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Abstract

The copy-on-write optimization is used in operating systems such as Mach [8] to avoid copying data when large portions of memory are sent between processes in messages. The kernel maintains data structures which allow the system to defer copying any data until either the sender or recipient needs to store a new value. After repeated copies, these structures may grow complex. In this paper, we formalize the copy-on-write optimization using IMPS, an Interactive Mathematical Proof System developed at The MITRE Corporation. We prove formally that the copy-on-write optimization provides the same user-visible behavior as if all the data had been copied immediately in the naïve way.

1 Introduction

One of the prime optimizations of Mach [8, 7, 1] is the so-called copy-on-write optimization. In an operating system like Mach, which emphasizes client-server computing, processes very frequently send other processes, which are acting as servers, large amounts of data. The server process may not even handle the data itself; indeed, frequently the data is simply sent to a third (or fourth . . .) process before real actions are taken. Moreover, commonly, little or none of the data will be altered, although the client cannot know when the server will modify particular data. In this situation, traditional operating systems faced a dilemma. One possibility is to copy the data each time that it is sent in a message, but this takes time and is frequently unnecessary. Alternatively the memory to be transferred could be mapped into the virtual address space of the recipient as shared memory. Although this is fast, it is insecure, because the client can see any changes the server may make (and vice versa), and it is unreliable, because the processes must agree on a protocol for accessing and modifying the shared memory.

To resolve this problem, Mach offers the copy-on-write optimization. When memory is sent to another process, Mach does not in fact make a copy; the two processes will in fact read the same data. The microkernel ensures, however, that if either process writes to a portion of the shared memory, then Mach
will silently create a copy of that portion. Thus, each process sees only the modifications it makes itself. This is efficient because a portion of memory is copied only if this is necessary to provide each process with the illusion that memory was not shared.

In Mach, a “portion” of memory means a page as supported by the demand-paged virtual memory system. Copy-on-write is implemented by setting the page protection for shared pages to be read only; an attempt to write to the page causes a page fault. Mach responds to this page fault by copying the page containing the requested address, so that the write may be retried.

1.1 How Copy-on-Write Works

In order for this machinery to work properly, Mach must maintain data structures which indicate where to retrieve not-yet-copied pages and where to write them when they must indeed be copied. In Mach these interrelations are stored in the memory object data structures that the kernel maintains to represent the permanent or temporary objects that user processes have allocated in their address spaces.

When a copy is done using the copy-on-write optimization, the kernel creates two new memory objects, although no actual data is copied to either. One of the two is returned as the new object, and it will typically be sent to another process. The second is treated specially by the kernel; user processes will not access it. Instead, it serves as a snapshot of the state of the original memory object at the time that the copy was made. For clarity in the discussion below, we will refer to these three memory objects as the original $O$, the snapshot object $S$, and the user process’s copy object $C$; we refer to the time the copy operation occurs as $t_0$.

Two fields in the memory object data structure are relevant; they are illustrated in Figure 1. First, there is a default pointer which is set to point from the user’s copy $C$ to the snapshot object $S$, and from $S$ to the original $O$. Second, there is a dependent pointer which is set to point from the original object $O$ to the snapshot object $S$.

The expected effects of reads and writes are altered in the presence of these pointers. First, any attempt to write to $O$ will cause the page containing the target address to be “pushed” first, by which we mean copied from $O$ to $S$ before being altered. As a consequence, if $a$ is any address at which the original $O$ has data but $S$ does not, then the value of $O$ at $a$ is the same as it was at time $t_0$. If $a$ is an address for which $S$ does have data, then the value of $S$ at $a$ is the same as the value that $O$ had at time $t_0$; this is why we call $S$ a snapshot. If a particular page of $O$ has already been pushed, then writes to that page proceed normally, just as if no copy had been made.

Any attempt to write to $C$ will cause the page containing the target address to be “pulled” first. By this we mean that if the data is not already present in $C$, the operating system copies the data there. If the page is not in physical
memory, the system locates the correct data for that page by following the default pointers. It may be found in $S$, or alternatively the operating system may follow $S$'s default pointer to retrieve it from $O$. The page of data, once found, is then copied into $C$. As a consequence, whenever $C$ does not have data for an address $a$, no write attempt has occurred, and the value expected for $C$ at that address is the same as the value that $O$ had at time $t_0$. Once the data has been pulled into $C$, this write attempt—and subsequent writes—may occur normally.

An attempt to read data from $C$ will cause a search along the default chain. That is, if the data is present in $C$, then that value is used; otherwise, the default pointer is followed to $S$. Here again, either the data is present, or else the default pointer is followed to $O$. The result of the search will be cached. Later fetches from the same page do not require intervention from the operating system unless the virtual memory system has removed or relocated the page of data.

The situation becomes more complex when a second object is copied from the same original. Let us now refer to the initial copy as $C_0$ and the initial snapshot as $S_0$. The effect of the second operation depends on whether the original has been altered between $t_0$ and the time $t_1$ when the second copy $C_1$ is made.

When there have been alterations to $O$ before $t_1$, so that pages have been pushed into $S_0$, then $C_1$ must see the new data in $O$. In this case, $C_1$ must have its own snapshot $S_1$. However, Mach ensures that when alterations are made to $O$, the pages need only be pushed to one snapshot object. This is achieved by changing $S_0$'s default to point to $S_1$, as shown in Figure 2. If data has been changed between $t_0$ and $t_1$, that data is already present in $S_0$. Hence,
the values present in $S_0$ will be used; later values represented in $O$ or $S_1$ will never be visible to $C_0$. On the other hand, data in $O$ altered only after $t_1$ will be copied to $S_1$. Since these pages are not represented in $S_0$, the values in $S_1$ will show through when Mach follows the default chain. For data that is never changed, the default chain will lead back all the way to $O$.

By contrast, if no writes have been made against $O$ in the interval, then the initial snapshot $S_0$, which as yet contains no data, can be reused for both objects (see Figure 3). When, later, alterations are made to $O$, and the original unchanged pages are moved to $S_0$, these pages will be visible to both $C_0$ and $C_1$.

As a consequence of this scheme, reads against $C_0$ will deliver whatever values $O$ held at time $t_0$, while reads against $C_1$ will deliver the values $O$ held at time $t_1$. Moreover, an alteration to $O$ never requires a page to be pushed to more than one snapshot object.

A succession of copies may be made from the same original. Thus, if the object changes frequently, the default chain may grow long. If copies are made more frequently than the original object changes, the structure may grow bushy. The mechanism in Mach has some additional fine points:

- A copy may start at a specified offset $n$ in the original. In this case, the 0th word in $C$ has the same value as the $n$th word in $O$, and generally when there is an $i$th word in $C$, it has the same value as the $n+i$th word in $O$. 

Figure 2: Relations Created by a Second Copy Operation (Original Altered)
• A copy may have a limited length \( \ell_C \). In this case, the copy contains at most \( \ell_C \) words; more exactly, it has \( \min(\ell_C, \ell_O - n) \) words, where \( \ell_O \) is the current length of the original and \( n \) is the offset, or 0 if none is specified.

Given that there is a flexible relation between the contents of the original and those of the copy, we found it convenient to specify the semantics of the copy operation in a way that allows any function to interrelate their locations.

### 1.2 Correctness Condition for Copy-on-Write

Intuitively, the copy-on-write mechanism seems just as good as actually carrying out all the copying; however, questions may remain about just what would occur with complicated sequences of copy operations. It is also not clear which states are legitimate, in the sense of which graph-like structures of default and dependent pointers would make starting points from which the copy-on-write mechanism behaves as expected.

In this subsection we will describe what correctness means for the copy-on-write mechanism. In the remainder of the paper, we will establish that it really is correct in this sense. As part of carrying out the proof strategy, we will also determine the set of states which provide legitimate starting-points for copy-on-write behavior.

The sense in which copy-on-write is as good as the unoptimized alternative, which we will refer to as *eager* copying, is that user-level processes receive the same services from the operating system no matter which is used, except that
they presumably receive that service more promptly when copy-on-write is used. The intuition is that user processes may request a sequence of actions, and that these actions will issue in the same visible consequences no matter which copy strategy the operating system selects. So if an applications program exhibits some behavior when the operating system offers eager copying, then it will exhibit just the same behavior (except possibly more quickly) if the operating system instead offers copy-on-write.

Thus we view the operating system as providing a collection of services to its clients, including operations to copy memory objects, and to fetch and store values as their contents. We regard these services as providing a state machine interface. In each state, a set of events is offered. Which set of events is available will depend on the state of the machine; this is how the model expresses information made available from the state machine (which, in our case, represents the kernel) to its environment (which, in our case, represents the user-level processes).

The fact that copy-on-write is a faithful refinement of eager copy may then be formalized as the assertion that one machine, which offers services including a copy operation using the copy-on-write strategy, is a faithful refinement of a different machine, which instead offers a copy operation using the unoptimized eager copy. We will refer to the latter as the “abstract” state machine, and to the former as the “concrete,” or “implementation,” state machine.

One strategy for formalizing this is to introduce an abstraction function. The abstraction function yields a state of the abstract machine, when given as an argument a state of the implementation machine. The purpose of the abstraction function is to say which abstract state a concrete state corresponds to. An abstraction function may be used when there may be several concrete states, all of which represent the same abstract state. By contrast, in formalizing refinements in which a single concrete state may represent several different abstract states, an abstraction relation is needed, instead of an abstraction function. When a function is usable, as is the case in the current example, it is more convenient to do so. We will refer to the abstraction function as $\text{abstr}$.

The main correctness property is the claim that every computation\footnote{That is, a finite or infinite sequence $C$ of states such that $C(0)$ is an initial state, and for every $j$ where $C(j + 1) \downarrow$, there is an operation $h$ such that $C(j + 1) = h(C(j))$.} of the abstract state machine corresponds to a computation of the implementation machine and \emph{vice versa}, in a certain sense of “correspond.” To state it, we will use $\downarrow$ to mean “is defined,” and we will say that $s \simeq t$ (read “$s$ is quasi-equivalent to $t$”) if $(s \downarrow \lor t \downarrow) \Rightarrow s = t$. Quasi-equivalence says that the terms have the same denotation or lack thereof, and in our logic [3, 2] it is the condition that justifies substitution of $s$ for $t$, wherever $s$ is free for $t$.

If $C_i$ is a computation of the implementation, then an abstract computation $C$ corresponds to $C_i$ if there is a non-decreasing function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ onto the domain of $C$ such that $\text{abstr}(C_i(j)) \simeq C(f(j))$, for all $j$. This notion of
refinement is closely connected with the storage layout relations used in VLISP [6, 5].

The refinement theorems are divided into safety theorems and liveness theorems. Suppose first that \( g \) is one of the specified operations, with parameters fixed, and \( h \) is the implementation version of that operation. Then the safety condition states that \( h(\sigma_i) \downarrow \Rightarrow \text{abstr}(h(\sigma_i)) = g(\text{abstr}(\sigma_i)) \).

To state the liveness constraints, we will call a function \( f \) on implementation states, which is a composition of state machine operations, an abstract no-op when \( \text{abstr}(f(\sigma_i)) = \text{abstr}(\sigma_i) \). The liveness condition for an abstract operation \( g \) and the corresponding concrete operation \( h \) states that there is an abstract no-op \( f \) such that

\[
\text{abstr}(h(f(\sigma_i))) \simeq g(\text{abstr}(\sigma_i))
\]

This is a liveness condition: when the abstract machine can undergo operation \( g \) from \( \text{abstr}(\sigma_i) \), then even if the implementation cannot undergo \( h \) from \( \sigma_i \), it can evolve to an indistinguishable state \( f(\sigma_i) \) from which it can undergo \( h \).

In our case, the situation is slightly more complex. There is a contrast among two different ways that memory objects can be used in the Mach-style copy-on-write mechanism. First, there are the objects \( O \) and \( C \), which are of interest to user-level processes, and produced at their request. Second, there are the snapshot objects \( S \), which are not of interest to user-level processes, but are rather used by the operating system for its own bookkeeping purposes. These objects are intended not to be user-visible. Operations intended to be abstract no-ops, such as adding a snapshot, are in fact no-ops only if there is a way of masking off the visibility of these system-maintained objects.

One way to do so would be to use an implementation-level state which specified, in one of its components, which objects are user-visible in that state. There were two reasons why we have not done so. First, it appeared to be a distraction from the main line of development, focused on the structure of the default relations. Second, Mach itself does not appear to classify memory objects in this way. Although there is a notion of an internal memory object, in the current implementation (Mach 3.0 [1]), it is used differently. It coincides with "temporary" objects, which are all objects paged against the system's default pager. Many of these objects are user-visible, such as ordinary memory allocated in the address space of a user-level process. Instead, Mach appears to rely on its convention of naming objects by means of ports to ensure that user-level processes do not gain access to snapshot objects. This is a complicated mechanism, which relies on the assumption that no part of the code of the kernel or of the default pager will pass a right to the port to any other user-level process.

Thus, we have pursued a different idea. We will add a parameter to the abstraction function. Thus, given an implementation state and a set of "intended" user-visible objects, the abstraction function returns an abstract state from which other objects have been hidden. Correctness theorems will naturally assume that certain objects are not user-visible.
In our case, the operations offered by the abstract machine will be:

- \texttt{a\_copy}, to cause a new memory object \(C\) to have its data initialized to equal the data of a specified original memory object \(O\);
- \texttt{a\_fetch}, to retrieve a word of data from a memory object; and
- \texttt{a\_store}, to alter the value of a word in a memory object.

The semantics of \texttt{a\_store} are the eager semantics in which the data of \(C\) is initialized right away.

The implementation machine provides some similar operations, and also an additional operation. To avoid confusion, we will label corresponding operations in the implementation machine with a leading \(i\):

- \texttt{i\_copy}, to cause the defaults to be updated for a set of places;
- \texttt{i\_redirect}, to re-route default pointers from one object to another (always a snapshot), when it can be used instead;
- \texttt{i\_snapshot}, to cause the defaults to be updated for a set of places, when these are to be used as a snapshot object;
- \texttt{i\_fill}, to cause a data to be copied from the source determined by the default chain;
- \texttt{i\_fetch}, to retrieve the word stored in a place by dereferencing through the default chain;
- \texttt{i\_store}, to alter the value of a word in a memory object, but possible only when the value is immediately present, without using the default chain.

The operation \texttt{i\_fill} is used to implement both the “push” that copies a page of data from \(O\) to \(S\) and also the “pull” that copies a page of data to \(C\), from either \(S\) or \(O\). The operations \texttt{i\_fetch} and \texttt{i\_store} are trivial, and omitted below.

In the pages that follow, then, we will concentrate on the kernel level data structures. However, for our purposes it will be unnecessary to formalize the \textit{dependent} pointers. Our formalization can always consider whether \(O\) is in the range of the \textit{default} pointers. By contrast, the implementation must be able to efficiently discover the snapshot \(S\) that defaults to \(O\).

We have also chosen here to abstract from the issue of page protection, and the handling of page faults when a process tries to store into a write-protected portion of a copy-on-write object. We have not postponed it because it raises difficult questions. On the contrary, we set it to one side because it seems completely amenable to the method developed in a previous paper [4].
2 The Abstract State Machine

In Mach, memory objects are the natural unit. Memory objects are used both to represent permanent storage objects such as files and also temporary storage such as a process’s private address space. Conceptually, a memory object is a sequence of locations, indexed by natural numbers. Each location stores a word-sized datum. The association between locations and their contents is modelled by a function $\gamma$ on $\mathcal{P}$. Thus $\gamma(m, n)$ is the word in memory object $m$ at index $n$. However, for the correctness of the copy-on-write strategy this product decomposition is totally unnecessary. We thus view memory as a homogeneous set of points called places on which is defined a partial function representing stored data; the values that can be stored are called words. This abstraction allows the essential mathematical elements to become more apparent. In this model, immediate memory is represented by a partial function $\gamma$ defined on the set of places. Though simplifying the mathematics, however, the change of view also requires that some commonly understood operations (such as copying a portion of one memory object to another) must be reformulated in a less constrained manner. We will specify a relation between source and target by giving a function $f$ from places to places. When $f(p_1) = p_2$, that will indicate that the value for $p_1$ should be copied from $p_2$. The function, thus, maps target to source.

**Language 2.1** language-for-places
Embedded Language: $h$-o-real-arithmetic
Base Types: $\mathcal{P}$ $\mathcal{W}$

The base types $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{W}$ denote places and words respectively.

**Theory 2.2** places
Language: language-for-places
Component Theories: $h$-o-real-arithmetic.

In the view of memory as a product set, “copying” a memory object $m$ to $m'$ in effect extends the domain of the memory contents function $\gamma$ to a new function $\gamma'$ obtained by composition with the mapping $(m', i) \mapsto (m, i)$. This motivates the following:

**Definition 2.3** Let $f : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}, \Phi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$.

$\text{copy}(\Phi, f) = \Phi \circ f$.

Theory: places

This general definition allows for copying with an offset, and it allows for copying a limited portion of a memory object.

We want copying to preserve existing memory and not to overwrite memory locations currently in use. On the other hand, when a copy is made, the source
should have contents. Therefore, a restriction must be imposed on copying functions; it is embodied in the following definition. The leading $\iff$ should be read, “The following are equivalent.”

**Definition 2.4** Let $f : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}, \Phi : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{W}$.

$\iff$

- $\text{copy}_f(\Phi, f)$
- conjunction
  - $\forall x : \mathcal{P} \quad x \in \text{dom}(\Phi) \supset f(x) = x$
  - $\text{ran}(f) \subseteq \text{dom}(\Phi)$.

Theory: `places`

The abstract machine’s copy operation may thus be defined:

**Definition 2.5** Let $f : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}, \Phi : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{W}$.

$a_{\text{copy}}(\Phi, f) = \text{conditionally, if } \text{copy}_f(\Phi, f)$

- then $\text{copy}(\Phi, f)$
- else $\bot[\mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{W}]$.

The theory: `places`

We treat the abstract machine’s operation to store with similar generality:

**Definition 2.6** Let $h, \Phi : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{W}$.

$a_{\text{store}}(\Phi, h) = [x : \mathcal{P} \mapsto$

- conditionally, if $x \in \text{dom}(h)$
  - then $h(x)$
  - else $\Phi(x)$.

The theory: `places`

On the other hand, the abstract machine’s fetch operation retrieves a value for a single location. It returns the given state unaltered. However, to determine the word retrieved, it uses a “guessing” style. If the third argument is the correct guess for the value to be retrieved, the state is returned unaltered; otherwise, the result is undefined. This approach is discussed in more detail in [4].

**Definition 2.7** Let $w : \mathcal{W}, p : \mathcal{P}, \Phi : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{W}$.

$a_{\text{fetch}}(\Phi, p, w) = \text{conditionally, if } w = \Phi(p)$

- then $\Phi$
- else $\bot[\mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{W}]$.

The theory: `places`
3 Concrete Machine: The State and its Properties

We turn next to the structure of the class of implementation states (denoted by $\Omega$). An implementation state is an ordered pair consisting of a memory contents function $\gamma$ and a default function $\delta$. We will prove the main theorems in this section, before introducing the concrete machine’s operations, and applying them to prove the correctness theorems, in Section 4.

**Cartesian Product Sort 3.1 $\Omega$**
Components: $[\mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{W}]$ $[\mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}]$
Accessors: $\gamma$ $\delta$
Constructor: make_istate

Much of the mathematical content needed here concerns function iteration and a theory of discrete flows. That material has been developed in a more abstract context; it is presented in the Appendices. Here we will simply import it. The constant $\text{first}_\text{entry}$ is introduced in Definition A.11, while $\text{flow}_\text{ext}$ is introduced in Definition A.18.

**Translation 3.2 $\text{ind}_2$-to-place**
Source: generic-theory-2
Target: places
Fixed Theories: h-a-real-arithmetic
Sorts: $\textbf{I}_1 \to \mathcal{P}$ $\textbf{I}_2 \to \mathcal{W}$

We will overload the symbols $\text{first}_\text{entry}$ and $\text{flow}_\text{ext}$, and use them for the corresponding notions in this more concrete theory of places and words.

**Transported Symbols 3.1** Transport:
$\text{first}_\text{entry} \to \text{first}_\text{entry}$ $\text{flow}_\text{ext} \to \text{flow}_\text{ext}$ $\text{iterate} \to \text{iterate}$
Translation: $\text{ind}_2$-to-place

In the concrete machine, the values stored immediately in memory are used in combination with the default pointers. If a place $p$ has a value stored immediately, in the sense that $\gamma(\sigma)(p)$ is well-defined, then it represents that value. If it does not, then we consult the default function $\delta(\sigma)$. We apply $\delta(\sigma)$ as many times as needed to reach the immediately available memory. This is formalized using $\text{flow}_\text{ext}$.

**Definition 3.3** Let $\text{pl} : \mathcal{P}, \sigma : \Omega$.
$\text{promote}(\sigma, \text{pl}) = \text{flow}_\text{ext}(\delta(\sigma), \gamma(\sigma), \text{pl})$.

Theory: places
The bound memory of a state is the set of places for which promote is well defined. It is written $\mathcal{P}_B$.

**Definition 3.4** Let $\sigma : \Omega$.

$$\mathcal{P}_B(\sigma) = \text{dom}\{[p : \mathcal{P} \mapsto \text{promote}(\sigma, p)]\}.$$ 

Theory: places

Thus we will refer to the immediate memory of a state, meaning the set of $p$ such that $\gamma(\sigma)(p)$ is well-defined, as well as the bound places of the state, which are all the places from which we can eventually reach immediate memory, by following default pointers.

**Theorem 3.5** bound%place-characterization

$$\forall \sigma : \Omega \quad \mathcal{P}_B(\sigma) = \{p : \mathcal{P} \mid \text{first\_entry}(\delta(\sigma), \text{dom}(\gamma(\sigma)), p) \downarrow\}.$$ 

Theory: places

We introduce now an auxiliary abstraction function. This is not the abstraction function mentioned in the introduction; that has an additional parameter to specify the set of places intended to be user-visible. This auxiliary function corresponds to the case in which all places are intended to be visible.

**Definition 3.6** Let $\sigma : \Omega$.

$$\text{abstr}(\sigma) = [m : \mathcal{P} \mapsto \text{promote}(\sigma, m)].$$ 

Theory: places

Observe that $\mathcal{P}_B(\sigma) = \text{dom}(\text{abstr}(\sigma))$.

One ingredient of the copy-on-write strategy is the factorization of the copy function, $\text{copy} = \delta' \circ \delta'$, where $\delta'$ is an extension of the default function for the given state. One application of $\delta'$ brings us from the copy object to a snapshot; another is needed to bring us to the original. As the state evolves, the number of times that the default must be applied to bring us back to immediate memory may increase.

Thus, we are interested in the places $x$ in the domain of the copy function, such there is some $n$ such that $\delta^n(x) \in \text{dom} \{\gamma\}$.

The notation of the following definition requires some explanation: Given an $x : \mathcal{P}$, we are interested in the first entry of the iterates $f^n(x)$ in the set $\mathcal{P}_B(\sigma)$. The first such iterate (if it exists) is of the form $f^{n_0}(x)$ for some integer $n_0$ depending on $x$. We will denote this $f^{[x]}$.

**Definition 3.7** Let $f : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}, \sigma : \Omega$.

$$f^{[x]} = [x : \mathcal{P} \mapsto \text{first\_entry}(f, \mathcal{P}_B(\sigma), x)].$$
Theory: places

This function symbol is referred to as `raise` in running prose (or theorem names).

The next result explains how the copy-on-write strategy works. In a way, the result is stated backwards, because we regard the user-supplied copy function as being of the form $f^{[v]}$ for some $f$. This function $f$ must agree with the existing default function $\delta(\sigma)(x)$ where it counts, namely on the set $\mathcal{P}_B(\sigma)$.

**Theorem 3.8** default-modification

$\forall f : \mathcal{P} \implies \mathcal{P}, \sigma : \Omega$ implication

- $\forall x : \mathcal{P}$ s. t. $x \in \mathcal{P}_B(\sigma), \delta(\sigma)(x) \simeq f(x)$
- conjunction
  - $\text{abstr(make\_istate}(\gamma(\sigma), f)) = \text{copy(abstr}(\sigma), f^{[v]})$
  - $\text{copy\_fn(abstr}(\sigma), f^{[v]}).

Theory: places

The other crucial lemma justifying the copy-on-write strategy allows the default pointers to be redirected. The lemma states that we can alter the default $\delta(\sigma)$ to $f$, wherever $f$ is defined, under a condition. The alteration will not change the abstract, user-visible state. We isolate the condition in the predicate $c\_redirect\_fn$. A redirection function $f$ for a state $\sigma$ has its range disjoint from its domain. Also, its range is disjoint from the immediate memory of $\gamma$. Finally, $f$ does not affect $\delta(\sigma)$ in the sense that $\delta(\sigma)(x) = \delta(\sigma)(f(x))$, where $f$ is defined at all.

**Definition 3.9** Let $\sigma : \text{istate}, f : \text{place} \implies \text{place}$.

$\iff$

- $c\_redirect\_fn(f, \sigma)$
- conjunction
  - $\text{ran}\{f\} \cap \text{dom}\{\gamma(\sigma)\} = \emptyset$
  - $\text{dom}\{f\} \cap \text{ran}\{f\} = \emptyset$
  - $\forall x : \text{place}$ s. t. $x \in \text{dom}\{f\}$, $\delta(\sigma)(x) = \delta(\sigma)(f(x))$.

Theory: places

**Theorem 3.10** default-multiplicity-reduction

$\forall f : \text{place} \implies \text{place}, \sigma : \text{istate}$ implication

- $c\_redirect\_fn(f, \sigma)$
- $\text{abstr(make\_istate}(\gamma(\sigma), \{x : \text{place} \implies$ conditionally, if $x \in \text{dom}\{f\}$
  - $\text{then } f(x)$
  - $\text{else } \delta(\sigma)(x))\})$

$= \text{abstr}(\sigma)$.

Theory: places
Definition 4.4 Let \( f : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}, \sigma : \Omega \).
\[
c_{\text{copy}}(\sigma, f) = \text{conditionally, if } c_{\text{copy fn}}(\sigma, f)
\]
- then make \( \text{state}(\gamma(\sigma), f) \)
- else \( \bot. \)

Theory: places

Figure 4: The Concrete Copy Operation

4 Concrete Machine: The Operations and their Correctness

The definition of a primitive copy operation for the implementation state machine is given in Figure 4. The safety and liveness theorems justifying it are Theorems 4.5–4.6. Each of these theorems is a straightforward consequence of the Default Modification Theorem (3.8). The liveness theorem also requires the auxiliary notion \textit{lower}, and a lemma relating it to the \textit{raise} operation \( f[^v] \).

Definition 4.1 Let \( f : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}, \sigma : \Omega \).
\[
\iff
\]
- \( c_{\text{copy fn}}(\sigma, f) \)
- \( \forall p : \mathcal{P} \text{ s. t. } p \in \mathcal{P}_B(\sigma), f(p) \approx \delta(\sigma)(p). \)

Theory: places

Definition 4.2 Let \( f : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}, \sigma : \Omega \).
\[
\text{lower}(\sigma, f) = [p : \mathcal{P} \Rightarrow \text{conditionally, if } p \in \mathcal{P}_B(\sigma)
\]
- then \( \delta(\sigma)(p) \)
- else \( f(p) \].

Theory: places

Theorem 4.3 \textit{raise-lower-composition}
\[
\forall f : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}, \sigma : \Omega \text{ s. t. } a_{\text{copy}}(\text{abstr}(\sigma), f) \downarrow,
f = (\text{lower}(\sigma, f))[^v] .
\]

Theory: places

Theorem 4.5 \textit{copy-safety}
Definition 4.8 Let \( f : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}, \sigma : \Omega \).
\[
\text{c\textunderscore redirect}(\sigma, f) = \text{conditionally, if } c\textunderscore redirect\textunderscore fn(f, \sigma)
\begin{itemize}
  \item then make\textunderscore state(\gamma(\sigma), \{ x : \mathcal{P} \mapsto \text{if } x \in \text{dom}\{f\} \text{ then } f(x) \text{ else } \delta(\sigma)(x) \})
  \item else \bot. \Omega.
\end{itemize}
\]
Theory: \( \text{places} \)

Figure 5: The Redirect Operation

\[
\forall f : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}, \sigma : \Omega \text{ s. t. } \text{c\textunderscore copy}(\sigma, f) \downarrow, \\
\text{abstr}(\text{c\textunderscore copy}(\sigma, f)) = \text{a\textunderscore copy}(\text{abstr}(\sigma), f[\sigma]).
\]
Theory: \( \text{places} \)

Theorem 4.6 \textit{copy\textunderscore liveness}
\[
\forall f : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}, \sigma : \Omega \text{ s. t. } \text{a\textunderscore copy}(\text{abstr}(\sigma), f) \downarrow, \\
\text{abstr}(\text{c\textunderscore copy}(\sigma, \text{lower}(\sigma, f))) = \text{a\textunderscore copy}(\text{abstr}(\sigma), f).
\]
Theory: \( \text{places} \)

Theorem 4.7 \textit{copy\textunderscore liveness\textunderscore corollary}
\[
\forall f : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}, \sigma : \Omega \text{ s. t. } \text{a\textunderscore copy}(\text{abstr}(\sigma), f) \downarrow, \\
\text{c\textunderscore copy}(\sigma, \text{lower}(\sigma, f)) \downarrow.
\]
Theory: \( \text{places} \)

We now introduce—in Figure 4—an operation \( \text{c\textunderscore redirect} \) which simply redirects default pointers. Its correctness is an immediate consequence of the Default Multiplicity Reduction Theorem 3.10.

Theorem 4.9 \textit{c\textunderscore redirect\textunderscore no\textunderscore op}
\[
\forall f : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}, \sigma : \Omega \text{ s. t. } \text{c\textunderscore redirect}(\sigma, f) \downarrow, \\
\text{abstr}(\text{c\textunderscore redirect}(\sigma, f)) = \text{abstr}(\sigma).
\]
Theory: \( \text{places} \)

Definition 4.10 Let \( u : \text{sets}[\mathcal{P}], g, f : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}. \)
\[
\iff \\
\begin{itemize}
  \item f \cong u g \\
  \item f \mid u = g \mid u.
\end{itemize}
\]
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Figure 6: The Snapshot Operation

Theory: places

When a snapshot is added to the state, the snapshot set is the set of locations that will newly come into service. These are the places in the domain of \( f \) which are not already bound places. By the condition for \( c_{\text{snapshot}} \) to be defined, \( f \) must be the identity for bound places.

**Definition 4.11** Let \( f : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P} \), \( \sigma : \Omega \).

\[
\text{snapshot}_\mathcal{P}(\sigma, f) = \text{dom}\{ f \} \cap (C(\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{B}(\sigma))).
\]

Theory: places

The snapshot operation causes no change in the user-visible portion of the state, so long as the snapshot set is not regarded as user-visible. The symbol \( \phi \) here should be read “is disjoint from.”

**Theorem 4.13** \( c_{\text{snapshot-no-op}} \)

\[
\forall f : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}, \nu : \text{sets}([\mathcal{P}]) \to \mathcal{P} \text{ implication}
\]

- conjunction
  - \( \nu \circ \text{snapshot}_\mathcal{P}(\sigma, f) \)
  - \( c_{\text{snapshot}}(\sigma, f) \downarrow \)
- user_eq(abstr(\sigma), abstr(c_{\text{snapshot}}(\sigma, f)), v).

Theory: places

Using the following definition, we can introduce (in Figure 4) the last interesting state machine operation, \( c_{\text{fill}} \).

**Definition 4.14** Let \( a : \text{sets}[\text{place}], \sigma : \text{istate} \).

\[
\text{ifill}(\sigma, a) = \text{make_istate}([p : \text{place} \mapsto
\text{conditionally, if } p \in a
\]

- then promote(\sigma, p)
- else \( \bot \text{word} ), \text{default}(\sigma) \).
Definition 4.16 Let $a : \text{sets}[P], \sigma : \Omega$.

\[
c_{\text{fill}}(\sigma, a) = \text{conditionally, if } \text{dom}\{\gamma(\sigma)\} \subseteq a \\
\quad \bullet \text{ then } \text{ifill}(\sigma, a) \\
\quad \bullet \text{ else } \bot \Omega.
\]

Theory: \text{places}

Figure 7: The Fill Operation

Theory: \text{places}

There is a restriction on $a$ in the theorem establishing that \text{ifill} is a no-op. The restriction has the effect of ensuring that the \text{ifill} does not throw away memory that already has immediate contents in $\sigma$.

Theorem 4.15 \text{ifill}-abstraction

\[
\forall \sigma : \text{istate}, a : \text{sets}[\text{place}] \quad s. \ t. \ \text{dom}\{\gamma(\sigma)\} \subseteq a, \\
\text{abstr(\text{ifill}(\sigma, a))} = \text{abstr}(\sigma).
\]

Theory: \text{places}

Theorem 4.17 \text{c%fill}-no-op

\[
\forall \sigma : \Omega, a : \text{sets}[P] \quad s. \ t. \ c_{\text{fill}}(\sigma, a) \downarrow, \\
\text{abstr}(\sigma) = \text{abstr}(c_{\text{fill}}(\sigma, a)).
\]

Theory: \text{places}

5 Mach: Three Cases for Copying

With these tools in hand, we can now turn to the details of Mach’s treatment of the copy-on-write optimization. In order to avoid unnecessary snapshot objects and redundant copying, the actual Mach system distinguishes three cases. Suppose that in state $\sigma$ a user-level copy is requested, and let the function $h$ carry the places of the desired copy object $C$ to the corresponding places of the original $O$. Let $h^+$ be

\[
[p : \text{place} \Rightarrow \text{if } p \in \text{bound}\text{.place}(\sigma) \text{ then } p \text{ else } h(p)]
\]

and let $h'$ be $\text{lower}(\sigma, h)$. Observe that $h' = \text{lower}(\sigma, h^+)$. 

Theorem 5.1 \text{lower-$h\%plus$}
\[ \forall \sigma : \Omega, h, h^+ : P \rightarrow P \text{ implication} \]

- \[ h^+ = \begin{cases} p : P \rightarrow \text{conditionally, if } p \in \mathcal{P}_B(\sigma) \\ \text{then } p \\ \text{else } h(p) \end{cases} \]
- \[ \text{lower}(\sigma, h^+) = \text{lower}(\sigma, h). \]

Theory: places

In the first case, the original has—as yet—no copies or snapshot objects. Formally, this is represented by the case where \( \text{ran}(h) \) and \( \text{ran}(\delta(\sigma)) \) are disjoint. In this case, to produce the relations pictured in Figure 8, three steps will be required. First, the system can apply \( \text{c} \_\text{copy}(\sigma, h') \) to simulate the intended effect of the \( \text{a} \_\text{copy} \), obtaining a new state \( \sigma_1 \). Second, a snapshot is selected. Formally, this consists of choosing a bijection on places \( g \) such that \( \text{ran}(g) = \text{ran}(h) \) and \( \text{dom}(g) \) is unused. The snapshot object is the set \( \text{dom}(g) \). If there is no such \( g \), then the system has run out of storage to use for its internal snapshot objects, and the operation must fail. Otherwise, let \( \sigma_2 = \text{c} \_\text{snapshot}(\sigma, g) \). Let \( \sigma_2 = \text{c} \_\text{copy}(\sigma, h) \). Finally, in the third step, we reduce the multiplicity (i.e., reduce the number of default pointers into \( \text{ran}(h) \)), by letting \( \sigma_3 = \text{c} \_\text{redirect}(\sigma_2, (g^{-1} \circ h)) \).

**Definition 5.2** Let \( \sigma : \Omega, h : P \rightarrow P \).

\[ \iff \]

- \( \text{h} \_\text{ok}(h, \sigma) \)
- conjunction
  - \( \text{ran}(h) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_B(\sigma) \)
  - \( \text{dom}(h) \notin \mathcal{P}_B(\sigma) \).
Theory: places

**Definition 5.3** Let $\sigma : \Omega, h, g : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$.

$\iff$

- $g \circ h \cdot \text{pk}(g, h, \sigma)$
- conjunction
  - bijective on $\{g, \text{dom}(g), \text{ran}(h)\}$
  - $\text{dom}(g) \in \mathcal{P}(\sigma)$
  - $\text{dom}(g) \circ \text{dom}(\delta(\sigma))$
  - $\text{dom}(g) \circ \text{dom}(h)$.

Theory: places

**Definition 5.4** Let $v : \text{sets}[\mathcal{P}], g : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$.

$\iff$

- snapshot - not-visible$(g, v)$
- $\text{dom}(g) \circ v$.

Theory: places

**Theorem 5.5** case-1-mach-copy-thm

$\forall \sigma : \Omega, g, h, f, h^+, h' : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}, v : \text{sets}[\mathcal{P}]$ implication

- conjunction
  - $h \cdot \text{pk}(h, \sigma)$
  - $\text{ran}(h) \circ \text{ran}(\delta(\sigma))$
  - $g \cdot \text{pk}(g, h, \sigma)$
  - snapshot - not-visible$(g, v)$
  - $h^+ = \{p : \mathcal{P} \mapsto \text{conditionally, if } p \in \mathcal{P}_B(\sigma)$
    - $\text{then } p$
    - $\text{else } h(p)\}$
  - $h' = \text{lower}(\sigma, h^+)$
  - $\text{copy}_f (\text{abstr}(\sigma), h^+)$
  - $f = \{p : \mathcal{P} \mapsto \text{conditionally, if } p \in \mathcal{P}_B(\text{copy}(\sigma, h'))$
    - $\text{then } p$
    - $\text{else } g(p)\}$
- $\text{a}_\text{copy}(\text{abstr}(\sigma), h^+)$

$\cong \text{e} \cdot \text{abstr}(\text{c}_\text{redirect}(\text{c}_\text{snapshot}(\text{c}_\text{copy}(\sigma, h'), f), g^{-1} \circ h))$.

Theory: places

The second case arises when a copy has already been made of all or part of the original $O$, and moreover some data has been altered, causing data to be copied into the snapshot. Here a new snapshot object $S_t$ is created, and the old snapshot is redirected to it (Figure 10). The second case really subsumes
the first, taking \( C_0 \) and \( S_0 \) to be empty, and we represent it, like the first case, as a composition of three state machine operations. Formally, this composite can be applied correctly even in case 3 below; it simply leads to a less efficient situation in which storage is wasted and longer chains of default pointers need to be traversed.

In this case, as in case 1, let \( g \) be a bijection on places such that \( \text{ran}(g) = \text{ran}(h) \) and \( \text{dom}(g) \) consists of unused places. If no such \( g \) exists, we have run out of storage. Otherwise, let \( \text{sigma}_1 = \text{c\_copy}(\sigma_1, h') \) to simulate the intended effect of the \( a\_copy \). Second, we add the new snapshot using \( \text{c\_snapshot}(\sigma_1, f) \), where \( f \) is the identity on the bound places of \( \sigma_1 \) and agrees with \( g \) elsewhere. Let \( \sigma_2 \) be the result. Finally, in the third step, we reduce the multiplicity (i.e., reduce the number of default pointers into \( \text{ran}(h) \)) by redirecting the defaults of the new copy object and the old snapshot object at once. The result is

\[
\sigma_3 = \text{c\_redirect}(\sigma_2, (g^{-1} \circ h')).
\]

Here, as in the other cases, it is quite easy to prove that the two states \( \text{a\_copy}(\text{abstr}(\sigma), h^+) \) and

\[
\text{c\_redirect}(\text{c\_snapshot}(\text{c\_copy}(\sigma, h'), f), g^{-1} \circ h')
\]

are indistinguishable to the user if the latter is well-defined. The work is showing that the conditions are met to execute the second and third steps. We show the theorem that establishes this.

**Theorem 5.6** \( \text{c\_redirect-c\_snapshot-c\_copy-definedness-case2} \)

20
\(\forall \sigma : \Omega, g, h, f, h^+, h' : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}, v : \text{sets}[\mathcal{P}] \) implication
- conjunction
  - \(h_{\text{ok}}(h, \sigma)\)
  - \(g_{\text{ok}}(g, h, \sigma)\)
  - \(\text{snapshot\_not\_visible}(g, v)\)
  - \(h^+ = [p : \mathcal{P} \mapsto \text{conditionally, if } p \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{B}}(\sigma)\)
    - then \(p\)
    - else \(h(p)\)\]
  - \(h' = \text{lower}(\sigma, h^+)\)
  - \(\text{copy\_fn}(\text{abstr}(\sigma), h^+)\)
  - \(f = [p : \mathcal{P} \mapsto \text{conditionally, if } p \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{B}}(c_\text{\_copy}(\sigma, h'))\)
    - then \(p\)
    - else \(g(p)\)\]
- \(c_\text{\_redirect}(c_\text{\_snapshot}(c_\text{\_copy}(\sigma, h'), f), g^{-1} \circ h')\).

Theory: \(\text{places}\)

**Theorem 5.7** \(\text{case\_2\_mach\_copy\_thm}\)

\(\forall \sigma : \Omega, g, h, f, h^+, h' : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}, v : \text{sets}[\mathcal{P}] \) implication
- conjunction
  - \(h_{\text{ok}}(h, \sigma)\)
  - \(g_{\text{ok}}(g, h, \sigma)\)
  - \(\text{snapshot\_not\_visible}(g, v)\)
  - \(h^+ = [p : \mathcal{P} \mapsto \text{conditionally, if } p \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{B}}(\sigma)\)
    - then \(p\)
    - else \(h(p)\)\]
  - \(h' = \text{lower}(\sigma, h^+)\)
  - \(\text{copy\_fn}(\text{abstr}(\sigma), h^+)\)
  - \(f = [p : \mathcal{P} \mapsto \text{conditionally, if } p \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{B}}(c_\text{\_copy}(\sigma, h'))\)
    - then \(p\)
    - else \(g(p)\)\]
- \(a_\text{\_copy}(\text{abstr}(\sigma), h^+)\)
  \(\cong_{e} \text{abstr}(c_\text{\_redirect}(c_\text{\_snapshot}(c_\text{\_copy}(\sigma, h'), f), g^{-1} \circ h')).\)

Theory: \(\text{places}\)

The third case arises when a copy object already exists, but no immediate data has been filled into the snapshot (Figure 11). Formally, this is the case where \(\text{ran}(h) \subset \text{ran}(\delta(\sigma))\), but \(\text{dom}(\gamma(\sigma))\) is disjoint from the inverse image of \(\text{ran}(h)\) under \(\delta(\sigma)\). We also require that the portion of \(\delta(\sigma)\) yielding values in \(\text{ran}(h)\) should be a bijection. Let \(g\) be this subfunction of \(\delta(\sigma)\), and let \(s\) be \(\text{dom}(g)\).

**Definition 5.8** Let \(\sigma : \Omega, s : \text{sets}[\mathcal{P}], h, g : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\).
Figure 11: New Relation Created by a Second Copy Operation (Original Unaltered)

\[ \iff \]
- \( g \cdot \text{pk}_3(g, h, s, \sigma) \)
- \( \text{conjunction} \)
  - \( \text{bijective on } \{g, s, \text{ran}\{h\}\} \)
  - \( \text{dom}\{g\} \land \text{dom}\{\gamma(\sigma)\} \)
  - \( \text{dom}\{g\} \land \text{dom}\{h\} \)
  - \( \forall p : P \quad s. t. \quad g(p) \downarrow, \quad g(p) = \delta(\sigma)(p). \)

Theory: \textit{places}

In this case, we can achieve the desired result in two steps. First, we apply \( c \cdot \text{copy}(\sigma, h') \) to simulate the intended effect of the \( a \cdot \text{copy} \). Next, we apply \( c \cdot \text{redirect} \) to the resulting state, using \( g^{-1} \circ h \) as the redirection function.

**Theorem 5.9** case-\textit{3-mach-copy-thm}

\[ \forall \sigma : \Omega, g, h, h^+, h' : P \to P, s, v : \text{sets}[P] \quad \text{implication} \]
- \( \text{conjunction} \)
  - \( h \cdot \text{ok}(h, \sigma) \)
  - \( g \cdot h \cdot \text{pk}_3(g, h, s, \sigma) \)
  - \( \text{snapshot not visible}(g, v) \)
  - \( h^+ = \begin{cases} p : P \mapsto \text{conditionally, if } p \in \text{P}_H(\sigma) \\ \text{then } p \\ \text{else } h(p) \end{cases} \)
  - \( h' = \text{lower}(\sigma, h^+) \)
  - \( \text{copy fn}(\text{abstr}(\sigma), h^+) \)
- \( a \cdot \text{copy}(\text{abstr}(\sigma), h^+) \)
  - \( \cong \varepsilon \text{abstr}(c \cdot \text{redirect}(c \cdot \text{copy}(\sigma, h'), g^{-1} \circ h)). \)

Theory: \textit{places}
A Iteration of Functions in IMPS

A.1 Basic Properties of Iteration

In order to deal with the Copy-on-Write strategies, we need to define iteration and state a few general facts about it. This is done in the context of the IMPS theory generic-theory-1.

Definition (Recursive)  A.1 Let \( n : \mathbb{Z}, x : I_1, f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1 \).

\[
\text{iterate}(f, x)(n) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } n = 0 \\ f(\text{iterate}(f, x)(n-1)) & \text{else} \end{cases}
\]

Theory: generic-theory-1

Note that the expression \( \text{iterate}(f, x)(n) \) is usually written \( f^n(x) \).

Theorem A.2 iterate-front-back-lemma

\[
\forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, x : I_1, z : \mathbb{Z} \quad f(\text{iterate}(f, x)(z)) \simeq \text{iterate}(f, f(x))(z).
\]

Theory: generic-theory-1

The next result says that once an iterate becomes undefined it remains undefined.

Theorem A.3 iterate-definability-refinement

\[
\forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, x : I_1, z, j : \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{implication}
\]

- conjunction
  - \( 0 \leq j \)
  - \( j \leq z \)
  - \( \text{iterate}(f, x)(z) \downarrow \)
- \( \text{iterate}(f, x)(j) \downarrow \).

Theory: generic-theory-1

Theorem A.4 iterate-additivity

\[
\forall m, n : \mathbb{Z}, x : I_1, f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1 \quad s. t. \quad 0 \leq n \wedge 0 \leq m,
\]

\[
\text{iterate}(f, \text{iterate}(f, x)(n))(m) \simeq \text{iterate}(f, x)(n + m).
\]

Theory: generic-theory-1

Quasi-constructor A.5 Let \( f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, s : \text{sets}[I_1] \).

invariant\( [s, f] \) expands to \( \forall m : I_1 \quad s. t. \quad m \in s \wedge f(m) \downarrow, \)

\( f(m) \in s \).

Language: pure-generic-theory-1

Theorem A.6 iterate-invariance
\( \forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, z : I, a : \text{sets}[I_1] \) implication

- conjunction
  - invariant\{a, f\}
  - \( x \in a \)
  - \( 0 \leq z \)
  - iterate\((f, x)(z) \downarrow \)
- iterate\((f, x)(z) \in a \).

Theory: \textit{generic-theory-1}

\textbf{Theorem A.7 iterate-locality}

\( \forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, z : I, a : \text{sets}[I_1] \) s. t. invariant\{a, f\} \& \( x \in a \),

\[ \text{iterate}(f, x)(z) \simeq \text{iterate}(f[a], x)(z). \]

Theory: \textit{generic-theory-1}

The entry index of \( f \) relative to a set \( s \) is the first index \( n \) for which the iterate \( f^n(x) \) lands in \( s \). Later we define first entry which is the value \( f^n(x) \).

\textbf{Definition A.8 Let x : I_1, s : \text{sets}[I_1], f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1.}

entry index\((f, s, x) = \text{set min}\{ m : Z | \text{iterate}(f, x)(m) \in s \}. \)

Theory: \textit{generic-theory-1}

\textbf{Theorem A.9 entry index-characterization}

\( \forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, s : \text{sets}[I_1], x : I_1, n : Z \iff \)

- entry index\((f, s, x) = n \)
- conjunction
  - iterate\((f, x)(n) \in s \)
  - \( \forall m : Z \) \( m < n \supset \neg \text{iterate}(f, x)(m) \in s \).

Theory: \textit{generic-theory-1}

\textbf{Theorem A.10 entry index-definedness}

\( \forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, s : \text{sets}[I_1], x : I_1 \iff \)

- entry index\((f, s, x) \downarrow \)
- \( \exists n : Z \) iterate\((f, x)(n) \in s \).

Theory: \textit{generic-theory-1}

\textbf{Definition A.11 Let x : I_1, s : \text{sets}[I_1], f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1.}

first entry\((f, s, x) = \text{iterate}(f, x)(\text{entry index}(f, s, x)). \)

Theory: \textit{generic-theory-1}

\textbf{Theorem A.12 first entry-locality}

\( \forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, x : I_1, a, s : \text{sets}[I_1] \) s. t. invariant\{a, f\} \& \( x \in a \),

\[ \text{first entry}(f, s, x) \simeq \text{first entry}(f[a], s, x). \]

Theory: \textit{generic-theory-1}
Theorem A.13 \textit{first\% entry-restriction-lemma}
\[
\forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, x : I_1, a, s : \text{sets}[I_1] \quad \text{s. t. invariant}\{a, f\} \land x \in a,
\]
\[
\text{first}._\text{entry}(f, s, x) \simeq \text{first}._\text{entry}(f, s \cap a, x).
\]
Theory: \textit{generic\-theory-1}

Theorem A.14 \textit{first\% entry-characterization}
\[
\forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, s : \text{sets}[I_1], x, y : I_1 \quad \iff
\]
\[
\bullet \text{first}._\text{entry}(f, s, x) = y
\]
\[
\bullet \text{conjunction}
\]
\[
\circ y \in s
\]
\[
\circ \exists n : \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{iterate}(f, x)(n) = y \land (\forall m : \mathbb{Z} \quad m < n \supset -\text{iterate}(f, x)(m) \in s)).
\]
Theory: \textit{generic\-theory-1}

Theorem A.15 \textit{first\% entry-minimality}
\[
\forall g, f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, s : \text{sets}[I_1] \quad \text{implication}
\]
\[
\bullet \forall x : I_1 \quad g(x) \simeq \text{conditionally, if } x \in s
\]
\[
\circ \quad \text{then } x
\]
\[
\circ \quad \text{else } g(f(x))
\]
\[
\bullet \forall x : I_1, s, \text{ t. } \text{first}._\text{entry}(f, s, x) \downarrow,
\]
\[
\text{first}._\text{entry}(f, s, x) = g(x).
\]
Theory: \textit{generic\-theory-1}

Theorem A.16 \textit{first\% entry-definedness}
\[
\forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, s : \text{sets}[I_1], x, y : I_1 \quad \iff
\]
\[
\bullet \text{first}._\text{entry}(f, s, x) \downarrow
\]
\[
\bullet \exists n : \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{iterate}(f, x)(n) \in s.
\]
Theory: \textit{generic\-theory-1}

Theorem A.17 \textit{first\% entry-equation}
\[
\forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, x : I_1, s : \text{sets}[I_1] \quad \text{first}._\text{entry}(f, s, x) \simeq \text{conditionally, if } x \in s
\]
\[
\bullet \quad \text{then } x
\]
\[
\bullet \quad \text{else } \text{first}._\text{entry}(f, s, f(x)).
\]
Theory: \textit{generic\-theory-1}

A.2 Flow Extension and its Properties

In the following definition, we view \(f\) as generating a discrete flow. The function \(g\) is extended along the flow as follows:

Definition A.18 Let \(x : I_1, g : I_1 \rightarrow I_2, f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1\).
\[
\text{flow}._\text{ext}(f, g, x) = g(\text{first}._\text{entry}(f, \text{dom}\{g\}, x)).
\]
Theory: \textit{generic\-theory-2}

Theorem A.19 \textit{flow\%ext-definedness}
\( \forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, g : I_1 \rightarrow I_2, x : I_1 \quad \iff \quad \begin{align*}
\bullet & \text{ flow}_{\text{ext}}(f, g, x) \downarrow \\
\bullet & \exists n : \mathbb{Z} \quad g(\text{iterate}(f, x)(n)) \downarrow .
\end{align*} \)

Theory: generic-theory-2

**Theorem A.20** flow\textunderscore ext-minimality\textunderscore lemma

\( \forall g : I_1 \rightarrow I_2, f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, h : I_1 \rightarrow I_2 \quad \text{implication} \quad \begin{align*}
\bullet & \forall x : I_1 \quad g(x) \simeq \text{conditionally, if } h(x) \downarrow \\
\bullet & \quad \text{then } h(x) \\
\bullet & \quad \text{else } g(f(x)) \\
\bullet & \forall x : I_1 \quad \text{s. t. } \text{flow}_{\text{ext}}(f, h, x) \downarrow , \\
\text{flow}_{\text{ext}}(f, h, x) & \simeq g(x).
\end{align*} \)

Theory: generic-theory-2

**Theorem A.21** flow\textunderscore ext-minimality

\( \forall g : I_1 \rightarrow I_2, f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, h : I_1 \rightarrow I_2 \quad \text{implication} \quad \begin{align*}
\bullet & \forall x : I_1 \quad g(x) \simeq \text{conditionally, if } h(x) \downarrow \\
\bullet & \quad \text{then } h(x) \\
\bullet & \quad \text{else } g(f(x)) \\
\bullet & \forall x : I_1 \quad \text{s. t. } \text{flow}_{\text{ext}}(f, h, x) \downarrow , \\
\text{flow}_{\text{ext}}(f, h, x) & \simeq g(x).
\end{align*} \)

Theory: generic-theory-2

**Theorem A.22** first\textunderscore entry-iteration

\( \forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, x : I_1, a, s : \text{sets}[I_1] \quad \text{first}_{\text{entry}}(f, \{ x : I_1 \mid \text{first}_{\text{entry}}(f, s, x) \downarrow \}, x) \simeq \text{conditionally, if } \text{first}_{\text{entry}}(f, s, x) \downarrow \quad \begin{align*}
\bullet & \quad \text{then } x \\
\bullet & \quad \text{else } \bot I_1.
\end{align*} \)

Theory: generic-theory-1

**Theorem A.23** domain-of-flow\textunderscore ext-lemma

\( \forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, g : I_1 \rightarrow I_2, x : I_1 \quad \text{dom}([ x : I_1 \mapsto \text{flow}_{\text{ext}}(f, g, x)]) = \{ x : I_1 \mid \text{first}_{\text{entry}}(f, \text{dom}(g), x) \downarrow \}. \)

Theory: generic-theory-2

**Theorem A.24** flow\textunderscore ext-idempotency

\( \forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, g : I_1 \rightarrow I_2, x : I_1 \quad \text{flow}_{\text{ext}}(f, [ x : I_1 \mapsto \text{flow}_{\text{ext}}(f, g, x)]), x) \simeq \text{flow}_{\text{ext}}(f, g, x). \)

Theory: generic-theory-2

**Theorem A.25** locality-of-flow\textunderscore ext

\( \forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, g : I_1 \rightarrow I_2, x : I_1, a, s : \text{sets}[I_1] \text{ s. t. invariant}\{a, f\} \land x \in a, \\
\text{flow}_{\text{ext}}(f, g, x) \simeq \text{flow}_{\text{ext}}(f\{a, g\} a, x). \)

Theory: generic-theory-2

26
Theorem A.26 locality-of-flow*ext-corollary

\[ \forall f, f_1 : I_1 \rightarrow I_2, g : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, a, s : \text{sets}[I_1] \quad \text{implication} \]

- conjunction
  - invariant\{a, f\}
  - \( \forall m : I_1 \quad m \in a \supset (f(m) \simeq f_1(m) \land g(m) \simeq g_1(m)) \)
  - \( x \in a \)
- flow*ext\((f, g, x) \simeq \text{flow*ext}\((f, g_1, x)\).

Theory: generic-theory-2

Theorem A.27 flow*ext-recursive-equation

\[ \forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, g : I_1 \rightarrow I_2, x : I_1 \quad \text{flow*ext}\((f, g, x) \simeq \text{conditionally, if } g(x) \downarrow \]

- then \( g(x) \)
- else \( \text{flow*ext}\((f, g, f(x))\).

Theory: generic-theory-2

Theorem A.28 flow*ext-restriction-lemma

\[ \forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, g : I_1 \rightarrow I_2, x : I_1 \quad \text{flow*ext}\((f, g, x) \simeq \text{flow*ext}\((f \mid \text{dom}\{g\}, g, x)\).

Theory: generic-theory-2

Theorem A.29 flow*ext-restricted-invariance

\[ \forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, g : I_1 \rightarrow I_2 \quad \text{invariant}\{\text{dom}\{x : I_1 \mapsto \}

\quad \text{flow*ext}\((f, g, x)\}\}, f \mid \text{dom}\{g\} \}.

Theory: generic-theory-2

Theorem A.30 flow*ext-complement-invariance

\[ \forall f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, g : I_1 \rightarrow I_2 \quad \text{invariant}\{\text{Cdom}\{x : I_1 \mapsto \}

\quad \text{flow*ext}\((f, g, x)\}\}, f \}.

Theory: generic-theory-2

Theorem A.31 flow*ext-domain-monotonicity

\[ \forall g : I_1 \rightarrow I_2, f : I_1 \rightarrow I_1, h : I_1 \rightarrow I_2, x : I_1 \quad \text{implication} \]

- conjunction
  - \text{dom}\{g\} \subseteq \text{dom}\{h\}
  - \text{flow*ext}\((f, g, x) \downarrow \)
- \text{flow*ext}\((f, h, x) \downarrow \).

Theory: generic-theory-2
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