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Abstract. We introduce a method for automated parameterized verification of fault-tolerant distributed algorithms. The distributed algorithms we consider are parameterized by both the number of processes and the assumed maximum number of Byzantine faulty processes. At the center of our technique is a parametric interval abstraction (PIA) where the interval boundaries are arithmetic expressions over parameters. Using PIA for both data abstraction and a new form of counter abstraction, we reduce the parameterized problem to finite-state model checking. We demonstrate the practical feasibility of our method by verifying several variants of the well-known distributed algorithm by Srikanth and Toueg. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first paper to achieve parameterized automated verification of Byzantine fault-tolerant distributed algorithms.

1 Introduction

Fault-tolerant distributed algorithms (FTDA) constitute an important and active area of research with a rich body of results [22,1]. The current paper is part of an interdisciplinary effort to develop a tool basis for the automated verification, and, in the long run, deployment of FTDA [17,19].

As discussed in [17,19], the verification of FTDA has to address two challenges, (i) the formalization problem, i.e., the question how to move from a mathematically intricate, but usually quite informal description in pseudocode to an adequate formal model, and (ii) the verification problem, i.e., how to verify FTDA by an automated model checking based method. This paper is exclusively concerned with the verification problem. Based on a formal framework of control flow automata for FTDA developed in [17], we develop abstraction-based methods for parameterized verification of FTDA, and demonstrate the feasibility of our approach for a family of FTDA after Srikanth and Toueg [27,28].

Most previous research on parameterized model checking has focused on concurrent systems with \( n + c \) processes where \( n \) is the parameter and \( c \) is a constant: \( n \) of these processes are identical copies; \( c \) processes represent the non-replicated
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part of the system, e.g., cache directories, shared memory, dispatcher processes etc. \[14,23,6\]. Many approaches abstract the \(n\) processes to a finite system, e.g., counter abstraction \[24\], and environment abstraction \[6\]. Note that most of the work on parameterized model checking considers only safety. Notable exceptions are \[15,24\] where several notions of fairness are considered in the context of abstraction to verify liveness.

FTDAs differ from this standard setting in a crucial aspect — a certain number \(t\) of the \(n\) processes can be faulty. In the case of e.g. Byzantine faults, this means that the faulty processes can send messages in an unrestricted manner. Importantly, the upper bound \(t\) for the faulty processes is also a parameter, and is essentially a fraction of \(n\). The relationship between \(t\) and \(f\) is given by a resilience condition, e.g. \(n > 3t\). Thus, the verification has to consider all systems with \(n - f\) non-faulty and \(f\) faulty processes, where \(f \leq t\) and \(n > 3t\).

It is evident that an FTDAs cannot wait for a specific process to send a message since the process can be faulty. Therefore, most FTDAs use counters to reason about their environment. If, for instance, a process receives a certain message \(m\) from more than \(t\) processes, it can conclude that one of the senders is non-faulty. A large class of FTDAs expresses these counting arguments using threshold guards:

\[
\text{if received } <m> \text{ from } n-t \text{ distinct processes then action}(m);
\]

The technical contribution of our paper is an abstraction method for parameterized verification of FTDAs with resilience conditions and threshold guards. Our abstraction proceeds in two steps. Both of them are based on parametric interval abstraction (PIA), a generalization of interval abstraction where the interval borders are parameters rather than constants. Using the PIA domain, we obtain a finite-state model checking problem in two steps:

**Step 1: PIA data abstraction.** We evaluate the threshold guards over the parametric intervals. Thus, we abstract away unbounded variables and parameters from the process code. We obtain a parameterized system where the replicated processes are finite-state and independent of the parameters.

**Step 2: PIA counter abstraction.** We use a new form of counter abstraction where the process counters are abstracted to PIA. Since Step 1 guarantees that we need only finitely many counters, PIA counter abstraction yields a finite-state system.

We show the practicality of our approach by model checking safety and liveness specifications of several variants of the distributed broadcasting algorithm by Srikant and Toueg \[28\]. Note that our PIA abstractions allow us to soundly abstract fairness requirements. This is required by many FTDAs.

Our experiments show the need for abstraction refinement to deal with spurious counterexamples \[5\]. We had to deal with spurious behaviors that are due to parameterized abstraction and fairness. In addition to refinement of counter abstraction by SMT solvers, we are also exploiting simple user-provided invariant candidates to refine the abstraction similar to the CMP method \[23,30\].
Related work. Traditionally, correctness of FTDAs was shown by handwritten proofs [22, 1], and, in some cases, by proof assistants [21, 26, 3, 20]. Completely automated approaches are usually not parameterized, e.g. [31, 29]. Our work stands in the tradition of parameterized model checking for protocols [21, 4, 12, 24, 6], i.e., distributed algorithms such as mutual exclusion, cache coherence etc.

We are aware of a single model checking paper [13] which addresses FTDAs in a parameterized setting. It is based on regular model checking. In contrast to our results, (i) the processes in [13] cannot contain references to parameters, and therefore cannot express threshold guards, and (ii) their case study considers only a simple fault model (crash) with 17 faults and \( n \) as the sole parameter.

An abstract domain similar to PIA was developed in [25]. It was used in the framework of abstract interpretation, and was developed as a generalization of the polyhedra domain. Starting from a similar domain, [25] is thus taking a direction that is substantially different from parameterized model checking.

2 Parameterized Model for Distributed Algorithms

We define the parameters, local variables of the processes, and shared variables referring to a single domain \( D \) that is totally ordered and has the operations addition and subtraction. In this paper we will assume that \( D = \mathbb{N}_0 \).

We start with some notation. Let \( Y \) be a finite set of variables ranging over \( D \). We will denote by \( D^|Y| \), the set of all \( |Y| \)-tuples of variable values. In order to simplify notation, given \( s \in D^|Y| \), we use the expression \( s.y \), to refer to the value of a variable \( y \in Y \) in vector \( s \). For two vectors of variable values \( s \) and \( s' \), by \( s = X s' \) we denote the case where for all \( x \in X \), \( s.x = s'.x \) holds.

Process. The set of variables \( V \) is \( \{sv\} \cup A \cup \Gamma \cup \Pi \): The variable \( sv \) is the status variable that ranges over a finite set \( SV \) of status values. The finite set \( A \) contains variables that range over the domain \( D \). The variable \( sv \) and the variables from \( A \) are local variables. The finite set \( \Gamma \) contains the shared variables that range over \( D \). The finite set \( \Pi \) is a set of parameter variables that range over \( D \), and the resilience condition \( RC \) is a predicate over \( D^|\Pi| \). In our example, \( \Pi = \{n, t, f\} \), and the resilience condition \( RC(n, t, f) \) is \( n > 3t \land f \leq t \land t > 0 \). Then, we denote the set of admissible parameters by \( P_{RC} = \{p \in D^|\Pi| \mid RC(p)\} \).

A process operates on states from the set \( S = SV \times D^|A| \times D^|\Gamma| \times D^|\Pi| \). Each process starts its computation in an initial state from a set \( S_0 \subseteq S \). A relation \( R \subseteq S \times S \) defines transitions from one state to another, with the restriction that the values of parameters remain unchanged, i.e., for all \( (s, t) \in R \), \( s =_R t \). Then, a parameterized process skeleton is a tuple \( Sk = (S, S_0, R) \).

We get a process instance by fixing the parameter values \( p \in D^|\Pi| \): one can restrict the set of process states to \( S_{|p} = \{s \in S \mid s =_R p\} \) as well as the set of transitions to \( R_{|p} = R \cap (S_{|p} \times S_{|p}) \). Then, a process instance is a process skeleton \( Sk_{|p} = (S_{|p}, S_0_{|p}, R_{|p}) \) where \( p \) is constant.

In analogy to software model checking where programs are translated into Kripke structures, we use control flow automata to represent distributed algorithms that contain threshold guards, and then show how they induce process
skeletons. In particular, we use control flow automata in a representation where transitions are in a form of single static assignment (SSA) \[10\]. Formally, a guarded control flow automaton (CFA) is an edge-labeled directed acyclic graph \( A = (Q, q_I, q_F, E) \) with a finite set \( Q \) of nodes, called the locations, an initial location \( q_I \in Q \), and a final location \( q_F \in Q \). A path from \( q_I \) to \( q_F \) is used to describe one step of a distributed algorithm. The edges have the form \( E \subseteq Q \times \text{guard} \times Q \), where \text{guard} is defined as an expression of the following syntax:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{var} &::= \langle \text{name of a variable from } \Lambda \cup \Gamma \rangle \\
\text{sval} &::= \langle \text{an element of } SV \rangle \\
\text{param} &::= \langle \text{name of a parameter variable from } \Pi \rangle \\
\text{lin form} &::= \text{param} | \text{int} | \text{lin form} + \text{lin form} | \text{lin form} - \text{lin form} \\
\text{threshold} &::= \text{lin form} \\
\text{atomcond} &::= \text{var} \leq \text{var} + \text{lin form} \mid \text{threshold} \leq \text{var} \mid \\
&\hspace{1em} \text{var} > \text{var} + \text{lin form} \mid \text{threshold} > \text{var} \mid \\
&\hspace{2.5em} \text{var} = \text{var} + \text{lin form} \\
\text{guard} &::= \text{sv} = \text{sval} \mid \text{sv} \neq \text{sval} \mid \text{atomcond} \mid \text{guard} \land \text{guard}
\end{align*}
\]

Our threshold guarded commands can be expressed as combinations of threshold conditions via \text{guard}.

For every path from \( q_I \) to \( q_F \) each variable appears at most once in the left-hand side of every assignment. Every variable \( x \) has several copies: \( x \) for the initial value, \( x' \) for the final one, and \( x_1, x_2, \ldots \) for intermediate ones. As common in SSA \[10\], when different copies of \( x \) meet in a state \( q \), a \( \phi \)-function selects the latest copy of \( x \) that arrived to \( q \) along the current computation path.

Let us assume that \( SV, \Lambda, \Gamma, \Pi, RC, \) and \( N \) are given. Given a CFA \( A \), we now define the process skeleton \( Sk(A) = (S, S^0, R) \) induced by \( A \) as follows.

We assume that all variables that range over \( D \) are initialized to 0, and \( sv \) ranging over \( SV \) takes an initial value from a fixed subset of \( SV \). Every CFA path from \( q_I \) to \( q_F \) assigns values to its variables based on the values of input variables. We call a mapping \( v \) from variable names to the values from the respective domains a \textit{valuation} if every variable used in the guards of the path has a value assigned to it.

A path \( p \) of CFA induces a conjunction of all the guards along it. We may thus write \( v \models p \) to denote that the valuation \( v \) satisfies the guards of the path \( p \). We are now in the position to define the mapping between a CFA \( A \) and a process skeleton \( Sk(A) \): If there is a path \( p \) and a valuation \( v \) with \( v \models p \), then \( v \) defines a single transition \((s,t)\) of a process skeleton \( Sk(A) \), where for each variable \( x \in \Lambda \cup \Gamma \cup \Pi \cup \{sv\} \) it holds \( s.x = v(x) \) and \( t.x = v(x') \).

\textbf{System Instances}. For fixed admissible parameters \( p \), a distributed system is modeled as an asynchronous parallel composition of identical processes \( Sk|p \). The number of processes depends on the parameters. To formalize this, we define the
size of a system (the number of processes) using a function \( N : P_{RC} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \). For instance, when modeling only correct processes explicitly, \( n - f \) for \( N(n, t, f) \).

Finally, given \( p \in P_{RC} \), and a parameterized process skeleton \( Sk = (S, S^0, R) \), a system instance \( \text{Inst}(p, Sk) = (S_I, S^0_I, R_I, AP, \lambda_I) \) is a Kripke structure defined as an asynchronous parallel composition of \( N(p) \) process instances, indexed by \( i \in \{1, \ldots, N(p)\} \), following standard interleaving semantics. Given a state \( s \) of \( \text{Inst}(p, Sk) \), we denote the state of process \( i \) by \( s[i] \). (The formal definition is given in Appendix C.)

**Remark 1.** The set of global states \( S_I \) and the transition relation \( R_I \) are preserved under every transposition \( i \leftrightarrow j \) of process indices \( i \) and \( j \) in \( \{1, \ldots, N(p)\} \). That is, every system \( \text{Inst}(p, Sk) \) is fully symmetric by construction.

**Atomic Propositions.** The set \( AP_{SV} \) contains propositions that capture comparison against a given status value \( Z \in SV \), i.e., \([\forall i. sv_i = Z] \) and \([\exists i. sv_i = Z] \). Further, fairness conditions usually involve comparisons on variables ranging over \( D \). Thus, we add a set of atomic propositions \( AP_D \) that capture comparison of variables \( x, y \), and constant \( c \) that all range over \( D \); \( AP_D \) consists of propositions of the form \([\exists i. x_i + c < y_i] \) and \([\forall i. x_i + c \geq y_i] \). We then define \( AP \) to be the disjoint union of \( AP_{SV} \) and \( AP_D \). The labeling function \( \lambda_I \) of a system instance \( \text{Inst}(p, Sk) \) maps a state \( s \) to expressions \( p \) from \( AP \) as follows (the existential case is defined accordingly using disjunctions):

\[
[\forall i. sv_i = Z] \in \lambda_I(s) \iff \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq N(p)} (s[i].sv = Z)
\]

\[
[\forall i. x_i + c \geq y_i] \in \lambda_I(s) \iff \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq N(p)} (s[i].x + c \geq s[i].y)
\]

**Temporal Logic.** We specify properties of distributed algorithms in formulas of temporal logic \( LTL_X \) over \( AP_{SV} \). We use the standard definitions of paths and \( LTL_X \) semantics \cite{4}. A formula of \( LTL_X \) is defined inductively as:

- a literal \( p \) or \( \neg p \), where \( p \in AP_{SV} \), or
- \( F \phi, G \phi, \phi U \psi, \phi \lor \psi, \) and \( \phi \land \psi \), where \( \phi \) and \( \psi \) are \( LTL_X \) formulas.

**Fairness.** We are interested in verifying safety and liveness properties. The latter can be usually proven only in the presence of fairness constraints. The authors of \cite{18,24} paid special attention to verification of safety and liveness in systems with justice and compassion as fairness constraints. Similarly, in our paper we define fair paths of a system instance \( \text{Inst}(p, Sk) \) using a set of justice constraints \( J \subseteq AP_D \). A path \( \pi \) of a system \( \text{Inst}(p, Sk) \) is \( J \)-fair if for every \( p \in J \) there are infinitely many states \( s \in \pi \) with \( p \in \lambda_I(s) \). By \( \text{Inst}(p, Sk) \models J \phi \) we denote that the formula \( \phi \) holds on all \( J \)-fair paths of \( \text{Inst}(p, Sk) \).
Parameterized Model Checking Problem. Given:

- a domain \( D \),
- a parameterized process skeleton \( Sk = (S, S_0, R) \),
- a resilience condition \( RC \) (generating a set of admissible parameters \( P_{RC} \)),
- justice requirements \( J \), and an LTL-\( X \) formula \( \varphi \),

check whether for all \( p \in P_{RC} \) it holds that \( \text{Inst}(p, Sk) \models_J \varphi \).

3 Case study: Byzantine Fault-tolerant Broadcast

Figure 2 is the guarded control flow automaton of the core of the Byzantine fault-tolerant broadcasting algorithm by Srikanth and Toueg [28]. It is obtained from the formalization in [17] (which is provided in Figure 1), using the SSA transformation algorithm from [10]. In our experiments we will consider additional three variants of this algorithm that differ in the threshold guards. The variants deal with different fault models and resilience conditions; the algorithms are:

(\( \text{Byz} \)), which is the algorithm from the figure, for \( t \) Byzantine faults if \( n > 3t \),
(\( \text{symm} \)) for \( t \) symmetric (identical Byzantine faults) if \( n > 2t \),
(\( \text{omit} \)) for \( t \) send omission faults if \( n > 2t \), and
(\( \text{clean} \)) for \( t \) clean crash faults if \( n > t \).

In this paper we verify the following safety and liveness specifications for the
In asynchronous distributed algorithms one assumes, e.g., communication
fairness, i.e., every message sent is eventually received. To capture this, we use
justice requirements, i.e., \( J = \{ \forall i. \text{rcvd}_i \geq \text{nsnt} \} \).

After presenting our abstraction techniques in the following section, Section 5
discusses the experimental evaluation.

4 Abstraction Scheme

The input to our abstraction method is the infinite parameterized family \( \mathcal{F} = \{ \text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}(A)) \mid p \in P_{RC} \} \) of Kripke structures specified via a CFA \( A \). The
family \( \mathcal{F} \) has two principal sources of unboundedness: unbounded variables in
the process skeleton \( \text{Sk}(A) \), and the unbounded number of processes \( N(p) \). We
deal with these two aspects separately, using two abstraction steps, namely the
PIA data abstraction and the PIA counter abstraction. In both abstraction steps
we use the parametric interval abstraction PIA that we introduce in Section 4.1.

4.1 Abstract Domain of Parametric Intervals (PIA)

From the thresholds used in the guards of a CFA \( A \) from Section 2 we syntactically extract a finite threshold set \( \mathcal{T} \) that contains threshold functions \( \vartheta_i : P_{RC} \to D \), for \( 0 \leq i < |\mathcal{T}| \). Additionally, we assume that for all \( p \in P_{RC} \), \( \vartheta_0(p) \) has to be 0, and and \( \vartheta_1(p) \) has to be 1. Let \( \mu + 1 \) be the cardinality of the threshold set \( \mathcal{T} \). Then we define the domain of parametric intervals:

\[ \hat{D} = \{ I_j \mid 0 \leq j \leq \mu \} \]

Our abstraction rests on an implicit property of many fault-tolerant distributed algorithms, namely, that the resilience condition \( RC \) induces an order on the thresholds used in the algorithm (e.g., \( t + 1 < n - t \)). Assuming such an order does not limit the application of our approach: In cases where only a partial order is induced by \( RC \), one can simply enumerate all possible total orders. As parameters, and thus thresholds, are kept unchanged in a run, one can verify an algorithm for each threshold order separately, and then combine the results. We may thus restrict the threshold sets we consider by:

**Definition 1.** The finite set \( \mathcal{T} \) is uniformly ordered if for all \( p \in P_{RC} \), and all \( \vartheta_j(p) \) and \( \vartheta_k(p) \) in \( \mathcal{T} \) with \( 0 \leq j < k \leq \mu \), it holds that \( \vartheta_j(p) < \vartheta_k(p) \).
Definition 1 allows us to properly define the parameterized abstraction function \( \alpha_p : D \rightarrow \hat{D} \) and the parameterized concretization function \( \gamma_p : \hat{D} \rightarrow 2^D \).

\[
\alpha_p(x) = \begin{cases} 
I_j & \text{if } x \in [\vartheta_j(p), \vartheta_{j+1}(p)] \text{ for some } 0 \leq j < \mu \\
I_\mu & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\gamma_p(I_j) = \begin{cases} 
[\vartheta_j(p), \vartheta_{j+1}(p)] & \text{if } j < \mu \\
[\vartheta_\mu(p), \infty] & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

From \( \vartheta_0(p) = 0 \) and \( \vartheta_1(p) = 1 \), it immediately follows that for all \( p \in \mathbb{P}_{RC} \), we have \( \alpha_p(0) = I_0 \), \( \alpha_p(1) = I_1 \), and \( \gamma_p(I_0) = \{0\} \). Moreover, from the definitions and Definition 1 one immediately obtains:

**Proposition 1.** For all \( p \in \mathbb{P}_{RC} \), and for all \( a \in D \), it holds that \( a \in \gamma_p(\alpha_p(a)) \).

**Definition 2.** \( I_k \leq I_\ell \) iff \( k \leq \ell \).

The PIA domain has similarities to predicate abstraction because the interval borders are naturally expressed as predicates, and computations over PIA are directly reduced to SMT solvers. On the other hand, notions such as the order of Definition 2 are not naturally expressed in terms of predicate abstraction.

### 4.2 PIA data abstraction

Our parameterized data abstraction is based on two abstraction ideas. First, the variables used in a process skeleton are unbounded and we have to map those unbounded variables to a fixed-size domain. If we fix parameters \( p \in \mathbb{P}_{RC} \), then an interval abstraction \cite{9} is a natural solution to the problem of unboundedness. Second, we want to produce a single process skeleton that does not depend on parameters \( p \in \mathbb{P}_{RC} \) and captures the behavior of all process instances. This can be done by using ideas from existential abstraction \cite{7,11,18} and sound abstraction of fairness constraints \cite{18}. Our contribution consists of combining these two ideas to arrive at parametric interval data abstraction.

Our abstraction maps values of unbounded variables to parametric intervals \( I_j \), whose boundaries are symbolic expressions over parameters. This abstraction differs from interval abstraction \cite{9} in that the interval bounds are not numeric. However, for every instance, the boundaries are constant because the parameters are fixed. We hence do not have to deal with symbolic ranges over variables in the sense of \cite{25}.

We now discuss an existential abstraction of a formula \( \Phi \), whose syntax is captured by \text{atomcond} (we consider general formulas following the syntax of \text{guard} later). To this end we introduce notation for sets of vectors satisfying \( \Phi \). According to Section 3, the formula \( \Phi \) has two kinds of free variables: parameter variables from \( \Pi \) and data variables from \( A \cup I' \). Let \( x^p \) be a vector of parameter variables \( (x_1^p, \ldots, x_{|\Pi|}^p) \) and \( x^v \) be a vector of variables \( (x_1^v, \ldots, x_k^v) \) over \( D^k \). Given a \( k \)-dimensional vector \( d \) of values from \( D \), by \( x^p = p, x^v = d \models \Phi \) we
denote that $\Phi$ is satisfied on concrete values $x^v_1 = d_1, \ldots, x^v_k = d_k$ and parameter values $p$. We define $||\Phi||_E \subseteq \hat{D}^k$:

$$
||\Phi||_E = \{ \hat{d} \in \hat{D}^k \mid \exists p \in P_{RC} \exists d = (d_1, \ldots, d_k) \in D^k.
\hat{d} = (\alpha_p(d_1), \ldots, \alpha_p(d_k)) \land x^p = p, x^v = d \models \Phi \}.
$$

Hence, $||\Phi||_E$ contains all vectors of abstract values that correspond to some concrete values satisfying $\Phi$. Note carefully, that parameters do not appear anymore due to existential quantification. A PIA existential abstraction of $\Phi$ is defined to be a formula $\hat{\Phi}$ over a vector of variables $\hat{x} = \hat{x}_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_k$ over $\hat{D}^k$ such that

$$
\{ \hat{d} \in \hat{D}^k \mid \hat{x} = \hat{d} \models \hat{\Phi} \} \supseteq ||\Phi||_E.
$$

Computing PIA abstractions. The central property of our abstract domain is that it allows to abstract comparisons against thresholds in a precise way. That is, we can abstract formulas of the form $x_1 \geq \vartheta_j(p)$ by $\hat{x}_1 \geq I_j$ and $x_1 < \vartheta_j(p)$ by $\hat{x}_1 < I_j$. In fact, this abstraction is precise in the following sense.

**Proposition 2.** For all $p \in P_{RC}$ and all $a \in D$ it holds that:

$$
a \geq \vartheta_j(p) \iff \alpha_p(a) \geq I_j, \text{ and } a < \vartheta_j(p) \iff \alpha_p(a) < I_j
$$

For all formulas that are not threshold guards we are going to use a general form (which is well-known from the literature), namely:

$$
\hat{\Phi}_E = \bigvee_{(d_1, \ldots, d_k) \in ||\Phi||_E} \hat{x}_1 = \hat{d}_1 \land \cdots \land \hat{x}_k = \hat{d}_k
$$

**Proposition 3.** If $\Phi$ is a formula over variables $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ over $D$, then $\hat{\Phi}_E$ is a PIA existential abstraction.

If the domain $\hat{D}$ is small (as it is in our case), then one can enumerate all vectors of abstract values in $\hat{D}^k$ and check which of them belong to our abstraction $||\Phi||_E$, using an SMT solver.

Transforming CFA. We now describe a general method to abstract guard formulas, and thus construct an abstract process skeleton. To this end, we denote by $\alpha_E$ a mapping from a concrete formula $\Phi$ to some existential abstraction of $\Phi$ (not necessarily constructed as above). By fixing $\alpha_E$, we can define an abstraction of a guard of a CFA:

$$
abst(g) = \begin{cases} 
\alpha_E(g) & \text{if } g \text{ is atomcond} \\
g & \text{if } g \text{ is one of } sv = sval, sv \neq sval \\
abst(g_1) \land abst(g_2) & \text{otherwise, i.e., } g \text{ is } g_1 \land g_2
\end{cases}
$$

By slightly abusing the notation, for a CFA $A$ by $abst(A)$ we denote the CFA that is obtained from $A$ by replacing every guard $g$ with $abst(g)$. Note that $abst(A)$ contains only guards over $sv$ and over abstract variables over $\hat{D}$.
Definition 3. We define a mapping $h^\text{dat}_p$ from valuations $v$ of a CFA $A$ to valuations $\bar{v}$ of CFA $\text{abst}(A)$ as follows: for each variable $x$ over $D$, $\bar{v}.x = \alpha_p(v.x)$, and for each variable $y$ over $SV$, $\bar{v}.y = v.y$.

The following theorem follows immediately from the definition of existential abstraction and $\text{abst}(A)$:

Theorem 1. For all $p$ in $P_{RC}$ and for all valuations $v$ with $v =_H p$ if $v \models \text{guard}$, then $h^\text{dat}_p(v) \models \text{abst}(\text{guard})$.

For model checking purposes we have to reason about the Kripke structures that are built using the skeletons obtained from CFAs. We denote by $\text{Sk}_{\text{abs}}(A)$, the process skeleton that is induced by CFA $\text{abst}(A)$. Analogously to $h^\text{dat}_p$, we define the parameterized abstraction mapping $\bar{h}^\text{dat}_p$ that maps states from $\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}(A))$ to states from $\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}_{\text{abs}}(A))$. After that, we obtain Theorem 2 from Theorem 1 and the construction of system instances.

Definition 4. Let $\sigma$ be a state of $\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}(A))$, and $\hat{\sigma}$ be a state of the abstract instance $\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}_{\text{abs}}(A))$. Then, $\hat{\sigma} = \bar{h}^\text{dat}_p(\sigma)$ if for each variable $y \in \Lambda \cup \Gamma \cup H$, $\hat{\sigma}.y = \alpha_p(\sigma.y)$, and $\hat{\sigma}.sv = \sigma.sv$.

Theorem 2. For all $p \in P_{RC}$, and for all CFA $A$, if system instance $\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}(A)) = (S_I, S_0, R_I, AP, \lambda_I)$ and system instance $\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}_{\text{abs}}(A)) = (S_I, S_0, R_I, AP, \lambda_I)$, then:

if $(\sigma, \sigma') \in R_I$, then $(\bar{h}^\text{dat}_p(\sigma), \bar{h}^\text{dat}_p(\sigma')) \in R_I$.

Theorem 2 is the first step to prove simulation. In order to actually do so, we now define the labeling function $\lambda_I$. For propositions from $p \in AP_{SV}$, $\lambda_I(\hat{\sigma})$ is defined in the same way as $\lambda_I$. Similarly to $\lambda_S$ for propositions from $p \in AP_D$, which are used in justice constraints, we define:

$\exists i.x_i + c < y_i \in \lambda_I(\hat{\sigma})$ if $\bigvee_{1 \leq i \leq N(p)} \hat{\sigma}[i] = \alpha_E(\{x_i + c < y_i\})$

$\forall i.x_i + c \geq y_i \in \lambda_I(\hat{\sigma})$ if $\bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq N(p)} \hat{\sigma}[i] = \alpha_E(\{x_i + c \geq y_i\})$

From Theorem 2 the definition of $\bar{h}^\text{dat}_p$ with respect to the variable $sv$, and the definition of $\lambda_I$ one immediately obtains the following theorems. Theorem 3 ensures that justice constraints $J$ in the abstract system $\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}_{\text{abs}}(A))$ are a sound abstraction of justice constraints $J$ in $\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}(A))$.

Theorem 3. For all $p \in P_{RC}$, and for all CFA $A$, it holds $\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}(A)) \preceq \text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}_{\text{abs}}(A))$, with respect to $AP_{SV}$.

Theorem 4. Let $\pi = \{\sigma_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ be a $J$-fair path of $\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}(A))$. Then $\hat{\pi} = \{\bar{h}^\text{dat}_p(\sigma_i)\}_{i \geq 1}$ is a $J$-fair path of $\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}_{\text{abs}}(A))$. 

10
4.3 PIA counter abstraction

In this section, we present a counter abstraction inspired by \[24\] which maps a system instance composed of *identical finite state* process skeletons to a single finite state system. We use the PIA domain \(\hat{D}\) along with abstractions \(\alpha_E(\{x' = x + 1\})\) and \(\alpha_E(\{x' = x - 1\})\) for the counters.

Let us consider a process skeleton \(Sk = (S, S_0, R)\), where \(S = SV \times \hat{D}^{|\Gamma|} \times \hat{D}^{|\Pi|}\) that is defined using an arbitrary finite domain \(\hat{D}\). (Note that we do not require that the skeleton is obtained from a CFA.) Our counter abstraction over the abstract domain \(\hat{D}\) proceeds in two steps, where the first step is only a change in representation, but not an abstraction.

**Step 1:** Vector addition state system (VASS). Let \(L = \{\ell \in SV \times \hat{D}^{|\Gamma|} | \exists s \in S. \ell = (sv)\cup \Lambda s\}\) be the set of local states of a process skeleton. As the domain \(\hat{D}\) and the set of local variables \(\Lambda\) are finite, \(L\) is finite. We write the elements of \(L\) as \(\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{|L|}\). We define the counting function \(K: S_I \times L \rightarrow D\) such that \(K(\sigma, \ell)\) is the number of processes \(i\) whose local state is \(\ell\) in global state \(\sigma\), i.e., \(\sigma[\ell] = (sv)\cup \Lambda \ell\). Thus, we represent the system state \(\sigma \in S_I\) as a tuple \((g_1, \ldots, g_k, K[\sigma, \ell_1], \ldots, K[\sigma, \ell_{|L|}])\), i.e., by the shared global state and by the counters for the local states. If a process moves from local state \(\ell_i\) to local state \(\ell_j\), the counters of \(\ell_i\) and \(\ell_j\) will decrement and increment, respectively.

**Step 2:** Abstraction of VASS. We will now abstract the counters \(K\) of the VASS representation using the PIA domain to obtain a finite state Kripke structure \(\text{Cnt}(Sk)\). To compute \(\text{Cnt}(Sk) = (S_\text{Cnt}, S^0_\text{Cnt}, R_\text{Cnt}, \text{AP}, \lambda_\text{Cnt})\) we proceed as follows:

A state \(w \in S_\text{Cnt}\) is given by values of shared variables from the set \(\Gamma\), ranging over \(\hat{D}^{|\Gamma|}\), and by a vector \((\kappa[\ell_1], \ldots, \kappa[\ell_{|L|}])\) over the abstract domain \(\hat{D}\) from Section \[44\]. More concisely, \(S_\text{Cnt} = \hat{D}^{|L|} \times \hat{D}^{|\Gamma|}\).

**Definition 5.** The parameterized abstraction mapping \(\hat{h}_p^{cnt}\) maps a global state \(\sigma\) of the system \(\text{Inst}(p, Sk)\) to a state \(w\) of the abstraction \(\text{Cnt}(Sk)\) such that:

For all \(\ell \in L\) it holds that \(w, \kappa[\ell] = \alpha_p(K[\sigma, \ell])\), and \(w =_\Gamma \sigma\).

From the definition one can see how to construct the initial states. Informally, we require (1) that the initial shared states of \(\text{Cnt}(Sk)\) correspond to initial shared states of \(Sk\), (2) that there are actually \(N(p)\) processes in the system, and (3) that initially all processes are in an initial state.

The intuition\[1\] for the construction of the transition relation is as follows: Like in VASS, a step that brings a process from local state \(\ell_i\) to \(\ell_j\) can be modeled by decrementing the (non-zero) counter of \(\ell_i\) and incrementing the counter of \(\ell_j\). Like Pnueli, Xu, and Zuck \[24\] we use the idea of representing counters in an abstract domain, and performing increment and decrement using existential abstraction. They used a three-valued domain representing 0, 1, or more processes. As we are interested, e.g., in the fact whether at least \(t + 1\) or \(n - t\) processes are in a certain state, the domain from \[24\] is too coarse for us.

\[1\] A formal definition of the transition relation is given in Appendix \(A\).
Theorem 5. For all \( p \in P_{RC} \), and all finite state process skeletons \( Sk \), let system instance \( Inst(p, Sk) = (S_I, S^0_I, R_I, AP, \lambda_I) \), and \( Cnt(Sk) = (S_{Cnt}, S^0_{Cnt}, R_{Cnt}, AP, \lambda_{Cnt}) \). Then:

\[
\text{if } (\sigma, \sigma') \in R_I, \text{ then } (h^cnt_p(\sigma), h^cnt_p(\sigma')) \in R_{Cnt}.
\]

To prove simulation, we now define the labeling function \( \lambda_{Cnt} \). Here we consider propositions from \( AP_D \cup AP_{SV} \) in the form of \( \exists i. \Phi(i) \) and \( \forall i. \Phi(i) \).

Formula \( \Phi(i) \) is defined over variables from the \( \Pi \)-dimensional vector \( x^\ell \) of local variables and \( sv \), an \( m \)-dimensional vector of global variables \( x^g \). Then, the labeling function is defined by

\[
[\exists i. \Phi(i)] \in \lambda_{Cnt}(w) \text{ iff } \bigvee_{\ell \in L} (x^\ell = \ell, x^g = R w \models abst(\Phi(i)) \land w.k[\ell] \neq I_0)
\]

\[
[\forall i. \Phi(i)] \in \lambda_{Cnt}(w) \text{ iff } \bigwedge_{\ell \in L} (x^\ell = \ell, x^g = R w \models abst(\Phi(i)) \lor w.k[\ell] = I_0).
\]

Theorem 6. For all \( p \in P_{RC} \), and for all finite state process skeletons \( Sk \), \( Inst(p, Sk) \subseteq Cnt(Sk) \), with respect to \( AP_{SV} \).

Theorem 7. Let \( \pi = \{\sigma_i\}_{i \geq 1} \) be a J-fair path of \( Inst(p, Sk_{abs}(A)) \). Then \( \hat{\pi} = \{h^cnt_p(\sigma_i)\}_{i \geq 1} \) is a J-fair path of \( Cnt \).

From Theorems 3, 4, 6 and 7 we obtain the following central corollary in the form necessary for our parameterized model checking problem.

**Corollary 1 (Soundness of data & counter abstraction).** For all CFA \( A \), and for all formulas \( \varphi \) from LTL over \( AP_{SV} \) and justice constraints \( J \subseteq AP_D \): if \( Cnt(Sk_{abs}(A)) \models J \varphi \), then for all \( p \in P_{RC} \) it holds \( Inst(p, Sk(A)) \models J \varphi \).

### 4.4 Abstraction Refinement of Parameterized Systems

Due to parametric existential abstraction we have to deal with spurious behavior. (A detailed explanation on our techniques for refinement is given in Appendix B.)

The first one is caused by spurious transitions. Consider a transition \( \tau \) of \( Cnt(Sk_{abs}(A)) \). We say that the transition \( \tau \) is spurious w.r.t. \( p \in P_{RC} \), if there is no transition in \( Inst(p, Sk(A)) \) that is a concretization of \( \tau \). This situation can be detected by known techniques [5] for a fixed \( p \). However, it is unsound to remove \( \tau \) from \( Cnt(Sk_{abs}(A)) \), unless \( \tau \) is spurious w.r.t. all \( p \in P_{RC} \). We call transitions that are spurious w.r.t. all admissible parameters uniformly spurious. Detecting such transitions is a challenge and to the best of our knowledge, this problem has not been investigated before. To detect such transitions we use one more intermediate abstraction in the form of VASS that abstracts local variables as in Section 4.2 and keeps concrete shared variables and process counters.
Table 1. Experimental data on abstraction of algorithms tolerant to faults: Byzantine, symmetric, omission, clean crashes. Run on a 3.3GHz Intel® Core™ 4GB machine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>System Prop Valid</th>
<th>Spin Time</th>
<th>Spin Memory</th>
<th>Spin States</th>
<th>Spin Trans</th>
<th>Spin Depth</th>
<th>Ref-t Steps</th>
<th>Total Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BYZ (U) ✓</td>
<td>2.14 sec.</td>
<td>84 MB</td>
<td>509 · 10^9</td>
<td>1262 · 10^9</td>
<td>9929</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BYZ (C) ✓</td>
<td>4.03 sec.</td>
<td>114 MB</td>
<td>1264 · 10^9</td>
<td>1937 · 10^9</td>
<td>30607</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BYZ (R) ✓</td>
<td>8.79 sec.</td>
<td>133 MB</td>
<td>1993 · 10^9</td>
<td>4412 · 10^9</td>
<td>23812</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SYMM (U) ✓</td>
<td>0.07 sec.</td>
<td>68 MB</td>
<td>19 · 10^3</td>
<td>36 · 10^3</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SYMM (C) ✓</td>
<td>0.06 sec.</td>
<td>68 MB</td>
<td>18 · 10^3</td>
<td>36 · 10^3</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SYMM (R) ✓</td>
<td>3.51 sec.</td>
<td>75 MB</td>
<td>260 · 10^3</td>
<td>2243 · 10^3</td>
<td>5691</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>280 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OMIT (U) ✓</td>
<td>0.01 sec.</td>
<td>68 MB</td>
<td>4 · 10^3</td>
<td>8 · 10^3</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>OMIT (C) ✓</td>
<td>0.02 sec.</td>
<td>68 MB</td>
<td>5 · 10^3</td>
<td>12 · 10^3</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>OMIT (R) ✓</td>
<td>0.03 sec.</td>
<td>68 MB</td>
<td>6 · 10^3</td>
<td>17 · 10^3</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CLEAN (U) ✓</td>
<td>0.03 sec.</td>
<td>68 MB</td>
<td>14 · 10^3</td>
<td>26 · 10^3</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CLEAN (C) ✓</td>
<td>0.04 sec.</td>
<td>68 MB</td>
<td>14 · 10^3</td>
<td>27 · 10^3</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CLEAN (R) ✓</td>
<td>0.08 sec.</td>
<td>68 MB</td>
<td>21 · 10^3</td>
<td>54 · 10^3</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 sec.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independently of uniformly spurious transitions, parametric abstraction leads to the second, interesting problem. Consider transitions \(\tau_1\) and \(\tau_2\) of \(\text{Cnt}(\text{Sk}_{\text{abs}}(A))\) that are not spurious w.r.t. \(p_1\) and \(p_2\) in \(P_{RC}\), respectively, for \(p_1 \neq p_2\). There is a possibility that a path \(\tau_1, \tau_2\) is in \(\text{Cnt}(\text{Sk}_{\text{abs}}(A))\) and there is no \(p_3 \in P_{RC}\) such that \(\tau_1, \tau_2\) is a path in \(\text{Inst}(p_3, \text{Sk}(A))\), i.e., the path \(\tau_1, \tau_2\) is uniformly spurious. We detect such spurious behavior by user-provided invariant candidates.

As observed by [24], counter abstraction may lead to justice suppression. Given a counter-example in the form of a lasso, we detect, whether its loop contains only unjust states. If this is the case, we refine \(\text{Cnt}(\text{Sk}_{\text{abs}}(A))\) by adding a justice requirement, which is consistent with existing requirements in all concrete instances \(\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}(A))\). This refinement is similar to an idea from [24].

5 Experimental Evaluation

We have implemented the PIA abstractions and the refinement loop in OCaml as a prototype tool ByMC. We evaluated it on the algorithms and the specifications discussed in Section 3.

We extended the Promela language [15] with a few constructs to express \(\Pi\), \(\text{AP}\), \(\text{RC}\), and \(N\). ByMC receives a description of a CFA \(A\) in this extended Promela, and then syntactically extracts the thresholds. Their uniform order (Definition 1) is checked using the Yices SMT solver. Further, static analysis partitions the variables into \(\Gamma\), \(A\), \(sv\), and scratch variables. Then, the expressions of the CFA \(A\) are analyzed, and using Yices, the existential abstractions are computed. Based on this, our tool ByMC translates \(A\) into VASS encoding, which in turn it then translates into a standard Promela encoding of the counter abstraction \(\text{Cnt}(A)\). Finally, ByMC also implements the refinements...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>RC Prop</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Spin Time</th>
<th>Spin Memory</th>
<th>Spin States</th>
<th>Spin Trans</th>
<th>Spin Depth</th>
<th>Ref-t Steps</th>
<th>Total Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BYZ</td>
<td>(a) (U)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>4.41 sec.</td>
<td>99 MB</td>
<td>1022 · 10^9</td>
<td>2056 · 10^9</td>
<td>20176</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BYZ</td>
<td>(a) (C)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>2.2 sec.</td>
<td>83 MB</td>
<td>494 · 10^5</td>
<td>1125 · 10^5</td>
<td>14461</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BYZ</td>
<td>(a) (R)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>0.37 sec.</td>
<td>70 MB</td>
<td>81 · 10^5</td>
<td>184 · 10^5</td>
<td>7126</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BYZ</td>
<td>(b) (U)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2.91 sec.</td>
<td>89 MB</td>
<td>654 · 10^3</td>
<td>1689 · 10^3</td>
<td>9930</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BYZ</td>
<td>(b) (C)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.72 sec.</td>
<td>105 MB</td>
<td>1172 · 10^3</td>
<td>2157 · 10^3</td>
<td>23706</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BYZ</td>
<td>(b) (R)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>1.74 sec.</td>
<td>85 MB</td>
<td>575 · 10^3</td>
<td>990 · 10^3</td>
<td>13131</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SYMM</td>
<td>(a) (U)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>0.07 sec.</td>
<td>68 MB</td>
<td>18 · 10^3</td>
<td>40 · 10^3</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SYMM</td>
<td>(a) (C)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>0.08 sec.</td>
<td>68 MB</td>
<td>21 · 10^3</td>
<td>42 · 10^3</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SYMM</td>
<td>(a) (R)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.08 sec.</td>
<td>73 MB</td>
<td>185 · 10^3</td>
<td>1793 · 10^3</td>
<td>5294</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>OMIT</td>
<td>(c) (U)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0.02 sec.</td>
<td>68 MB</td>
<td>4 · 10^3</td>
<td>14 · 10^3</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>OMIT</td>
<td>(c) (C)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>0.03 sec.</td>
<td>68 MB</td>
<td>4 · 10^3</td>
<td>16 · 10^3</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>OMIT</td>
<td>(c) (R)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>0.01 sec.</td>
<td>68 MB</td>
<td>0.068 · 10^3</td>
<td>0.086 · 10^3</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Experimental data on abstraction of fault-tolerant algorithms with incorrect resilience conditions (RC): (a) $f \leq t + 1$; (b) $n \geq 3t$; (c) $n \geq 2t$.

introduced in Section 4.4 and refines the Promela code for $\text{Cnt}(A)$ by introducing predicates capturing spurious transitions and unjust states.

Table 1 summarizes the experiments where we used resilience conditions as provided from the literature. “Ref-t Steps” is the number of refinement steps. In the cases where it is greater than zero, refinement was necessary, and “Spin Time” refers to the SPIN running time after the last refinement step.

In Table 2 we used different resilience conditions under which we expected the algorithms to fail. The cases (a) capture the case where more faults occur than expected by the algorithm designer, while the cases (b) and (c) capture the cases where the algorithms were designed by assuming wrong resilience conditions. We omit (CLEAN) in Table 2 as the only sensible case $n = f$ (all processes are faulty) results into a trivial abstract domain of one interval $[0, \infty)$.

6 Conclusions

We presented a novel technique to model check fault-tolerant distributed algorithms. To this end, we extended the standard setting of parameterized model checking to processes which use threshold guards, and are parameterized with a resilience condition. As a case study we have chosen the core of the broadcasting algorithms [28] under different failure models. These algorithms are widely applied in the literature: typically, multiple (possibly an unbounded number of) instances are used in combination. As future work, we plan to use compositional model checking techniques [23] for parameterized verification of such algorithms.
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APPENDIX

A Details of the counter abstraction

Initial states. Let \( L_0 \) be a set \( \{ \ell \mid \ell \in L \land \exists s_0 \in S_0, \ell = \{sv\} \cup A \ s_0 \} \); it captures initial local states. Then \( w_0 \in S^0_{Cnt} \) if and only the following conditions are met:

\[
\exists p \in P_{RC} \exists k_1 \cdots \exists k_{|L|}, \sum_{1 \leq i \leq |L|} k_i = N(p) \land \forall i: 1 \leq i \leq |L|, \alpha_b(k_i) = w_0.\kappa[\ell_i] \\
\forall i: 1 \leq i \leq |L|, (\ell_i \notin L_0) \rightarrow (w_0.\kappa[\ell_i] = I_0) \\
\exists s_0 \in S_0, w_0 = \Gamma s_0
\]

Less formally: Concrete counter values are mapped to \( w_0.\kappa[\ell_i] \) using \( \alpha_b \); We consider only combinations of counters that give a system size \( N(p) \); Every counter \( \kappa[\ell_i] \) is initialized to zero, if the local state \( \ell_i \) is met in no initial state \( s_0 \in S_0 \); a shared variable \( g \) of \( w_0 \) may be initialized to a value \( v \) only if there is some initial state \( s_0 \in S_0 \) with \( s_0.g = v \).

Transition relation. We now formalize the transition relation \( R_{Cnt} \) of \( Cnt(Sk) \).

The formal definition of when for two states \( w \) and \( w' \) of the counter abstraction it holds that \( (w, w') \in R_{Cnt} \) is given below in (1) to (10). We will discuss each of these formulas separately. We start from the transition relation \( R \) of the process skeleton \( Sk \) from which we abstract. Recall that \( (s, s') \in R \) means that a process can go from \( s \) to \( s' \). From \( (3) \) and \( (5) \) we get that, FROM is the local state of \( s \), and TO is the local state of \( s' \).

In the abstraction, if FROM \( \neq \) TO, a step from \( s \) to \( s' \) is represented by increasing the counter at index TO by 1 and decreasing the one at FROM by 1. Otherwise, that is, if FROM = TO, the counter of FROM should not change. Here "increase" and "decrease" is performed using the corresponding functions over the abstract domain \( \hat{D} \), and the mentioned updates of the counters are enforced in \( (3) \), \( (5) \), and \( (7) \). Further, the counters of all local states different from FROM and TO should not change, which we achieved by \( (10) \). Performing such a transition should only be possible if there is actually a process in state \( s \), which means in the abstraction that the corresponding counter is greater than \( I_0 \). We enforce this restriction by \( (2) \).

By the above, we abstract the transition with respect to local states. However, \( s \) and \( s' \) also contain the shared variables. We have to make sure that the shared variables are updated in the abstraction in the same way they are updated in the concrete system, which is achieved in \( (1) \) and \( (6) \).

We thus arrive at the formal definition of the abstract transition relation: \( R_{Cnt} \) consists of all pairs \( (w, w') \) for which there exist \( s \) and \( s' \) in \( S \), and FROM and TO in \( L \) such that equations (1) – (10) hold:

\[
(\text{s, s'}) \in R \quad \text{FROM} = \{sv\} \cup A s \quad \text{TO} = \{sv\} \cup A s' \\
w.\kappa[\text{FROM}] \neq I_0 \quad w = \Gamma s \quad w' = \Gamma s' 
\]
B Abstraction Refinement in Parameterized Setting

In Section 4.4 we gave a high-level description of parameterized abstraction refinement. In the following we provide a more detailed discussion.

We give a general framework for a sound refinement of \( \text{Cnt}(\text{Sk}_{abs}(A)) \) in Section B.1 and then introduce techniques that allow us to do refinement in practice in Sections B.2 and B.3.

B.1 Refinement Framework for Parameterized Systems

To simplify presentation, we define a monster system as a (possibly infinite) Kripke structure \( \text{Sys}_\omega = (S_\omega, S^0_\omega, R_\omega, \text{AP}, \lambda_\omega) \), whose state space and transition relation are disjoint unions of state spaces and transition relations of system instances \( \text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}(A)) = (S_p, S^0_p, R_p, \text{AP}, \lambda_p) \) over all admissible parameters:

\[
S_\omega = \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RC}}} S_p, \quad S^0_\omega = \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RC}}} S^0_p, \quad R_\omega = \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RC}}} R_p
\]

\[
\lambda_\omega : S_\omega \to 2^{\text{AP}} \text{ and for all } p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RC}}, s \in S_p \text{ it holds } \lambda_\omega(s) = \lambda_p(s)
\]

Using abstraction mappings \( \bar{h}^{\text{dat}}_p \) and \( \bar{h}^{\text{cnt}}_p \) we define an abstraction mapping \( \bar{h}^{\text{dc}}_p : S_\omega \to S_{\text{Cnt}} \) from \( \text{Sys}_\omega \) to \( \text{Cnt}(\text{Sk}_{abs}(A)) \): If \( \sigma \in S_p \), then \( \bar{h}^{\text{dc}}(\sigma) = \bar{h}^{\text{cnt}}(\bar{h}^{\text{dat}}(\sigma)) \).

Definition 6. A sequence \( T = \{\sigma_i\}_{i \geq 1} \) is a concretization of path \( \bar{T} = \{w_i\}_{i \geq 1} \) from \( \text{Cnt}(\text{Sk}_{abs}(A)) \) if and only if \( \sigma_1 \in S_\omega \) and for all \( i \geq 1 \) it holds \( \bar{h}^{\text{dc}}(\sigma_1) = w_i \).

Definition 7. A path \( \bar{T} \) of \( \text{Cnt}(\text{Sk}_{abs}(A)) \) is a spurious path iff every concretization \( T \) of \( \bar{T} \) is not a path in \( \text{Sys}_\omega \).

While for finite state systems there are methods to detect, whether a path is spurious [5], we are not aware of a method to detect, whether a path \( \bar{T} \) in \( \text{Cnt}(\text{Sk}_{abs}(A)) \) corresponds to a path in the (concrete) infinite monster system \( \text{Sys}_\omega \). Therefore, we limit ourselves to detecting and refining uniformly spurious transitions and unjust states.

Definition 8. An abstract transition \( (w, w') \in R_{\text{Cnt}} \) is uniformly spurious iff there is no transition \( (\sigma, \sigma') \in R_\omega \) with \( w = \bar{h}^{\text{dc}}(\sigma) \) and \( w' = \bar{h}^{\text{dc}}(\sigma') \).
Definition 9. An abstract state \( w \in S_{\text{Cnt}} \) is unjust under \( q \in AP_D \) iff there is no concrete state \( \sigma \in S_\omega \) with \( w = h^{\text{dc}}(\sigma) \) and \( q \in \lambda_\omega(\sigma) \).

We give a general criterion that ensures soundness of abstraction, when removing uniformly spurious transitions. In other words, removing a transition does not affect the property of transition preservation.

Theorem 8. Let \( T \subseteq R_{\text{Cnt}} \) be a set of spurious transitions. Then for every transition \( (\sigma, \sigma') \in R_\omega \) there is a transition \( (h^{\text{dc}}(\sigma), h^{\text{dc}}(\sigma')) \) in \( R_{\text{Cnt}} \setminus T \).

Proof. Assume that there is transition \( (\sigma, \sigma') \in R_\omega \) with \( w = h^{\text{dc}}(\sigma) \), \( w' = h^{\text{dc}}(\sigma') \), and \( (w, w') \in R_{\text{Cnt}} \cap T \). As \( T \) is a set of uniformly spurious transitions, we have that the transition \( (w, w') \) is uniformly spurious. Consider a pair of states \( \rho, \rho' \in S_\omega \) with the property \( h^{\text{dc}}(\rho) = w \) and \( h^{\text{dc}}(\rho') = w' \). From Definition 8 it follows that \( (\rho, \rho') \notin R_\omega \). This contradicts the assumption \( (\sigma, \sigma') \in R_\omega \) as we can take \( \rho = \sigma \) and \( \rho' = \sigma' \). \( \square \)

From the theorem it follows that the system \( \text{Cnt}_{\text{re}} = (S_{\text{Cnt}}, S^0_{\text{Cnt}}, R_{\text{Cnt}} \setminus T, AP, \lambda_{\text{Cnt}}) \) still simulates \( \text{Sys}_\omega \). After the criterion of removing individual transitions, we now consider infinite counterexamples of \( \text{Cnt}(\text{Sk}_{\text{abs}}(A)) \), which have a form of lassos. For such a counterexample \( \tilde{T} \) we denote the set of states in the lasso’s loop by \( U \). We then check, whether all states of \( U \) are unjust under some justice constraint \( q \in J \). If this is the case, \( \tilde{T} \) is a spurious counterexample, because the justice constraint \( q \) is violated. Note that it is sound to only consider infinite paths, where states outside of \( U \) appear infinitely often; in fact, this is a justice requirement. To refine \( \text{Cnt} \)’s unjust behavior we add a corresponding justice requirement. Formally, we augment \( J \) (and \( AP_D \)) with a propositional symbol \([\text{off } U]\). Further, we augment the labelling function \( \lambda_{\text{Cnt}} \) such that every \( w \in S_{\text{Cnt}} \) is labelled with \([\text{off } U]\) if and only if \( w \in U \).

Theorem 9. Let \( J \subseteq AP_D \) be a set of justice requirements, \( q \in J \), and \( U \subseteq S_{\text{Cnt}} \) be a set of unjust states under \( q \). Let \( \pi = \{\sigma_i\}_{i \geq 1} \) be an arbitrary fair path of \( \text{Sys}_\omega \) under \( J \). The path \( \hat{\pi} = \{h^{\text{dc}}(\sigma_i)\}_{i \geq 1} \) is a fair path in \( \text{Cnt}(\text{Sk}_{\text{abs}}(A)) \) under \( \{\alpha_A(\rho) \mid \rho \in J\} \cup \{[\text{off } U]\} \).

Proof. Consider an arbitrary fair path \( \pi = \{\sigma_i\}_{i \geq 1} \) of \( \text{Sys}_\omega \) under \( J \). Assume that \( \hat{\pi} = \{h^{\text{dc}}(\sigma_i)\}_{i \geq 1} \) is fair under \( J \), but it becomes unfair under \( J \cup \{[\text{off } U]\} \).

If \( \hat{\pi} \) is unfair under \( \{[\text{off } U]\} \), then \( \hat{\pi} \) does not have infinitely many states labelled with \([\text{off } U]\). Thus, \( \hat{\pi} \) must have an infinite suffix \( \text{suf}(\hat{\pi}) \), where each \( w \in \text{suf}(\hat{\pi}) \) has the property \([\text{off } U] \notin \lambda_{\text{Cnt}} \). From the definition of \([\text{off } U]\) we immediately conclude that every state \( w \in \text{suf}(\hat{\pi}) \) belongs to \( U \), i.e., \( w \) is unjust under \( q \in J \).

Using the suffix \( \text{suf}(\hat{\pi}) \) we reconstruct a corresponding suffix \( \text{suf}(\pi) \) of \( \pi \) (by skipping the prefix of the same length as in \( \hat{\pi} \)). From the fact that every state of \( \text{suf}(\hat{\pi}) \) is unjust under \( q \) we know that every state \( \sigma \in \text{suf}(\pi) \) violates the constraint \( q \) as well, namely, \( q \notin \lambda_\omega(\sigma) \). Thus, \( \pi \) has at most finitely many states labelled with \( q \in J \). It immediately follows from the definition of fairness that \( \pi \) is not fair under \( J \). This contradicts the assumption of the theorem. \( \square \)
From the last theorem we derive the criterion that loops containing only unjust states can be eliminated, and thus $\text{Cnt}(\text{Sk}_{\text{abs}}(A))$ be refined.

### B.2 Detecting Spurious Transitions and Unjust States

In this section we show symbolic techniques to detect spurious transitions and unfair states for our specific PIA abstractions. We are concerned with symbolic representations that can be encoded as a formula of an SMT solver. While there are systems where one can encode the monster system $\text{Sys}_\omega$ (Section B.1) in an SMT solver [18, 24], it is not obvious how to do this for threshold-based distributed algorithms, which have a parameterized local state space.

Our method consists of using a model for refinement that abstracts only local state space, but is finer than $\{\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}_{\text{abs}}(A))\}_{p \in P_{\text{RC}}}$. Thus, we introduce a family $\{\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}_{\Lambda}(A))\}_{p \in P_{\text{RC}}}$, where $\text{Sk}_{\Lambda}(A)$ is a skeleton obtained by applying a data abstraction similar to Section 4.2, but shared variables $\Gamma$ preserve their concrete values. Because guards operate on variables both in the abstract and concrete domain, we have to define a finer abstraction of guards.

We need some additional notation. Let $\text{lin}_\text{form}(\vartheta_j)$ be the threshold expression of CFA that induces the threshold function $\vartheta_j$ for $0 \leq j \leq \mu$. Then we construct a formula $\text{in}(y, I_a)$ expressing that a variable $y$ lies within the interval captured by $I_a$. (Note that parameter variables are free in the formula.)

$$\text{in}(y, I_a) \equiv (I_a = I_\mu \land (\text{lin}_\text{form}(\vartheta_a) \leq y)) \lor (I_a \neq I_\mu \land (\text{lin}_\text{form}(\vartheta_a) \leq y < \text{lin}_\text{form}(\vartheta_{a+1})))$$

The abstraction of CFA guards is done as follows:

$$\text{abst}_A(g) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \bigvee_{(I_a, I_b) \in ||g||} \hat{x} = I_a \land \text{in}(y, I_b) & \text{if } g \text{ is } x \leq y + \beta \text{ or } x > y + \beta \\
\text{and } x \in \Lambda, y \in \Gamma & \text{and } \beta \text{ is a } \text{lin}_\text{form} \\
\text{and } g \text{ is a guard over } x, y \in \Gamma & \\
\text{if } g \text{ is } g_1 \land g_2 & \\
\text{otherwise} & \\
\alpha_E(g) & \end{array} \right.$$  

Similarly to Section 4.2 we construct a CFA $\text{abst}_A(A)$ and then use a process skeleton $\text{Sk}_A(A)$ induced by $\text{abst}_A(A)$. For every parameter values $p \in P_{\text{RC}}$ one can construct an instance $\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}_A(A))$ using $\text{Sk}_A(A)$. We are going to show that this abstraction is coarser than $\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}(A))$ and finer than $\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}_{\text{abs}}(A))$ due to:

**Proposition 4 (abstractions hierarchy).** $\text{Sk}(A) \preceq \text{Sk}_A(A) \preceq \text{Sk}_{\text{abs}}(A)$.

Now we encode the whole family $\{\text{Inst}(p, \text{Sk}_A(A))\}_{p \in P_{\text{RC}}}$ using the VASS representation introduced in Section 4.3. A global state of the system $\text{VASS}_A$ is represented by a vector of parameter values, a vector of shared variable values,
and a vector of process counters: \((p, g, K)\), where \(p \in P_{RC}\), \(g \in D|F|\), \(K \in \mathbb{N}_0^{|L|}\).

Moreover, \(N(p) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq |L|} K_i\).

One can define a formula \(Init(p, g, K)\) that captures the initial states \((p, g, K)\) similarly to the initial states of \(\text{Cnt}(Sk_{abs}(A))\).

\(VASS_A\) makes a step from a global state \((p, g, K)\) to a global state \((p', g', K')\) when:

- \(p' = p\):
- there is a step \((s, s') \in R\) of the skeleton \(Sk_A(A)\), where a process moves from the local state \(FROM =_A s\) to the local state \(TO =_A s'\);
- at least one process stays in \(FROM\), i.e. \(K_{FROM} > 0\);
- the counters are updated as \(K'_{FROM} = K_{FROM} - 1\) and \(K'_{TO} = K_{TO} + 1\);
- other counters do not change values, i.e. \(\forall i : 1 \leq i \leq |L|. (i \neq FROM \land i \neq TO) \rightarrow K'_i = K_i\).

We can encode these constraints by a symbolic formula \(Step(p, g, K, p', g', K')\).

The function \(\lambda_{VASS_A}\) labels states with justice constraints similar to the equations that define \(\lambda_{Cnt}\) in Section 4.3. We omit the formal definition here.

**Proposition 5.** The system \(VASS_A\) simulates the system \(Sys_w\).

Proposition 5 allows us to use the following strategy. We take a transition \(\tau\) of \(\text{Cnt}(Sk_{abs}(A))\) and try to replay it in \(VASS_A\). If \(\tau\) is not reproducible in \(VASS_A\), due to Proposition 8, \(\tau\) is a spurious transition in \(Sys_w\) and it can be removed. The following theorem provides us with a condition to check if \(\tau\) can be replayed in \(VASS_A\):

**Theorem 10.** Let \((w, w') \in R_{Cnt}\) be a transition of \(\text{Cnt}(Sk_{abs}(A))\). If there exists a transition \((\sigma, \sigma') \in R_w\) such that \(w = h^{dc}(\sigma)\) and \(w' = h^{dc}(\sigma')\), then there exists a transition \(Step(p, g, K, p, g', K')\) of \(VASS_A\) satisfying the following condition:

\[
\bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq |L|} (in(K_i, w, \kappa[i]) \land in(K'_i, w', \kappa[i])) \land \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq |F|} (in(g_i, w, g_j) \land in(g'_i, w', g_j))
\]

In other words, if the formula from Theorem 11 is unsatisfiable, the transition \((w, w')\) can be removed safely.

Further, we check whether an abstract state \(w \in S_{Cnt}\) is an unjust one. If it is, then Theorem 11 allows us to refine justice constraints. The following theorem provides us with a condition that a state is unjust in \(VASS_A\):

**Theorem 11.** Let \(w \in S_{Cnt}\) be a state of \(\text{Cnt}(Sk_{abs}(A))\) and \(q \in AP_D\) be a proposition expressing a justice constraint. If there exists a state \(\sigma \in S_w\) such that \(w = h^{dc}(\sigma)\) and \(q \in \lambda_w(\sigma)\), then there exists a state \((p, g, K)\) of \(VASS_A\) satisfying the following condition:

\[
q \in \lambda_{VASS_A}((p, g, K)) \land \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq |L|} in(K_i, w, \kappa[i]) \land \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq |F|} in(g_i, w, g_j)
\]
In other words, if the formula from Theorem 11 is unsatisfiable, there is no state \( \sigma \in S_{\omega} \) with \( q \in \lambda_{\omega}(\sigma) \) abstracted to \( w \). Thus, \( w \) is unjust.

Remark 2. The system \( \text{VASS}_A \) and the constraints of Theorems 10 and 11 can be encoded in an SMT solver. By checking satisfiability we detect spurious transitions and unjust states. Moreover, unsatisfiable cores allow us to prune several spurious transitions and unjust states at once.

B.3 Invariant Candidates Provided by the User

In the transition-based approach of the previous section we cannot detect paths of being spurious in the case they do not contain uniformly spurious transitions (cf. beginning of Section B). In this case a human guidance might help: An expert gives an invariant candidate. Assuming the invariant candidate is expressed as as a formula \( \text{Inv} \) over a global state \((p, g, K)\) of \( \text{VASS}_A \), the invariant candidate can be automatically proven to indeed being an invariant by verifying satisfiability of the formulas:

\[
\text{Init}(p, g, K) \rightarrow \text{Inv}(p, g, K) \tag{11}
\]

\[
\text{Inv}(p, g, K) \land \text{Step}(p, g, K, p', g', K') \rightarrow \text{Inv}(p', g', K') \tag{12}
\]

Then a transition \((w, w') \in R_{\text{Cnt}}\) is spurious if the following formula is not satisfiable:

\[
\text{Inv}(p, g, K) \land \text{Step}(p, g, K, p', g', K') \land \text{Inv}(p', g', K') \land \\
\bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq |L|} (\text{in}(K_i, w, k[i]) \land \text{in}(K'_i, w', k'[i])) \land \\
\bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq |\Gamma|} (\text{in}(g_i, w, g_j) \land \text{in}(g'_i, w', g_j))
\]

If we receive a counterexample \( \hat{T} \) that cannot be refined with the techniques from the previous section, we test each transition of \( \hat{T} \) against the above formula. If the formula is unsatisfiable for a transition \((w, w') \in \hat{T}\), it is sound to remove it from \( \text{Cnt}(\text{Sk}_{\text{abs}}(A)) \) due to Theorem 8, Equations 11, 12, and the formula above.

Example 1. To give an impression, how simple an invariant can be, for our case study (cf. Section 2) the relay specification required us to introduce the following invariant candidate: If \( \bar{L}_s = \{ \ell \in L \mid \ell.sv = SE \lor \ell.sv = AC \} \), then the following formula is an invariant \( \text{nsnt} = \sum_{\ell \in \bar{L}_s} K_{\ell} \). Intuitively, it captures the obvious property that the number of messages sent is equal to the number of processes that have sent a message. This property was, however, lost in the course of abstraction.

C Detailed Proofs

C.1 Additional Definitions.

Parallel Composition. Given \( p \in P_{RC} \), and a parameterized process skeleton \( \text{Sk} = (S, S_0, R) \), we can define a system instance. Let \( \text{AP} \) be a set of atomic propositions. A system instance \( \text{Inst}(p, Sk) \) is a Kripke structure \((S_I, S_0, R_I, \text{AP}, \lambda_I)\) where:
The set of (global) states is $S_I = \{ (\sigma[1], \ldots, \sigma[N(p)]) \in (S_p)^N(p) \mid \forall i, j \in \{1, \ldots, N(p)\}, \sigma[i] = \cap_{R \in H} \sigma[j] \}$. More informally, a global state $\sigma$ is a Cartesian product of the state $\sigma[i]$ of each process $i$, where the values of parameters and shared variables are the same at each process.

$S_I^0 = (S^0)^N(p) \cap S_I$ is the set of initial (global) states, where $(S^0)^N(p)$ is the Cartesian product of initial states of individual processes.

A transition $(\sigma, \sigma')$ from a global state $\sigma \in S_I$ to a global state $\sigma' \in S_I$ belongs to $R_I$ iff there is an index $i$, $1 \leq i \leq N(p)$, such that:

- $\text{(MOVE)}$. The $i$-th process moves: $(\sigma[i], \sigma'[i]) \in R_I$.
- $\text{(FRAME)}$. The values of the local variables of the other processes are preserved: for every process index $j \neq i$, $1 \leq j \leq N(p)$, it holds that

$$\sigma[j] = \cap_{\{w\} \cup A} \sigma'[j].$$

$\lambda_I : S_I \rightarrow 2^{AP}$ is a state labeling function.

**Simulation.** In order to compare the behavior of system instances we use the notion of simulation. Given two Kripke structures $M_1 = (S_1, S_0^1, R_1, AP, \lambda_1)$ and $M_2 = (S_2, S_0^2, R_2, AP, \lambda_2)$, a relation $H \subseteq S_1 \times S_2$ is a simulation relation with respect to a set of atomic propositions $AP' \subseteq AP$ iff for every pair of states $(s_1, s_2) \in H$ the following conditions hold:

- $\lambda_1(s_1) \cap AP' = \lambda_2(s_2) \cap AP'$
- for every state $t_1$, with $(s_1, t_1) \in R_1$, there is a state $t_2$ with the property $(s_2, t_2) \in R_2$ and $(t_1, t_2) \in H$.

If there is a simulation relation $H$ on $M_1$ and $M_2$ such that, for every initial state $s_1^0 \in S_0^1$ there is an initial state $s_2^0 \in S_0^2$ with the property $(s_1^0, s_2^0) \in H$, then we write $M_1 \leq M_2$. In this case we say $M_1$ is simulated by $M_2$.

**C.2 The Proofs.**

**Proposition** For all $p \in P_{RC}$ and all $a \in D$ it holds that:

$$a \geq \vartheta_j(p) \iff \alpha_p(a) \geq I_j, \text{ and } a < \vartheta_j(p) \iff \alpha_p(a) < I_j.$$

**Proof.** Fix an arbitrary $p \in P_{RC}$.

**Case** $a \geq \vartheta_j(p)$. ($\Rightarrow$) Fix an arbitrary $a \in D$ satisfying $a \geq \vartheta_j(p)$. Let $k$ be a maximum number such that $a \geq \vartheta_k(p)$. Then $\alpha_p(a) = I_k$. By Definition of $\alpha_p$ we have $k \geq j$ and thus, by Definition 2, $I_k \geq I_j$. It immediately gives $\alpha_p(a) \geq I_j$.

($\Leftarrow$) Let $a \in D$ be a value satisfying $\alpha_p(a) \geq I_j$. There is $k$ such that $\alpha_p(a) = I_k$ and $a \geq \vartheta_k(p)$. From $\alpha_p(a) \geq I_j$ it follows that $I_k \geq I_j$ and, by Definition 2, $k \geq j$. Then by Definition 1 we have $\vartheta_k(p) \geq \vartheta_j(p)$ and by transitivity $a \geq \vartheta_j(p)$.
Case $a < \vartheta_j(p)$. $(\Rightarrow)$ Fix an arbitrary $a \in D$ satisfying $a < \vartheta_j(p)$. Let $k$ be a maximum number such that $a \geq \vartheta_k(p)$. Then $\alpha_p(a) = I_k$.

Consider the case when $k \geq j$. By Definition 2, it implies $I_k \geq I_j$. It immediately gives $\alpha_p(a) \geq I_j$, which contradicts the assumption $a < \vartheta_j(p)$. Thus, the only case is $k < j$.

By Definition 2 $k < j$ implies $I_k \leq I_j$. As we excluded the case $k = j$ we have $I_k \leq I_j$, $I_k \neq I_j$ or, equivalently, $\alpha_p(a) = I_k < I_j$.

$(\Leftarrow)$ Let $a \in D$ be a value satisfying $\alpha_p(a) < I_j$ or, equivalently, $\alpha_p(a) \leq I_j$ and $\alpha_p(a) \neq I_j$. There exists $k$ such that $\alpha_p(a) = I_k$ and either (a) $a < \vartheta_{k+1}(p)$ or (b) $k = \mu$. From the assumption we have $I_k \leq I_j$ and $I_k \neq I_j$. From this we conclude: (c) $k \neq \mu$ excluding (b); (d) $I_{k+1} \leq I_j$. From (d) by Definition 2 $k+1 < j$. This implies by Definition 1 $\vartheta_{k+1}(p) \leq \vartheta_j(p)$. From this and (a) we conclude that $a < \vartheta_j(p)$. \qed

**Proposition 3.** If $\Phi$ is a formula over variables $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ over $D$, then $\Phi_E$ is a PIA existential abstraction.

**Proof.** Consider an arbitrary $d \in \|\Phi\|_E$. As $d \in \|\Phi\|_E$, it satisfies the conjunct $\hat{x}_1 = \hat{d}_1 \land \cdots \land \hat{x}_k = \hat{d}_k$ and thus satisfies the disjunction $\hat{\Phi}$, i.e. $x = d \models \hat{\Phi}_E$. As $d$ is chosen arbitrarily, we conclude that $\|\Phi\|_E \subseteq \{\hat{x} \in \hat{D}^k \mid \hat{x} \models \hat{\Phi}_E\}$. \qed

**Theorem 2.** For all $p \in P_{RC}$, and for all CFA $A$, if system instance $\text{Inst}(p, Sk(A)) = (S_I, S_P^I, R_I, AP, \lambda_I)$ and system instance $\text{Inst}(p, Sk_{abs}(A)) = (S_I, S_P^I, R_I, AP, \lambda_I)$, then:

$$\text{if } (\sigma, \sigma') \in R_I, \text{ then } (\bar{h}_{\text{dat}}(\sigma), \bar{h}_{\text{dat}}(\sigma')) \in R_{abs}. $$

**Proof.** Let $R$ and $R_{abs}$ be the transition relations of $Sk(A)$ and $Sk_{abs}(A)$ respectively. From $(\sigma, \sigma') \in R_I$ and the definition of $\text{Inst}(p, Sk(A))$ it follows that there is a process index $i$ : $1 \leq i \leq N(p)$ such that $(\sigma[i], \sigma'[i]) \in R$ and other processes do not change their local states.

Let $v$ be a valuation of $A$. By the definition of $Sk(A)$ from $(\sigma[i], \sigma'[i]) \in R$ we have that CFA $A$ has a path $q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_k$ such that $q_1 = q_I, q_k = q_F$ and for every guard $g_j$ it holds that $v \models g_j$. Moreover, for any $x \in \Pi \cup A \cup \Gamma \cup \{sv\}$ it holds $v(x) = \sigma[i].x$ and $v(x') = \sigma'[i].x$.

We choose the same path in $abst(A)$ and construct the valuation $h_{\text{dat}}(v)$. From Theorem 1 we have that for every guard $g_j$ it holds that $h_{\text{dat}}(v) \models g_j$. Hence, the path $q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_k$ is a path of CFA $abst(A)$ as well.

By the definitions of $h_{\text{dat}}(v)$ and $\bar{h}_{\text{dat}}(v)$ we have that for every $x \in \Pi \cup A \cup \Gamma \cup \{sv\}$ it holds $h_{\text{dat}}(v)(x) = \bar{h}_{\text{dat}}(\sigma)[i].x$ and $h_{\text{dat}}(v)(x') = \bar{h}_{\text{dat}}(\sigma')[i].x$. By the definition of $Sk_{abs}(A)$ it immediately follows that $(\bar{h}_{\text{dat}}(\sigma), \bar{h}_{\text{dat}}(\sigma')) \in R_{abs}$.

Finally, $(\bar{h}_{\text{dat}}(\sigma), \bar{h}_{\text{dat}}(\sigma')) \in R_{abs}$ implies that $(\bar{h}_{\text{dat}}(\sigma), \bar{h}_{\text{dat}}(\sigma')) \in R_I$. \qed

**Theorem 4.** Let $\pi = \{\sigma_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ be a $J$-fair path of $\text{Inst}(p, Sk(A))$. Then $\hat{\pi} = \{\bar{h}_{\text{dat}}(\sigma_i)\}_{i \geq 1}$ is a $J$-fair path of $\text{Inst}(p, Sk_{abs}(A))$. \hfill 24
Proof. By inductively applying Theorem 2 to π we conclude that \( \bar{\pi} \) is indeed a path of \( \text{Inst}(\mathbf{p}, S_{k, \text{abs}}(A)) \).

Fix an arbitrary justice constraint \( q \in J \subseteq \text{AP}_D \); infinitely many states on \( \pi \) are labelled with \( q \). Fix a state \( \sigma \) on \( \pi \) with \( q \in \lambda_I \). We show that \( q \in \lambda_I(\hat{h}_\mathbf{p}^\text{dat}(\sigma)) \).

Consider two cases:

**Case 1.** Proposition \( q \) has a form \( [\exists i. \Phi(i)] \), where \( \Phi \) has free variables of two types: a vector of parameters \( \mathbf{x}^p = x_1^p, \ldots, x_n^p \) from \( \Pi \) and a vector of variables \( \mathbf{x}^v = x_1^v, \ldots, x_k^v \). There is a process index \( i : 1 \leq i \leq N(\mathbf{p}) \) such that \( \sigma[i] \models \Phi(i) \). Hence, \( \mathbf{x}^p = \mathbf{p}, x_1^v = \sigma[i], x_1^v, \ldots, x_k^v = \sigma[i], x_k^v \models \Phi(i) \). From the definition of the existential approximation it follows that \( (\alpha_p(\sigma[i], x_1), \ldots, \alpha_p(\sigma[i], x_k)) \in ||\Phi(i)||_E \). Thus, \( \hat{x}_1^v = \alpha_p(\sigma[i], x_1), \ldots, \hat{x}_k^v = \alpha_p(\sigma[i], x_k) \models \alpha_E(\Phi(i)) \). As for every \( x_j : 1 \leq j \leq k \) the value \( \hat{h}_\mathbf{p}^\text{dat}(\sigma)[i].x_j \) is exactly \( \hat{x}_j^v \), we arrive at \( \hat{h}_\mathbf{p}^\text{dat}(\sigma)[i] \models \alpha_E(\Phi(i)) \). Then by the construction of \( \lambda_I \) it holds that \( \lambda_I(\hat{h}_\mathbf{p}^\text{dat}(\sigma)) \).

**Case 2.** Proposition \( q \) has a form \( [\forall i. \Phi(i)] \), where \( \Phi \) has free variables of two types: a vector of parameters \( \mathbf{x}^p = x_1^p, \ldots, x_n^p \) from \( \Pi \) and a vector of variables \( \mathbf{x}^v = x_1^v, \ldots, x_k^v \). Then for every process index \( i : 1 \leq i \leq N(\mathbf{p}) \) it holds \( \sigma[i] \models \Phi(i) \). By fixing an arbitrary \( i : 1 \leq i \leq N(\mathbf{p}) \) and repeating exactly the same argument as in the Case 1, we show that \( \lambda_I(\hat{h}_\mathbf{p}^\text{dat}(\sigma)) \).

From Cases 1 and 2 we conclude that \( q \in \lambda_I(\hat{h}_\mathbf{p}^\text{dat}(\sigma)) \). As we chose \( \sigma \) to be an arbitrary state on \( \pi \) labelled with \( q \) and we know that there are infinitely many such states on \( \pi \), we have shown that there are infinitely many states \( \hat{h}_\mathbf{p}^\text{dat}(\sigma) \) on \( \bar{\pi} \) labelled with \( q \). Finally, as \( q \) was chosen to be an arbitrary justice constraint from \( J \), we conclude that every justice constraint \( q \in J \) appears infinitely often on \( \bar{\pi} \).

This proves that \( \bar{\pi} \) is a fair path. \( \square \)

**Theorem 5.** For all \( \mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{P}_{RC} \), and all finite state process skeletons \( S_k \), let system instance \( \text{Inst}(\mathbf{p}, S_k) = (S_I, S_0^I, R_I, \text{AP}, \lambda_I) \), and \( \text{Cnt}(S_k) = (S_{\text{Cnt}}, S_0^\text{Cnt}, R_{\text{Cnt}}, \text{AP}, \lambda_{\text{Cnt}}) \). Then:

\[
\text{if } (\sigma, \sigma') \in R_I, \text{ then } (\hat{h}_\mathbf{p}^{\text{cnt}}(\sigma), \hat{h}_\mathbf{p}^{\text{cnt}}(\sigma')) \in R_{\text{Cnt}}.
\]

Proof. We have to show that if \( (\sigma, \sigma') \in R_I \), then \( w = \hat{h}_\mathbf{p}^{\text{cnt}}(\sigma) \) and \( w' = \hat{h}_\mathbf{p}^{\text{cnt}}(\sigma') \) satisfy \([\mathbf{L}] \) to \([\mathbf{X}] \). We first note that as \( (\sigma, \sigma') \in R_I \), it follows from the \( \langle \text{MOVE} \rangle \) property of transition relations that there is a process index \( i \) such that \( (\sigma[i], \sigma'[i]) \in R_I \); we will use the existence of \( i \) in the following:

\([\mathbf{L}] \). Abbreviating \( s = \sigma[i] \) and \( s' = \sigma'[i] \), \([\mathbf{L}] \) follows.

\([\mathbf{S}] \text{ and } [\mathbf{X}] \). Follows immediately from the definition of \( L \).
From the definition of $h^\text{cnt}_p$ it follows that $w.K[\text{FROM}] = \alpha_p(K(\sigma, \text{FROM}))$.

From the existence of the index $i$ it follows that $K(\sigma, \text{FROM}) \geq 1$. Hence, we have $K(\sigma, \text{FROM}) \neq 0$ and from the definition of $\alpha_p$ it follows that $\alpha_p(K(\sigma, \text{FROM})) \neq 0$. From $\alpha_p(1) = I_1$ and Definition 2 of total order we conclude $2$, i.e. $\alpha_p(K(\sigma, \text{FROM})) \neq I_0$.

(2) and (3). Follows immediately from the definition of $h^\text{cnt}_p$.

(4). Since TO = FROM, it follows from (3) and (5) that $s = \{sv\}_{v \in A} s'$. Thus the process with index $i$ does not change its local state. Moreover from the property (FRAME) of transition relations, all processes other than $i$ maintain their local state. It follows that for all $\ell$ in $L$, $K(\sigma, \ell) = K(\sigma', \ell)$, and further that $\alpha_p(K(\sigma, \ell)) = \alpha_p(K(\sigma', \ell))$, and in particular $\alpha_p(K(\sigma, \text{FROM})) = \alpha_p(K(\sigma', \text{FROM}))$. Then (4) follows from the definition of $h^\text{cnt}_p$.

(5) and (6). From the property (FRAME) of transition relations, all processes other than $i$ maintain their local state. Since TO $\neq$ FROM it follows that $i$ changes its local state. It follows that

$$K(\sigma', \text{FROM}) = K(\sigma, \text{FROM}) - 1.$$  

From the definition of $h^\text{cnt}_p$ we have

$$w'.K[\text{TO}] = \alpha_p(K(\sigma', \text{TO})) \quad \text{and} \quad w.K[\text{TO}] = \alpha_p(K(\sigma, \text{TO})) \tag{15}$$

$$w'.K[\text{FROM}] = \alpha_p(K(\sigma', \text{FROM})) \quad \text{and} \quad w.K[\text{FROM}] = \alpha_p(K(\sigma, \text{FROM})) \tag{16}$$

From Proposition 11 follows that

$$K(\sigma', \text{TO}) \in \gamma_p(w'.K[\text{TO}]) \quad \text{and} \quad K(\sigma, \text{TO}) \in \gamma_p(w.K[\text{TO}]) \tag{17}$$

$$K(\sigma', \text{FROM}) \in \gamma_p(w'.K[\text{FROM}]) \quad \text{and} \quad K(\sigma, \text{FROM}) \in \gamma_p(w.K[\text{FROM}]). \tag{18}$$

Point (7) follows from (13), (17), and the definition of existential abstraction $\alpha_E$, while (9) follows from (14), (18), and the definition of existential abstraction $\alpha_E$.

(10). From property (FRAME) processes other than $i$ do not move. The move of process $i$ does not change the number of processes in states other than FROM and TO. Consequently, for all local states $\ell$ different from FROM and TO it holds that $K(\sigma', \ell) = K(\sigma, \ell)$. It follows that $\alpha_p(K(\sigma', \ell)) = \alpha_p(K(\sigma, \ell))$, and (10) follows from the definition of $h^\text{cnt}_p$. \qed

**Theorem 6.** For all $p \in P_{RC}$, and for all finite state process skeletons $Sk$, $\text{Inst}(p, Sk) \preceq \text{Cat}(Sk)$, with respect to $AP_{SV}$.

**Proof.** Due to Theorem 6 it is sufficient to show that if a proposition $p \in AP_{SV}$ holds in state $\sigma$ of $\text{Inst}(p, Sk)$ then it also holds in state $h^\text{cnt}_p(\sigma)$. We distinguish the two types of propositions.
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If \( p = \forall i. sv_i = Z \), then it follows that \( p \in \lambda_I(\sigma) \). Thus, in global state \( \sigma \) all processes are in a local state with \( sv = Z \). In other words, no process is in a local state with \( sv \neq Z \). It follows that each local state \( \ell \) satisfies in \( \sigma \) that \( \ell, sv = Z \) or \( K(\sigma, \ell) = 0 \). From the definition of \( \hat{h}^{cnt}_p \) and the definition of \( \lambda_{\text{cnt}} \) this case follows.

If \( p = \exists i. sv_i = Z \), then it follows from \( p \in \lambda_I(\sigma) \) that \( \exists 1 \leq i \leq N(p) (\sigma[i].sv = Z) \). Thus, in global state \( \sigma \) there is a process in a local state \( \ell \) with \( sv = Z \). It follows that \( K(\sigma, \ell) > 0 \). From the definition of \( \hat{h}^{cnt}_p \) and the definition of \( \lambda_{\text{cnt}} \) the theorem follows.

Theorem 7. Let \( \pi = \{\sigma_i\}_{i \geq 1} \) be a J-fair path of Inst(\( p, S_k(\text{abs}(A)) \)). Then \( \hat{\pi} = \{\hat{h}^{cnt}(_{\sigma_i})\}_{i \geq 1} \) is a J-fair path of Cnt.

Proof. By inductively applying Theorem 5 to \( \pi \) we conclude that \( \hat{\pi} \) is indeed a path of Cnt.

Fix an arbitrary justice constraint \( q \in J \subseteq \text{AP}_D \); infinitely many states on \( \pi \) are labelled with \( q \). Fix an arbitrary state \( \sigma \) on \( \pi \) such that \( q \in \lambda_I \). We show that \( q \in \lambda_{\text{cnt}}(\hat{h}^{cnt}(\sigma)) \).

Propositions from \( \text{AP}_D \) have the form of \( \exists i. \Phi(i) \) and \( \forall i. \Phi(i) \), where each \( \Phi(i) \) has free variables of two types: a vector of parameters \( x^p = x^p_1, \ldots, x^p_{|\Pi|} \) from \( \Pi \) a vector of local variables \( x^\ell = x^\ell_1, \ldots, x^\ell_k \) from \( \Lambda \), and a vector of global variables \( x^g = x^g_1, \ldots, x^g_m \) from \( \Gamma \).

\[
[\exists i. \Phi(i)] \in \lambda_{\text{cnt}}(w) \iff \bigvee_{\ell \in L} (x^\ell = \ell, x^g = w \models \alpha_E(\Phi(i)) \land w.k[\ell] \neq I_0) \quad (19)
\]

\[
[\forall i. \Phi(i)] \in \lambda_{\text{cnt}}(w) \iff \bigwedge_{\ell \in L} (x^\ell = \ell, x^g = w \models \alpha_E(\Phi(i)) \lor w.k[\ell] = I_0) \quad (20)
\]

Consider two cases:

Existential case [17]. There is a process index \( i : 1 \leq i \leq N(p) \) such that \( \hat{\sigma}[i] \models \alpha_E(\Phi(i)) \).

Consider a local state \( \ell \in L \) with \( \ell =_L \hat{\sigma}[i] \). As \( \hat{\sigma}[i] \models \alpha_E(\Phi(i)) \) it follows that \( x^\ell_i = \ell.x^\ell_1, \ldots, x^\ell_k = \ell.x^\ell_k, x^g_i = w.x^g_1, \ldots, x^g_m = w.x^g_m \models \alpha_E(\Phi(i)) \). As \( i \) is the index of a process with \( \ell =_L \hat{\sigma}[i] \), it immediately follows that \( K(w, \ell) \neq 0 \). From the definition of \( \alpha \) it follows that for every \( p \in P_{RC} \) it holds \( \alpha_p(K(w, \ell)) \neq I_0 \).

Hence, both requirements of equation (19) are met for \( \ell \) and from the property of disjunction we have \( q \in \lambda_{\text{cnt}}(w) \).

Universal case [27]. Then for every process index \( i : 1 \leq i \leq N(p) \) it holds \( \hat{\sigma}[i] \models \alpha_E(\Phi(i)) \).

By fixing an arbitrary \( i : 1 \leq i \leq N(p) \), choosing \( \ell \in L \) with \( \ell =_L w \) and by repeating exactly the same argument as in the existential case, we show that \( x^\ell_i = \ell.x^\ell_1, \ldots, x^\ell_k = \ell.x^\ell_k, x^g_i = w.x^g_1, \ldots, x^g_m = w.x^g_m \models \alpha_E(\Phi(i)) \). Thus, for
every $\ell \in L$ such that there exists $i : 1 \leq i \leq N(p)$ with $\ell =_L w$ the disjunct for $\ell$ in (20) holds true.

Consider $\ell' \in L$ such that for every $i : 1 \leq i \leq N(p)$ it holds $\ell' \neq_L w$. It immediately follows that $K(w, \ell') = 0$; from the definition of $\alpha_p$ we have that $\alpha_p(K(w, \ell')) = I_0$ and thus $\kappa[\ell'] = I_0$. Then for $\ell'$ the disjunct in (20) holds true as well.

Thus, we conclude that the conjunction in the right-hand side of the equation (20) holds, which immediately results in $q \in \lambda_{\text{Cnt}}(w)$.

From Universal case and Existential Case we conclude that $q \in \lambda_{\text{Cnt}}(w)$. As we chose $\hat{\sigma}$ to be an arbitrary state on $\pi$ labelled with $q$ and we know that there are infinitely many such states on $\pi$, we have shown that there are infinitely many states $h_{p}^{\text{cnt}}(\hat{\sigma})$ on $\hat{\pi}$ labelled with $q$. Finally, as $q$ was chosen to be an arbitrary justice constraint from $J$, we conclude that every justice constraint $q \in J$ appears infinitely often on $\hat{\pi}$.

This proves that $\hat{\pi}$ is a fair path. \qed