## A Proofs for Main Paper

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Proceed by case analysis on  $\delta$ . Assume validity of  $\delta$  as described in Section 4.1.

```
(1) \delta = \operatorname{setChannel}(\operatorname{id}^*, C, \operatorname{fn}). Let \langle T, D, S \rangle = P[\operatorname{id}^*]. Then
eval(patch(\delta, P)) = eval([id^* \mapsto \langle T, D, [C \mapsto fn]S \rangle]P)
                                     = evalLayer(id*, \langle T, D, [C \mapsto fn]S \rangle) \cup eval(P \setminus \{id^*\})
                                     = \{ \operatorname{mark}(\operatorname{getMT}(T), \operatorname{id}^{\star}, \operatorname{d}, [C \mapsto \operatorname{fn}]S) \mid \operatorname{d} \in D \} \cup \operatorname{eval}(P \setminus \{\operatorname{id}^{\star}\}) \}
                                     = \{ mark(mt, id^*, d, [C \mapsto fn]S) \mid mark(mt, id^*, d, S) \in evalLayer(id^*, \langle T, D, S \rangle) \}
                                              \cup eval(P \setminus \{id^{\star}\})
                                     = \{ mark(mt, id^*, d, [C \mapsto fn]S) \mid mark(mt, id^*, d, S) \in eval(P) \}
                                              \cup \{ \mathbf{mark}(\mathsf{mt}, \mathsf{id}, \mathsf{d}, S) \mid \mathbf{mark}(\mathsf{mt}, \mathsf{id}, \mathsf{d}, S) \in \mathbf{eval}(P), \mathsf{id} \neq \mathsf{id}^* \}
                                     = recon(\delta, eval(P))
    (2) \delta = \text{removeChannel}(\text{id}^*, C). Let \langle T, D, S \rangle = P[\text{id}^*]. Then
 eval(patch(\delta, P)) = eval([id^* \mapsto \langle T, D, S \setminus \{C\} \rangle]P)
                                      = evalLayer(id*, \langle T, D, S \setminus \{C\} \rangle) \cup eval(P \setminus \{id^*\})
                                      = \{ \mathbf{mark}(\mathbf{getMT}(T), \mathsf{id}^{\star}, \mathsf{d}, S \setminus \{C\}) \mid \mathsf{d} \in D \} \cup \mathbf{eval}(P \setminus \{\mathsf{id}^{\star}\}) 
                                      = {mark(mt, id*, d, S \setminus \{C\}) | mark(mt, id*, d, S) \in evalLayer(id*, \langle T, D, S \rangle)}
                                               \cup eval(P \setminus \{id^*\})
                                      = {mark(mt, id^*, d, S \setminus \{C\}) | mark(mt, id^*, d, S) \in eval(P)}
                                               \cup \{ \mathsf{mark}(\mathsf{mt}, \mathsf{id}, \mathsf{d}, S) \mid \mathsf{mark}(\mathsf{mt}, \mathsf{id}, \mathsf{d}, S) \in \mathsf{eval}(P), \mathsf{id} \neq \mathsf{id}^{\star} \}
                                      = recon(\delta, eval(P))
    (3) \delta = \text{addLayer}(\text{id}^*, \ell). Then
                                             eval(patch(\delta, P)) = eval([id^* \mapsto \ell]P)
                                                                                  = evalLayer(id^*, \ell) \cup eval(P)
                                                                                   = recon(\delta, eval(P))
    (4) \delta = \text{removeLayer}(\text{id}^*). Then
                 eval(patch(\delta, P)) = eval(P \setminus \{id^*\})
                                                     = \bigcup_{\mathsf{id} \in P.\mathsf{id} \neq \mathsf{id}^{\star}} \mathsf{evalLayer}(\mathsf{id}, P[\mathsf{id}])
                                                      = \{ \mathbf{mark}(\mathsf{mt}, \mathsf{id}, \mathsf{d}, S) \mid \mathbf{mark}(\mathsf{mt}, \mathsf{id}, \mathsf{d}, S) \in \mathbf{eval}(P), \mathsf{id} \neq \mathsf{id}^* \}
```

The third equality holds because marks from **evalLayer** are guaranteed to have the same id as the layer they are evaluated from.

 $= recon(\delta, eval(P))$ 

(5)  $\delta = \text{transformLayer}(\text{id}^*, \text{transform}).$  Let  $\langle T, D, S \rangle = P[\text{id}^*].$  Let  $\text{transform}(T, D, S) = \langle T', D', S' \rangle.$  Then

```
\begin{aligned} \mathbf{eval}(\mathsf{patch}(\delta,P)) &= \mathbf{eval}([\mathsf{id}^{\star} \mapsto \langle T',D',S'\rangle]P) \\ &= \mathbf{evalLayer}(\mathsf{id}^{\star},\langle T',D',S'\rangle) \cup \mathbf{eval}(P \setminus \{\mathsf{id}^{\star}\}) \\ &= \{\mathsf{mark}(\mathsf{getMT}(T'),\mathsf{id}^{\star},\mathsf{d}',S') \mid \mathsf{d}' \in D'\} \cup \mathbf{eval}(P \setminus \{\mathsf{id}^{\star}\}) \\ &\quad \cup \mathbf{eval}(P \setminus \{\mathsf{id}^{\star}\}) \\ &= \{\mathsf{mark}(\mathsf{getMT}(T'),\mathsf{id}^{\star},\mathsf{d}',S') \mid \mathsf{mark}(\mathsf{mt},\mathsf{id}^{\star},\mathsf{d},S) \in \mathbf{eval}(P), \\ &\quad \operatorname{transform}_1(\mathsf{getMT}^{-1}(\mathsf{mt}),\mathsf{d},S) = \langle T',\mathsf{d}',S'\rangle\} \\ &\quad \cup \{\mathsf{mark}(\mathsf{mt},\mathsf{id},\mathsf{d},S) \mid \mathsf{mark}(\mathsf{mt},\mathsf{id},\mathsf{d},S) \in \mathbf{eval}(P),\mathsf{id} \neq \mathsf{id}^{\star}\} \\ &= \operatorname{recon}(\delta, \mathbf{eval}(P)) \end{aligned}
```

The fourth equality holds because transform maps transform<sub>1</sub> over D.

Received 2024-11-15; accepted 2025-03-06

Proc. ACM Program. Lang., Vol. 9, No. PLDI, Article 175. Publication date: June 2025.