## appendix2

## 1. The modeling and implementation process

Scyther, as a formal verification tool, doesn't directly provide formal verification for authenticity. It necessitates verifying its authenticity through secret, aliveness, weak agreement, non-injective agreement, and non-injective synchronization. the strength of authenticity increases sequentially for Aliveness, weak agreement, non-injective agreement, and noninjective synchronization. Aliveness represents liveness authentication, serving as a fundamental form of authentication that ensures the expected communicating party A exists. Weakagree, denoting weak protocol authentication, demands that certain states or values among participating parties remain consistent throughout the protocol's execution. Niagree, referring to non-monotonic agreement authentication, describes how communication or negotiation outcomes between parties cannot be repudiated during protocol execution. Nisynch, or noninjective synchronization authentication, indicates that, in the event an attacker gains access to the private key of proxy A, all send/receive events preceding a claimed event are correctly executed by proxy A in the correct order and content. This property ensures the integrity of received messages, Nisynch's definition is quite similar to Niargree's, with the distinction that Nisynch adds a requirement for expected order, thus exhibiting stronger authenticity.

The modeling and implementation process is shown in Table 5:

Table 1: The modeling and implementation process in scyther

| Table 1. The modeling and implementation process in scyther |  |
|---|--|
| $1.A_1$ performs  | match(e, H(R, PK, m));   |
| computational operations.                                   | match $(TIDa, H(A_1, g));$   |
|   | match (w, H(TIDa, pw));  |
|   | match $(m, H(TIDa, TIDdb, w, T1, NA1, pk(A_1), QA, e, y))$                         |
| 2. A <sub>1</sub> sends a message to DB.                    | $send_2(A_1,DB,TIDa,DB,w,T1,NA1,pk(A_1),y,m,QApk(DB));$                            |
| 3. <i>DB</i> receives the message.                          | $recv_2(A_1,DB,TIDa,DB,w,T1,NA1,pk(A1),y,m,QApk(DB));$                             |
| 4. DB sends a signature conversion request                  | $send_3(DB, NP_1, DB, NP_1, T2, NDB1, pk(A_1), pk(NP_1), QApk(NP_1));$             |
| to the inter-chain notary $NP_1$                            |  |
| 5. Notary $NP_1$ receives the message.                      | $recv_3(DB, NP_1, DB, NP_1, T2, NDB1, pk(A_1), pk(NP_1), QApk(NP_1));$             |
| 6. Notary $NP_1$ performs computations.                     | $match(j,H(NP_1));$  |
| 7. Notary $NP_1$ sends a response message to                | $send_4(NP_1, DB, NP_1, DB, T3, NDB1, j, QBpk(DB));$                               |
| DB.   |  |
| 8. DB receives the response message.                        | $recv_4(NP_1, DB, NP_1, DB, T3, NDB1, j, QBpk(DB));$                               |
| 9. DB performs computations.                                | $match(p,H(A_1));$   |
|   | $match(m1,H(NP_1,TIDa,DB,Z,y,T2,NDB2,NA1,pk(DB),p));$                              |
| 10. DB sends a response message to $A_1$                    | $send_5(DB, A_1, NP_1, TIDa, DB, Z, y, T4, NDB2, NA1, pk(DB), p, QDB, m1pk(A_1));$ |
| $11.A_1$ receives the response message.                     | $recv_5(DB, A_1, NP_1, TIDa, DB, Z, y, T4, NDB2, NA1, pk(DB), p, QDB, m1pk(A_1))$  |