

Safety Verification of Declarative Smart Contracts

Haoxian Chen¹, Lan Lu¹, Brendan Massey¹, Yuepeng Wang², and
Boon Thau Loo¹

¹ University of Pennsylvania
{hxchen,lanlu,masseybr,boonloo}@seas.upenn.edu

² Simon Fraser University
yuepeng@sfu.ca

Abstract. Smart contracts manage a large number of digital assets nowadays. Bugs in these contracts have led to significant financial loss. Verifying the correctness of smart contracts is therefore an important task. This paper presents a safety verification tool DCV that targets declarative smart contracts written in DeCon, a logic-based domain-specific language for smart contract implementation and specification. DCV is sound and fully automatic. It proves safety properties by mathematical induction and can automatically infer inductive invariants without annotations from the developer. Our evaluation shows that DCV is effective in verifying smart contracts adapted from public repositories, and can verify contracts not supported by other tools. Furthermore, DCV significantly outperforms baseline tools in verification time.

1 Introduction

Smart contracts are programs that process transactions on blockchains: a type of decentralized and distributed ledgers. The combination of smart contracts and blockchains has enabled a wide range of innovations in fields including banking [6], trading [31,8], and financing [37], etc.

Nowadays, smart contracts are managing a massive amount of digital assets³, but they also suffer from security vulnerabilities [2,3,1], which leads to significant financial loss. In addition, since smart contracts are stored and executed on blockchains, once they are deployed, it is hard to terminate execution and update the contracts when new vulnerabilities are discovered.

One way to reduce potential vulnerabilities, whose patterns are unknown during development, is safety verification: a smart contract that is always safe is less likely to suffer from undiscovered vulnerabilities[25,32]. Thus, this work focuses on the problem of safety verification for smart contracts.

Most existing solutions directly verify the implementation of smart contracts [10,23,28,25,32]. These solutions have worked very well on verifying transaction-level properties, e.g., pre/post conditions, integer overflow, etc. However, when

³ According to Etherscan, at the writing of this paper, the top ERC20 tokens are managing billions dollars worth of tokens.

it comes to contract-level properties, where an invariant needs to hold across an infinite sequence of transactions, these approaches suffer from low efficiency due to state explosion issues. Some solutions [21,16] trade soundness for efficiency, verifying properties up to a certain number of transactions.

On the other hand, in model-based verification approaches, a formal model of the smart contract is specified separately from the implementation. Given such a formal model and the implementation, two kinds of verification are performed: (1) does the formal model satisfy the desired properties [29,17]? (2) is the implementation consistent with the formal model [19]? This verification approach is more efficient, because the formal model typically abstracts away implementation details that are irrelevant to the verification task. However, a separate model needs to be written in addition to the implementation, and is typically in a formal language that is unfamiliar to software engineers.

In this paper, we propose an alternative verification approach based on an executable specification of smart contracts. In particular, we target smart contracts written in DeCon [18], a domain-specific language for smart contract specification and implementation. A DeCon contract is a declarative specification for the smart contract logic in itself, making it more efficient to reason about than the low-level implementation in Solidity. It is also executable, in that it can be automatically compiled into a Solidity program that can be deployed on the Ethereum blockchain. When verification is completed, the automatic code generation saves developers' effort to manually implement the contract following the specification. The high-level abstraction and executability make DeCon an ideal target for verifying contract-level properties.

We implement a prototype, DCV (DeCon Verifier), for verifying declarative smart contracts. DCV performs sound verification of safety invariants using mathematical induction. A typical challenge in induction is to infer inductive invariants that can help prove the target property. A key insight is that the DeCon language exposes the exact logical predicates that are necessary for constructing such inductive invariants, which makes inductive invariant inference tractable.

As another benefit of using DeCon as the verification target, DeCon provides uniform interfaces for both contract implementation and property specification. It models the smart contract states as relational databases, and properties as violation queries against these databases. Thus, both the smart contract transaction logic and properties can be specified in a declarative and succinct way. With DCV, developers can specify both the contract logic and its properties in DeCon, and have it verified and implemented automatically.

This paper makes the following contributions.

- A sound and efficient verification method for smart contracts, targeting contract-level safety invariants that is based on a declarative specification language and induction proof strategy (Sections 4, 5).
- A domain-specific adaptation of the Houdini algorithm [26] to infer inductive invariants for induction proof (Section 5).
- An open-source verification tool for future study and comparison.

- Evaluation that compares DCV with state-of-the-art verification tools, on ten representative benchmark smart contracts. DCV successfully verifies all benchmarks, is able to handle benchmarks not supported by other tools, and is significantly more efficient than baseline tools. In some instances, DCV completes verification within seconds when other tools timeout after an hour (Section 6).

2 Illustrative Example




Fig. 1: Overview of DCV.

Figure 1 presents an overview of DCV. It takes a smart contract and a property specification (in the form of a violation query) as input, both of which are written in the DeCon language (Section 3). The smart contract is then translated into a state transition system, and the property is translated into a safety invariant on the system states. DCV then proves the transition system preserves the safety invariant by mathematical induction. In our implementation, theorem proving is performed by Z3 [14], an automatic theorem prover.

If the proof succeeds, the smart contract is verified to be safe, meaning that the violation query result is always empty, and an inductive invariant is returned as a safety proof. Otherwise, DCV returns “unknown”, meaning that the smart contract may not satisfy the specified safety invariant.

In the rest of this section, we use a voting contract (Listing 1.1) as an example to illustrate the work flow of DCV. This example is adapted from the voting example in Solidity [11], simplified for ease of exposition.

2.1 A Voting Contract

Listing 1.1 shows a voting contract written in DeCon. In DeCon, transaction records and contract states are modeled as relational tables (lines 1-10). These declarations define table schemas in relational databases, where each schema has the table name followed by column names and types in a parenthesis. Optionally, a square bracket annotates the index of the primary key columns, meaning that these columns uniquely identify a row. For example, the relation `votes(proposal : uint, c : uint) [0]` on line 5 has two columns, named `proposal` and `c`, and both have

```

1 /* Declare relations. */
2 .decl recv_vote(proposal: uint)
3 .decl vote(p: address, proposal: uint)
4 .decl isVoter(v: address, b: bool)[0]
5 .decl votes(proposal: uint, c: uint)[0]
6 .decl wins(proposal: uint, b: bool)[0]
7 .decl voted(p: address, b: bool)[0]
8 .decl *winningProposal(proposal: uint)
9 .decl *hasWinner(b: bool)
10 .decl *quorumSize(q: uint)
11
12 .init isVoter
13
14 /* Transaction where voter v cast a vote to proposal p. */
15 vote(v,p) :- recv_vote(p), msgSender(v), hasWinner(false),
16             voted(v, false), isVoter(v, true).
17
18 /* Count votes for each proposal p. */
19 votes(p,c) :- vote(_,p), c = count: vote(_,p).
20
21 /* A proposal wins by reaching a quorum. */
22 wins(p, true) :- votes(p,c), quorumSize(q), c >= q.
23 hasWinner(true) :- wins(_,b), b==true.
24 winningProposal(p) :- wins(p,b), b==true.
25
26 voted(v,true) :- vote(v,_).
27
28 /* Safety invariant: at most one winning proposal. */
29 .decl inconsistency(p1: uint, p2: uint)[0,1]
30 .violation inconsistency
31 inconsistency(p1,p2) :- wins(p1,true), wins(p2,true), p1!=p2.

```

Listing 1.1: A smart contract for voting, written in DeCon [18] language.

type `uint`. The first column is the primary key. If no primary keys are annotated, all columns are interpreted as primary keys, i.e., the table is a set of tuples.

A special kind of relation is singleton relation, annotated by `*`. Singleton relations only have one row, e.g., `winningProposal` in line 8.

By default all relational tables are initialized to be empty, except relations annotated by the `init` keyword (line 12). These relations are initialized by the constructor arguments passed during deployment.

Each transaction is written in the form of a rule used in Datalog programs: `head :- body`. The rule body consists of a list of relational literals, and is evaluated to true if and only if all relational literals are true. If the rule body is true, the head is inserted into the corresponding relational table. For example, the rule in line 15 specifies that a `vote` transaction can be committed if there is no winner yet, the message sender is a voter, and the voter has not voted yet. The literal `recv_vote(p)` is a transaction handler that evaluates to true on receiving a `vote` transaction request. Rules that contain such transaction handlers (literal with a `recv_` prefix in the relation name) are called transaction rules.

Inserting a new `vote(v,p)` literal triggers updates to all its direct dependent rules. A rule is directly dependent on a relation R if and only if a literal of relation R is in its body. In this case, relation `wins` and `voted` are updated next.

The chain of dependent rule updates go on until no further dependent rules can be triggered, and the transaction handling is finished.

On the other hand, if the body of a transaction rule is evaluated to false on receiving a transaction request, then no dependent rule is triggered, and the transaction is returned as failed.

Line 31 specifies a safety property in the form of a violation query. If the rule is evaluated to true, it means that there exists two different winning proposals, indicating a violation to the safe invariant that there is at most one winning proposal. Such violation query rule is expected to be always false during the execution of a correct smart contract.




Fig. 2: The voting contract as a state transition system.

2.2 Translating DeCon Contract to State Transition System

In order to verify the DeCon contract against the safety invariant, the declarative rules are translated into a state transition system. Figure 2 illustrates part of the transition system translated from the voting contract in Listing 1.1, where all relational tables are the states, and every smart contract transaction commit results in a state transition step.

The middle portion of Figure 2 shows a state after i transactions from one of the initial states, where proposal p_1 has two votes, proposal p_2 has one vote, and there is no winner yet.

Two outgoing edges from this state are highlighted. Suppose the quorum size Q in this example is three. On the top is the transaction $\text{vote}(p_1)$, where p_1 gets another vote, making it reach the quorum and become the winner. The edge annotates the conditions for this transaction to go through (only a fraction of the condition is shown in the figure due to space limit). It is translated from the transaction rule r in Listing 1.1 line 15 ($\text{recv_vote}(p_1) \wedge \neg \text{hasWinner} \wedge \dots$), as well as r 's dependent rules from line 19 to 26 ($\text{votes}[p_1] \geq Q \wedge \dots$). This edge leads to a new state where proposal p_1 's votes is incremented by one, and it becomes the winner, which is also translated from line 19 to 26.

Similarly, the bottom right shows another transaction where proposal p_2 gets a vote, but *hasWinner* remains *False* since there is no proposal reaching the quorum.

Section 4.2 formally describes the algorithm to translate a DeCon smart contract into a state transition system.

Property. The violation query rule (line 31) is translated into the following safety invariant: $\neg[\exists p_1, p_2. \text{wins}(p_1) \wedge \text{wins}(p_2) \wedge p_1 \neq p_2]$, It says that there do not exist proposals p_1 and p_2 such that the violation query is true, which means that there is at most one winning proposal.

2.3 Proof by Induction

Given the state transition system translated from the DeCon smart contract, the target property $\text{prop}(s)$ is proven by mathematical induction. In particular, let S be the set of states in the transition system, and E be the set of transaction types. Given $s, s' \in S, e \in E$, let $\text{init}(s)$ indicate whether s is in the initial state, and $\text{tr}(s, e, s')$ indicate whether s can transition to s' via transaction e . The mathematical induction is as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{ProofByInduction}(\text{init}, \text{tr}, \text{prop}) \triangleq \text{Base}(\text{init}, \text{prop}) \wedge \text{Induction}(\text{tr}, \text{prop}) \\
 \text{Base}(\text{init}, \text{prop}) \triangleq \forall s \in S. \text{init}(s) \implies \text{prop}(s) \\
 \text{Induction}(\text{tr}, \text{prop}) \triangleq \forall s, s' \in S, e \in E. \text{inv}(s) \wedge \text{prop}(s) \\
 \quad \wedge \text{tr}(s, e, s') \implies \text{inv}(s') \wedge \text{prop}(s')
 \end{array} \tag{1}$$

where $\text{inv}(s) \wedge \text{prop}(s)$ is an inductive invariant inferred by DCV such that $\text{prop}(s)$ is proved to be an invariant of the transition system.

To find such an inductive invariant, DCV first generates a set of candidate invariants using predicates extracted from transaction rules in the DeCon contract, and then applies the Houdini algorithm [26] to find the inductive invariant. The detailed steps are as follows:

(1) Extract predicates from all transaction rules. Take the transaction rule in line 15 as an example. The following predicates can be extracted from it: $\neg \text{hasWinner}$, $\neg \text{voted}[v]$, $\text{isVoter}[v]$.

(2) Generate candidate invariants. Given the extracted predicates, candidate invariants are generated in the form, $\forall x \in X. \neg \text{init}(s) \implies \neg p(s, x)$, where X is the set of all possible values of the local variables (variables other than the state variables) in predicate $p(s, x)$. And $p(s, x)$ is one of the predicates extracted from the transaction rules. $\neg \text{init}(s)$ is introduced as the premise of the implication so that the candidate invariant is trivially implied by the system's initial constraints. Having $\neg p(s, x)$ in the implication conclusion is based on the heuristics that in order to prove safety invariants, the lemma should prohibit the system from making an unsafe transition.

For example, the following invariant is generated following the above pattern:

$$\forall u \in \text{Proposal}. \text{wins}[u] \implies \text{hasWinner} \tag{2}$$

The invariant expresses that if any proposal $u \in Proposal$ is marked as winner, the predicate *hasWinner* must also be true.

(3) Infer inductive invariants. Given the set of candidate invariants, DCV applies the Houdini algorithm [26] and returns the formula in Equation 2 as an inductive invariant. Applying the inductive invariant *inv* to the induction procedure (Equation 1), the target property can be proven.

3 The DeCon Language

The syntax of a DeCon smart contract is shown as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 (\text{Contract}) P := Decl \mid Annot \mid Rule \\
 Decl := SR \mid SG \\
 Annot := .(init \mid violation \mid public) Str \\
 (\text{Relation}) SR := .decl Str(Str : Type, Str : Type, \dots)[k1, k2, \dots] \\
 (\text{Singleton relation}) SG := .decl * Str(Str : Type, Str : Type, \dots) \\
 Type := address \mid uint \mid int \mid bool
 \end{array}$$

A DeCon smart contract consists of three main blocks: (1) Relation declarations, (2) Relation annotations, and (3) Rules.

Relation declarations. There are two kinds of relation declarations. Simple relations (*SR*) have a string for a relation name, followed by a schema in parenthesis, and optional primary key indices in a square bracket. The schema consists of a list of column names and types. When inserting a new tuple to a relational table, if a row with the same primary keys exists, then the row is updated by the new tuple.

Singleton relations (*SG*) are relations annotated with a * symbol. These relations have only one row. Row insertion is also an update for singleton relations.

Relation annotations. DeCon supports three kinds of relation annotations. First, *init* indicates that the relation is initialized by a constructor argument passed during deployment. Second, *violation* means that the relation represents a safety violation query. Third, *public* generates a public interface to read the contents of the corresponding relational table.

Rules. The syntax of a DeCon rule is as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 Rule := H(\bar{x}) : - Body \\
 Body := Join \mid R(\bar{x}), y = Agg n : R(\bar{y}) \\
 Join := R(\bar{x}) \mid Pred, Join \\
 Agg := sum \mid max \mid min \mid count \\
 Pred := R(\bar{x}) \mid C(\bar{x}) \mid y = F(\bar{x}) \\
 (\text{Condition}) C := > \mid < \mid \geq \mid \leq \mid \neq \mid == \\
 (\text{Function}) F := + \mid - \mid \times \mid /
 \end{array}$$

where $H(\bar{x})$ and $R(\bar{x})$ are relational literals, with H and R being the relation name, and \bar{x} is an array of variables or constants.

Rule semantics. A DeCon rule is of the form $head:-body$, and is interpreted from right to left: if the body is true, then it inserts the head tuple into the corresponding relational table.

A rule body is a conjunction of literals, and is evaluated to true if there exists a valuation of variables $\pi : V \mapsto D$ such that all literals are true. π maps a variable $v \in V$ to its concrete value in domain D . Given a variable valuation π , a relational literal is evaluated to true if and only if there exists a matching row in the corresponding relational table. Other kinds of literals, including conditions, functions, and aggregations, are interpreted as constraints on the variables.

Join rules. Join rules are rules that have a list of predicates in the rule body, and contain at least one relational literal. A predicate can be either a relational literal, a condition, or a function.

Transaction rules. Transaction rules are a special kind of join rules that have one special literal in the body: transaction handlers. A transaction handler literal has `recv_` prefix in its relation name, and is evaluated to true when the corresponding transaction request is received. The rest of the rule body specifies the approving condition for the transaction.

Aggregation rules are rules that contain a relational literal $R(\bar{x})$ and an aggregator literal $y = Agg\ n : R(\bar{y})$, where Agg can be either max , min , $count$, or sum . For each valid valuation of variables in $R(\bar{x})$, it computes the aggregate on the matching rows in $R(\bar{y})$. Take the following rule from the voting contract as an example.

```
votes ( p , c ) : - vote ( _ , p ) , c = count : vote ( _ , p ) .
```

For each unique value p in the second column of table `vote`, the aggregator `c = count : vote (_ , p)`, counts the number of rows in table `vote` whose second column equals p .

4 Program Transformation

4.1 Declarative Smart Contracts as Transition Systems

This section introduces the algorithm to translate a DeCon smart contract into a state transition system $\langle S, I, E, Tr \rangle$ where

- S is the state space: the set of all possible valuations of all relational tables in DeCon.
- $I \subseteq S$ is the set of initial states that satisfy the initial constraints of the system. All relations are by default initialized to zero, or unconstrained if they are annotated to be initialized by constructor arguments.
- E is the set of events. Each element in E correspond to a kind of transaction in DeCon.
- $Tr \subseteq S \times E \times S$ is the transition relation, generated from DeCon rules. $Tr(s, e, s')$ means that state s can transit to state s' via transaction e .

In the rest of this section, we introduce the algorithm to generate the transition relation from a DeCon smart contract.

4.2 Transition Relation

The transition relation Tr is defined by a boolean formula $tr : S \times E \times S \mapsto Bool$. Given $s, s' \in S, e \in E$, s can transition to s' in one step via transaction e if and only if $tr(s, e, s')$ is true. Equation 3 defines tr as a disjunction over the set of formulas encoding each transaction rule. R is the set of rules in the DeCon contract. Γ is a map from relation to its modeling variable, e.g., the relation `vote` (`proposal:uint, c:uint`) [0] is mapped to `votes : uint \mapsto uint`. Recall from Section 3 that transaction rules are rules that listen to incoming transaction and is only triggered by the incoming transaction request ($r.trigger$ is the literal with `recv_` prefix in r 's body).

$$tr \triangleq \bigvee_{r \in TransactionRules} [\text{EncodeDeConRule}(r, R, \Gamma, r.trigger) \wedge e = r.TxName] \quad (3)$$

Algorithm 1 EncodeDeConRule(r, R, Γ, τ).

Input: (1) a DeCon rule r , (2) the set of all DeCon rules R , (3) a map from relation to its modeling variable Γ , (4) a trigger τ , the newly inserted literal that triggers r 's update.

Output: A boolean formula over $S \times S$, encoding r 's body condition, and all state updates triggered by inserting r 's head literal.

- 1: $Body \leftarrow \text{EncodeRuleBody}(\Gamma, \tau, r)$
 - 2: $Dependent \leftarrow \{\text{EncodeDeConRule}(dr, R, \Gamma, r.head) \mid dr \in \text{DependentRules}(r, R)\}$
 - 3: $(H, H') \leftarrow \text{GetStateVariable}(\Gamma, r.head)$
 - 4: $Update \leftarrow H' = H.insert(r.head)$
 - 5: $TrueBranch \leftarrow Body \wedge Update \wedge (\bigwedge_{d \in Dependent} d)$
 - 6: $FalseBranch \leftarrow \neg Body \wedge (H' = H)$
 - 7: **return** $TrueBranch \oplus FalseBranch$
-

The procedure `EncodeDeConRule` is defined by algorithm 1. We explain it using the voting contract in Listing 1.1 as an example.

In step 1, r 's body is encoded as a boolean formula, *BodyConstraint*, by calling a procedure *EncodeRuleBody* (Section 4.3). Take the rule for `vote` transaction in listing 1.1 line 15 as an example. Its body is encoded as:

$$\neg hasWinner \wedge \neg hasVoted[v] \wedge isVoter[v]$$

In step 2, for each direct dependent rule dr of r , it gets dr 's encoding by recursively calling itself on dr . A rule dr is directly dependent on rule r if and only if r 's head relation appear in dr 's body. For example, rules in line 19 and 26 of Listing 1.1 are directly dependent on the `vote` transaction rule in line 15.

Step 3 generates state variables for the head relation, where H is for the current step, and H' is for the next transition step. Step 4 generates the head

relation update constraint: H' equals to inserting r 's head literal into H . Suppose we are in the recursion step for encoding the `votes` rule in line 19, its update constraint is generated as: $votes' = Store(votes, p, votes[p] + 1)$, where the votes for proposal p is incremented by one.

Step 5 generates the constraint where r 's body is true, in conjunction with the update constraint and all dependent rules' constraints. Step 6, on the other hand, generates constraints where r 's body is false, no dependent rule is triggered, and the head relation remains the same. Step 7 returns the final formula as an exclusive-or of the true and false branches, which encodes r 's body and how its update affects other relations in the contract.

4.3 Encoding Rule Bodies

The procedure `EncodeRuleBody` is defined by two sets of inference rules. The first judgment of the form $\Gamma, \tau \vdash r \hookrightarrow \phi$ states that a DeCon rule r is encoded by a boolean formula ϕ under context Γ and τ . The second judgment of the form $\Gamma, \tau \vdash Pred \rightsquigarrow \phi$ states that a predicate $Pred$ is encoded by a formula ϕ under context Γ and τ . The contexts (Γ and τ) of both judgement forms are defined the same as the input of Algorithm 1.

The judgment $\Gamma, \tau \vdash r \hookrightarrow \phi$ is defined by the following inference rules:

$$\frac{\Gamma, \tau \vdash R(\bar{x}) \rightsquigarrow \phi}{\Gamma, \tau \vdash H(\bar{y}) :- R(\bar{x}) \hookrightarrow \phi} \text{ (Join1)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, \tau \vdash Pred \rightsquigarrow \phi_1 \quad \Gamma, \tau \vdash H(\bar{y}) :- Join \hookrightarrow \phi_2}{\Gamma, \tau \vdash H(\bar{y}) :- Pred, Join \hookrightarrow \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2} \text{ (Join2)}$$

$$\frac{s' = \Gamma(H)[\bar{k}].value + n}{\Gamma, \tau \vdash H(\bar{y}) :- R(\bar{x}), s = sum\ n : R(\bar{z}) \hookrightarrow s = s'} \text{ (Sum)}$$

where \bar{k} represents the primary keys of relation H , extracted from the array \bar{y} , and $\Gamma(H)[\bar{k}].value$ reads the current sum value. Note that, unlike the join rules, the literal $R(\bar{x})$ here does not join with the aggregation literal, because it is only introduced to obtain valid valuations for the rule variables (every row in table R is a valid valuation). For each valid valuation, the aggregator computes the aggregate summary for the matching rows in table R (Section 3). This applies to all inference rules for aggregators.

$$\frac{m' = \Gamma(H)[\bar{k}].value \quad \phi := (n > m' \wedge m = n) \oplus (n \leq m')}{\Gamma, \tau \vdash H(\bar{y}) :- R(\bar{x}), m = max\ n : R(\bar{z}) \hookrightarrow \phi} \text{ (Max)}$$

$$\frac{m' = \Gamma(H)[\bar{k}].value \quad \phi := (n < m' \wedge m = n) \oplus (n \geq m')}{\Gamma, \tau \vdash H(\bar{y}) :- R(\bar{x}), m = min\ n : R(\bar{z}) \hookrightarrow \phi} \text{ (Min)}$$

$$\frac{\phi := c = \Gamma(H)[\bar{k}].value + 1}{\Gamma, \tau \vdash H(\bar{y}) :- R(\bar{x}), c = count : R(\bar{z}) \hookrightarrow \phi} \text{ (Count)}$$

Following are the inference rules for judgment: $\Gamma, \tau \vdash Pred \rightsquigarrow \phi$

$$\frac{\tau.rel = R}{\Gamma, \tau \vdash R(\bar{x}) \rightsquigarrow \tau = R(\bar{x})} \text{ (Lit1)} \quad \frac{\tau.rel \neq R}{\Gamma, \tau \vdash R(\bar{x}) \rightsquigarrow \Gamma(R)[\bar{k}] = \bar{v}} \text{ (Lit2)}$$

where \bar{k} represents the primary keys in relational literal $R(\bar{x})$, extracted from \bar{x} , and \bar{v} represents the remaining fields in \bar{x} .

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, \tau \vdash C \rightsquigarrow C} \text{ (Condition)} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma, \tau \vdash y = F(\bar{x}) \rightsquigarrow y = F(\bar{x})} \text{ (Function)}$$

Assumptions. DCV assumes that on every new incoming transaction request, there is at most one new tuple derived by each rule, and that there is no recursion in the rules.

Recursion means that there is a mutual dependency between rules. A rule r_a is dependent to another rule r_b ($r_a \rightarrow r_b$) if and only if r_b 's head relation appears in r_a 's body, or there exists another rule r_c such that $r_a \rightarrow r_c \wedge r_c \rightarrow r_b$.

This assumption keeps the size of the transition constraint linear to the number of rules in the Decon contract, thus making the safety verification tractable. We find this assumption holds for most smart contracts in the financial domain, and is true for all of the ten benchmark contracts in our evaluation.

4.4 Safety Invariant Generation

For each violation query rule qr in a DeCon contract, it is first encoded as a formula ϕ such that $\Gamma, \tau \vdash qr \hookrightarrow \phi$. Note that the context Γ is the same mapping used in the transition system encoding process. The second context, trigger τ , is a reserved literal $check()$, which triggers the violation query rule after every transaction.

Next, the safety invariant is generated from ϕ as follows:

$$Prop \triangleq \neg(\exists x \in X. \phi(s, x))$$

where X is the state space for the set of non-state variables in ϕ . The property states that there exists no valuations of variables in X such that the violation query is non-empty. In other words, the system is safe from such violation.

5 Verification Method

5.1 Proof by Induction

Given a state transition system $\langle S, I, E, Tr \rangle$ transformed from the Decon contract, DCV uses mathematical induction to prove the target property $prop$. The

induction procedure is defined in Equation 1, where $init$ and tr are the Boolean formulas that define the set of initial states I and the transition relation Tr . The rest of this section introduces the algorithm to infer the inductive invariant inv used by the induction proof.

Algorithm 2 Procedure to find inductive invariants.

Input: a transition system ts , a map from relation to its modeling variable Γ , and a set of DeCon transaction rules R .

Output: an inductive invariant of ts .

```

1: function FINDINDUCTIVEINVARIANT( $C, ts$ )
2:   for  $inv$  in  $C$  do:
3:     if refuteInvariant( $inv, C, ts$ ) then
4:       return FindInductiveInvariant( $C \setminus inv, ts$ )
5:     end if
6:   end for
7:   return  $\bigwedge_{c_i \in C} c_i$ 
8: end function
9:  $P \leftarrow \bigcup_{r \in R} \text{ExtractPredicates}(r, \Gamma)$ 
10:  $C \leftarrow \text{GenerateCandidateInvariants}(P)$ 
11: return FindInductiveInvariant( $C, ts$ )

```

Algorithm 2 presents the procedure to infer inductive invariants. It first extracts a set of predicates P from the set of transaction rules R (Section 5.2). Then it generates a set of candidate invariants using predicates in P , following two heuristic patterns (Section 5.3). Finally, it invokes a recursive subroutine FINDINDUCTIVEINVARIANT to find an inductive invariant.

The procedure FINDINDUCTIVEINVARIANTS is adopted from the Houdini algorithm [26]. It iteratively refutes candidate invariants in C , until there is no candidate that can be refuted, and returns the conjunction of all remaining invariants. The subroutine refuteInvariant is defined in Equation 4, which refutes a candidate invariant if it is not inductive.

$$\text{refuteInvariant}(inv, C, ts) \triangleq \bigvee \neg (ts.init \implies inv) \vee \neg [(\bigwedge_{c \in C} c) \wedge ts.tr \implies inv'] \quad (4)$$

where inv' is adopted by replacing all state variables in inv with their corresponding variable in the next transition step.

A property of this algorithm is that, given a set of candidate invariants C , it always returns the strongest inductive invariant that can be constructed in the form of conjunction of the candidates in C [26].

5.2 Predicate Extraction

Algorithm 3 presents the predicate extraction procedure. It first transforms each literal in the transaction rule into a predicate, and puts them into a set P_0 .

Algorithm 3 ExtractPredicate(r, Γ).

Input: a transaction rule r , a map from relation to its modeling variable Γ .

Output: a set of predicates P .

- 1: $\tau \leftarrow r.trigger$
 - 2: $P_0 \leftarrow \{p \mid l \in r.body, \Gamma, \tau \vdash l \rightsquigarrow p\}$
 - 3: $P_1 \leftarrow \{p \wedge q \mid p \in P_0, q \in \text{MatchingPredicates}(p, r)\}$
 - 4: **return** $P_0 \cup P_1$
-

Some predicates in P_0 do not contain enough information on their own, e.g., predicates that contain only free variables. Because the logic of a rule is established on the relation among its literals (e.g. two literals sharing the same variable v means joining on the corresponding columns). On the contrary, predicates that contain constants, e.g. `hasWinner == true`, convey the matching of a column to a certain concrete value, and can thus be used directly in candidate invariant construction.

Therefore, in the next step, each predicate p in P_0 is augmented by one of its matching predicates in $matchingPredicates(p, r)$, which is the set of predicates in rule r that share at least one variable with predicate p . This set of augmented predicates is P_1 . Finally, the union of P_0 and P_1 is returned.

5.3 Candidate Invariant Generation

Given the set of predicates in P , DCV generates candidate invariants in the following patterns:

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\forall x \in X. \neg init(s) \implies \neg p(s, x) \mid p \in P\} \\ & \{\forall x \in X. \neg init(s) \wedge q(s, x) \implies \neg p(s, x) \mid p, q \in P\} \end{aligned}$$

where X is the set of non-state variables in the body of the formula. $\neg init(s)$ is used as the implication premise so that the whole formula can be trivially implied by the transition system’s initial constraints. Having $\neg p$ as the implication conclusion is based on the observation that, in order to prove safety invariants, a lemma is needed to prevent the system from unsafe transitions. In the second pattern, we add another predicate $q \in P_0$ in the implication premise to make the pattern more robust.

6 Evaluation

Benchmarks. We survey public smart contract repositories [9,13,11], and gather 10 representative contracts as the evaluation benchmarks. Each selected contract either has contract-level safety specifications annotated, or has proper documentation from which we can come up with a contract-level safety specification. They cover a wide range of application domains, including ERC20 [5] and ERC721 [7], the two most popular token standards. Table 1 shows all contract names and their target properties.

Table 1: Benchmark properties.

Benchmarks	Properties
wallet	No negative balance.
crowFunding	No missing fund.
ERC20	Account balances add up to totalSupply.
ERC721	All existing token has an owner.
ERC777	No default operators is approved for individual account.
ERC1155	Each token’s account balances add up to that token’s totalSupply.
paymentSplitter	No overpayment.
vestingWallet	No early release.
voting	At most one winning proposal.
auction	Each participant can withdraw at most once.

Baselines. We use solc [12] and solc-verify [23] as the comparison baselines. Solc is a Solidity compiler with a built-in checker to verify assertions in source programs. It has been actively maintained by the Ethereum community, and version 0.8.13 is used for this experiment. Solc-verify extends from solc 0.7.6 and performs automated formal verification using strategies of specification annotation and modular program verification. We have also considered Verx [32] and Zeus [25], but neither is publicly available.

Experiment setup. We modify certain functionalities and syntax of the benchmark contracts so that they are compatible with all comparison tools. In particular, the delegate vote function of the voting contract contains recursion, which is not yet supported by DeCon, and is thus dropped. In addition, solc and solc-verify do not support inline assembly analysis. Therefore, inline assembly in the Solidity contracts are replaced with native Solidity code. Minor syntax changes are also made to satisfy version requirements of the two baseline tools.

With these modifications, for each reference contract in Solidity, we implement its counterpart in DeCon. Then we conduct verification tasks on three versions of benchmark contracts: (1) DeCon contracts with DCV, (2) reference Solidity contracts with solc and solc-verify, and (3) Solidity contracts generated from DeCon with solc and solc-verify. For each set of verification tasks, we measure the verification time and set the time budget to be one hour. All experiments are performed on a server with 32 2.6GHz cores and 125GB memory.

Results. Table 2 shows the evaluation results. DCV verifies all but two contracts in one second, with ERC1155 in three seconds and auction in 54 seconds. In particular, the properties for the voting and auction contract are not inductive, and thus require inductive invariant generation. Auction takes more time because it contains more rules and has a more complicated inductive invariant.

On the other hand, solc only successfully verifies four reference contracts, with comparable efficiency. It times out on four contracts, and reports SMT solver invocation error on another two. This error has been an open issue according to the GitHub repository issue tracker [4], which is sensitive to the operating system and the underlying library versions of Z3.

Similarly, solc-verify verifies five reference contracts, and reports unknown on three others. It also returns errors on two contracts because it cannot analyze

Table 2: Verification efficiency measured in time (seconds). TO stands for timeout after 1 hour. Unknown means the verifier cannot verify the contract property. Errors from solc are caused by a known software issue [4]. Solc-verify fails to analyze part of the OpenZeppelin libraries, and thus returns error.

Benchmarks	#Rules LOC		DCV	Solc		Solc-verify	
				reference	DeCon	reference	DeCon
wallet	12	67	1	1	unknown	4	unknown
crowFunding	14	85	1	1	error	unknown	7
ERC20	19	389	1	26	error	error	8
ERC721	13	520	1	TO	TO	error	8
ERC777	31	562	1	TO	unknown	10	unknown
ERC1155	18	645	3	12	TO	6	8
paymentSplitter	6	166	1	TO	TO	4	unknown
vestingWallet	7	113	1	TO	unknown	9	4
voting	6	36	1	error	2	unknown	unknown
auction	13	146	54	error	TO	unknown	unknown

certain parts of the included OpenZeppelin libraries, although the libraries are written in compatible Solidity version.

For Solidity contracts generated from DeCon, solc verifies one and solc-verify verifies five. The performance difference between the reference version and the DeCon-generated version is potentially caused by the fact that DeCon generates stand-alone contracts that implement all functionalities without external libraries. On the other hand, DeCon implements contract states (relations) as mappings from primary keys to tuples, which may incur extra analysis complexity compared to the reference version.

In summary, DCV is highly efficient in verifying contract-level safety invariants, and can handle a wider range of smart contracts compared to other tools. By taking advantage of the high-level abstractions of the DeCon language, it achieves significant speedup over the baseline verification tools. In several instances, alternative tools timeout after an hour or report an error, while DeCon is able to complete verification successfully.

7 Related work

Verification of Solidity smart contracts. Solc [28], Solc-verify [23], Zeus [25], Verisol [38], and Verx [32] perform safety verification for smart contracts. Similar to DCV, they infer inductive invariants to perform sound verification of safety properties. They also generate counter-examples as a sequence of transactions to disprove the safety properties. SmartACE [39] is a safety verification framework that incorporates a wide variety of verification techniques, including fuzzing, bounded model checking, symbolic execution, etc. In addition to safety properties, SmartPulse [35] supports liveness verification. It leverages the counterexample-guided abstraction refinement (CEGAR) paradigm to perform efficient model checking, and can generate attacks given an environment model.

DCV differs from these work in that it uses a high-level executable specification, DeCon, as the verification target. Such high-level modeling improves verification efficiency, but it also means that DCV can only apply to smart contracts written in DeCon, which is a new language, while the other tools can work on most existing smart contracts in Solidity.

Formal semantics of smart contracts. KEVM [19] introduces formal semantics for smart contracts, and can automatically verify that a Solidity program (its compiled EVM bytecode) implements the formal semantics specified in KEVM. This verification is also sound, but it focuses on the functional correctness of each Solidity function, instead of the state invariants across multiple transactions.

Formal semantics of EVM bytecode have also been formalized in F* [22] and Isabelle/HOL [15]. Scilla [33] is a type-safe intermediate language for smart contracts that also provides formal semantics. They offer precise models of the smart contract behaviors, and support deductive verification via proof assistants. However, working with a proof assistant requires non-trivial manual effort. On the contrary, DCV provides fully automatic verification.

Vulnerability detection. Securify [36] encodes smart contract semantic information into relational facts, and uses Datalog solver to search for property compliance and violation patterns in these facts. Oyente [27] uses symbolic execution to check generic security vulnerabilities, including reentrancy attack, transaction order dependency, etc. Maian [30] detects vulnerabilities by analyzing transaction traces. Unlike the sound verification tools, which require some amount of formal specification from the users, these work require no formal specification and can be directly applied to any existing smart contracts without modification, offering a quick and light-weight alternative to sound verification, although may suffer from false positives or negatives.

Fuzzing and testing. Fuzzing and testing techniques have also been widely applied to smart contract verification. They complement deductive verification tools by presenting concrete counter-examples. ContractFuzzer [24] instruments EVM bytecodes to log run-time contract behaviors, and uncovers security vulnerabilities from these run-time logs. Smartisan [20] uses static analysis to predict effective transaction sequences, and uses this information to guide fuzzing process. SmartTest [34] introduces a language model for vulnerable transaction sequences, and uses this model to guide the search path in the fuzzing phase.

8 Conclusion

We present DCV, an automatic safety verification tool for declarative smart contracts written in the DeCon language. It leverages the high-level abstraction of DeCon to generate succinct models of the smart contracts, performs sound verification via mathematical induction, and applies domain-specific adaptations of the Houdini algorithm to infer inductive invariants. Evaluation shows that it is highly efficient, verifying all 10 benchmark smart contracts, with significant speedup over the baseline tools.

Our experience with DCV has also inspired interesting directions for future research. First, although DCV can verify a wide range of contracts in the financial domain, we find certain interesting applications that require non-trivial extensions to the modeling language, including contract inheritance, interaction between contracts, and functions that lie outside relational logic. Second, since DCV verifies on the contract logic-level, we would also like to verify translation correctness for the DeCon-to-Solidity compiler, to ensure the end-to-end soundness of DCV’s verification results.

References

1. King of the ether throne — post-mortem investigation. <https://www.kingoftheether.com/postmortem.html>, 2016.
2. Understanding the dao attack. <https://www.coindesk.com/learn/2016/06/25/understanding-the-dao-attack/>, 2016.
3. Not a fair game – fairness analysis of dice2win. https://blogs.360.net/post/Fairness_Analysis_of_Dice2win_EN.html, 2018.
4. Cannot replicate smtchecker example output. <https://github.com/ethereum/solidity/issues/13073>, 2022.
5. Erc-20 token standard. <https://eips.ethereum.org/EIPS/eip-20>, 2022.
6. Erc-20 top tokens. <https://etherscan.io/tokens>, 2022.
7. Erc-721 token standard. <https://eips.ethereum.org/EIPS/eip-721>, 2022.
8. Non-fungible tokens (nft). <https://etherscan.io/tokens-nft>, 2022.
9. Openzeppelin. <https://github.com/OpenZeppelin/openzeppelin-contracts>, 2022.
10. Smtchecker and formal verification. <https://docs.soliditylang.org/en/v0.8.17/smtchecker.html>, 2022.
11. Solidity by example. <https://docs.soliditylang.org/en/v0.8.17/solidity-by-example.html>, 2022.
12. The solidity contract-oriented programming language. <https://github.com/ethereum/solidity>, 2022.
13. Verx smart contract verification benchmarks. <https://github.com/eth-sri/verx-benchmarks>, 2022.
14. Z3. <https://github.com/Z3Prover/z3>, 2022.
15. Sidney Amani, Myriam Bégel, Maksym Bortin, and Mark Staples. Towards verifying ethereum smart contract bytecode in isabelle/hol. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs*, pages 66–77, 2018.
16. Pedro Antonino and AW Roscoe. Formalising and verifying smart contracts with solidifier: a bounded model checker for solidity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.02710*, 2020.
17. Franck Cassez, Joanne Fuller, and Horacio Mijail Antón Quiles. Deductive verification of smart contracts with dafny. In *International Conference on Formal Methods for Industrial Critical Systems*, pages 50–66. Springer, 2022.
18. Haoxian Chen, Gerald Whitters, Mohammad Javad Amiri, Yuepeng Wang, and Boon Thau Loo. Declarative smart contracts. In *ESEC/FSE ’22*, 2022.
19. Xiaohong Chen, Daejun Park, and Grigore Roşu. A language-independent approach to smart contract verification. In *International Symposium on Leveraging Applications of Formal Methods*, pages 405–413. Springer, 2018.

20. Jaeseung Choi, Doyeon Kim, Soomin Kim, Gustavo Grieco, Alex Groce, and Sang Kil Cha. Smartian: Enhancing smart contract fuzzing with static and dynamic data-flow analyses. In *2021 36th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, pages 227–239. IEEE, 2021.
21. Joel Frank, Cornelius Aschermann, and Thorsten Holz. {ETHBMC}: A bounded model checker for smart contracts. In *29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 20)*, pages 2757–2774, 2020.
22. Ilya Grishchenko, Matteo Maffei, and Clara Schneidewind. A semantic framework for the security analysis of ethereum smart contracts. In *International Conference on Principles of Security and Trust*, pages 243–269. Springer, 2018.
23. Ákos Hajdu and Dejan Jovanović. solc-verify: A modular verifier for solidity smart contracts. In *Working conference on verified software: theories, tools, and experiments*, pages 161–179. Springer, 2019.
24. Bo Jiang, Ye Liu, and Wing Kwong Chan. Contractfuzzer: Fuzzing smart contracts for vulnerability detection. In *2018 33rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, pages 259–269. IEEE, 2018.
25. Sukrit Kalra, Seep Goel, Mohan Dhawan, and Subodh Sharma. Zeus: analyzing safety of smart contracts. In *Ndss*, pages 1–12, 2018.
26. Shuvendu K Lahiri and Shaz Qadeer. Complexity and algorithms for monomial and clausal predicate abstraction. In *International Conference on Automated Deduction*, pages 214–229. Springer, 2009.
27. Loi Luu, Duc-Hiep Chu, Hrishi Olickel, Prateek Saxena, and Aquinas Hobor. Making smart contracts smarter. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pages 254–269, 2016.
28. Matteo Marescotti, Rodrigo Otoni, Leonardo Alt, Patrick Eugster, Antti EJ Hyvärinen, and Natasha Sharygina. Accurate smart contract verification through direct modelling. In *International Symposium on Leveraging Applications of Formal Methods*, pages 178–194. Springer, 2020.
29. Zeinab Nehai, Pierre-Yves Piriou, and Frederic Dumas. Model-checking of smart contracts. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Internet of Things (iThings) and IEEE Green Computing and Communications (GreenCom) and IEEE Cyber, Physical and Social Computing (CPSCom) and IEEE Smart Data (SmartData)*, pages 980–987. IEEE, 2018.
30. Ivica Nikolić, Aashish Kolluri, Ilya Sergey, Prateek Saxena, and Aquinas Hobor. Finding the greedy, prodigal, and suicidal contracts at scale. In *Proceedings of the 34th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference, ACSAC '18*, page 653–663, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery.
31. Benedikt Notheisen, Magnus Gödde, and Christof Weinhardt. Trading stocks on blocks-engineering decentralized markets. In *International Conference on Design Science Research in Information System and Technology*, pages 474–478. Springer, 2017.
32. Anton Permenev, Dimitar Dimitrov, Petar Tsankov, Dana Drachler-Cohen, and Martin Vechev. Verx: Safety verification of smart contracts. In *2020 IEEE symposium on security and privacy (SP)*, pages 1661–1677. IEEE, 2020.
33. Ilya Sergey, Vaivaswatha Nagaraj, Jacob Johannsen, Amrit Kumar, Anton Trunov, and Ken Chan Guan Hao. Safer smart contract programming with scilla. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 3(OOPSLA):1–30, 2019.
34. Sunbeom So, Seongjoon Hong, and Hakjoo Oh. {SmarTest}: Effectively hunting vulnerable transaction sequences in smart contracts through language {Model-Guided} symbolic execution. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 1361–1378, 2021.

35. Jon Stephens, Kostas Ferles, Benjamin Mariano, Shuvendu Lahiri, and Isil Dillig. Smartpulse: automated checking of temporal properties in smart contracts. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 555–571. IEEE, 2021.
36. Petar Tsankov, Andrei Dan, Dana Drachler-Cohen, Arthur Gervais, Florian Buenzli, and Martin Vechev. Securify: Practical security analysis of smart contracts. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 67–82, 2018.
37. Shuai Wang, Yong Yuan, Xiao Wang, Juanjuan Li, Rui Qin, and Fei-Yue Wang. An overview of smart contract: architecture, applications, and future trends. In *2018 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 108–113. IEEE, 2018.
38. Yuepeng Wang, Shuvendu K Lahiri, Shuo Chen, Rong Pan, Isil Dillig, Cody Born, Immad Naseer, and Kostas Ferles. Formal verification of workflow policies for smart contracts in azure blockchain. In *Working Conference on Verified Software: Theories, Tools, and Experiments*, pages 87–106. Springer, 2019.
39. Scott Wesley, Maria Christakis, Jorge A Navas, Richard Treffer, Valentin Wüstholtz, and Arie Gurfinkel. Verifying solidity smart contracts via communication abstraction in smartace. In *International Conference on Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation*, pages 425–449. Springer, 2022.