# A Core Calculus for Equational Proofs of Distributed Cryptographic Protocols: Technical Report

September 10, 2022

#### Abstract

We outline the proof that the exact equality of protocols in IPDL implies the existence of a protocol bisimulation.

#### 1 Soundness for Reactions

**Definition 1** (Reaction bisimulation). A reaction bisimulation  $\sim$  is a binary relation on distributions on reactions  $\Delta$ ;  $\cdot \vdash R : I \to \tau$  satisfying the following conditions:

• Closure under joint convex combinations: We have

$$\sum_{i:=1,\dots,k} c_i \eta_i \sim \sum_{i:=1,\dots,k} c_i \varepsilon_i$$

for convex coefficients  $\sum_{i:=1,...,k} c_i = 1$  and distributions  $\eta_i \sim \varepsilon_i$  for i:=1,...,k.

- Closure under input assignment: For any distributions  $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ , channel  $i : \tau \in \Delta$ , and value  $v \in \{0,1\}^{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket}$ , we have  $\eta[\mathsf{read}\ i := \mathsf{val}\ v] \sim \varepsilon[\mathsf{read}\ i := \mathsf{val}\ v]$ .
- Closure under evaluation: For any distributions  $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ , if  $\eta \Downarrow \eta'$  and  $\varepsilon \Downarrow \varepsilon'$ , then  $\eta' \sim \varepsilon'$ .
- Valuation property: For any distributions  $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ , there exists a joint convex combination

$$\eta = \sum_{i:=1,\dots,k} c_i \eta_i \sim \sum_{i:=1,\dots,k} c_i \varepsilon_i = \varepsilon$$

such that for each i := 1, ..., k, the distributions  $\eta_i \sim \varepsilon_i$  have the same value v, or lack thereof.

Lemma 1. We have the following:

- The identity relation is a reaction bisimulation.
- The inverse of a reaction bisimulation is a reaction bisimulation.
- The composition of two reaction bisimulations is a reaction bisimulation.

We now describe one canonical way to construct reaction bisimulations:

**Definition 2.** Let  $\sim$  be an arbitrary relation on distributions on reactions  $\Delta$ ;  $\cdot \vdash R : I \to \tau$ . The lifting  $\sim_{\mathcal{L}}$  is the closure of  $\sim$  under joint convex combinations. Explicitly,  $\sim_{\mathcal{L}}$  is defined by

$$\sum_{i:=1,\dots,k} c_i \eta_i \sim_{\mathcal{L}} \sum_{i:=1,\dots,k} c_i \varepsilon_i$$

for convex coefficients  $\sum_{i:=1,\ldots,k} c_i = 1$  and distributions  $\eta_i \sim \varepsilon_i$  for  $i:=1,\ldots,k$ .

**Lemma 2.** Let  $\sim$  be a relation on distributions on reactions  $\Delta$ ;  $\cdot \vdash R : I \rightarrow \tau$  satisfying the following conditions:

- Closure under input assignment: For any distributions  $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ , channel  $i : \tau \in \Delta$ , and value  $v \in \{0,1\}^{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket}$ , we have  $\eta[\text{read } i := \text{val } v] \sim \varepsilon[\text{read } i := \text{val } v]$ .
- Lifting closure under evaluation: For any distributions  $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ , if  $\eta \downarrow \eta'$  and  $\varepsilon \downarrow \varepsilon'$ , then  $\eta' \sim_{\mathcal{L}} \varepsilon'$ .
- Valuation property: For any distributions  $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ , there exists a joint convex combination

$$\eta = \sum_{i:=1,\dots,k} c_i \eta_i \sim \sum_{i:=1,\dots,k} c_i \varepsilon_i = \varepsilon$$

such that for each i := 1, ..., k, the distributions  $\eta_i \sim \varepsilon_i$  have the same value v, or lack thereof.

Then the lifting  $\sim_{\mathcal{L}}$  is a reaction bisimulation.

$$\frac{\mathsf{d}_1:\sigma_1\to\tau_1,\mathsf{d}_2:\sigma_2\to\tau_2\in\Sigma\quad\Gamma\vdash e_1:\sigma_1\quad\Gamma\vdash e_2:\sigma_2}{\Delta;\;\Gamma\vdash\left(x_1\leftarrow\mathsf{samp}\;(\mathsf{d}_1\;e_1);\;x_2\leftarrow\mathsf{samp}\;(\mathsf{d}_2\;e_2);\;\mathsf{ret}\;(x_1,x_2)\right)=}_{\left(x_2\leftarrow\mathsf{samp}\;(\mathsf{d}_2\;e_2);\;x_1\leftarrow\mathsf{samp}\;(\mathsf{d}_1\;e_1);\;\mathsf{ret}\;(x_1,x_2)\right):I\to\tau_1\times\tau_2}$$
 EXCH-SAMP-SAMP 
$$\frac{\mathsf{d}:\sigma\to\tau_1\in\Sigma\quad\Gamma\vdash e:\sigma\quad i:\tau_2\in\Delta\quad i\in I}{\Delta;\;\Gamma\vdash\left(x_1\leftarrow\mathsf{samp}\;(\mathsf{d}\;e);\;x_2\leftarrow\mathsf{read}\;i;\;\mathsf{ret}\;(x_1,x_2)\right)=}_{\left(x_2\leftarrow\mathsf{read}\;i;\;x_1\leftarrow\mathsf{samp}\;(\mathsf{d}\;e);\;\mathsf{ret}\;(x_1,x_2)\right):I\to\tau_1\times\tau_2}$$
 EXCH-SAMP-READ 
$$\frac{i_1:\tau_1,i_2:\tau_2\in\Delta\quad i_1,i_2\in I}{\Delta;\;\Gamma\vdash\left(x_1\leftarrow\mathsf{read}\;i_1;\;x_2\leftarrow\mathsf{read}\;i_2;\;\mathsf{ret}\;(x_1,x_2)\right)=}_{\left(x_2\leftarrow\mathsf{read}\;i_2;\;x_1\leftarrow\mathsf{read}\;i_1;\;\mathsf{ret}\;(x_1,x_2)\right):I\to\tau_1\times\tau_2}$$

Figure 1: Alternative formulation of the EXCH rule.

**Lemma 3** (Soundness of equality of reactions). If  $\Delta$ ;  $\Gamma \vdash R_1 = R_2 : I \to \tau$ , then there is a reaction bisimulation  $\sim$  such that for any valued substitution  $\theta : \cdot \to \Gamma$ , we have  $1[\theta^*(R_1)] \sim 1[\theta^*(R_2)]$ .

*Proof.* We first replace the exchange rule EXCH by the three rules EXCH-SAMP-SAMP, EXCH-SAMP-READ, and EXCH-READ-READ in Figure 1; it is easy to see that this new set of rules is equivalent to the original one.  $\Box$ 

## 2 Soundness for Protocols (Exact)

**Definition 3** (Protocol bisimulation). A protocol bisimulation  $\sim$  is a binary relation on distributions on protocols  $\Delta \vdash P : I \to O$  satisfying the following conditions:

• Closure under joint convex combinations: We have

$$\sum_{i:=1,\dots,k} c_i \eta_i \ \sim \ \sum_{i:=1,\dots,k} c_i \varepsilon_i$$

for convex coefficients  $\sum_{i:=1,...,k} c_i = 1$  and distributions  $\eta_i \sim \varepsilon_i$  for i:=1,...,k.

- Closure under input assignment: For any distributions  $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ , channel  $i : \tau \in \Delta$ , and value  $v \in \{0,1\}^{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket}$ , we have  $\eta[\text{read } i := \text{val } v] \sim \varepsilon[\text{read } i := \text{val } v]$ .
- Closure under evaluation: For any distributions  $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ , if  $\eta \Downarrow \eta'$  and  $\varepsilon \Downarrow \varepsilon'$ , then  $\eta' \sim \varepsilon'$ .
- Valuation property: For any output channel o and distributions  $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ , there exists a joint convex combination

$$\eta = \sum_{i:=1,\dots,k} c_i \eta_i \sim \sum_{i:=1,\dots,k} c_i \varepsilon_i = \varepsilon$$

such that for each i := 1, ..., k, the distributions  $\eta_i \sim \varepsilon_i$  have the same value v, or lack thereof, on o.

### Lemma 4. We have the following:

- The identity relation is a protocol bisimulation.
- The inverse of a protocol bisimulation is a protocol bisimulation.
- The composition of two protocol bisimulations is a protocol bisimulation.

We now describe one canonical way to construct protocol bisimulations:

**Definition 4.** Let  $\sim$  be an arbitrary relation on distributions on protocols  $\Delta \vdash P : I \to O$ . The lifting  $\sim_{\mathcal{L}}$  is the closure of  $\sim$  under joint convex combinations. Explicitly,  $\sim_{\mathcal{L}}$  is defined by

$$\sum_{i:=1,\dots,k} c_i \eta_i \sim_{\mathcal{L}} \sum_{i:=1,\dots,k} c_i \varepsilon_i$$

for convex coefficients  $\sum_{i:=1,...,k} c_i = 1$  and distributions  $\eta_i \sim \varepsilon_i$  for i:=1,...,k.

**Lemma 5.** Let  $\sim$  be a relation on distributions on protocols  $\Delta \vdash P : I \to O$  satisfying the following conditions:

- Closure under input assignment: For any distributions  $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ , channel  $i : \tau \in \Delta$ , and value  $v \in \{0,1\}^{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket}$ , we have  $\eta[\text{read } i := \text{val } v] \sim \varepsilon[\text{read } i := \text{val } v]$ .
- Lifting closure under evaluation: For any distributions  $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ , if  $\eta \downarrow \eta'$  and  $\varepsilon \downarrow \varepsilon'$ , then  $\eta' \sim_{\mathcal{L}} \varepsilon'$ .
- Valuation property: For any output channel o and distributions  $\eta \sim \varepsilon$ , there exists a joint convex combination

$$\eta = \sum_{i:=1,\dots,k} c_i \eta_i \sim \sum_{i:=1,\dots,k} c_i \varepsilon_i = \varepsilon$$

such that for each i := 1, ..., k, the distributions  $\eta_i \sim \varepsilon_i$  have the same value v, or lack thereof, on o.

Then the lifting  $\sim_{\mathcal{L}}$  is a reaction bisimulation.

$$\frac{o:\tau\in\Delta\quad o\notin I\quad b:\mathsf{Bool}\in\Delta\quad \Delta;\ \cdot\vdash S_1:I\cup\{o\}\to\tau\quad \Delta;\ \cdot\vdash S_2:I\cup\{o\}\to\tau}{\Delta\vdash \left(\mathsf{new}\ l:\tau\ \mathsf{in}\ o:=x\leftarrow\mathsf{read}\ b;\ \mathsf{if}\ x\ \mathsf{then}\ \mathsf{read}\ l\ \mathsf{else}\ S_2\mid\mid l:=x\leftarrow\mathsf{read}\ b;\ S_1\right)=} \xrightarrow{\left\{o:=x\leftarrow\mathsf{read}\ b;\ \mathsf{if}\ x\ \mathsf{then}\ S_1\ \mathsf{else}\ S_2\right):I\to\{o\}}$$

$$\frac{o: \tau \in \Delta \quad o \notin I \quad b: \mathsf{Bool} \in \Delta \quad \Delta; \ \cdot \vdash S_1: I \cup \{o\} \to \tau \quad \Delta; \ \cdot \vdash S_2: I \cup \{o\} \to \tau}{\Delta \vdash \left(\mathsf{new} \ r: \tau \ \mathsf{in} \ o:=x \leftarrow \mathsf{read} \ b; \ \mathsf{if} \ x \ \mathsf{then} \ S_1 \ \mathsf{else} \ \mathsf{read} \ r \ || \ r:=x \leftarrow \mathsf{read} \ b; \ S_2\right) =} \\ (o:=x \leftarrow \mathsf{read} \ b; \ \mathsf{if} \ x \ \mathsf{then} \ S_1 \ \mathsf{else} \ S_2\right): I \to \{o\}$$

Figure 2: Alternative formulation of the FOLD-IF-LEFT and FOLD-IF-RIGHT rules.

**Lemma 6** (Soundness of equality of protocols). If the ambient exact IPDL theory is sound, and  $\Delta \vdash P_1 = P_2 : I \to O$ , then there is a protocol bisimulation  $\sim$  such that  $1[P_1] \sim 1[P_2]$ .

*Proof.* We first replace the rules FOLD-IF-LEFT and FOLD-IF-RIGHT by their equivalent formulation in Figure 2. We now proceed by induction on this alternative set of rules for exact protocol equality.

- REFL: Our desired bisimulation is the identity relation.
- SYM: Our desired bisimulation is the inverse of the bisimulation obtained from the premise  $\Delta \vdash P_1 = P_2 : I \to O$ .
- TRANS: Our desired bisimulation is the composition of the two bisimulations obtained from the two premises  $\Delta \vdash P_1 = P_2 : I \to O$  and  $\Delta \vdash P_2 = P_3 : I \to O$ .

- AXIOM: The desired bisimulation exists by assumption.
- EMBED: Let  $\sim$  be the bisimulation obtained from the premise  $\Delta \vdash P_1 = P_2 : I \to O$ . Our desired bisimulation  $\sim_{\theta}$  is defined by
  - $-\theta^{\star}(\eta) \sim_{\theta} \theta^{\star}(\eta')$  if  $\eta \sim \eta'$
- CONG-REACT: Let  $\sim$  be the (reaction) bisimulation obtained from the premise  $\Delta$ ;  $\cdot \vdash R = R' : I \cup \{o\} \to \tau$ . Our desired bisimulation is the lifting of the relation  $\sim_{\mathsf{rea}}$  defined by
  - $-\ (o:=\eta) \sim_{\mathsf{rea}} (o:=\eta') \text{ if } \eta \sim \eta'$
  - $-1[o := v] \sim_{\mathsf{rea}} 1[o := v] \text{ for a value } v \in \{0, 1\}^{[\tau]}$
- CONG-COMP-LEFT: Let  $\sim$  be the bisimulation obtained from the premise  $\Delta \vdash P = P' : I \cup O_2 \to O_1$ . Our desired bisimulation is the lifting of the relation  $\sim_{par}$  defined by
  - $-(\eta \parallel Q) \sim_{\mathsf{par}} (\eta' \parallel Q) \text{ for } \eta \sim \eta' \text{ and a protocol } \Delta \vdash Q : I \cup O_1 \to O_2$
- CONG-NEW: Let  $\sim$  be the bisimulation obtained from the premise  $\Delta, o : \tau \vdash P = P' : I \to O \cup \{o\}$ . Our desired bisimulation  $\sim_{\mathsf{new}}$  is defined by
  - (new  $o: \tau$  in  $\eta$ )  $\sim_{\text{new}}$  (new  $o: \tau$  in  $\eta'$ ) if  $\eta \sim \eta'$
- COMP-COMM: Our desired bisimulation is the lifting of the relation  $\sim$  defined by
  - $-1[P_1 \parallel P_2] \sim 1[P_2 \parallel P_1]$  for protocols  $\Delta \vdash P_1 : I \cup O_2 \to O_1$  and  $\Delta \vdash P_2 : I \cup O_1 \to O_2$
- $\bullet$  COMP-ASSOC: Our desired bisimulation is the lifting of the relation  $\sim$  defined by
  - 1[(P<sub>1</sub> || P<sub>2</sub>) || P<sub>3</sub>] ~ 1[P<sub>1</sub> || (P<sub>2</sub> || P<sub>3</sub>)] for protocols Δ ⊢ P<sub>1</sub> : I ∪ O<sub>2</sub> ∪ O<sub>3</sub> → O<sub>1</sub> and Δ ⊢ P<sub>2</sub> : I ∪ O<sub>1</sub> ∪ O<sub>3</sub> → O<sub>2</sub> and Δ ⊢ P<sub>3</sub> : I ∪ O<sub>1</sub> ∪ O<sub>2</sub> → O<sub>3</sub>
- NEW-EXCH: The desired bisimulation is the lifting of the relation  $\sim$  defined by
  - 1[new  $o_1 : \tau_1$  in new  $o_2 : \tau_2$  in P]  $\sim$  1[new  $o_2 : \tau_2$  in new  $o_1 : \tau_1$  in P] for a protocol  $\Delta, o_1 : \tau_1, o_2 : \tau_2 \vdash P : I \rightarrow O \cup \{o_1, o_2\}$
- COMP-NEW: Our desired bisimulation is the lifting of the relation  $\sim$  defined by
  - $-1[P \mid\mid (\mathsf{new}\ o : \tau \ \mathsf{in}\ Q)] \sim 1[\mathsf{new}\ o : \tau \ \mathsf{in}\ (P \mid\mid Q)]$  for protocols  $\Delta \vdash P : I \cup O_2 \to O_1 \ \mathsf{and}\ \Delta, o : \tau \vdash Q : I \cup O_1 \to O_2 \cup \{o\}$
- ABSORB-LEFT: Our desired bisimulation is the lifting of the relation  $\sim$  defined by
  - $-1[P \mid\mid Q] \sim 1[P]$  for protocols  $\Delta \vdash P : I \to O$  and  $\Delta \vdash Q : I \cup O \to \emptyset$
- DIVERGE: Our desired bisimulation is the lifting of the relation  $\sim$  defined by
  - $-1[o:=x:\tau\leftarrow \text{read }o;\ R]\sim 1[o:=\text{read }o] \text{ for a reaction }\Delta;\ \cdot\vdash R:I\cup\{o\}\rightarrow\tau$
- FOLD-IF-LEFT: Our desired bisimulation is the lifting of the relation  $\sim$  defined by
  - 1[new  $l:\tau$  in  $o:=x\leftarrow \text{read }b;$  if x then read l else  $S_2\mid\mid l:=x\leftarrow \text{read }b;$   $S_1]\sim 1[o:=x\leftarrow \text{read }b;$  if x then  $S_1$  else  $S_2]$  for reactions  $\Delta; \cdot\vdash S_1:I\cup\{o\}\to \tau$  and  $\Delta; \cdot\vdash S_2:I\cup\{o\}\to \tau$
  - 1[new  $l: \tau$  in  $o:=x \leftarrow \text{val } v$ ; if x then read l else  $S_2 \mid\mid l:=x \leftarrow \text{val } v$ ;  $S_1$ ]  $\sim$  1[ $o:=x \leftarrow \text{val } v$ ; if x then  $S_1$  else  $S_2$ ] for a value  $v \in \{0,1\}$  and reactions  $\Delta$ ;  $\cdot \vdash S_1: I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau$  and  $\Delta$ ;  $\cdot \vdash S_2: I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau$
  - $-1[\text{new }l:\tau \text{ in }o:=\text{read }l\mid \mid l:=S_1] \sim 1[o:=S_1] \text{ for a reaction }\Delta; \cdot \vdash S_1:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau$

```
 \begin{array}{l} -1 [\mathsf{new} \ l : \tau \ \mathsf{in} \ o := v_1 \ || \ l := v_1] \sim 1 [o := v_1] \ \mathsf{for} \ \mathsf{a} \ \mathsf{value} \ v_1 \in \{0,1\}^{[\![\tau]\!]} \\ -1 [\mathsf{new} \ l : \tau \ \mathsf{in} \ o := S_2 \ || \ l := S_1] \sim \\ 1 [o := S_2] \ \mathsf{for} \ \mathsf{reactions} \ \Delta; \ \cdot \vdash S_1 : I \cup \{o\} \to \tau \ \mathsf{and} \ \Delta; \ \cdot \vdash S_2 : I \cup \{o\} \to \tau \\ -1 [\mathsf{new} \ l : \tau \ \mathsf{in} \ o := S_2 \ || \ l := v_1] \sim \\ 1 [o := S_2] \ \mathsf{for} \ \mathsf{a} \ \mathsf{value} \ v_1 \in \{0,1\}^{[\![\tau]\!]} \ \mathsf{and} \ \mathsf{a} \ \mathsf{reaction} \ \Delta; \ \cdot \vdash S_2 : I \cup \{o\} \to \tau \\ -1 [\mathsf{new} \ l : \tau \ \mathsf{in} \ o := v_2 \ || \ l := S_1] \sim \\ 1 [o := v_2] \ \mathsf{for} \ \mathsf{a} \ \mathsf{reaction} \ \Delta; \ \cdot \vdash S_1 : I \cup \{o\} \to \tau \ \mathsf{and} \ \mathsf{a} \ \mathsf{value} \ v_2 \in \{0,1\}^{[\![\tau]\!]} \\ -1 [\mathsf{new} \ l : \tau \ \mathsf{in} \ o := v_2 \ || \ l := v_1] \sim \\ 1 [o := v_2] \ \mathsf{for} \ \mathsf{values} \ v_1, v_2 \in \{0,1\}^{[\![\tau]\!]} \end{array}
```

- FOLD-IF-RIGHT: Our desired bisimulation is the lifting of the relation  $\sim$  defined by
  - $-1[\text{new } r:\tau \text{ in } o:=x \leftarrow \text{read } b; \text{ if } x \text{ then } S_1 \text{ else read } r \mid\mid r:=x \leftarrow \text{read } b; S_2] \sim \\ 1[o:=x \leftarrow \text{read } b; \text{ if } x \text{ then } S_1 \text{ else } S_2] \text{ for reactions } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_1:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \cdot \vdash S_2:I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ a$
  - $\begin{array}{l} -1 \big[ \text{new } r: \tau \text{ in } o := x \leftarrow \mathsf{val} \ v; \text{ if } x \text{ then } S_1 \text{ else read } r \mid \mid r := x \leftarrow \mathsf{val} \ v; \ S_2 \big] \sim \\ 1 \big[ o := x \leftarrow \mathsf{val} \ v; \text{ if } x \text{ then } S_1 \text{ else } S_2 \big] \text{ for a value } v \in \{0,1\} \text{ and reactions } \Delta; \ \cdot \vdash S_1 : I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \ \cdot \vdash S_2 : I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \end{array}$
  - $\begin{array}{lll} & 1 \big[ \text{new } r : \tau \text{ in } o := S_1 \mid\mid r := S_2 \big] \sim \\ & 1 \big[ o := S_1 \big] \text{ for reactions } \Delta; \; \cdot \vdash S_1 : I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and } \Delta; \; \cdot \vdash S_2 : I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \\ \end{array}$
  - $\begin{array}{l} -1 \big[ \text{new } r: \tau \text{ in } o:=S_1 \mid\mid r:=v_2 \big] \sim \\ 1[o:=S_1] \text{ for a reaction } \Delta; \; \cdot \vdash S_1: I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \text{ and a value } v_2 \in \{0,1\}^{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket} \end{array}$
  - $\begin{array}{l} -1 \big[ \text{new } r: \tau \text{ in } o:=v_1 \mid \mid r:=S_2 \big] \sim \\ 1[o:=v_1] \text{ for a value } v_1 \in \{0,1\}^{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket} \text{ and a reaction } \Delta; \; \cdot \vdash S_2: I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau \end{array}$
  - $\begin{array}{ll} \ 1 \big[ \text{new} \ r : \tau \ \text{in} \ o := v_1 \mid\mid r := v_2 \big] \sim \\ 1 \big[ o := v_1 \big] \ \text{for values} \ v_1, v_2 \in \{0,1\}^{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket} \end{array}$
  - $\begin{array}{ll} -\ 1[\mathsf{new}\ r:\tau\ \mathsf{in}\ o:=\mathsf{read}\ r\mid\mid r:=S_2]\sim \\ 1[o:=S_2]\ \mathsf{for}\ \mathsf{a}\ \mathsf{reaction}\ \Delta;\ \cdot\vdash S_2:I\cup\{o\}\to\tau \end{array}$
  - $\begin{array}{lll} & 1[\mathsf{new}\ r:\tau\ \mathsf{in}\ o:=v_2\ ||\ r:=v_2] \sim \\ & & 1[o:=v_2]\ \mathsf{for}\ \mathsf{a}\ \mathsf{value}\ v_2 \in \{0,1\}^{\llbracket\tau\rrbracket} \end{array}$
- $\bullet$  FOLD-BIND: Our desired bisimulation is the lifting of the relation  $\sim$  defined by
  - 1[new  $c : \sigma$  in  $o := x : \sigma \leftarrow \text{read } c; \ S \mid\mid c := R] \sim 1[o := x : \sigma \leftarrow R; \ S]$  for reactions  $\Delta$ ;  $\cdot \vdash R : I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau$  and  $\Delta$ ;  $x : \sigma \vdash S : I \cup \{o\} \rightarrow \tau$
  - $-1 \big[ \text{new } c : \sigma \text{ in } o := S \mid\mid c := u \big] \sim 1 \big[ o := S \big]$  for a value  $u \in \{0,1\}^{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}$  and a reaction  $\Delta; \; \cdot \vdash S : I \cup \{o\} \to \tau$
  - $-1[\mathsf{new}\ c:\sigma\ \mathsf{in}\ o:=v\ ||\ c:=u] \sim 1[o:=v]\ \mathsf{for}\ \mathsf{values}\ u\in\{0,1\}^{\llbracket\sigma\rrbracket}\ \mathsf{and}\ v\in\{0,1\}^{\llbracket\tau\rrbracket}$
- SUBSUME: Our desired bisimulation is the lifting of the relation  $\sim$  defined by
  - $\begin{array}{l} -1 \left[ o_1 := x_0 : \tau_0 \leftarrow \text{read } o_0; \ R_1 \mid \mid o_2 := x_0 : \tau_0 \leftarrow \text{read } o_0; \ x_1 : \tau_1 \leftarrow \text{read } o_1; \ R_2 \right] \sim \\ 1 \left[ o_1 := x_0 : \tau_0 \leftarrow \text{read } o_0; \ R_1 \mid \mid o_2 := x_1 : \tau_1 \leftarrow \text{read } o_1; \ R_2 \right] \\ \text{for reactions } \Delta; \ x_0 : \tau_0 \vdash R_1 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \rightarrow \tau_1 \text{ and } \Delta; \ x_1 : \tau_1 \vdash R_2 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \rightarrow \tau_2 \end{array}$
  - $\begin{array}{l} -1 \big[ o_1 := x_0 : \tau_0 \leftarrow \mathsf{val} \ v_0; \ R_1 \ || \ o_2 := x_0 : \tau_0 \leftarrow \mathsf{val} \ v_0; \ x_1 : \tau_1 \leftarrow \mathsf{read} \ o_1; \ R_2 \big] \sim \\ 1 \big[ o_1 := x_0 : \tau_0 \leftarrow \mathsf{val} \ v_0; \ R_1 \ || \ o_2 := x_1 : \tau_1 \leftarrow \mathsf{read} \ o_1; \ R_2 \big] \\ \text{for reactions } \Delta; \ x_0 : \tau_0 \vdash R_1 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \rightarrow \tau_1 \ \text{and} \ \Delta; \ x_1 : \tau_1 \vdash R_2 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \rightarrow \tau_2, \ \text{and a value} \\ v_0 \in \{0, 1\} \big[ \mathcal{T}_0 \big] \end{array}$
  - $-1 \big[ o_1 := R_1 \mid\mid o_2 := x_1 : \tau_1 \leftarrow \text{read } o_1; \ R_2 \big] \sim 1 \big[ o_1 := R_1 \mid\mid o_2 := x_1 : \tau_1 \leftarrow \text{read } o_1; \ R_2 \big]$  for reactions  $\Delta; \ \cdot \vdash R_1 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \rightarrow \tau_1 \text{ and } \Delta; \ x_1 : \tau_1 \vdash R_2 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \rightarrow \tau_2$

```
 \begin{array}{l} -1[o_1:=v_1 \mid \mid o_2:=R_2] \sim 1\big[o_1:=v_1 \mid \mid o_2:=R_2\big] \\ \text{ for a value } v_1 \in \{0,1\}^{\llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket} \text{ and a reaction } \Delta; \; \cdot \vdash R_2:I \cup \{o_1,o_2\} \rightarrow \tau_2 \\ -1[o_1:=v_1 \mid \mid o_2:=v_2] \sim 1\big[o_1:=v_1 \mid \mid o_2:=v_2\big] \\ \text{ for values } v_1 \in \{0,1\}^{\llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket} \text{ and } v_2 \in \{0,1\}^{\llbracket \tau_2 \rrbracket} \end{array}
```

• SUBST: Our desired bisimulation is the lifting of the relation  $\sim$  defined by

```
 \begin{split} &-1 \big[ o_1 := R_1 \mid \mid o_2 := x_1 : \tau_1 \leftarrow \text{read } o_1; \ R_2 \big] \sim 1 \big[ o_1 := R_1 \mid \mid o_2 := x_1 : \tau_1 \leftarrow R_1; \ R_2 \big] \\ &\text{for reactions } \Delta; \ \cdot \vdash R_1 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \rightarrow \tau_1 \text{ and } \Delta; \ x_1 : \tau_1 \vdash R_2 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \rightarrow \tau_2 \\ &-1 \big[ o_1 := v_1 \mid \mid o_2 := R_2 \big] \sim 1 \big[ o_1 := v_1 \mid \mid o_2 := R_2 \big] \\ &\text{for a value } v_1 \in \{0, 1\}^{\llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket} \text{ and a reaction } \Delta; \ \cdot \vdash R_2 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \rightarrow \tau_2 \\ &-1 \big[ o_1 := v_1 \mid \mid o_2 := v_2 \big] \sim 1 \big[ o_1 := v_1 \mid \mid o_2 := v_2 \big] \\ &\text{for values } v_1 \in \{0, 1\}^{\llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket} \text{ and } v_2 \in \{0, 1\}^{\llbracket \tau_2 \rrbracket} \end{split}
```

• UNUSED: Let  $\sim$  be the (reaction) bisimulation obtained from the premise  $\Delta$ ;  $\cdot \vdash (x_1 : \tau_1 \leftarrow R_1; R_2) = R_2 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \rightarrow \tau_2$ . Our desired bisimulation is the lifting of the relation  $\sim_{\mathsf{drop}}$  defined by

```
-(o_1 := \eta_1 \mid\mid o_2 := x_1 \leftarrow \text{read } o_1; R_2) \sim_{\mathsf{drop}} (o_1 := \eta_1 \mid\mid o_2 := \eta_2) \text{ for }
        * a distribution \eta_1 on reactions \Delta; \cdot \vdash R_1 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \to \tau_1
        * a distribution \eta_2 on reactions \Delta; \cdot \vdash R_2 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \to \tau_2
        * computed distributions \varepsilon, \mu on reactions \Delta; \cdot \vdash R_2 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \to \tau_2
        * a reaction \Delta; \cdot \vdash R_2 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \rightarrow \tau_2
    such that R_2 \Downarrow \varepsilon, \eta_2 \Downarrow \varepsilon, (x_1 : \tau_1 \leftarrow \eta_1; R_2) \Downarrow \mu, and \mu \sim \varepsilon
-(o_1 := \eta_1 \mid\mid o_2 := x_1 \leftarrow \text{read } o_1; R_2) \sim_{\mathsf{drop}} (o_1 := \eta_1 \mid\mid o_2 := \eta_2) \text{ for }
        * distributions \eta_1, \bar{\eta}_1 on reactions \Delta; \cdot \vdash R_1 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \rightarrow \tau_1
        * a distribution \eta_2 on reactions \Delta; \cdot \vdash R_2 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \rightarrow \tau_2
        * computed distributions \varepsilon, \mu on reactions \Delta; \cdot \vdash R_2 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \to \tau_2
        * a reaction \Delta; \cdot \vdash R_2 : I \cup \{o_1, o_2\} \rightarrow \tau_2
    such that R_2 \Downarrow \varepsilon, \eta_2 \Downarrow \varepsilon, (x_1 : \tau_1 \leftarrow c\eta_1 + \bar{c}\bar{\eta}_1; R_2) \Downarrow \mu for some c + \bar{c} = 1, and \mu \sim \varepsilon
- (o_1 := v_1 \mid\mid o_2 := R_2) \sim_{\mathsf{drop}} (o_1 := v_1 \mid\mid o_2 := R_2)
    for a value v_1 \in \{0,1\}^{||\tau_1||} and reaction \Delta; \cdot \vdash R_2 : I \cup \{o_1,o_2\} \to \tau_2
- (o_1 := v_1 \mid\mid o_2 := v_2) \sim_{\mathsf{drop}} (o_1 := v_1 \mid\mid o_2 := v_2)
    for values v_1 \in \{0, 1\}^{[\tau_1]} and v_2 \in \{0, 1\}^{[\tau_2]}
```