [\bar{v}/\bar{w}] \quad \pi_{eq} = \text{freeEQ}(\rho)}{\Delta_1 \wedge \pi_{eq} \vdash_L \Delta_2[\bar{v}/\bar{w}] \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}, \Phi_f)}}{P((r, \bar{v})) * \Delta_1 \vdash_L P((r, \bar{w})) * \Delta_2 \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}, \Phi_f)}$
$\frac{[LU]}{\frac{\bigvee \Delta_{u_i} = \text{unfold}(P(\bar{v}) * \Delta_1, 0)}{\Delta_{u_i} * \Delta_1 \vdash_L \Delta_2 \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}_i, \Phi_i) \quad i=1 \dots n}}{P(\bar{v}) * \Delta_1 \vdash_L \Delta_2 \rightsquigarrow (\bigwedge \mathcal{R}_i, \bigvee \Phi_i)}$	$\frac{[RU]}{\frac{\bigvee \Delta_{f_i} = \text{unfold}(P(\bar{v}) * \Delta_2, 0)}{\Delta_1 \vdash_L \Delta_{f_i} * \Delta_2 \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}_i, \Phi_i) \quad i=1 \dots n}}{\Delta_1 \vdash_L P(\bar{v}) * \Delta_2 \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}_i, \Phi_i)}$
$\frac{[ALIAS]}{\frac{y \mapsto c(\bar{v}) * \kappa_1 \wedge x = y \wedge \pi_1 \vdash_L \Delta_2 \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}, \Phi_R)}{x \mapsto c(\bar{v}) * \kappa_1 \wedge x = y \wedge \pi_1 \vdash_L \Delta_2 \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}, \Phi_R)}}$	$\frac{[XPURE]}{\frac{\text{XPure}(\kappa_1) \wedge \pi_1 \implies \pi_2 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{R}}{\kappa_1 \wedge \pi_1 \vdash_L \pi_2 \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}, \kappa_1 \wedge \pi_1)}}$

Fig. 5. Basic Inference Rules for Entailment Checking
Entailment procedure between Δ_a and Δ_c is formalized as follows:

$$\Delta_a \vdash_L \Delta_c \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{R}, \Phi_f)$$

The entailment outputs residual frame Φ_f and a set of relational assumptions \mathcal{R} . (For simplicity, we discard footprints and existential quantifiers of consequent in this discussion.) Inference rules are presented in Fig. 5.

To derive a proof for an entailment check, our system deduces antecedent into two parts (i) relevant one would be subsumed by models of the consequent; (ii) the rest will be inferred as residual frame. To do that, it subtracts (match) heap two sides until heap in the consequent is empty (via the $[*M]$, $[LU]$, $[RU]$ inference rules). After that, it semantically check the validity for the implication of the pure part by using external SMT solvers and theorem provers (via $[XPURE]$ inference rule). Typically, an entailment check is performed as follows.

- **Subtracting.** Match up identified heap chains. Starting from identified root pointers, the procedure keeps matching all their reachable heaps with $[M]$ and $[PRED-M]$ rules. The former (latter) rule matches two points-to (user-defined, resp.) predicates in antecedent and consequent if they have an identified root. After that, it unifies corresponding fields of matched roots by using auxiliary function $\text{freeEQ}(\rho)$: $\text{freeEQ}([u_i/v_i]_{i=1}^n) = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \{u_i = v_i\}$.
- **Unfolding.** Derive alternative heap chains. When the procedure is unable to make a progress on matching, it will look up alternative chains for matching through unfolding heap predicates. While the unfolding in the antecedent ($[LU]$ rule) does cases split, the unfolding in the consequent ($[RU]$ rule) does proof search.
- **XPure Reducing.** Reduce entailment checking on separation logic to implication checking on the first order-logic with $[XPURE]$ rule. This reduction was presented in [25]. When the consequent remains empty heap, e.g. $\text{emp} \wedge \pi_c$, the procedure

employs $\boxed{\text{XPure}}$ inference rule to decide the entailment result. Firstly, this rules make use of the XPure reduction to transform the combination of remain heaps in the antecedent and footprints into the first order-logic formula on the combination of pure domains, e.g. π_a . Then it checks the implication $\pi_a \implies \pi_c$. Technically, to perform such implication checking, the following satisfiability check is performed: $\text{sat}(\pi_a \wedge \neg(\pi_c))$. If it returns `unsat`, the result of the implication is valid; it returns `sat`, the result of the implication is invalid; otherwise, the result of the implication is unknown.

During the heap chains matching, aliasing relation on pointers are considered to introduce alternative proofs via $\boxed{\text{ALIAS}}$ rule.

Instantiation Mechanism. A variable is instantiable if it is an actual parameter of a UD predicate instance in the consequent (RHS) and is quantifier-free. This mechanism is applied for predicate matching rule [11] (corresponding rule used in [16] is subtracting) and predicate folding rule [11] (corresponding rule used in [7] is unfolding predicate in RHS). Whenever a match of a UD predicate instance occurs, the entailment procedure binds its instantiable parameters coming from the RHS with corresponding variables from the antecedent (LHS) and moves the equality constraints to the LHS. Whenever a UD predicate instance in the RHS is unfolded, our proof system moves pure constraints over instantiable (actual) parameters of the unfolded formulas to the LHS. Moreover, this mechanism is proven sound and is able to enhance the completeness of entailment procedure for a SL fragment including UD predicates with pure properties [11].

B Theorem Exploration

B.1 Generating Reverse/Split/Join Lemmas

Step 1. This subsection explores theorem over segment predicates as follows.

Definition 2 (Segment Predicate) A predicate $\text{SP}(r, \bar{v}, s)$ is a segment predicate if r is a root parameter and for any base formula Δ which is derived by unfolding $\text{SP}(r, \bar{v}, s)$, s is a leaf pointer reached from r . We will refer s as a segment parameter.

For instance, linked-list segment predicate with size property is defined as follows:

$$\text{pred glsegn}(\text{root}, s, n) \equiv \text{emp} \wedge \text{root} = s \wedge n = 0 \vee \exists q. \text{root} \mapsto_{c_1}(q) * \text{glsegn}(q, s, n-1);$$

The predicate glsegn above may be an acyclic list, or a complete cyclic list, or a lasso (an acyclic fragment followed by a cycle). The *acyclic* list segment predicate lsegn (Sec. 2) is a special segment predicate. Tree segment predicates can be found in [7].

A UD predicate is syntactically classified as segment predicate if it has one root parameter r and one segment parameter s such that s is a leaf pointer which is reached from r . A UD predicate is syntactically classified as *acyclic* segment predicate if it is a segment predicate and the formula $r \neq s$ occurs in all inductive branches.

Step 2. Reverse lemmas explore relations between reverse directions of linked heaps i.e. forwardly and backwardly linked list from root parameter to segment parameter in inductive branches of segment predicates. Our implementation for reverse lemmas currently restricts for reachable heaps linked by points-to predicates and segment predicate

instances. With a segment predicate $Q(\text{root}, \bar{w}, s)$, for each inductive branch $\exists \bar{w}_i \cdot \Delta_i$, reverse linked heaps $\exists \bar{w}_i \cdot \Delta_{i_r}$ of is examined as follows: (i) mark reachable heaps, a set of points-to predicates and segment predicate instances from root to s ; (ii) swap root and s . Now, s is a root variable of either a points-to predicate or a segment predicate instance; (iii) starting from the heap predicate with s , reverse the reachable heaps following the links. (For each points-to predicate, swap points-to variable with downstream field variable of the links. For each segment predicate instance, swap root parameter and segment parameter); (iv) keep the rest of Δ_i unchanged.

Reverse conjectures are initially generated over reachable heaps as: $\exists \bar{w}_i \cdot \Delta_{i_r} \rightarrow Q(\text{root}, \bar{w}, s)$.

For example, with segment list `glsegn` above, we generate the following lemma: lemma `rev1` $\exists q \cdot q \mapsto c_1(s) * \text{glsegn}(\text{root}, q, n-1) \rightarrow \text{glsegn}(\text{root}, n, s)$. Heap-only conjecture to explore join relation for the segment predicate $P(x, \bar{w}, s)$ (x is a root parameter and s is a segment parameter) is generated as:

$$\exists z, \bar{w}_1, \bar{w}_2 \cdot P(x, \bar{w}_1, z) * P(z, \bar{w}_2, s) \rightarrow \exists \bar{w} \cdot P(x, \bar{w}, s)$$

Two heap-only conjectures to explore join relation for the acyclic segment predicate $Q(x, \bar{w}, s)$ of data type `data c{f1:v1;}` are generated as:

$$\exists z, \bar{w}_1, \bar{w}_2 \cdot Q(x, \bar{w}_1, z) * Q(z, \bar{w}_2, \text{null}) \rightarrow \exists \bar{w} \cdot Q(x, \bar{w}, \text{null})$$

and

$$\exists z, \bar{w}_1, \bar{w}_2 \cdot Q(x, \bar{w}_1, z) * Q(z, \bar{w}_2, s) * s \mapsto c(\bar{w}_3) \rightarrow \exists \bar{w}, \bar{w}_3 \cdot Q(x, \bar{w}, s) * s \mapsto c(\bar{w}_3)$$

Similarly, *split* heap-only conjecture $\Delta \rightarrow \Delta_1 * \Delta_2$ is generated as a opposite form of the corresponding join heap-only conjecture $\Delta_1 * \Delta_2 \rightarrow \Delta$.

B.2 Generating Separating Lemmas

Step 1. This subsection explores relations over UD predicates including either parallel or consequence separating parameters. Two parameters of a predicate are *parallel* separating if they are both root parameters (e.g. those of the predicate `zip`, Sec. 5.1). Two parameters of a predicate are *consequence* separating if one is root parameter and another parameter is internal variable reachable from the root in all base formulas derived by unfolding the predicate (e.g. those of the predicate U_{post} , Sec. C.3). We generate these separating lemmas to explicate separation globally. As a result, the separation of actual parameters is visible from analyses. This visible separation enables strong updates in modular heap analysis or frame inference in modular verification.

Step 2. Suppose r_1, r_2 are consequence or parallel parameters in $Q(r_1, r_2, \bar{w})$, heap conjecture is generated as: $Q(r_1, r_2, \bar{w}) \rightarrow Q_1(r_1) * Q_2(r_2) * Q_3(\bar{w})$.

For example, the `zip` predicate is suggested to split through the following parallel separating conjecture: lemma `para zip` $Q(\text{root}, r_2) \rightarrow Q_1(\text{root}) * Q_2(r_2)$.

C More Examples

C.1 Universal Lemma Synthesis

To illustrate the lemma synthesis, consider the following entailment check E_1

$$\exists k. \text{lln}(x, n) \wedge n \geq k \wedge k \geq 0 \wedge i = k \wedge j = n - k \vdash_{\emptyset} \exists p. \text{lsegn}(x, p, i) * \text{lln}(p, j)$$

We define the `lln` (`lsegn`) predicate to describe an acyclic singly-linked list null-terminated (segment, respectively) over the data type `c1` with size property `n` as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pred lln}(\text{root}, n) &\equiv \text{emp} \wedge \text{root} = \text{null} \wedge n = 0 & \text{pred lsegn}(\text{root}, s, n) &\equiv \text{emp} \wedge \text{root} = s \wedge n = 0 \\ &\vee \exists q. \text{root} \mapsto c_1(q) * \text{lln}(q, n-1); & &\vee \exists q. \text{root} \mapsto c_1(q) * \text{lsegn}(q, s, n-1) \wedge \text{root} \neq s; \end{aligned}$$

whereas `struct c1` { `c1 * next`; }. E_1 verifies that the list x can be split into two smaller list segments. (The list y is the residue.) To derive a proof for E_1 , our system automatically generates the following auxiliary conjecture with universal guards and unknown predicate P :

$$\text{lemma sp } \forall n, a, b. \text{lln}(\text{root}, n) \wedge P(n, a, b) \rightarrow \exists p. \text{lsegn}(\text{root}, p, a) * \text{lln}(p, b).$$

and its reverse conjecture

$$\text{lemma jn } \forall n, a, b. \exists p. \text{lsegn}(\text{root}, p, a) * \text{lln}(p, b) \rightarrow \text{lln}(\text{root}, n) \wedge P(n, a, b).$$

Our system will prove the validity of one lemma and infer definition of P , simultaneously. After that, this inferred definition of P is substituted into another lemma before this lemma is proven. As `jn` has more predicates, it may need more case splits. Thus we choose `jn` for inference since it would generate more relational constraints and our system can obtain more precise definition of P . To prove `jn`, our lemma proving component unfolds the predicate `lsegn`(`root`, `p`, `a`) in the antecedent and generates the two subgoals E_2 and E_3 as

$$\begin{aligned} E_2: & \forall n, a, b. \exists p. \text{lln}(p, b) \wedge \text{root} = p \wedge a = 0 \vdash_{\{\text{jn}\}} \text{lln}(\text{root}, n) \wedge P(n, a, b) \\ E_3: & \forall n, a, b. \exists p, q_1, a_1. \text{root} \mapsto c_1(q_1) * \text{lsegn}(q_1, p, a_1) * \text{lln}(p, b) \wedge a = a_1 + 1 \vdash_{\{\text{jn}\}} \text{lln}(\text{root}, n) \wedge P(n, a, b) \end{aligned}$$

Inspired by cyclic proof systems [6, 7, 37, 12], our system has employed the lemma `jn` as induction hypothesis for proving E_2 and E_3 . For E_2 , we subtract (match) the predicate `lln` pointed by `root` in both sides, instantiate n and generate the following assumption to successfully prove the rest of RHS:

$$\mathcal{R}_2: a = 0 \wedge n = b \wedge b \geq 0 \Rightarrow P(n, a, b)$$

For E_3 , we unfold the predicate `lln` pointed by `root` in RHS (recursive case), subtract points-to predicate pointed by `root` in both sides, apply lemma `jn` and generate the following assumption to successfully prove the rest of RHS:

$$\mathcal{R}_3: n = n_1 + 1 \wedge a = a_1 + 1 \wedge P(n_1, a_1, b) \wedge n_1 \geq 0 \wedge a_1 \geq 0 \wedge b \geq 0 \Rightarrow P(n, a, b)$$

Using a fixed point computation (i.e. FixCalc [33]) to solve $\mathcal{R}_2 \wedge \mathcal{R}_3$, a definition of P can be derived as $P(n, a, b) \equiv n = a + b \wedge n \geq b \wedge b \geq 0$. The lemma `jn` is synthesized as:

$$\text{lemma jn } \forall n, a, b. \exists p. \text{lsegn}(\text{root}, p, a) * \text{lln}(p, b) \rightarrow \text{lln}(\text{root}, n) \wedge n = a + b \wedge n \geq b \wedge b \geq 0$$

Moreover, our system also successfully verifies the lemma `sp` (substituted with P) as:

$$\text{lemma sp } \forall n, a, b. \text{lln}(\text{root}, n) \wedge n = a + b \wedge n \geq b \wedge b \geq 0 \rightarrow \exists p. \text{lsegn}(\text{root}, p, a) * \text{lln}(p, b)$$

Now, `jn` and `sp` can be soundly applied for upcoming proof search. By applying the lemma `sp`, our entailment procedure can prove the validity of E_1 and inferring the residue as: $\Delta_{\text{frame}} \equiv \text{emp} \wedge n \geq k \wedge k \geq 0 \wedge i = k \wedge j = n - k \wedge i = a' \wedge j = b'$.

C.2 Modular Verification with Last Element


```

1 c1* append_shape(c1 x, c1 y)
2 /*requires ll(x)*ll(y) ∧ x ≠ null
3   ensures ll(res) */
4 {c1*t=x;
5   while(t->next) t=t->next;
6   t->next=y;
7   return x; }

```

Fig. 6. Code of method `append_shape`.

To illustrate how our proof system can support induction reasoning together with complex frame inference, consider the *modular* verification of the method `append_shape` in Fig. 6. This method appends a list pointed by `y` to the end of a list pointed by `x`. The user provides its pre-post specification (lines 2-3) and the predicates `ll`

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pred ll}(\text{root}) &\equiv \text{emp} \wedge \text{root} = \text{null} \\ &\vee \exists q. \text{root} \mapsto c_1(q) * \text{ll}(q); \end{aligned}$$

whereas `struct c1{c1* next;}`. The `while` loop is annotated with the natural invariant as follows: `requires ll(t) ∧ t ≠ null ensures ll_last(t, t')`, whereas `t'` is the value of `t` after the loop and the predicate `ll_last` is supplied as ⁴

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pred ll_last}(\text{root}, s) &\equiv \text{root} \mapsto c_1(\text{null}) \wedge \text{root} = s \\ &\vee \exists q. \text{root} \mapsto c_1(q) * \text{ll_last}(q, s); \end{aligned}$$

As a (bottom-up) modular verification, the loops are verified prior to the verification of the method check; and the correctness of a method is reduced to the validity of appropriate verification conditions generated. Our system generates verification conditions to ensure absence of memory errors (no null dereference, no double free and no memory leak), validity of functional calls/loops via compositional pre-/post- conditions and post-conditions holding.

The most challenging step to verify this example is the proving of absence of null dereference at line 6. The symbolic state is computed before line 6 is

$$\text{ll_last}(t, t') * \text{ll}(y) \wedge t = x \wedge x \neq \text{null}$$

For memory safety at line 6, our system generates the following proof obligation

$$\text{ll_last}(t, t') * \text{ll}(y) \wedge t \neq \text{null} \vdash_{\emptyset} t' \mapsto c_1(q)$$

Since the information of `t'` is deeply embedded in the base case of predicate `ll_last`, this entail check challenges existing SL proof systems. Additionally for a proper reasoning, a proof system also needs to infer the frame as the list `ll(y)` and a list segment from `t` to the node before `t'`. Inferring such frame is nontrivial. Our system generates the conjecture:

$$\text{lemma c: ll_last}(t, t') * \text{ll}(y) \wedge t \neq \text{null} \rightarrow t' \mapsto c_1(q) * \text{U}_2(t, t', q, y)$$

Then, proves its validity as follows.

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{(Base)} \quad \text{(Induction)} \\ \hline \text{ll_last}(t, t') * \text{ll}(y) \wedge t \neq \text{null} \vdash_{\emptyset} t' \mapsto c_1(q) * \text{U}_2(t, t', q, y) \rightsquigarrow (\sigma_1 \wedge \sigma_2, \text{emp}) \\ \\ \text{AF} \frac{\text{emp} \vdash_{\{c\}} \text{emp} \rightsquigarrow (\sigma_1, \text{emp})}{\text{ll}(y) \wedge t' = t \wedge q = \text{null} \wedge t \neq \text{null} \vdash_{\{c\}} \text{U}_2(t, t', q, y)} \\ \text{M} \frac{\text{(Base): } t \mapsto c_1(\text{null}) * \text{ll}(y) \wedge t' = t \wedge t \neq \text{null} \vdash_{\{c\}} t' \mapsto c_1(q) * \text{U}_2(t, t', q, y)}{\text{ll_last}(t, t') * \text{ll}(y) \wedge t \neq \text{null} \vdash_{\emptyset} t' \mapsto c_1(q) * \text{U}_2(t, t', q, y)} \end{array}$$

⁴ Indeed, this invariant is the outcome of the state-of-the-art shape analysis tools like [8,24] when they are used for invariant inference.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{AF} \frac{\text{emp} \vdash_{\{c\}} \text{emp} \rightsquigarrow (\sigma_1, \text{emp})}{\text{M} \frac{\text{t} \mapsto_{c_1} (q_1) * \text{U}_2(q_1, t', q_2, y) \vdash_{\{c\}} \text{U}_2(t, t', q_2, y)}{\text{LAPP} \frac{\text{t} \mapsto_{c_1} (q_1) * \text{t}' \mapsto_{c_1} (q_2) * \text{U}_2(q_1, t', q_2, y) \vdash_{\{c\}} \text{t}' \mapsto_{c_1} (q) * \text{U}_2(t, t', q, y)}{(\text{Induction}): \text{t} \mapsto_{c_1} (q_1) * \text{ll_last}(q_1, t') * \text{ll}(y) \wedge t \neq \text{null} \vdash_{\{c\}} \text{t}' \mapsto_{c_1} (q) * \text{U}_2(t, t', q, y)}}
\end{array}$$

Relational assumptions are inferred as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_1: & \text{ll}(y) \wedge t' = t \wedge q = \text{null} \wedge t \neq \text{null} \Rightarrow \text{U}_2(t, t', q, y) \\
\sigma_2: & t \mapsto_{c_1} (q_1) * \text{U}_2(q_1, t', q_2, y) \Rightarrow \text{U}_2(t, t', q_2, y)
\end{aligned}$$

From σ_1 and σ_2 , our system synthesizes the following definition for U_2 as

$$\text{U}_2(\text{root}, t', q, y) \equiv \text{ll}(y) \wedge \text{root} = t' \wedge q = \text{null} \wedge \text{root} \neq \text{null} \vee \exists q_1. \text{root} \mapsto_{c_1} (q_1) * \text{U}_2(q_1, t', q, y);$$

Using theorem exploration presented in Sec 6 and App. B, our system generate the following two-way lemma to normalize the predicate U_2 :

$$\text{lemma conseq}_0: \text{U}_2(\text{root}, t', q, y) \leftrightarrow \text{U}_3(\text{root}, t') * \text{ll}(y) \wedge q = \text{null} \wedge \text{root} \neq \text{null}$$

with U_3 is a newly-inferred predicate as follows.

$$\text{U}_3(\text{root}, t') \equiv \text{emp} \wedge \text{root} = t' \vee \exists q_1. \text{root} \mapsto_{c_1} (q_1) * \text{U}_3(q_1, t');$$

In summary, our system successfully proves validity and infers frame for the entailment.

We present a reasoning on both shape and size properties of a more complicated revision of the append method in App. C.3.

C.3 Modular Verification with Incremental Specification Inference

1 $c_1 * \text{append}(\text{int } n, \text{int } m) \{$	7 $c_1 * \text{create_ll}(\text{int } s) \{$
2 $c_1 * x = \text{creat_ll}(n);$	8 $\text{if}(s=0) \text{return null};$
3 $c_1 * y = \text{creat_ll}(m);$	9 $\text{else } \{$
4 $c_1 * t = x;$	10 $c_1 * p = \text{malloc}(c_1);$
5 $\text{while}(t \rightarrow \text{next}) t = t \rightarrow \text{next};$	11 $p \rightarrow \text{next} = \text{create_ll}(s-1);$
6 $t \rightarrow \text{next} = y; \text{return } x; \}$	12 $\text{return } p; \}$

Fig. 7. Code of method `append`.

In order to minimize the burden of program verification, we pursue a compositional verification of programs whose specifications are partially supplied. Concretely, the user is only required to provide specifications of pre/post conditions for critical methods and loop invariants whereas specifications of the rest are inferred automatically. This specification inference has been implemented incrementally for the combined domains. such that shape-only specifications are inferred first and then constraints over pure domains are additionally synthesized. In the context of heap-manipulating programs, recursive methods and loop invariants normally relate to recursive predicates; consequently, compositionally verifying these specifications requires both inductive reasoning and frame inference. Our proposed approach brings the best support for such verification. To illustrate how our proof system is used to *compositionally* and *incrementally* verify heap-manipulating programs, consider the method `append` in Fig. 7 which appends a list pointed by `y` to the end of a list pointed by `x`. The user provides the predicates `lln`, `lseg` (Sec. 2) and `append`'s specification as: `requires $n > 0 \wedge m \geq 0$ ensures $\text{lln}(\text{res}, m+n)$.`

Verifying safety properties that require both heap and data reasoning has been studied in the literature, e.g. abstract interpretation [41], TVLA [21] and interpolation [2]. Different to these proposals, ours is compositional and based on the proposed inductive proof system. We enhance inference techniques [8,24,42] to generate specification and invariant for the combined domains of the method `create_ll` and `while` loop (of pre/post condition). Our verification is bottom-up (i.e. verifying the method `create_ll` and `while` loop before the method `append`) and incremental (i.e. analyzing *shape* and then *size* property for the loop invariant inference). Concretely, our system inferred the specification for `create_ll` and `while` loop as: `requires $s \geq 0$ ensures $\text{lln}(\text{res}, s)$` and (s_3) `requires $\exists q. \text{t} \mapsto_{c_1}(q) * \text{lln}(q, i) \wedge i \geq 0$ ensures $\text{lsegn}(t, t', j) * \text{t}' \mapsto_{c_1}(\text{null}) \wedge j = i$` , resp.

In the following, we present the specification inference for the loop. To infer *shape* specification of the loop invariant the system initially generates specification with two unknown *shape* predicates as follows: `requires $U_{\text{pre}}(t)$ ensures $U_{\text{post}}(t, t')$` , whereas t' is the value of t after the loop. Using the modular *shape* analysis in [24], the predicate U_{pre} and U_{post} are synthesized as

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\text{pre}}(\text{root}) &\equiv \exists q. \text{root} \mapsto_{c_1}(q) * U_1(q) \\ U_1(\text{root}) &\equiv \text{emp} \wedge \text{root} = \text{null} \vee \exists q. \text{root} \mapsto_{c_1}(q) * U_1(q) \\ U_{\text{post}}(\text{root}, l) &\equiv \text{root} \mapsto_{c_1}(\text{null}) \wedge \text{root} = l \vee \exists q. \text{root} \mapsto_{c_1}(q) * U_{\text{post}}(q, l) \wedge \text{root} \neq l \end{aligned}$$

whereas U_1 is an auxiliary predicate. Whenever receiving these predicate definitions, our theorem exploration component will generate new lemmas to study interesting properties of these predicates. In this example, our system generates the following lemmas to explicate the separation between two parameters of the predicate U_{post} :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{lemma } \text{consep } U_{\text{post}}(\text{root}, l) &\leftrightarrow U_2(\text{root}, l) * \text{t} \mapsto_{c_1}(\text{null}) \\ U_2(\text{root}, s) &\equiv \text{emp} \wedge \text{root} = s \vee \exists q. \text{root} \mapsto_{c_1}(q) * U_2(q, s) \wedge \text{root} \neq s \end{aligned}$$

Then, the *shape* invariant of the loop is constructed as follows:

$$\text{requires } \exists q. \text{x} \mapsto_{c_1}(q) * U_1(q) \quad \text{ensures } U_2(x, x') * \text{x}' \mapsto_{c_1}(\text{null})$$

To extend the above *shape* invariant with the *size* property, we first use predicate extension [42] to automatically append the *size* property into U_1 (U_{n_1}) and U_2 (U_{n_2})

$$\begin{aligned} U_{n_1}(\text{root}, n) &\equiv \text{emp} \wedge \text{root} = \text{null} \wedge n = 0 \vee \exists q. \text{root} \mapsto_{c_1}(q) * U_{n_1}(q, n-1) \\ U_{n_2}(\text{root}, s, n) &\equiv \text{emp} \wedge \text{root} = s \wedge n = 0 \vee \exists q. \text{root} \mapsto_{c_1}(q) * U_{n_2}(q, s, n-1) \wedge \text{root} \neq s \end{aligned}$$

Our theorem exploration, again, generates two lemmas to match U_{n_1} with `lln` and U_{n_2} with `lsegn` as: $U_{n_1}(\text{root}, n) \leftrightarrow \text{lln}(\text{root}, n)$ and $U_{n_2}(\text{root}, s, n) \leftrightarrow \text{lsegn}(\text{root}, s, n)$. After that, we generate specification with unknown pure predicates P_2, P_3 :

$$\text{requires } \exists q. \text{t} \mapsto_{c_1}(q) * \text{lln}(q, i) \wedge P_2(i) \quad \text{ensures } \text{lsegn}(t, t', j) * \text{t}' \mapsto_{c_1}(\text{null}) \wedge P_3(i, j)$$

whereas P_2 and P_3 are placeholders to capture constraints over the *size* variables. Using SOBD for pure properties inference [42], the following definitions are synthesized: $P_2(i) \equiv i \geq 0$ and $P_3(i, j) \equiv j = i$. Finally, loop invariant is inferred as the specification s_3 . This loop invariant is now used in the verification of the main method `append`. To verify the correctness and memory safety (no null-dereference and no leakage) of `append`, our system generates and successfully proves the following three verification conditions:⁵

⁵ For simplicity, we discard the verification conditions at line 2 and line 3.

$VC_1. \text{lln}(x,n) * \text{lln}(y,m) \wedge n > 0 \wedge m \geq 0 \vdash_L \exists q. \tau \mapsto_{c_1}(q) * \text{lln}(q,i) \wedge i \geq 0$
 $\leadsto (\text{true}, \text{lln}(y,m) \wedge x = t \wedge t \neq \text{null} \wedge n = i - 1 \wedge n > 0 \wedge i \geq 0)$ // line 5, pre-proving (of loop)
 $VC_2. \text{lsegn}(t,t',j) * \tau' \mapsto_{c_1}(\text{null}) * \text{lln}(y,m) \wedge i = j \wedge x \neq \text{null} \wedge n = i - 1 \wedge n > 0 \vdash_L \tau' \mapsto_{c_1}(-)$
 $\leadsto (\text{true}, \text{lsegn}(t,t',j) * \text{lln}(y,m) \wedge i = j \wedge x = t \wedge t \neq \text{null} \wedge n = i - 1 \wedge n > 0) \wedge m \geq 0$
// before line 6, no null-dereference
 $VC_3. \text{lsegn}(\text{res},t',j) * \tau' \mapsto_{c_1}(y) * \text{lln}(y,m) \wedge i = j \wedge x = t \wedge t \neq \text{null} \wedge n = i - 1 \wedge n > 0 \wedge m \geq 0$
 $\vdash_L \text{lln}(\text{res},m+n) \leadsto (\text{true}, \text{emp} \wedge x = t \wedge t \neq \text{null} \wedge n = i - 1 \wedge n > 0 \wedge i \geq 0)$
// after line 6, post-condition, **no leakage**

whereas L is the set of lemmas either supplied by the user or generated by our system (i.e. to explore predicate relations like the `conseq` lemmas above).

We highlight two advantages achieved from our proposed approach. First, if the two-way lemma `conseq` was not synthesized, the condition VC_2 would be generated as: $U_{\text{post}}(t,t') * \text{lln}(y,m) \wedge x = t \wedge i = j \wedge t \neq \text{null} \wedge n = i - 1 \wedge n > 0 \vdash_L \tau' \mapsto_{c_1}(-)$. We are not aware of any proof systems that are capable of discharging such obligation and inferring the residual frame, simultaneously. Second, simultaneously automated proving VC_3 and inferring its residual heap `emp` (to confirm no memory is leaked) require nontrivial inductive reasoning which is not supported by most existing SL entailment procedures.