

My research interests are in **logic** and **formal methods** (FM), with a focus on improving formal correctness guarantees of programming language implementations and formal analysis tools.

Formal methods use various logics, calculi, formal semantics approaches, and type systems to formalize programs and/or programming languages, specify their correctness claims, and prove those claims using nontrivial algorithms, encodings, translations, optimizations, and heuristics. However, there are always underlying assumptions, or the so-called trust base, whenever a correctness claim is made or proved using formal methods. Oversight of the underlying assumptions can lead to a compromise of correctness. My **research vision** is to build a trustworthy, systematic, and efficient infrastructure to make, store, use, and assert—with *absolute formal guarantees*—correctness claims about any programs, program properties, and programming languages. Thus, my research is unfolded on the following **three themes**:

- T1. How can we use *one fixed logic* to axiomatically define the formal semantics of any programming language and express any program property?
- T2. How can we use *one fixed proof system* to reason directly about programs, prove any program properties, and check them using *one fixed proof checker*?
- T3. How can we automatically generate complete, rigorous, transparent, human-accessible, and machine-checkable logic proofs as formal correctness guarantees of programs, programming language implementations, and formal analysis tools? In short, how to do *proof generation*?

My **prior Ph.D. research** spans all three themes, and I will continue to work on them in the future. Regarding (T1), I proposed *matching logic* (<http://matching-logic.org>) as a unifying logical foundation for programming languages [14][15], program specification [3][5][6][8][12][13], and program reasoning [2][4][6][9][11][13][15]. Regarding (T2), I designed a powerful proof system for matching logic with only 15 proof rules and implemented a proof check using only 240 lines of code [9][16]. Regarding (T3), I initiated long-term research on *proof generation* to bring the best-known assurance levels to software and computers. As a proof of concept, I implemented a proof generator for concrete (non-symbolic) execution of imperative programs [9].

I work on both foundational theories and practical applications, and my research has had both **academic and practical impacts**. On the academic side, matching logic has attracted attention from the global PL/FM community for its simplicity, elegance, expressive power, and reasoning power. Research teams, groups, and labs from King's College London (UK), University of Kent (UK), Peking University (China), University of Bucharest (Romania), Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași (Romania), Eötvös Loránd University (Hungary), and Masaryk University (Czechia) have started collaborations on the study of matching logic and the development of related tools. I have participated in all collaborations and I am leading the core projects.

On the practical side, I am cooperating with the startup Runtime Verification Inc. to transfer my research on matching logic and proof generation into practical products to improve the formal correctness guarantees of the semantics-based tools in the K framework (<https://kframework.org>). My recent proposal on studying proof generation raised a \$30,000-funding from the Ethereum Foundation for its potential to significantly increase the safety, reliability, and transparency of cryptocurrencies and smart contracts [20].

Prior Work

Matching Logic. Formal methods use rigorous mathematical tools to specify and verify computing systems. Since the 1960s, various formal semantics approaches have been proposed, including Floyd-Hoare axiomatic semantics, Scott-Strachey denotational semantics, initial algebra semantics, and operational semantics. Various formal logics and calculi have been used/proposed to express and reason about program properties, including first-order logic, higher-order logic, equational logic, fixpoint logic, separation logic, modal logic, temporal logic, dynamic logic, type systems, as well as their variants and extensions. *How can we capture these semantics approaches, formal logics, and calculi in one unifying logic, where each of them is faithfully defined as a logical theory using axioms and notations?*

I proposed matching logic [15] as an answer to the above research question. Matching logic is a practical and unifying foundation for programming languages, program specification, and program reasoning, where all the above semantics approaches, formal logics, and calculi are definable as logical theories. I worked with the startup Runtime Verification Inc. (RV) to incorporate matching logic into the K framework—a practical formal language semantics framework that has been used to formalize real-world programming languages (C, Java, JavaScript, Python, Rust, x86-64, Ethereum VM, LLVM, etc.), to model and verify safety-critical systems by Boeing, DARPA, NASA, and Toyota, and to model and verify smart contracts, consensus protocols, programming languages, and virtual machines by ConsenSys, DappHub, Ethereum Foundation, Gnosis, IOHK, MakerDAO, Uniswap, and RV itself. Matching logic is now the logical foundation of K. All the real-world programming languages above have their complete formal semantics defined as matching logic theories.

Proof System and Proof Checking. The key question for a unifying logic such as matching logic is: *What set of proof rules does it use for formal reasoning, and how powerful are they?* To answer this question, I designed a Hilbert-style proof system for matching logic with only 15 proof rules and proved several completeness properties [15]. I proved that the first-order (FO) fragment of matching logic is complete, extending the classical result on hybrid completeness to many-sorted and polyadic settings. I proved a novel global completeness property for all theories in the FO fragment that feature equality. I proved the (relative) completeness property for reasoning about programs' functional correctness, showing that matching logic is a (relatively) complete formal verification framework. I proved that initial algebra semantics are definable in matching logic, and various induction principles are derivable using the proof system, showing that matching logic is a unifying logical framework for induction and recursion [13].

I implemented a matching logic proof checker using 240 lines of code, making it one of the smallest of its kind. Matching logic proofs are encoded into proof objects and checked by the proof checker. More than 100 matching logic lemmas/theorems were manually proved and encoded into a public database of matching logic formal theorems [15][17] for future research. A research team from Eötvös Loránd University (Hungary) uses the database to encode and check matching logic proofs carried out using the Coq proof assistant [18].

I implemented a prototype automated prover for matching logic. The prover consists of a set of high-level proof strategies in separate modules for reasoning about data structures, frames, contexts, fixpoints, and user-defined recursive properties, as well as invariant synthesis [2][11]. The prover is shown to be generic and effective using a cross-language benchmark. It successfully proved all the

challenging heap properties in the **SL-COMP** competition for separation logic provers, when instantiated by the matching logic theory of finite-domain heaps.

Proof Generation. In 2020, I initiated a long-term research agenda on proof generation. Proof generation is a logically sound and practically feasible means to address the community’s long-standing need for more trustworthy language implementations and analysis tools. As a proof of concept, I prototyped a proof generator for a semantics-based interpreter [9]. The proof generator takes as input (1) a formal semantics of a programming language and (2) a program execution trace, and outputs a machine-checkable proof certificate that the execution trace is correct with respect to the given formal semantics. The technique has caught the industry’s eye, especially of the blockchain community, for it can provide the best-known assurance level for smart contracts. In 2022, the Ethereum Foundation offered \$30,000 for the proposal “Trustworthy Formal Verification for Ethereum Smart Contracts via Machine-Checkable Proof Certificates,” which I helped write.

Other Work. I am also interested in (1) using matching logic to specify and reason about computation beyond traditional scenarios and (2) developing more efficient semantics-based tools. Regarding (1), I co-designed MediK as an executable formal semantics of an interactive medical guidance system [8], which interacts with a web interface and forms an end-to-end guidance system for medical experts and physicians. I used matching logic to specify hybrid systems and properties [14] and hyper-properties [10]. I used matching logic as a unifying logical framework for neural networks, where various types of neural networks and their properties can be specified in a uniform way [5]. Regarding (2), I participate in developing KPLC, a high-performance executable formal semantics of programmable logic controllers (PLC). I co-authored [1] and presented an efficient internal algorithm of **K** that compiles formal semantics into high-performance LLVM code for efficient execution of concrete (non-symbolic) programs.

Future Directions

I will continue pursuing my research agenda on matching logic and proof generation to improve formal correctness guarantees of programs, programming language implementations, and formal analysis tools. My methodology is to generate complete, rigorous, transparent, human-accessible, and machine-checkable proof certificates as formal correctness certificates for any property of any program in any programming language. Each proof certificate clearly states the program property being proved and the underlying formal programming language semantics. Both the property and the formal semantics are encoded in one fixed logic: matching logic, and the entire proof steps are automatically checked by a small, fixed proof checker. This way, the trusted code base is reduced to the minimum. Every programming language implementation, formal analysis tool, verification algorithm, or proof strategy will no longer belong to the trusted code base. They become heuristics of finding and generating the final formal correctness certificates.

My **five-year research plan** is to continue my research on the discussed themes (T1)-(T3). I propose to keep studying the fundamental problems of matching logic regarding its expressive power, completeness properties, decision procedures, and more efficient proof strategies. I will extend my proof-of-concept work on proof generation to support trustworthy and transparent semantics-based program execution and formal verification. I will continue developing tool support for matching logic, with a focus on bringing more interactive reasoning power to real-world programming languages by connecting matching logic with existing proof assistants. I am also eager

to transfer my research into practical products. I have identified two promising directions. The first is proof-certifying smart contracts, where matching logic proof certificates are generated for smart contracts execution and verification, bringing their trustworthiness to a high level. The second is to combine proof generation with succinct non-interactive arguments of knowledge (SNARKs) to obtain more succinct cryptographic proof certificates for any program in any programming language. Below, I elaborate on some research projects of potentially high impact.

Proof-Certifying Formal Verification. Formal verification is the act of proving correctness of a program with respect to its formal specification. In terms of trustworthiness, it *transfers* the trust in the program being verified to that in the verifier. As a result, it makes the trusted code base more manageable. Instead of trusting countless unverified programs, one can verify them and trust a single program: the verifier itself. *Proof-certifying formal verification* pushes one step further and eliminates verifiers from the trusted code base by generating proof certificates for formal verification. These proof certificates will make formal verification more transparent and accessible, as what is currently hidden behind the complex algorithms, transformations, heuristics, and optimization—the actual logic reasoning—will become explicit. The key component is a proof generator that takes as input (1) a formal programming language semantics and (2) a successful verification run of a given program, and outputs the proof certificate for the verification result. Since the proof certificate will be checked, the proof generator does not belong to the trust code base. I have started developing a prototype for the verification of deterministic programs [4]. Although the current prototype can only handle small academic programming languages, it is semantics-based and works with various programming paradigms, including imperative, functional, and assembly languages. I will extend the prototype to support non-deterministic programs and real-world programming languages.

I identify two promising directions to transfer proof-certifying execution and verification into impactful, practical products. The first is **proof-certifying smart contracts**. Today, matching logic and **K** have been used to formalize and verify more than 8 blockchain consensus protocols, 43 smart contracts, 4 blockchain virtual machines, programming languages, and specifications [19]. Still, to trust the executions of these smart contracts or their verification results, one needs to trust an unverified implementation of a programming language or a virtual machine, or the unverified semantics-based interpreter or verifier of **K**. My research will address the above issue by reducing computation to proof checking. Proof-certifying smart contracts will lead us to a next-generation blockchain, where smart contracts are executed only once. Execution results are published to the blockchain with their corresponding proof certificates, so validators need not re-execute transactions but check the proof certificates using a fixed checker—the only program running on-chain.

The second direction is **SNARK-ing the proof certificates**. The term SNARK, which stands for succinct non-interactive arguments of knowledge, refers to the production of a cryptographic proof where one can show the possession of certain information. SNARKs will significantly reduce the sizes of the proof certificates from millions or more lines of code to constant size and reduce the proof checking time. The key idea is to produce a cryptographic SNARK proof that states that there exists a sequence of proof steps for a given execution trace or a verification run, which will pass the checking of the fixed, matching logic proof checker. This way, we can generate SNARKs as succinct proof certificates for any property of any program in any programming language. I have started cooperating with the startup RISC-zero Inc. to develop a SNARK proof generator for

matching logic and explore its application to proof-certifying smart contracts. I was invited to the New England Verification Day 2022 to share the research progress.

Matching Logic Tool Support. Proof assistants such as Coq, Isabelle, and Lean are widely used in defining formal language semantics and reasoning about programs, with decent support for both interactive and automated reasoning. On the other hand, matching logic processes the complete formal definitions of many real-world programming languages. There is a great need for more interactive reasoning support for them, especially when the fully automated matching logic theorem prover fails to deliver. Therefore, I propose exporting the formal semantics in matching logic to existing proof assistants to get the best of both worlds. Matching logic will obtain more interactive reasoning power from these proof assistants, and users who are already familiar with these proof assistants can get access to the formal semantics of numerous real-world languages. I co-worked with a research team from Eötvös Loránd University (Hungary) and mechanized matching logic in Coq [7]. I am also involved in another parallel effort led by the Institute for Logic and Data Science at the University of Bucharest (Romania) in mechanizing matching logic in Lean.

References

- [1] B. Collie, T. Kasampalis, X. Chen, D. Guth, G. Roşu, "An efficient language-agnostic semantics-based interpreter," PLDI Submission (under review).
- [2] T. Trinh, X. Chen, N. Rodrigues, G. Roşu, "Automatic abstraction for fixpoint reasoning in matching logic," PLDI Submission (under review).
- [3] X. Chen, G. Roşu, "Defining binders in matching logic (featuring a case study of contexts in K)," Journal of Functional Programming (JFP) ICFP Special Issue (under review).
- [4] Z. Lin, X. Chen, T. Trinh, J. Wang, G. Roşu, "Generating proof certificates for a language-agnostic deductive program verifier," OOPSLA Submission (under review). Technical Report <https://hdl.handle.net/2142/112785>.
- [5] X. Zhang, X. Chen, M. Sun, "Towards a unifying logical framework for neural networks," in Proceedings of ICTAC, 2022.
- [6] X. Chen, D. Lucanu, G. Roşu, "Capturing constrained constructor patterns in matching logic," Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming, vol. 130, 2022.
- [7] P. Berczky, X. Chen, D. Horpácsi, T. Mizsei, L. Peña, J. Tusil, "Mechanizing matching logic in Coq," in Working Formal Methods Symposium (FROM), 2022.
- [8] M. Saxena, X. Chen, S. Song, S. Meng, L. Sha, G. Roşu, "Rewriting-based computer-interpretable clinical practice guidelines," Technical Report <https://hdl.handle.net/2142/116016>, 2022.
- [9] X. Chen, Z. Lin, T. Trinh, G. Roşu, "Towards a trustworthy semantics-based language framework via proof generation," in Proceedings of CAV, 2021.
- [10] J. Tusil, X. Chen, G. Roşu, "Hyperproperties in Matching Logic," Technical Report <https://hdl.handle.net/2142/109298>, 2021.
- [11] X. Chen, T. Trinh, N. Rodrigues, L. Peña, G. Roşu, "Towards A unified proof framework for automated fixpoint reasoning using matching logic," in Proceedings of OOPSLA, 2020.

- [12] X. Chen, G. Roşu, "A general approach to define binders using matching logic," in Proceedings of ICFP, 2020.
- [13] X. Chen, D. Lucanu, G. Roşu, "Initial algebra semantics in matching logic," Technical Report <https://hdl.handle.net/2142/107781>, 2020.
- [14] M. Saxena, X. Chen, N. Rodrigues, G. Roşu, "Formal semantics of hybrid automata," Technical Report <https://hdl.handle.net/2142/106822>, 2020.
- [15] X. Chen, G. Roşu, "Matching μ -logic," in Proceedings of LICS, 2019.
- [16] GitHub, Matching logic proof checker, <https://github.com/kframework/proof-generation/blob/main/theory/matching-logic-240-loc.mm>.
- [17] GitHub, Matching logic theorem database, <https://github.com/kframework/proof-generation/tree/main/theory>.
- [18] GitHub, AML Formalization, <https://github.com/harp-project/AML-Formalization>.
- [19] GitHub, Runtime Verification Publications, <https://github.com/runtimeverification/publications>
- [20] News Article, <https://cs.illinois.edu/news/new-academic-research-grant-through-ethereum-will-increase-safety-of-smart-contracts-and-blockchain-applications>