

Reactive Synthesis of Smart Contract Control Flows

Bernd Finkbeiner¹, Jana Hofmann², Florian Kohn¹, and Noemi Passing¹

¹ CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Saarbrücken, Germany
`{finkbeiner,florian.kohn,noemi.passing}@cispa.de`

² Microsoft Research, Cambridge, UK
`t-jhofmann@microsoft.com`

Abstract. Smart contracts are small but highly error-prone programs that implement agreements between multiple parties. We present a reactive synthesis approach for the automatic construction of smart contract state machines. Towards this end, we extend temporal stream logic (TSL) with universally quantified parameters over infinite domains. Parameterized TSL is a convenient logic to specify the temporal control flow, i.e., the correct order of transactions, as well as the data flow of the contract’s fields. We develop a two-step approach that 1) synthesizes a finite representation of the – in general – infinite-state system and 2) splits the system into a compact hierarchical architecture that enables efficient handling of the state machine in Solidity. We implement the approach in our tool SCSYNT, which leverages efficient symbolic algorithms based on the observation that smart contract specifications naturally fall into the safety fragment. As a result, SCSYNT synthesizes correct-by-design Solidity code from various specifications within seconds.

Keywords: Reactive Synthesis · Smart Contracts · Temporal Stream Logic.

1 Introduction

Smart contracts are small programs that implement digital contracts between multiple parties. They are deployed on the blockchain and thereby remove the need for a trusted third party that enforces a correct execution of the contract. Recent history, however, has witnessed numerous bugs in smart contracts, some of which led to substantial monetary losses. One critical aspect is the implicit state machine of a contract: to justify the removal of a trusted third party – a major selling point for smart contracts – all parties must trust that the contract indeed enforces the agreed order of transactions.

Formal methods play a significant role in the efforts to improve the trustworthiness of smart contracts. Indeed, the *code is law* paradigm is shifting towards a *specification is law* paradigm [1]. Formal verification has been successfully applied to prove the correctness of the implicit state machine of smart contracts, for example, by verifying the contract against temporal logic specifications [41,46,38]

or a given state machine [49]. Other approaches model the control flow with state machines and construct Solidity code from it [50,34,8,31]. Synthesis, i.e., the automatic construction of Solidity code *directly* from a temporal specification, has hardly been studied so far (except for a first step [47], see related work paragraph). This is despite the fact that the benefits of synthesis are especially applicable to smart contracts. Many contracts extend standardized classes like the ERC20 token standard with new functionality. Synthesis as a property-oriented approach enables an incremental development process: specifications can be easily extended with additional conjuncts describing new features. The implications on the state machine are handled by the synthesis algorithm.

In this paper, we study the synthesis of smart contracts from temporal stream logic (TSL), which we equip with universally quantified parameters. TSL extends linear-time temporal logic (LTL) with cells that hold data from an infinite domain. Additionally, it uses uninterpreted functions and predicates. These features enable us to reason about the order of transactions as well as the data flow of the contract’s fields. To distinguish method calls from different callers, we extend the logic with universally quantified parameters. For example, the following parameterized TSL formula expresses that every voter can only vote once and that a field `numVotes` is increased with every vote.

$$\forall m. \Box(\text{vote}(m) \rightarrow [\![\text{numVotes} \leftarrow \text{numVotes} + 1]\!] \wedge \Box\neg\text{vote}(m))$$

Due to the universal quantification over an infinite domain, the above formula describes an infinite-state system. This poses the challenges of 1) synthesizing a finite representation of the system that 2) can be translated into a Solidity contract that keeps the gas consumption at a moderate level.

We proceed in two steps. First, we observe that smart contract specifications fall into the safety fragment, which enables us to use the simpler past-time fragment of TSL. Unfortunately, we show that the realizability problem of pastTSL is already undecidable, even without parameters. For unparameterized pastTSL formulas, however, we can still employ a sound reduction to LTL, following [15].

In a second step, we lift the synthesis to parameterized pastTSL. We present a sound algorithm that splits the infinite-state machine into a hierarchical structure of smaller, distributed finite-state machines. This architecture minimizes the number of transactions needed to keep the system up to date at runtime.

We implement the toolchain in our tool SCSYNT, which, due to the past-time fragment, leverages efficient symbolic algorithms. We evaluate SCSYNT on ten different smart contract specifications, and obtain an average synthesis time of two seconds. Our largest specification is based on Avolab’s NFT auction [3] and produces a state machine with 12 states in 12 seconds. To summarize, we

- show how to specify smart contract control flows in pastTSL with and without parameters,
- prove undecidability of the general realizability problem of pastTSL,
- define pastTSL with universally quantified parameters and show how to synthesize infinite-state machines with an efficient representation in Solidity,

- present SCSYNT, the first tool that synthesizes smart contracts from a temporal specification that reasons about the transaction order, method access rights, and the fields’ data flow.

Related Work. Formal approaches to smart contracts range from the automatic construction of contracts from state machines [34,35], over the verification against temporal logics [41,46,38] and state machines [49,28], to deductive verification approaches [10,23]. Closest to our work is a synthesis approach based on LTL specifications [47]. The approach does not reason about the contract’s data, neither about the current value of the fields, nor about parameters like the method’s caller. To quote the authors of [47]: the main challenge in the synthesis of smart contracts is “how to strike a balance between simplicity and expressivity [...] to allow effective synthesis of practical smart contracts”. TSL has been successfully applied to synthesize the control flow of FPGAs [18] and functional reactive programs [14]. To include domain-specific reasoning, TSL has been extended with theories [13] and SMT solvers [32]. A recent approach combines TSL reactive synthesis with SyGus to synthesize implementations for TSL’s uninterpreted functions [7]. Parameterized synthesis has so far focused on distributed architectures parameterized in the number of components [22,24,25,33]. Orthogonal to this work, these approaches rely on a reduction to bounded isomorphic synthesis [22,24,25] or apply a learning-based approach [33].

Overview. We first provide some brief preliminaries on state machines, reactive synthesis, and TSL. In Section 3, we demonstrate how to specify smart contracts using pure pastTSL and prove the undecidability of its realizability problem. Next, in Section 4, we introduce parameterized pastTSL and demonstrate its features with the specification of an ERC20 contract. We proceed with the synthesis algorithm for parameterized specifications in Section 5. Finally, in Sections 6 and 7, we present the implementation and evaluation of SCSYNT.

2 Preliminaries

We assume familiarity with linear-time temporal logic (LTL). A definition with past-time temporal operators can be found in [19,9]. We only assume basic knowledge about smart contracts; for an introduction we refer to [12].

2.1 State Machines and Reactive Synthesis

We give a very brief introduction to Mealy machines, safety properties and reactive synthesis. A more detailed version of these preliminaries is given in Appendix A. In this work, we interpret smart contracts as reactive systems represented by *Mealy state machines* [37]. A Mealy machine is a tuple (S, s_0, δ) of states S , initial state s_0 , and transition relation $\delta \subseteq S \times I \cup O \times S$. We work with specifications that are *safety properties* (see, [27,29]). Given an LTL safety formula φ , we can represent its safety region with a Mealy machine, meaning that a trace t satisfies φ iff it is a trace of the Mealy machine.

For a safety specification, the *reactive synthesis* problem is to determine the *winning region*, i.e., the maximal subset of its safety region such that for every state and input combination, there is a transition into said subset. For specifications that consist of assumptions and guarantees, we only depict the transitions of a winning region whose inputs are allowed by the assumption. As an example, consider the specification with input a , output b , assumption $\Box(a \rightarrow \neg \Diamond a)$, and guarantee $\Box((b \rightarrow \neg \Diamond b) \wedge (b \rightarrow \odot \Box \neg a))$. The winning region for this example is depicted in Figure 1.




Fig. 1: Exemplary winning region. | separates inputs and outputs.

2.2 Past-time Temporal Stream Logic

PastTSL is the past-time variant of TSL [15], which extends LTL with cells that can hold data from a possibly infinite domain. To abstract from concrete data, TSL includes uninterpreted functions and predicates. *Function terms* $\tau_f \in \mathcal{T}_F$ are recursively defined by

$$\tau_f ::= \mathbf{s} \mid f \tau_f^1 \dots \tau_f^n$$

where \mathbf{s} is either a cell $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{C}$ or an input $i \in \mathbb{I}$, and $f \in \Sigma_F$ is a function symbol. Constants are 0-ary function symbols. *Predicate terms* $\tau_p \in \mathcal{T}_P$ are obtained by applying a predicate symbol $p \in \Sigma_P$ with $\Sigma_P \subseteq \Sigma_F$ to a tuple of function terms. PastTSL formulas are built according to the following grammar:

$$\varphi, \psi ::= \neg \varphi \mid \varphi \wedge \psi \mid \ominus \varphi \mid \varphi \mathcal{S} \psi \mid \tau_p \mid \llbracket \mathbf{c} \leftarrow \tau_f \rrbracket$$

An *update term* $\llbracket \mathbf{c} \leftarrow \tau_f \rrbracket \in \mathcal{T}_U$ denotes that cell \mathbf{c} is overwritten with τ_f . The temporal operators are called “Yesterday” \ominus and “Since” \mathcal{S} . Inputs, function symbols, and predicate symbols are purely syntactic objects. To assign meaning to them, let \mathcal{V} be the set of values with $\mathbb{B} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. We denote by $\mathcal{I} : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ the evaluation of inputs. An *assignment function* $\langle \cdot \rangle : \Sigma_F \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ assigns function symbols to functions $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{V}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$.

The type $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_U$ describes an update of all cells. For every cell $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{C}$, let $init_{\mathbf{c}}$ its initial value. The evaluation function $\eta_{\langle \cdot \rangle} : \mathcal{C}^\omega \times \mathcal{I}^\omega \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathcal{T}_F \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ evaluates a function term at point in time t with respect to an *input stream* $\iota \in \mathcal{I}^\omega$ and a *computation* $\varsigma \in \mathcal{C}^\omega$:

$$\eta_{\langle \cdot \rangle}(\varsigma, \iota, t, \mathbf{s}) := \begin{cases} \iota \ t \ \mathbf{s} & \text{if } \mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{I} \\ init_{\mathbf{s}} & \text{if } \mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{C} \wedge t = 0 \\ \eta_{\langle \cdot \rangle}(\varsigma, \iota, t-1, \varsigma \ (t-1) \ \mathbf{s}) & \text{if } \mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{C} \wedge t > 0 \end{cases}$$

$$\eta_{\langle \cdot \rangle}(\varsigma, \iota, t, f \ \tau_0 \dots \tau_{m-1}) := \langle f \rangle \ \eta_{\langle \cdot \rangle}(\varsigma, \iota, t, \tau_0) \dots \eta_{\langle \cdot \rangle}(\varsigma, \iota, t, \tau_{m-1})$$

Note that $\iota \ t \ \mathbf{s}$ denotes the value of \mathbf{s} at position t according to ι . Likewise, $\varsigma \ t \ \mathbf{s}$ is the function term that ς assigns to \mathbf{s} at position t . For the semantics

of pastTSL, we concentrate on the cases that differ from the standard, LTL-like semantics. The full semantics is provided in Appendix A.2.

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma, \iota, t \models_{\langle \rangle} \llbracket \mathbf{v} \leftarrow \tau \rrbracket & \quad \text{iff} \quad \varsigma \ t \ \mathbf{v} \equiv \tau \\ \varsigma, \iota, t \models_{\langle \rangle} p \ \tau_0 \dots \tau_m & \quad \text{iff} \quad \eta_{\langle \rangle}(\varsigma, \iota, t, p \ \tau_0 \dots \tau_{m-1}) \end{aligned}$$

We use \equiv to syntactically compare two terms. We derive three additional operators: $\ominus \varphi := \neg \ominus \neg \varphi$, $\Diamond \varphi := \text{true} \ \mathcal{S} \ \varphi$, and $\Box \varphi := \neg \Diamond \neg \varphi$. The difference between \ominus and “Weak Yesterday” \odot is that \ominus evaluates to *false* in the first step, \odot to *true*. We use pastTSL formulas to describe safety properties. Therefore, we define that computation ς and an input stream ι satisfy a pastTSL formula φ , written $\varsigma, \iota \models_{\langle \rangle} \varphi$, if $\forall t \in \mathbb{N}. \varsigma, \iota, t \models_{\langle \rangle} \varphi$.

The realizability problem of a pastTSL formula φ asks whether there exists a strategy which reacts to predicate evaluations with cell updates according to φ . Formally, a strategy is a function $\sigma : (2^{\mathcal{T}_P})^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. For $\iota \in \mathcal{I}^\omega$, we write $\sigma(\iota)$ for the computation $\varsigma = \sigma(\iota[0]) \ \sigma(\iota[0..1]) \ \sigma(\iota[0..2]) \dots$. A strategy induces an infinite *strategy tree* that branches according to the predicate evaluations and whose nodes are labeled with the cell updates chosen by the system.

Definition 1 ([15]). *A pastTSL formula φ is realizable if, and only if, there exists a strategy $\sigma : (2^{\mathcal{T}_P})^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ such that for every input stream $\iota \in \mathcal{I}^\omega$ and every assignment function $\langle \rangle : \Sigma_F \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ it holds that $\sigma(\iota), \iota \models_{\langle \rangle} \varphi$.*

3 Synthesis from Pure PastTSL Specifications

We first demonstrate the use of pastTSL for the specification of smart contracts with the example of a small voting contract. Second, we show that even though past-time variants of temporal logics usually lead to significantly easier algorithms [27], the pastTSL realizability problem is undecidable in general.

Form of our Specifications. Our specifications describe the temporal control flow of the contract’s method calls and the data flow of its fields. We distinguish between *requirements* φ_R , *obligations* φ_O , and *assumptions* φ_A . Requirements enforce the right order of method calls with correct arguments. Obligations describe the data flow in the fields of the contract. Assumptions formulate properties of uninterpreted predicates that are needed for the synthesis to succeed. Each type of specification can be given as invariant φ^{inv} or as initial formula φ^{init} . Together, they form the following pastTSL formula, which we, according to the definition of pastTSL, require to hold globally:

$$(\ominus \text{false} \rightarrow \varphi_A^{init} \wedge \varphi_R^{init}) \wedge (\Box(\varphi_A^{inv} \wedge \varphi_R^{inv})) \rightarrow (\ominus \text{false} \rightarrow \varphi_O^{init}) \wedge \varphi_O^{inv}$$

We use $\ominus \text{false}$ to refer to the first position of a trace. In the following, we indicate invariants with a preceding \Box operator to improve readability.

3.1 Example: Voting Contract

We specify a small voting contract with three methods: `vote`, `close`, and `reveal`. The fields of the contract are described with TSL's cells, here we use a single cell `voters`. In the context of smart contracts, we use the terms cells and fields interchangeably. Additionally, our specification uses an input `sender`, which holds the current caller of the method, and a constant `owner()`, which is the static owner of the contract. The requirements φ_R are a conjunct of the following formulas.

```

□((close → ⊙ □ ¬close) ∧ (reveal → ◇ close))
□(close → sender = owner() ∧ time > cTime())
□(vote → ¬(sender ∈ voters) ∧ ¬(time > cTime()))

```

Technically, `close` is syntactic sugar for a predicate term `isClose(methodinput)`. In our tool (see Section 6), we automatically add that at most one method is called in each step. `sender` refers to the caller of the method. The first invariant describes the control flow of the contract, the other two express conditions that must hold for a call. E.g., method `close` can only be called by the owner and after a threshold `cTime()` was passed. Lastly, as obligations φ_O , we state that the field `voters` is updated when `vote` is called and left unchanged otherwise:

```

□(vote → [voters ← add(sender, voters)])
□(¬vote → [voters ← voters])

```

We also need a typical consistency assumption on the `time` input:

```

□(⊙(time > cTime()) → time > cTime())

```

For a useful contract, we would probably also add fields to count the votes for each respective candidate. We skip this part in this toy example.

On Safety Properties. For smart contracts, safety specifications seem to lie in a sweet spot between expressiveness and synthesis performance (see Section 7). In our experience, this choice did not feel restrictive, as many contracts enforce that no party can betray the other with a malicious sequence of transactions.

3.2 PastTSL Undecidability

We establish undecidability of pastTSL realizability by a reduction from the universal halting problem of lossy counter machines [36]. We employ a version of lossiness where a counter can suddenly become zero if it is tested for zero [36]. A definition of n -counter machines is provided in Appendix B.1.

Theorem 1. *The pastTSL realizability problem is undecidable.*

Proof (sketch). We use the undecidable problem whether a 4-counter machine with lossiness halts from every initial configuration [36]. The main idea is to use two cells c_x^{inc} and c_x^{dec} for each counter x . Expression $f(c_x^{inc})$ increases x and $f(c_x^{dec})$ decreases it. To test a counter for zero, we use $\psi_x^0 := p(c_x^{inc}) \leftrightarrow p(c_x^{dec})$. If x really is zero, then ψ_x^0 must evaluate to true according to the semantics of pastTSL. If not, ψ_x^0 may evaluate to true, which corresponds to lossy behavior. We use the temporal operators of pastTSL to encode that the machine never reaches a halting state. The full proof is given in Appendix B.1.




Fig. 2: Winning region of the voting specification.

PastTSL Synthesis via PastLTL Approximation Even if the pastTSL synthesis problem is undecidable, we can employ a reduction from TSL to LTL proposed in [15] to synthesize a state machine. Given a TSL formula φ , we define

$$\psi_{\text{pastLTL}} := \text{syntacticConversion}(\varphi) \wedge \text{cellUpdates}(\varphi)$$

where $\text{syntacticConversion}(\varphi)$ replaces all predicate and update terms of φ with unique atomic propositions, e.g., a_{p-x} for $p(x)$ and $a_{x.to-f.x}$ for $\llbracket x \leftarrow f(x) \rrbracket$. Formula $\text{cellUpdates}(\varphi)$ ensures that every cell is updated with exactly one function term in each step. If φ is a pastTSL formula, then ψ_{pastLTL} is a pastLTL formula.

The reduction is sound but not complete, i.e., the TSL formula might be realizable even if the LTL formula is not. This is because the LTL formula does not enforce consistent predicate evaluations on cells that logically must contain the same value. As an example, after an update $\llbracket x \leftarrow y \rrbracket$, all predicates must evaluate to the same value on x and y according to the TSL semantics. This is not enforced in the LTL formula, where setting a_{p-x} to *true* and a_{p-y} to *false* constitutes a valid input. In the case of spurious unrealizability, [15] describes how to refine the LTL formula to exclude the spurious input valuations. Interestingly, for our smart contract specifications, we never encountered spurious unrealizability. In practice, the approximation seems to work quite well.

For the voting example of Section 3.1, the state machine is depicted in Figure 2. We automatically translate this state machine into Solidity code (c.f. Section 6), which by design enforces a correct order of method calls and data flow in the contract.

4 Parameterized PastTSL

In this section, we introduce parameterized pastTSL for the specification of smart contract temporal control flows. We first illustrate the logic by means of two examples: an extension of the voting specification presented in Section 3.1 and an ERC20 token contract. We then formally define parameterized TSL and, for approximations, parameterized LTL.

4.1 Parameterized Contract Specifications

Parameterized Voting Contract. Parameters enable us to distinguish between different calls to the same method. They may refer to the caller of the method

or to one of the method’s arguments. We write `vote(m)` for a call to method `vote` with parameter `m`; it is syntactic sugar for `isVote(methodinput, m)`. In this example, `m` refers to the caller of the method (this information is added for the translation to Solidity, see Section 6). Compared with the specification in Section 3.1, we do not have to use a field that stores the voters in order to make sure that everybody only votes once. Instead, we simply state:

$$\forall m. \Box(\text{vote}(m) \rightarrow \Box \neg \text{vote}(m))$$

In the following, we do not explicitly add the universal quantification as all parameters are always universally quantified.

ERC Token Contract. As a second example, we illustrate how specifications with parameters can be used to specify an ERC20 token system. We follow the Open Zeppelin documentation [39] but also add additional functionality. An ERC20 token system provides a platform to transfer tokens between different accounts. The core contract consists of methods `transfer`, `transferFrom`, and `approve`. We do not model getters like `totalSupply` or `balanceOf` as they are not relevant for the temporal behavior of the contract. From a synthesis point-of-view, the challenge is that there is not only a global control flow but also one for each pair of accounts interacting with the contract. We therefore use two parameters `m` and `n`, where `m` refers to the address from which tokens are subtracted and parameter `n`, whenever different from `m`, to the contract that initiates the transfer. Parameterized fields correspond to mappings.

We only present some key aspects of the specification, the full spec can be found in Appendix C.1. First, if we want to transfer from `m`’s account, there needs to be sufficient funds available:

$$\Box(\text{transfer}(m) \vee \text{transferFrom}(m,n) \rightarrow \text{suffFunds}(m, \text{arg@amount}))$$

Above, the label `arg@` indicates that `amount` is the current method’s argument. If `n` wants to transfer from `m`’s account, the requested amount must have been approved. We use a mapping `approved(m,n)` to record the amount of tokens `m` allows `n` to spend in their name.

$$\begin{aligned} &\Box(\text{transferFrom}(m,n) \rightarrow \text{approved}(m,n) \geq \text{arg@amount} \\ &\quad \wedge \llbracket \text{approved}(m,n) \leftarrow \text{approved}(m,n) - \text{arg@amount} \rrbracket) \end{aligned}$$

The Open Zeppelin ERC20 contract offers various extensions of the core contract, one of which is the ability to pause all transfers. We additionally add methods `localPause(m)` and `localUnpause(m)`. While `pause` stops *all* transfers, `localPause(m)` can be called by `m` to stop transfers from `m`’s account only. We specify local pausing as follows. Global pausing is specified similarly.

$$\begin{aligned} &\Box(\text{transferFrom}(m,n) \vee \text{transfer}(m) \vee \text{approve}(m,n) \\ &\quad \rightarrow ((\neg \text{localPause}(m)) \mathcal{S} \text{localUnpause}(m)) \vee \Box \neg \text{localPause}(m)) \end{aligned}$$

Note that the correct addition and subtraction of tokens upon transfer must currently still be implemented by hand. We discuss this limitation in Section 5.5.

As parameters are universally quantified, the specification describes a state machine for each instantiation of the parameters. This state machine is depicted




Fig. 3: Synthesized state machine of the ERC20 token system with local pause function. Predicates that are not relevant for the transition and all field updates are omitted for readability. We also write **a** instead of **arg@amount**.

in Figure 3. The different instances are not independent, though. The contract can be in different states for different instantiations of **m** and **n**. But, if **pause** is called, all instances must move to a state where no transfer is possible.

4.2 Parameterized LTL and TSL

We introduce parameterized TSL and parameterized LTL together with some notation we make use of in the next section.

Parameterized TSL Technically, parameterized TSL is TSL with quantification over infinitely many constants and cells. Let P be a set of parameters and \mathbb{C}_P a set of parameterized cells, where each cell is of the form $c(p_1, \dots, p_m)$ with $p_1, \dots, p_m \in P$. A parameterized TSL formula is a formula $\forall p_1, \dots, \forall p_n. \psi$, where ψ is a TSL formula with cells from \mathbb{C}_P and which allows parameters from P as base terms in function terms and predicate terms. We require that the formula is closed, i.e., every parameter occurring in ψ is bound in the quantifier prefix.

Parameterized TSL formulas are evaluated with respect to a domain \mathbb{P} for the parameters. To keep the definition of the semantics simple, we assume that \mathbb{P} is a subset of the set of constants. We use $\mu : P \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$ to denote a function that instantiates all parameters. For each μ , we assume that $c(\mu(p_1), \dots, \mu(p_m)) \in \mathbb{C}$, i.e., the instantiation of a parameterized cell refers to a normal cell. Given a parameterized TSL formula $\forall p_1, \dots, \forall p_n. \psi$, let $\psi[\mu]$ be the TSL formula obtained by replacing all parameters in ψ according to μ . Given a computation ς and an input stream ι , we define $\varsigma, \iota \models \forall p_1, \dots, \forall p_n. \psi$ iff $\forall \mu : P \rightarrow \mathbb{P}. \varsigma, \iota \models \psi[\mu]$.

Parameterized LTL Parameterized LTL has been studied in the settings parameterized verification [2] and parameterized synthesis [22]. We define it analogously to parameterized TSL. A parameterized LTL formula is a closed formula $\forall p_1, \dots, \forall p_n. \psi$ such that $p_1, \dots, p_n \in P$ and ψ is an LTL formula over atomic propositions AP , each of the form $a(p_1, \dots, p_m)$. We usually denote the sequence p_1, \dots, p_m with some P_i , for which we also use set notation. We assume that every proposition occurs with only one sequence of parameters, i.e., there are no $a(P_i), a(P_j) \in AP$ with $P_i \neq P_j$. If a is not parameterized, then $P_i = \emptyset$.

Given $P_i = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$ and $\mu : P \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$, $P_i[\mu]$ denotes $(\mu(p_1), \dots, \mu(p_m))$. For $a(P_i) \in AP$ we write, slightly abusing notation, $a \in AP$ and $a[\mu]$ for $a(P_i[\mu])$. Let $AP_{\mathbb{P}} = \{a[\mu] \mid a \in AP, \mu : P \rightarrow \mathbb{P}\}$. For each $\alpha \in AP_{\mathbb{P}}$, there is exactly one a such that $a[\mu] = \alpha$ for some μ . A trace t over $AP_{\mathbb{P}}$ satisfies a parameterized LTL formula $\forall p_1, \dots, p_n. \psi$ if for all μ , it holds that $t \models \psi[\mu]$.

We can approximate parameterized TSL with parameterized LTL. We translate TSL predicate and update terms to LTL input and output propositions as described in Section 3.2 but keep all parameters a term contains as parameters of the proposition. For example, $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{m}) > \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{n})$ is translated to some parameterized proposition $a_greater_b(m, n)$.

5 Synthesis from Parameterized PastTSL

The synthesis of a smart contract from a pastTSL specification comes with several challenges. Our aim is to translate the state machine to Solidity code, so we need to make sure that the state machine is finitely representable. Furthermore, as each Solidity computation costs gas, we need to minimize the number of transactions needed to update the transition system at runtime. We first formulate synthesis problem formally and describe our approach in a nutshell, before we proceed with the algorithm and finally prove its correctness.

5.1 Problem Definition

Let a parameterized pastLTL formula $\varphi = \forall p_1, \dots, p_n. \psi$ over $AP = I \cup O$ be given, which is the approximation of a parameterized pastTSL formula. For $A \subseteq AP$, we write $A|_O$ instead of $A \cap O$. We denote the set of atomic propositions that correspond to some method call $\mathbf{f}(P_i)$ by $I_{call} \subseteq I$ and the set of output propositions that denote self-updates like $\llbracket \mathbf{voters} \leftarrow \mathbf{voters} \rrbracket$ by $O_{self} \subseteq O$.

Definition 2. Let \mathbb{P} be a parameter domain. An infinite-state machine \mathcal{M} over $2^{AP_{\mathbb{P}}}$ implements a smart contract if (i) for each transition $(s, A, s') \in \delta$, there is exactly one $\alpha \in A$ with $\alpha = \mathbf{f}(P_i)[\mu]$ for some μ and $\mathbf{f}(P_i) \in I_{call}$ and (ii) in every state $s \in S$, for every instance μ , and all inputs $A_I \subseteq I$, there exists a transition $(s, A, s') \in \delta$ such that $\{a[\mu] \mid a \in A_I\} \subseteq A$.

The definition requires that in each state, every instance must have the possibility to make progress. An instance is given by an instantiation μ of the parameters. In each transition, on the other hand, the state machine processes a method call for exactly one instance of the parameters. This does not mean that only one instance makes progress per transition. For example, if `localPause(m)` is called with $\mu(\mathbf{m}) = 1$ in the ERC20 token system from Section 4.1, this affects all instances μ' with $\mu'(\mathbf{m}) = 1$. To project on steps relevant for an instance μ , we project the traces of \mathcal{M} to steps that either include a method call to μ or a non-self-update of one of μ 's fields. For $A \subseteq AP_{\mathbb{P}}$, we define A_{μ} as $\{\alpha \in A \mid \exists a \in AP. \alpha = a[\mu]\}$. Given $t \in \text{traces}(\mathcal{M})$, let $t' = (t[0])_{\mu}(t[1])_{\mu} \dots$. Now, we define t_{μ} to be the trace obtained from t' by deleting all positions i such




Fig. 4: State machines for all non-empty parameter sets. For readability, we omit the value predicates and field updates.

that $(t[i]_\mu)_O \subseteq O_{self}$ and $\neg \exists f(P_i) \in I_{call}. f(P_i)[\mu] \in t'[i]$. Note that t_μ might be a finite trace even if t is infinite. Since t_μ only deletes steps from t that do not change the value of the cells, t_μ still constitutes a sound computation regarding the original pastTSL formula. We define $traces_\mu(\mathcal{M}) = \{t_\mu \mid t \in traces(\mathcal{M})\}$. Similarly, $finTraces_\mu(\mathcal{M}) = \{t_\mu \mid t \in finTraces(\mathcal{M})\}$. We use $traces(\mathcal{M})$ and $finTraces(\mathcal{M})$ for the (in)finite traces of a state machine, see Appendix A.1.

Definition 3. A state machine implementing a smart contract satisfies a pastLTL formula $\varphi = \forall p_1. \dots, \forall p_n. \psi$ if for all instances μ and traces $t_\mu \in traces_\mu(\mathcal{M})$, we have $t_\mu \models \psi[\mu]$.

5.2 Approach in a Nutshell

In a nutshell, we proceed as follows. First, we interpret the specification as being unquantified, i.e., we treat parameters as being part of the proposition's name. The synthesized finite-state machine describes the behavior of a single instance. The different instances depend on each other; therefore, it is not possible to just keep a duplicate of the state machine for every instance: if `localPause(m)` is called for $m = 1$, this needs to be recorded in all state machines for instances that share the value of m . We would have to iterate over all state machines of so-far observed instances, which would be way too costly in Solidity.

To obtain a more feasible solution, we describe an algorithm to split the synthesized state machine into multiple machines, one for each subset of parameters. Together, these machines represent the full system. For the ERC20 example, we obtain the three systems depicted in Figure 4. Each node is labeled with a “knowledge” set K . If we follow a run of the original system in all subsystems, the knowledge states denote which state the original system might be in. We also add guards to the transitions, where `in_s1` means that the subsystem can only take the transition if it knows for sure that the full system is currently in state s_1 . The systems share their knowledge about the state of the original system in a hierarchical structure. A subsystem for parameters P_i may share its knowledge only with systems for parameters $P_j \supseteq P_i$. We define an independence check that is successful if every subsystem comes at every state to a definite conclusion whether a transition can be taken.

In the following, we first describe the splitting algorithm together with two technical requirements on the synthesized finite-state machine and the independence criterion. For the correctness argument, we define how the distributed knowledge about the current state of the system can be put together to construct a realizing infinite-state machine. Finally, we argue that the approach is sound, i.e., if all criteria are met, then the infinite-state machine implements a smart contract that satisfies the parameterized formula.

5.3 Splitting Algorithm

Let $\varphi = \forall p_1 \dots \forall p_n. \psi$ and let $\mathcal{W} = (S_{\mathcal{W}}, s_{\mathcal{W}}^0, \delta_{\mathcal{W}})$ be the finite-state machine over AP that represents the winning region of ψ . We define two requirements on \mathcal{W} , which can be checked easily by inspecting all its transitions. First, we require that calls to a method parameterized with parameter sequence P_i only lead to field updates parameterized with the same parameter sequence.

Requirement 1 (Local Updates). *For every transition $(s, A, s') \in \delta_{\mathcal{W}}$, if $\circ(P_i) \in A|_O$ and $\circ(P_i) \notin O_{\text{self}}$, then there is a method call proposition $\mathbf{f}(P_i) \in A$.*

Second, whether a method can be called at a given state must not depend on predicates with parameters that are not included in the current method call.

Requirement 2 (Independence of Irrelevant Predicates). *For every $(s, A, s') \in \delta_{\mathcal{W}}$, if $\mathbf{f}(P_i) \in A$, then for every $a(P_j) \in I$ with $P_j \not\subseteq P_i$ and $a(P_j) \notin I_{\text{call}}$, there is a transition (s, A', s') with $a(P_j) \in A$ iff $a(P_j) \notin A'$ and $A|_O = A'|_O$.*

If \mathcal{W} satisfies the above requirements, we split the state machine into multiple state machines, one for every subset P_i of parameters. Each \mathcal{W}_{P_i} projects \mathcal{W} to the method calls with parameters P_i . We label each state of \mathcal{W}_{P_i} with the state's knowledge regarding the global state of the contract. The algorithm to construct \mathcal{W}_{P_i} combines several standard automata-theoretic concepts:

1. Introduce a new guard proposition in_s for every state $s \in S_{\mathcal{W}}$ of \mathcal{W} . For every transition $(s, A, s') \in \delta_{\mathcal{W}}$, replace A with $A \cup \{\text{in}_s\}$.
2. Label all transitions $(s, A, s') \in \delta_{\mathcal{W}}$ for which there is no $\mathbf{f}(P_i) \in A$ with ϵ . The result is a nondeterministic safety automaton with ϵ -edges.
3. \mathcal{W}_{P_i} is obtained by determinizing the safety automaton using the standard subset construction. This removes all ϵ transitions. During the construction, we label each state with the subset of $S_{\mathcal{W}}$ it represents, these are the knowledge sets.

We use S_i for the states of \mathcal{W}_{P_i} , δ_i for its transition relation, and $K_i : S_i \rightarrow 2^{S_{\mathcal{W}}}$ for the knowledge sets. Note that every transition in \mathcal{W} is labeled with exactly one method call proposition and is therefore present in exactly one \mathcal{W}_{P_i} . The following two propositions follow from the correctness of the subset construction for the determinization of finite automata. The first proposition states that the outgoing transitions of a state $s_i \in \mathcal{W}_{P_i}$ are exactly the outgoing transitions of all states $s \in K_i(s_i)$.

Proposition 1. *For every state $s_i \in S_i$, if $s \in K_i(s_i)$, then for all $s' \in S$ and $A \subseteq AP$, $(s, A, s') \in \delta_{\mathcal{W}}$ iff $(s_i, A \cup \{\text{in}_s\}, s'_i) \in \delta_i$ for some $s'_i \in S_i$.*

The second one states that the knowledge labels in \mathcal{W}_{P_i} are consistent with the transitions of \mathcal{W} .

Proposition 2. *Let $(s, A, s') \in \delta_{\mathcal{W}}$ with $f(P_i) \in A$. Then, for every state $s_i \in S_i$ with $s \in K_i(s_i)$, and every transition $(s_i, A \cup \{\text{in}_s\}, s'_i) \in \delta_i$, it holds that $s' \in K_i(s'_i)$. Furthermore, for every s_j of \mathcal{W}_{P_j} with $i \neq j$, if $s \in K_j(s_j)$, then $s' \in K_j(s_j)$.*

Check for Independence We now define the check if transitions in \mathcal{W}_{P_i} can be taken independently of the current state of all \mathcal{W}_{P_j} with $P_j \not\subseteq P_i$. If the check is positive, we can implement the system efficiently in Solidity: when a method $f(P_i)$ is called, we only need to make progress in system \mathcal{W}_{P_i} and whether the transition can be taken only depends on parameters P_i .

Let s_i and s'_i be states in \mathcal{W}_{P_i} and $A \subseteq AP$. Let $G_{(s_i, A, s'_i)} = \{s \mid (s_i, A \cup \{\text{in}_s\}, s'_i) \in \delta_i\}$ be the set of all guard propositions that occur on transitions from s_i to s'_i with A . Let P_{j_1}, \dots, P_{j_l} be the maximum set of parameter subsets such that $P_{j_k} \subseteq P_i$ for $1 \leq k \leq l$. A transition (s_i, A, s'_i) is *independent* if for all states s_{j_1}, \dots, s_{j_l} with $s_{j_k} \in S_{j_k}$ either

- (i) $K_i(s_i) \cap \bigcap_{1 \leq k \leq l} K_{j_k}(s_{j_k}) \subseteq G_{(s_i, A, s'_i)}$ or
- (ii) $(K_i(s_i) \cap \bigcap_{1 \leq k \leq l} K_{j_k}(s_{j_k})) \cap G_{(s_i, A, s'_i)} = \emptyset$.

The check combines the knowledge of \mathcal{W}_{P_i} in state s_i with the knowledge of each combination of states from $\mathcal{W}_{P_{j_1}}, \dots, \mathcal{W}_{P_{j_l}}$. For each potential combination, it must be possible to determine whether transition (s_i, A, s'_i) can be taken. If the first condition is satisfied, then the combined knowledge leads to the definite conclusion that \mathcal{W} is currently in a state where an A -transition can be taken. If the second condition is satisfied, it definitely cannot be taken. If none of the two is satisfied, then the combined knowledge of P_i and all P_{j_k} is not sufficient to reach a definite answer. Note that some state combinations $s_i, s_{j_1}, \dots, s_{j_l}$ might be impossible to reach. But then, we have that $K_i(s_i) \cap \bigcap_{1 \leq k \leq l} K_{j_k}(s_{j_k}) = \emptyset$ and the second condition is satisfied. The check is successful if all transitions (s_i, A, s'_i) in all δ_i are independent.

5.4 Correctness

If the above check is successful, all \mathcal{W}_{P_i} together represent an infinite-state machine \mathcal{M} that implements a smart contract. We construct \mathcal{M} as follows. A state in \mathcal{M} is a collection of $n = |2^P|$ functions f_1, \dots, f_n , where $f_i : \mathbb{P}^m \rightarrow S_i$ if $P_i = (p_{i_1}, \dots, p_{i_m})$. Each f_i indicates in which state of \mathcal{W}_{P_i} instance μ currently is. The initial state is the collection of functions that all map to the initial states of their respective \mathcal{W}_{P_i} . For every state $s = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ of \mathcal{M} , every $P_i \subseteq P$, and every instance μ , we add a transition where $P_i[\mu]$ makes progress and all other instances stay idle. Let $f_i(P_i[\mu]) = s_i$, $s'_i \in S_i$, $A \subseteq AP$, and

$G_{(s_i, A, s'_i)} = \{s \mid (s_i, A \cup \{\text{in}_s\}, s'_i) \in \delta_i\}$. Let P_{j_1}, \dots, P_{j_l} be all subsets of P_i . If $K_i(s_i) \cap \bigcap_{1 \leq k \leq l} K_{j_k}(f_{j_k}(P_{j_k}[\mu])) \subseteq G_{(s_i, A, s'_i)}$, we add the transition (s, A', s') to \mathcal{M} , where A' and s' are defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} A' &= \{a[\mu] \mid a \in A\} \cup \{o[\mu'] \mid o \in O_{\text{self}}, o[\mu'] \neq o[\mu]\} \\ s' &= (f_1, \dots, f_i[P_i[\mu] \mapsto s'_i], \dots, f_n) \end{aligned}$$

The label A' sets all propositions of instance μ as in A and sets all other input propositions to *false*. Of all other outputs propositions, it only sets those denoting self-updates to *true*.

We observe that, as \mathcal{W} describes a collection of strategies for ψ , \mathcal{M} describes a smart contract as defined in Definition 2. It remains to prove that the traces of \mathcal{M} satisfy φ according to Definition 3. Most of the work is done in the following lemma. We define \mathcal{W}_μ as the state machine that replaces the transition labels of \mathcal{W} with their instantiations according to μ , i.e., if $(s, A, s') \in \mathcal{W}$, then $(s, A[\mu], s') \in \mathcal{W}_\mu$. We provide a proof of the lemma in Appendix B.2.

Lemma 1. *For every instance μ , $\text{traces}_\mu(\mathcal{M}) \cup \text{finTraces}_\mu(\mathcal{M}) = \text{traces}(\mathcal{W}_\mu) \cup \text{finTraces}(\mathcal{W}_\mu)$.*

Not every infinite run of \mathcal{M} corresponds to an infinite run in \mathcal{W}_μ for every μ . Therefore, the above lemma only holds for the union of finite and infinite traces. However, as we work with past-time logics, a trace satisfies a formula iff all its prefixes satisfy the formula. Thus, \mathcal{M} satisfies a pastLTL formula ψ iff for every $t \in \text{traces}(\mathcal{M}) \cup \text{finTraces}(\mathcal{M})$, it holds that $t \models \psi$. From the above lemma we therefore directly obtain the desired correctness result for \mathcal{M} .

Theorem 2. *Let $\varphi = \forall p_1, \dots, p_m. \psi$ be a parameterized pastLTL formula obtained by approximating a parameterized pastTSL formula ρ . If $\mathcal{W} \models \psi$, \mathcal{W} satisfies Requirements 1 and 2, and can be split into $\mathcal{W}_{P_1}, \dots, \mathcal{W}_{P_n}$ such that the check for independence is successful, then $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi$.*

Since all parameters are universally quantified, it follows from the soundness of the LTL approximation of TSL formulas [15] that the infinite-state machine \mathcal{M} then also satisfies the original pastTSL formula ρ .

5.5 Extension to Existential Quantifiers

Currently, our approach cannot handle existential quantifiers. In the example of the ERC20 contract, this forbids us to use a field `funds(m)` to store the balance of all users of the contract. If we were to try, we could use an additional parameter `r` for the recipient of the tokens and state the following.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall m, n, r. \Box & (\text{transferFrom}(m, n, r) \vee \text{transfer}(m, r) \\ & \rightarrow [\text{funds}(m) \leftarrow \text{funds}(m) - \text{arg@amount}] \\ & \wedge [\text{funds}(r) \leftarrow \text{funds}(r) + \text{arg@amount}]) \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 5: Workflow of our smart contract control flow synthesis.

However, for completeness, we would have to specify that the **funds** field does not spuriously increase, which would require existential quantifiers.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall r. \Box(\llbracket \text{funds}(r) \leftarrow \text{funds}(r) + \text{arg@amount} \rrbracket \\ \rightarrow \exists m. \exists n. \text{transferFrom}(m, n, r) \vee \text{transfer}(m, r)) \end{aligned}$$

A similar limitation stems from Requirement 1, which requires that a field parameterized with set P_i can only be updated by a method which is also parameterized with P_i . As for existential quantifiers, we would otherwise not be able to distinguish spurious updates from intended updates of fields. While it might be challenging to extend the approach with arbitrary existential quantification, it should be possible for future work to include existential quantification that prevents spurious updates. One could, for example, define some sort of “lazy synthesis”, which only does a non-self-update when necessary.

6 Implementation

We implemented our approach in a toolchain consisting of several steps. First, we translate the pastTSL specification into a pastLTL formula using TSLtools [26], which we adapted to handle past-time operators. We then synthesize a state machine using BDD-based symbolic synthesis. To make our lives easier, we implemented a simple analysis to detect free choices and deadlocks, which both indicate potential specification errors. If the specification contains parameters, we split up the resulting state machine as described in Section 5. Lastly, the state machines are translated to Solidity code. The toolchain is implemented in our tool SCSYNT consisting of approximately 3000 lines of Python code (excluding TSLtools). From a user perspective, we obtain the workflow depicted in Figure 5.

Synthesis from PastLTL. The first part of our toolchain implements a symbolic synthesis algorithm for pastLTL. As such, it can also be employed outside the context of smart contract synthesis. We are not aware of any other tool that implements pastLTL synthesis. We first build the safety automaton of the specification using a representation as BDDs. For pastLTL, a symbolic approach is especially efficient due to the long-known fact that for evaluating a pastLTL formula at time point i , it is sufficient to know the value of all subformulas at point $i - 1$ [20]. Afterwards, we symbolically extract the winning region from

the safety region with a classic fixpoint attractor construction. Finally, we minimize the resulting state machine using an explicit implementation of Hopcroft’s minimization algorithm [21].

State Machine Analysis. We analyze the winning region for free choices and potential deadlocks, which both usually indicate specification errors. A free choice is a state which, for the same input, has multiple outgoing transitions into the winning region. If there are free choices and the developer has no preference which one is chosen, SCSYNT nondeterministically commits to one option. For the deadlock detection, we require the user to label *determined predicate terms*. We call a predicate determined if either 1) it becomes a constant at some time or 2) only method calls can change its value. An example of class 1 are predicates over the time, e.g., `time > cTime()`: if it is *true* at some point, it will never be *false* again. A class 2 example would be a predicate that counts whether the number stored in a field has passed a fixed threshold. A predicate like `sender ∈ voters`, on the other hand, is not determined as the evaluation changes with the input `sender`. SCSYNT automatically detects if, at some point, there is an evaluation of the determined predicate terms that is allowed by the assumptions but for which there is no valid transition. It then warns of a potential deadlock.

Translation to Solidity. Finally, SCSYNT translates the state machines into Solidity code. The developer needs to provide the implementation of all predicates and functions, as they are uninterpreted (which makes the synthesis feasible after all). Some of the most common functions and predicates (equality, addition, etc) are automatically replaced by SCSYNT. The signatures of all methods, functions, predicates, constants, fields, and parameters need to be provided as well. As an example, we attach the signatures of the parameterized voting contract from Section 4.1 in Appendix D.1. For each method of the contract, we create a function that contains the state machine logic for that particular method. For parameterized specifications, the contract is augmented with a mapping recording the knowledge of states (c.f. Section 5.3). The parameters of a method are included as arguments or, according to the signature, replaced with a fixed interpretation (e.g, if `m` is always `msg.sender`). Following [34], we also add automatic protection against reentrancy attacks by setting a Boolean flag if a method is currently executing. For the interested reader, we provide the Solidity code for the method `vote` from Section 3.1 in Appendix D.2. In Appendix D.3, there is also a general schema of our translation.

7 Evaluation

To evaluate SCSYNT, we specified and synthesized ten different smart contracts. We report on the running time of the synthesis procedure itself and the translation to Solidity code. We also compare our automatically generated Solidity code to handwritten reference implementations in terms of size and average gas consumption. Since the reference contracts do not provide any formal guarantees,

Table 1: Sizes of the specifications and state machines as well as the average running time of SCSYNT. #Conj. is the number of conjuncts, #Nodes is the number of nodes of the AST. If the spec has parameters, the state machine size is the sum of the states/transitions of the split state machines. The synthesis and translation times are the respective average on 10 runs of the same benchmark.

Contract	Specification		State Machine		Avg. Time (s)	
	#Conj.	#Nodes	#States	#Trans.	Synth.	Transl.
Asset Transfer	36	216	8	14	5.9996	0.0053
Blinded Auction	19	218	5	8	1.5446	0.0026
Coin Toss	27	154	5	7	1.6180	0.0029
Crowd Funding	17	100	4	8	0.2178	0.0026
ERC20	15	140	9	5	0.4812	0.0033
ERC20 Extended	19	244	10	7	1.9608	0.0040
NFT Auction	30	325	12	15	12.1853	0.0080
Simple Auction	15	83	4	7	0.1362	0.0026
Ticket System	13	97	4	6	0.1812	0.0028
Voting	17	98	6	5	0.1478	0.0023

we also conduct a comparison of different versions of the same contract, each automatically generated by tools that provide some form of formal guarantees.

Running Time. We synthesized typical smart contracts with a non-trivial temporal control flow. Of the ten specifications, four use specifications with parameters. A detailed description of all benchmarks is provided in Appendix E.1. We analyzed all contracts in terms of the size of the specification and of the synthesized state machine. All experiments were run on a 2020 Macbook with an Apple M1 chip, 16GB RAM, running MacOS. The results are shown in Table 1. The evaluation shows that our toolchain is efficient: the translation of the state machine into Solidity code is nearly instantaneous. For most contracts, SCSYNT synthesizes a state machine in less than two seconds. To show that the approach scales to larger, real-life contracts, we included the NFT auction, a parameterized specification for a contract actively maintained by Avolabs. Its reference implementation has over 1400 lines of code. We specified the contract according to the README provided on the GitHub of Avolabs [3].

Comparison to Handwritten Contracts. We compare the Solidity code generated by SCSYNT to handwritten implementations for the same contracts found in the literature but without formal guarantees. For a fair comparison, we extend our code with the implementation of the contract beyond the specified temporal control flow. A detailed table with the results is given in Appendix E.2. Overall, the automatically generated code has an overhead of 62% in terms of code length (including automatic reentrancy protection). An exception is the NFT auction, where SCSYNT’s code is 35% shorter. This is mostly due to code duplication at various locations in the handwritten contract which is needed to structure the code and make it readable. This is not necessary if the code is correct by

construction. It seems that SCSYNT has an advantage in terms of code length for more complicated and thus generally longer smart contracts.

We measured the gas consumption using the Truffle Suite [48]. Our synthesized code consumes 40% more gas than the handwritten, non-verified code. Without SCSYNT’s automatic prevention of reentrancy attacks, there is only a 25% overhead. We see that the average gas overhead is 50.6% for parameterized specification as compared to 34.5% for non-parameterized contracts. This is because the implementation of the hierarchical systems and the sharing of knowledge needs some machinery like additional enums and mappings.

Comparison to Other Approaches with Formal Guarantees. It is to be expected that automatically generated code is not as efficient as handwritten one. We therefore evaluate our code with respect to two comparable formal approaches that also automatically generate Solidity code. The first approach synthesizes a state machine from LTL specifications and translates the result to Solidity code [47]. The approach does not include any reasoning about the data flow in the fields or the arguments of a method. The second approach, the VERISOLID framework [34,35], generates Solidity code from a handwritten state machine.

The only benchmark available for all three approaches is the blinded auction contract. We make sure that the code is comparable by 1) adding a missing guard on the time requirements to [47]’ code, which was present in the specification but not in the Solidity code, 2) removing additional requirements that make sure only the owner can call certain methods from SCSYNT’s code and 3) removing reentrancy protection in SCSYNT’s and VERISOLID’s code.

The generated contract of the LTL synthesis approach is 42% longer than SCSYNT’s implementation and consumes 17% more gas. VERISOLID duplicates a method if it can be invoked in several states. Therefore, their code is slightly longer than ours (14%) and consumes 4% more gas. Their reentrancy protection is more efficient though: when enabled, SCSYNT’s code is 12% longer and consumes 5% more gas. This is a possibility for future optimizations in SCSYNT.

8 Conclusion

We have described the synthesis of Solidity code from specifications given in pastTSL equipped with universally quantified parameters. Our approach is the first one that facilitates a comprehensive specification of the implicit state machine of a smart contract, including the data flow of the contract’s fields and guards on the method’s arguments. While we have shown that pastTSL realizability without parameters is undecidable in general, solutions can be obtained via a sound reduction to LTL. For parameterized specifications, we have developed a representation of the described infinite-state system that enables a Solidity implementation with a moderate overhead in the gas consumption. Our tool SCSYNT implements the synthesis toolchain, including an analysis of the state machine regarding potential specification errors.

For future work, we aim to extend our approach to specifications given in pastTSL with alternating parameter quantifiers. There are also several exciting possibilities to combine our work with other synthesis and verification techniques. One avenue is to automatically prove necessary assumptions in deductive verification tools [10], especially for assumptions that state invariants maintained by method calls (e.g., “calling `close` does not increase the number of votes”). Another possibility is to synthesize function and predicate implementations in the spirit of [7]. Finally, we would like to generalize our work to a broader class of programs. We have developed this approach specifically for smart contracts but parameterized TSL, past-time synthesis, and our splitting technique should be applicable to other use cases as well.

References

1. Antonino, P., Ferreira, J., Sampaio, A., Roscoe, A.W.: Specification is law: Safe creation and upgrade of ethereum smart contracts. CoRR **abs/2205.07529** (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2205.07529>, <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2205.07529>
2. Apt, K.R., Kozen, D.: Limits for automatic verification of finite-state concurrent systems. Inf. Process. Lett. **22**(6), 307–309 (1986). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190\(86\)90071-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190(86)90071-2), [https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190\(86\)90071-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190(86)90071-2)
3. Avolabs: NFT auction reference contract. <https://github.com/avolabs-io/nft-auction> (2022), accessed: 2022-07-05
4. Azure: Asset transfer sample from the azure blockchain workbench. <https://github.com/Azure-Samples/blockchain/tree/master/blockchain-workbench/application-and-smart-contract-samples/asset-transfer> (2021), accessed: 2022-07-05
5. Azure: Asset transfer reference contract. <https://github.com/Azure-Samples/blockchain/blob/master/blockchain-workbench/application-and-smart-contract-samples/asset-transfer/ethereum/AssetTransfer.sol> (2022), accessed: 2022-07-05
6. Bansal, S., Vardi, M.Y.: Safety and co-safety comparator automata for discounted-sum inclusion. In: Dillig, I., Tasiran, S. (eds.) Computer Aided Verification - 31st International Conference, CAV 2019, New York City, NY, USA, July 15–18, 2019, Proceedings, Part I. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 11561, pp. 60–78. Springer (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25540-4_4, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25540-4_4
7. Choi, W., Finkbeiner, B., Piskac, R., Santolucito, M.: Can reactive synthesis and syntax-guided synthesis be friends? In: 43rd ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI) (June 2022), <https://publications.cispa.saarland/3674/>
8. Ciccio, C.D., Cecconi, A., Dumas, M., García-Bañuelos, L., López-Pintado, O., Lu, Q., Mendling, J., Ponomarev, A., Tran, A.B., Weber, I.: Blockchain support for collaborative business processes. Inform. Spektrum **42**(3), 182–190 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00287-019-01178-x>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00287-019-01178-x>
9. Cimatti, A., Roveri, M., Sheridan, D.: Bounded verification of past LTL. In: Hu, A.J., Martin, A.K. (eds.) Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design, 5th

- International Conference, FMCAD 2004, Austin, Texas, USA, November 15-17, 2004, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 3312, pp. 245–259. Springer (2004). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-30494-4_18, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-30494-4_18
10. Dharanikota, S., Mukherjee, S., Bhardwaj, C., Rastogi, A., Lal, A.: Celestial: A smart contracts verification framework. In: Proceedings of the 21st Conference on Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design (FMCAD 2021). pp. 133–142 (2021)
 11. Ehlers, R., Finkbeiner, B.: Reactive safety. In: D’Agostino, G., Torre, S.L. (eds.) Proceedings of Second International Symposium on Games, Automata, Logics and Formal Verification, GandALF 2011, Minori, Italy, 15-17th June 2011. EPTCS, vol. 54, pp. 178–191 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.54.13>, <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.54.13>
 12. Ethereum: Introduction to ethereum. <https://ethereum.org/en/developers/docs/intro-to-ethereum/> (2021), accessed: 2022-07-05
 13. Finkbeiner, B., Heim, P., Passing, N.: Temporal stream logic modulo theories. In: Bouyer, P., Schröder, L. (eds.) Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures - 25th International Conference, FOSSACS 2022, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2022, Munich, Germany, April 2-7, 2022, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 13242, pp. 325–346. Springer (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-99253-8_17, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-99253-8_17
 14. Finkbeiner, B., Klein, F., Piskac, R., Santolucito, M.: Synthesizing functional reactive programs. In: Eisenberg, R.A. (ed.) Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on Haskell, Haskell@ICFP 2019, Berlin, Germany, August 18-23, 2019. pp. 162–175. ACM (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3331545.3342601>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3331545.3342601>
 15. Finkbeiner, B., Klein, F., Piskac, R., Santolucito, M.: Temporal Stream Logic: Synthesis Beyond the Bools. In: Dillig, I., Tasiran, S. (eds.) Computer Aided Verification - 31st International Conference, CAV 2019, New York City, NY, USA, July 15-18, 2019, Proceedings, Part I. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 11561, pp. 609–629. Springer (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25540-4_35
 16. Fourswords: Simple auction reference contract. <https://fourswords.io/docs/smartcontracts/solidity-guide/solidity-examples/> (2022), accessed: 2022-07-05
 17. Fourswords: Voting reference contract. <https://fourswords.io/docs/smartcontracts/solidity-guide/solidity-examples/> (2022), accessed: 2022-07-05
 18. Geier, G., Heim, P., Klein, F., Finkbeiner, B.: Syntroids: Synthesizing a game for fpgas using temporal logic specifications. CoRR **abs/2101.07232** (2021), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.07232>
 19. Havelund, K., Rosu, G.: Synthesizing monitors for safety properties. In: Katoen, J., Stevens, P. (eds.) Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, 8th International Conference, TACAS 2002, Held as Part of the Joint European Conference on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2002, Grenoble, France, April 8-12, 2002, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 2280, pp. 342–356. Springer (2002). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-46002-0_24, https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-46002-0_24
 20. Havelund, K., Rosu, G.: Synthesizing monitors for safety properties. In: Katoen, J., Stevens, P. (eds.) Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, 8th International Conference, TACAS 2002, Held as Part of the Joint European Conference on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2002, Grenoble, France, April 8-12, 2002, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science,

- vol. 2280, pp. 342–356. Springer (2002). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-46002-0_24, https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-46002-0_24
21. Hopcroft, J.: An $n \log n$ algorithm for minimizing states in a finite automaton. In: Theory of machines and computations, pp. 189–196. Elsevier (1971)
 22. Jacobs, S., Bloem, R.: Parameterized synthesis. Log. Methods Comput. Sci. **10**(1) (2014). [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-10\(1:12\)2014](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-10(1:12)2014), [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-10\(1:12\)2014](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-10(1:12)2014)
 23. Kalra, S., Goel, S., Dhawan, M., Sharma, S.: ZEUS: analyzing safety of smart contracts. In: 25th Annual Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, NDSS 2018, San Diego, California, USA, February 18–21, 2018. The Internet Society (2018), http://wp.internet-society.org/ndss/wp-content/uploads/sites/25/2018/02/ndss2018\OT1\ss_09-1.Kalra_paper.pdf
 24. Khalimov, A., Jacobs, S., Bloem, R.: PARTY parameterized synthesis of token rings. In: Sharygina, N., Veith, H. (eds.) Computer Aided Verification - 25th International Conference, CAV 2013, Saint Petersburg, Russia, July 13–19, 2013. Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 8044, pp. 928–933. Springer (2013). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39799-8_66, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39799-8_66
 25. Khalimov, A., Jacobs, S., Bloem, R.: Towards efficient parameterized synthesis. In: Giacobazzi, R., Berdine, J., Mastroeni, I. (eds.) Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation, 14th International Conference, VMCAI 2013, Rome, Italy, January 20–22, 2013. Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 7737, pp. 108–127. Springer (2013). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-35873-9_9, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-35873-9_9
 26. Klein, F., Santolucito, M.: Tsl tools. <https://github.com/kleinreact/tsltools> (2019)
 27. Kupferman, O., Vardi, M.Y.: Model checking of safety properties. In: Halbwachs, N., Peled, D.A. (eds.) Computer Aided Verification, 11th International Conference, CAV '99, Trento, Italy, July 6–10, 1999, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 1633, pp. 172–183. Springer (1999). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-48683-6_17, https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-48683-6_17
 28. Lahiri, S.K., Chen, S., Wang, Y., Dillig, I.: Formal specification and verification of smart contracts for azure blockchain. CoRR **abs/1812.08829** (2018), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1812.08829>
 29. Lamport, L.: Proving the correctness of multiprocess programs. IEEE Trans. Software Eng. **3**(2), 125–143 (1977). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.1977.229904>, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.1977.229904>
 30. Lisitsa, A., Potapov, I.: Temporal logic with predicate lambda-abstraction. In: 12th International Symposium on Temporal Representation and Reasoning (TIME 2005), 23–25 June 2005, Burlington, Vermont, USA. pp. 147–155. IEEE Computer Society (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIME.2005.34>, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIME.2005.34>
 31. López-Pintado, O., García-Bañuelos, L., Dumas, M., Weber, I., Ponomarev, A.: Caterpillar: A business process execution engine on the ethereum blockchain. Softw. Pract. Exp. **49**(7), 1162–1193 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1002/spe.2702>, <https://doi.org/10.1002/spe.2702>
 32. Maderbacher, B., Bloem, R.: Reactive synthesis modulo theories using abstraction refinement. CoRR **abs/2108.00090** (2021), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.00090>
 33. Markgraf, O., Hong, C., Lin, A.W., Najib, M., Neider, D.: Parameterized synthesis with safety properties. In: d. S. Oliveira, B.C. (ed.) Programming Languages and Systems - 18th Asian Symposium, APLAS 2020, Fukuoka, Japan, November 30 -

- December 2, 2020, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12470, pp. 273–292. Springer (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64437-6_14, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64437-6_14
34. Mavridou, A., Laszka, A.: Designing secure ethereum smart contracts: A finite state machine based approach. In: Meiklejohn, S., Sako, K. (eds.) Financial Cryptography and Data Security - 22nd International Conference, FC 2018, Nieuwpoort, Curaçao, February 26 - March 2, 2018, Revised Selected Papers
 35. Mavridou, A., Laszka, A., Stachtari, E., Dubey, A.: Verisolid: Correct-by-design smart contracts for ethereum. In: Goldberg, I., Moore, T. (eds.) Financial Cryptography and Data Security - 23rd International Conference, FC 2019, Frigate Bay, St. Kitts and Nevis, February 18-22, 2019, Revised Selected Papers. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 11598, pp. 446–465. Springer (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-32101-7_27, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-32101-7_27
 36. Mayr, R.: Undecidable problems in unreliable computations. Theor. Comput. Sci. **297**(1-3), 337–354 (2003). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(02\)00646-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(02)00646-1), [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(02\)00646-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(02)00646-1)
 37. Mealy, G.H.: A method for synthesizing sequential circuits. The Bell System Technical Journal **34**(5), 1045–1079 (1955). <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1955.tb03788.x>
 38. Nehai, Z., Piriou, P.Y., Daumas, F.: Model-checking of smart contracts. In: 2018 IEEE International Conference on Internet of Things (iThings) and IEEE Green Computing and Communications (GreenCom) and IEEE Cyber, Physical and Social Computing (CPSCom) and IEEE Smart Data (SmartData). pp. 980–987. IEEE (2018)
 39. Open Zeppelin: Erc20 token system documentation from open zeppelin. <https://docs.openzeppelin.com/contracts/2.x/api/token/erc20> (2022), accessed: 2022-07-05
 40. Open Zeppelin: Erc20 token system reference contract. <https://github.com/OpenZeppelin/openzeppelin-contracts/blob/9b3710465583284b8c4c5d2245749246bb2e0094/contracts/token/ERC20/ERC20.sol> (2022), accessed: 2022-07-05
 41. Permenev, A., Dimitrov, D.K., Tsankov, P., Drachsler-Cohen, D., Vechev, M.T.: Verx: Safety verification of smart contracts. In: 2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2020, San Francisco, CA, USA, May 18-21, 2020. pp. 1661–1677. IEEE (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP40000.2020.00024>, <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP40000.2020.00024>
 42. Program the Blockchain: Coin funding reference contract. <https://programtheblockchain.com/posts/2018/01/19/writing-a-crowdfunding-contract-a-la-kickstarter/> (2022), accessed: 2022-07-05
 43. Program the Blockchain: Coin toss reference contract. <https://programtheblockchain.com/posts/2018/03/16/flipping-a-coin-in-ethereum/> (2022), accessed: 2022-07-05
 44. Solidity: Simple auction protocol from the solidity documentation. <https://docs.soliditylang.org/en/v0.6.8/solidity-by-example.html#simple-open-auction> (2021), accessed: 2022-07-05
 45. Solidity: Blinded auction reference contract. <https://docs.soliditylang.org/en/v0.5.11/solidity-by-example.html#id2> (2022), accessed: 2022-07-05

46. Stephens, J., Ferles, K., Mariano, B., Lahiri, S.K., Dillig, I.: Smartpulse: Automated checking of temporal properties in smart contracts. In: 42nd IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2021, San Francisco, CA, USA, 24-27 May 2021. pp. 555–571. IEEE (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP40001.2021.00085>, <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP40001.2021.00085>
47. Suvorov, D., Ulyantsev, V.: Smart contract design meets state machine synthesis: Case studies. CoRR **abs/1906.02906** (2019), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1906.02906>
48. Truffle Suite: <https://www.trufflesuite.com> (2021), accessed: 2022-07-05
49. Wang, Y., Lahiri, S.K., Chen, S., Pan, R., Dillig, I., Born, C., Naseer, I., Ferles, K.: Formal verification of workflow policies for smart contracts in azure blockchain. In: Chakraborty, S., Navas, J.A. (eds.) Verified Software. Theories, Tools, and Experiments - 11th International Conference, VSTTE 2019, New York City, NY, USA, July 13-14, 2019, Revised Selected Papers. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12031, pp. 87–106. Springer (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-41600-3_7, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-41600-3_7
50. Zupan, N., Kasinathan, P., Cuellar, J., Sauer, M.: Secure smart contract generation based on petri nets. In: Blockchain Technology for Industry 4.0, pp. 73–98. Springer (2020)

A Reactive Synthesis and State Machines

A.1 State Machines and Reactive Synthesis

In this paper, we view smart contracts as *reactive systems*, i.e., systems that run indefinitely and that continually interact with an environment. We model implementations of reactive systems with state machines. A *state machine* \mathcal{M} over an alphabet Σ is a tuple (S, s_0, δ) consisting of a set of states S , a designated initial state $s_0 \in S$, and a transition relation $\delta \subseteq S \times \Sigma \times S$. We call \mathcal{M} *finite-state machine* if both Σ and S are finite, and *infinite-state machine* otherwise. An infinite sequence $t \in \Sigma^\omega$ is a *trace* of \mathcal{M} if there is an infinite sequence of states $r \in S^\omega$ such that $r[0] = s_0$ and $(r[i], t[i], r[i+1]) \in \delta$ for all points in time $i \in \mathbb{N}$ with $i > 0$. A finite sequence of states $r \in S^+$ results in a finite trace $t \in \Sigma^+$. We denote the set of all traces of \mathcal{M} by $\text{traces}(\mathcal{M})$ and the set of all finite traces by $\text{finTraces}(\mathcal{M})$. We use two types of state machines, *Mealy machines* [37] and *safety automata* (see, e.g., [11,6]). We use Mealy machines to model reactive systems and safety automata to describe safety properties of such systems. Mealy machines separate the alphabet into environment inputs I and system outputs O . A Mealy machine *implements a strategy* if, in each state, there is exactly one outgoing transition for every valuation of the input propositions. We say that a trace $t \in \Sigma^\omega$ is *accepted* by a safety automaton \mathcal{A} if $t \in \text{traces}(\mathcal{A})$. A finite trace $t \in \Sigma^+$ is accepted if $t \in \text{finTraces}(\mathcal{A})$. A state machine \mathcal{M} with alphabet $\Sigma = 2^{AP}$ satisfies an LTL formula φ if $t \models \varphi$ holds for all traces $t \in \text{traces}(\mathcal{M})$. In this paper, we work with LTL specifications that are *safety properties*. A safety property can be equivalently expressed as safety automaton, which describes the *safety region* of the property.

Given a formal specification, *reactive synthesis* automatically generates a Mealy machine that implements a strategy and satisfies the specification. The *winning region* of a safety automaton is the maximal subset such that in every state, there exists at least one transition into the subset for every combination of inputs. Note that a winning region does not necessarily implement a strategy as a state might contain several transitions for the same valuation of input propositions. To obtain a strategy from the winning region, one can simply fix a transition for every input.

A.2 PastTSL Semantics

$\varsigma, \iota, t \models_{\langle \rangle} \neg \varphi$	iff	$\varsigma, \iota, t \not\models_{\langle \rangle} \varphi$
$\varsigma, \iota, t \models_{\langle \rangle} \varphi \wedge \psi$	iff	$\varsigma, \iota, t \models_{\langle \rangle} \varphi$ and $\varsigma, \iota, t \models_{\langle \rangle} \psi$
$\varsigma, \iota, t \models_{\langle \rangle} \odot \varphi$	iff	$t > 0 \wedge \varsigma, \iota, t-1 \models_{\langle \rangle} \varphi$
$\varsigma, \iota, t \models_{\langle \rangle} \varphi \mathcal{S} \psi$	iff	$\exists 0 \leq t' \leq t. \varsigma, \iota, t' \models_{\langle \rangle} \psi$ and $\forall t' < k \leq t. \varsigma, \iota, k \models_{\langle \rangle} \varphi$
$\varsigma, \iota, t \models_{\langle \rangle} \llbracket \mathbf{v} \leftarrow \tau \rrbracket$	iff	$\varsigma \ t \ \mathbf{v} \equiv \tau$
$\varsigma, \iota, t \models_{\langle \rangle} p \ \tau_0 \dots \tau_m$	iff	$\eta_{\langle \rangle}(\varsigma, \iota, t, p \ \tau_0 \dots \tau_{m-1})$

B Full Proofs

B.1 Proof of Theorem 1

A *lossy n -counter machine* consists of a finite set of instructions l_1, \dots, l_m , which modify n counters c_1, \dots, c_n . Each instruction l_i is of one of the following forms, where $1 \leq x \leq n$ and $1 \leq j, k \leq m$.

- $l_i: c_x := c_x + 1; \text{ goto } l_j$
- $l_i: \text{ if } c_x = 0 \text{ then goto } l_j \text{ else } c_x := c_x - 1; \text{ goto } l_k$
- $l_i: \text{ halt}$

A configuration of a lossy n -counter machine is a tuple (l_i, v_1, \dots, v_n) , where l_i is the next instruction to be executed, and v_1, \dots, v_n denote the values of the counters. We employ a version of lossiness where a counter can suddenly become zero if it is tested for zero [36]. An n -counter machine halts from an initial configuration if it eventually reaches a state with the halting instruction.

Theorem 1. *The pastTSL realizability problem is undecidable.*

Proof. We spell out the main ideas. Our formulas consist of one constant $z()$, one function f , and one predicate p . There are no explicit inputs. Borrowing an idea from [30], we use two fields for every counter c_x : c_x^{inc} to count increments and c_x^{dec} to count decrements. Applying f to c_x^{inc} increments the counter, applying f to c_x^{dec} decrements it. If the number of increments and decrements is equal, the counter is zero. In TSL, we use the formula $\psi_x^0 := p(c_x^{inc}) \leftrightarrow p(c_x^{dec})$ to test if a counter is zero. Note that if the counter really is zero, then the test for zero *must* evaluate to *true*. For all other cases, it *may* evaluate to *true*. If the equivalence evaluates to *true* even though the counter is non-zero, we interpret it as a spontaneous reset. Initially, the value of the counters need to be arbitrary. We reflect this by making no assumptions on the first step, thereby allowing the strategy to set the counter fields to any valid function term $f^*(z())$. We use n fields l_i for encoding the instructions. Globally, all instruction fields but the one indicating the next instruction, indicated by $\llbracket l_i \leftarrow f(l_i) \rrbracket$, need to self-update. We spell out the encoding of an instruction of the second type.

$$\begin{aligned} \square (\ominus \llbracket l_i \leftarrow f(l_i) \rrbracket \rightarrow (\psi_x^0 \rightarrow \llbracket l_j \leftarrow f(l_j) \rrbracket \wedge \llbracket c_x^{inc} \leftarrow z() \rrbracket \wedge \llbracket c_x^{dec} \leftarrow z() \rrbracket) \\ \wedge (\neg \psi_x^0 \rightarrow \llbracket l_k \leftarrow f(l_k) \rrbracket \wedge \llbracket c_x^{inc} \leftarrow c_x^{inc} \rrbracket \wedge \llbracket c_x^{dec} \leftarrow f(c_x^{dec}) \rrbracket)) \end{aligned}$$

The formula tests if the instruction to be executed is l_i . If so, we test the counter c_x for zero and set the corresponding fields to $z()$ if that was the case. Furthermore, the correct next instruction is updated by applying f . Finally, we encode that we never reach a halting state: $\square \neg \llbracket l_{halt} \leftarrow f(l_{halt}) \rrbracket$. The resulting pastTSL formula is realizable if, and only if, there is an initial state such that the machine never halts. Thus, undecidability of the pastTSL realizability problem follows.

B.2 Proof of Lemma 1

Lemma 1. *For every instance μ , $\text{traces}_\mu(\mathcal{M}) \cup \text{finTraces}_\mu(\mathcal{M}) = \text{traces}(\mathcal{W}_\mu) \cup \text{finTraces}(\mathcal{W}_\mu)$.*

We show that every (finite or infinite) run $r_\mathcal{M}$ of \mathcal{M} can be matched with a (finite or infinite) run $r_{\mathcal{W}_\mu}$ of \mathcal{W}_μ (and vice versa) such that $\text{trace}_\mu(r_\mathcal{M}) = \text{trace}(r_{\mathcal{W}_\mu})$. For the first direction of the equality, we show that every transition of $r_\mathcal{M}$ can be either matched with a transition in \mathcal{W}_μ or constitutes a step which is removed in the trace $t_\mu = \text{trace}(r_\mathcal{M})_\mu$. For the other direction, we show that every transition of $r_{\mathcal{W}_\mu}$ can be matched with a transition in \mathcal{M} . Assume \mathcal{M} is currently in state $s = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ of $r_\mathcal{M}$ and \mathcal{W}_μ is in state $s_\mathcal{W}$ of $r_{\mathcal{W}_\mu}$. We keep the invariant that $s_\mathcal{W} \in K_\mu = \bigcap_{1 \leq j \leq n} K_j(f_j(P_j[\mu]))$.

- For the first direction, assume that the next transition of \mathcal{M} is (s, A, s') with $s' = (f'_1, \dots, f'_n)$. Let $B \subseteq AP$ be such that $B[\mu] = A_\mu$. By construction of \mathcal{M} , there is an instance μ' and parameter subset P_i such that there is exactly one $\mathbf{f}(P_i[\mu']) \in A$. Let $B' \subseteq AP$ be such that $B'[\mu'] = A_{\mu'}$. We distinguish two cases.

- Assume $P_i[\mu] = P_i[\mu']$. Let $s_i = f_i(P_i[\mu'])$ and $s'_i = f'_i(P_i[\mu'])$. Let $G_{(s_i, B', s'_i)} = \{s \mid (s_i, B' \cup \{\text{in}_s\}, s'_i) \in \delta_i\}$. Let P_{j_1}, \dots, P_{j_l} be all subsets of P_i and $K = K_i(s_i) \cap \bigcap_{1 \leq k \leq l} K_{j_k}(f_{j_k}(P_{j_k}[\mu']))$. By definition of the independence check employed to construct \mathcal{M} , $K \subseteq G_{(s_i, B', s'_i)}$. As $P_i[\mu] = P_i[\mu']$, we have that $K_\mu \subseteq K$ and thus also $K_\mu \subseteq G_{(s_i, B', s'_i)}$. Therefore, by the invariant, $s_\mathcal{W} \in G_{(s_i, B', s'_i)}$ and there is a transition $(s_\mathcal{W}, B', s'_\mathcal{W})$ in \mathcal{W} .

Now, if $\mu' = \mu$, there is a transition $(s_\mathcal{W}, B[\mu], s'_\mathcal{W})$ in \mathcal{W}_μ , what shows that the step in \mathcal{M} can be mirrored in \mathcal{W}_μ . Otherwise, if $\mu' \neq \mu$, B and B' agree on the propositions parameterized with P_i . By construction of \mathcal{M} , B has all inputs not parameterized with P_i set to *false* and only self-updates of cells not parameterized with P_i set to *true*. By Requirements 1 and 2, since there is a transition $(s_\mathcal{W}, B', s'_\mathcal{W})$ in \mathcal{W} , there is also a transition $(s_\mathcal{W}, B, s'_\mathcal{W})$ in \mathcal{W} and therefore a transition $(s_\mathcal{W}, B[\mu], s'_\mathcal{W})$ in \mathcal{W}_μ .

All that remains to show is that the invariant is preserved by both transitions $(s_\mathcal{W}, B[\mu], s'_\mathcal{W})$ and $(s_\mathcal{W}, B'[\mu'], s'_\mathcal{W})$. That means that we need to show that $s'_\mathcal{W} \in K'_\mu$ for $K'_\mu = \bigcap_{1 \leq j \leq n} K_j(f'_j(P_j[\mu]))$ in either case. Since $s_\mathcal{W} \in K_\mu$, we have that for every j , $s_\mathcal{W} \in K_j(f_j(P_j[\mu]))$. Furthermore, $\mathbf{f}(P_i) \in B$ and $\mathbf{f}(P_i) \in B'$. For $j \neq i$ we have that $f'_j = f_j$ and, therefore, by Proposition 2, $s'_\mathcal{W} \in K_j(f'_j(P_j[\mu]))$. Furthermore, $K_\mu \subseteq G_{(s_i, B', s'_i)}$ and $(s_i, C \cup \{\text{in}_{s_\mathcal{W}}\}, s'_i) \in \delta_i$, for both $C = B$ and $C = B'$. Therefore, again by Proposition 2, $s'_\mathcal{W} \in f_i[P_i[\mu] \mapsto s'_i]$. Thus, $s'_\mathcal{W} \in K_j(f'_j(P_j[\mu]))$ for all j and the invariant holds for $s'_\mathcal{W}$.

- Assume $P_i[\mu] \neq P_i[\mu']$. By construction of \mathcal{M} , there is no $\mathbf{g}(P_j) \in B$. As \mathcal{W} satisfies Requirement 1, so does every \mathcal{W}_{P_i} . Together with how \mathcal{M} is constructed, it follows that $B|_O \subseteq O_{\text{self}}$. Thus, by definition of t_μ , the transition will not appear in t_μ and \mathcal{W}_μ thus stays in its current state.

It remains to show that the invariant is maintained by the transition in \mathcal{M} . Since $P_i[\mu] \neq P_i[\mu']$, we have by definition of \mathcal{M} that $f_j(P_j[\mu]) = f'_j(P_j[\mu])$ for all j , and therefore the invariant is maintained.

- For the second direction, assume that the next transition of \mathcal{W}_μ is $(s_\mathcal{W}, B[\mu], s'_\mathcal{W})$ for some $B \subseteq AP$. By construction of \mathcal{W} , there is a parameter subset P_i such that some $\mathbf{f}(P_i) \in B$. By our invariant, $s_\mathcal{W} \in K_i(s_i)$, therefore, by Proposition 1, there is a transition $(s_i, B \cup \{\text{in}_{s_\mathcal{W}}\}, s'_i) \in \delta_i$. By construction of \mathcal{M} , there is a transition from (f_1, \dots, f_n) to (f'_1, \dots, f'_n) such that $f'_i(P_i[\mu]) = s'_i$. Furthermore, the transition is labeled with A such that $A_\mu = B[\mu]$.

It remains to show that the invariant is maintained by the transition. For $j \neq i$, $f'_j = f_j$ and therefore, by Proposition 2, $s'_\mathcal{W} \in K_j(f_j(P_j[\mu]))$. Furthermore, since $(s_i, B \cup \{\text{in}_{s_\mathcal{W}}\}, s'_i) \in \delta_i$, again by Proposition 2, it holds that $s'_\mathcal{W} \in K_i(s'_i)$ and therefore, by definition of $f'_i = f_i[P_i[\mu] \mapsto s'_i]$, $s'_\mathcal{W} \in K_i(f'_i(P_i[\mu]))$. Therefore, the invariant is maintained for the transition.

C Full Specifications

C.1 ERC20 Contract

We start with the requirements. First, any transfer from \mathbf{m} needs to be backed by sufficient funds.

$$\square(\text{transfer}(\mathbf{m}) \vee \text{transferFrom}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \rightarrow \text{suffFunds}(\mathbf{m}, \text{arg@amount}))$$

We specify that no method call can happen after `pause` until `unpause` is called:

$$\begin{aligned} \square(\text{transferFrom}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \vee \text{transfer}(\mathbf{m}) \vee \text{approve}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \vee \text{localPause}(\mathbf{m}) \vee \\ \text{localUnpause}(\mathbf{m}) \\ \rightarrow (\neg \text{pause} \mathcal{S} \text{unpause}) \vee \Box \neg \text{pause}) \end{aligned}$$

In contrast, `localPause`(\mathbf{m}) only stops method calls related to \mathbf{m} 's account:

$$\begin{aligned} \square(\text{transferFrom}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \vee \text{transfer}(\mathbf{m}) \vee \text{approve}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \\ \rightarrow ((\neg \text{localPause}(\mathbf{m})) \mathcal{S} \text{localUnpause}(\mathbf{m})) \vee \Box \neg \text{localPause}(\mathbf{m})) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we want that `pause` and `unpause` cannot be called twice without the respective other in between. Additionally, `unpause` cannot be called if `pause` has not been called at least once.

$$\begin{aligned} \square(\text{unpause} \rightarrow \ominus(\neg \text{unpause} \mathcal{S} \text{pause})) \\ \square(\text{pause} \rightarrow \ominus(\neg \text{pause} \mathcal{S} \text{unpause}) \vee \ominus \Box \neg \text{pause}) \end{aligned}$$

For the obligations, we need to make sure that the approved field is updated correctly.

$$\begin{aligned} \square(\text{approve}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \rightarrow \llbracket \text{approved}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \leftarrow \text{arg@amount} \rrbracket) \\ \square(\text{transferFrom}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \rightarrow \llbracket \text{approved}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \leftarrow \text{approved}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) - \text{arg@amount} \rrbracket) \\ \square(\neg(\text{transferFrom}(\mathbf{m}) \vee \text{approve}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})) \rightarrow \llbracket \text{approved}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \leftarrow \text{approved}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \rrbracket) \end{aligned}$$

D Translation to Solidity

D.1 Signatures of the Voting Contract

In the following, we explain the structure of the signatures of the methods, functions, predicates, constants, fields, and parameters that need to be provided to SCSYNT by the developer. We provide the signatures for the voting contract presented in Section 4.1.

- *Methods.* The signature of a method is a 3-tuple, where the first element is a list of parameters with their possibly fixed definition. The second element is a list of arguments with their respective types and the third element is a Boolean flag indicating whether the method is *payable* in Solidity, i.e., whether the method is allowed to receive ether. For the voting contract, there are three methods:
 - `close`: (`[]`, `[]`, `False`)
 - `vote`: (`[(m, msg.sender)]`, `[(choice, uint)]`, `False`)
 - `reveal`: (`[]`, `[]`, `False`)
- *Functions and predicates.* A function/predicate signature consists of a list of parameters, a list of arguments, its definition and a Boolean flag indicating whether it has side effects. The voting contract only uses predefined predicates such as `≥`, `=`, and `isTrue`. Hence, it does not rely on additional functions that need to be defined using a signature. Nevertheless, we provide the signature of a simple incrementation function for illustration:
 - `addOne`: (`[]`, `[a]`, `a + 1`, `False`)
- *Constants.* Constants are fully defined by their type and their value given as an expression. The voting contract contains a single constant:
 - `cTime`: (`uint`, `block.timestamp + 3600`)
- *Cells.* A cell is defined by a list of parameters, its value type, its visibility in terms of *public* or *private* and its optional storage location (ie. *memory* or *storage*). Note that, if one or multiple parameters are given, the cell will be a mapping from its parameters to a value of the given type. The voting contract features one cell which is parameterized in `m`.
 - `voters`: (`[m]`, `bool`, `private`, `"`)
- *Parameters.* The signature of a parameter only contains its value type. The voting contract is parameterized in the voter `m` defined as follows:
 - `m`: `address`

D.2 Skeleton of Generated Code for Unparameterized Vote Method

The code is given in Solidity Code 1.1.

D.3 Translation Schema

The code is given in Solidity Code 1.2.

```

1 function vote(uint _choice) public {
2   require (!inMethod);
3   inMethod = true;
4   if(currState == <source state of  $t_1$ > && <guard of  $t_1$ >){
5     currState = <target state of  $t_1$ >
6     <field updates of  $t_1$ >
7   } else if(currState == <source state of  $t_2$ > && <guard of  $t_2$ 
8     >){
9     currState = <target state of  $t_2$ >
10    <field updates of  $t_2$ >
11  } else if ...
12  else{
13    revert();
14  }
15  inMethod = false;
16 }

```

Solidity Code 1.1: Sketch of generated Solidity code for method `vote`.

E Evaluation

E.1 Description of Benchmarks

- *Asset Transfer* (not parameterized, reference contract: [5]). This contract originates from Microsoft’s Azure Blockchain Workbench [4]. It has been formulated similarly in [49,10].
- *Blinded Auction* (not parameterized, reference contract: [45]). The blinded auction protocol, following [34], describes how to sell an item to the highest bidder. The bids of all bidders are hashed and are only revealed after the auction closed.
- *Coin Toss* (not parameterized, reference contract: [43]). In this protocol, following [4], two users bet, together with a wager, on whether a coin toss results in heads or tails. After reaching a time limit, the winner receives both wagers.
- *Crowd Funding* (not parameterized, reference contract: [42]). In this contract, following [47], users can donate coins until a time limit is reached. If the funding goal is reached by the end, the owner retrieves the donations. Otherwise, the users can reclaim their donations.
- *ERC20 Token System* (parameterized, reference contract: [40]). We consider a classical ERC20 token system following the Open Zeppelin documentation [39]. The specification is similar to the one presented in Section 4.1, yet, it does not contain the parameterized methods for pausing and unpausing a contract.
- *ERC20 Token System Extended* (parameterized). This is the contract described in Section 4.1 that extends the classical ERC20 token system with different methods for pausing.
- *NFT Auction* (parameterized, reference contract: [3]). This is a comparatively large contract from Avolabs that implements an NFT auction com-

```

1  contract <contract_name> {
2    // state machine states
3    enum State<Pi> { s1, ..., skPi }
4    enum KState { s1,..., skK }
5    // knowledge maps
6    <type> private kMap<Pi>;
7    // current state
8    <type> private currState<Pi> = <initial state Pi>;
9    // constants
10   <type> private immutable <name>;
11   <type> private immutable <name> = <definition>;
12   // fields
13   <type> <access_modifier> <name>;
14   address private owner;
15   bool inMethod = false;
16   // constructor
17   constructor(<args>) {
18     <init. of knowledge maps>
19     owner = msg.sender;
20     // init. of constants
21     <name> = <definition>;
22   }
23   // methods
24   function mi(<pars>,<args>) public
25     <is_payable> {
26     require(! inMethod);
27     inMethod = true;
28     <state_machine_logic_for_mi>
29     inMethod = false;
30   }

```

Solidity Code 1.2: Translation schema to generate the Solidity contract. k_{P_i} is the number of states in the state machine for P_i , k_K is the number of states in the original state machine.

bined with a buy-now feature. The original implementation has over 1400 lines of code. We specified the main requirements on the control flow as described in the README of Avolabs' GitHub.

- *Simple Auction* (not parameterized, reference contract: [16]). The simple auction protocol is a common example for smart contract control flows, see, e.g., [44]. It is similar to the blinded auction without the bids being hashed.
- *Ticket System* (not parameterized, reference contract written by the authors of this paper). The ticket system contract describes the selling process of tickets. As long as tickets are available and the sale has not been closed, users can buy tickets. Users can return their tickets while the ticket sale is still open.
- *Voting* (parameterized, reference contract: [17]). We consider the voting contract described in Section 4.1.

Table 2: Comparison in terms of contract size and average gas consumption of the contracts generated by SCSYNT to the handwritten reference contracts (Ref.) found in the literature. The gas consumption is the sum of the average gas consumption of deployment and all methods.

		Asset Transfer		Blinded Auction		Coin Toss	
		SCSYNT	Ref.	SCSYNT	Ref.	SCSYNT	Ref.
#Lines		74	62	107	91	65	32
Gas		1354451	998507	1513171	1484856	1092107	760954
		Crowd Funding		ERC20		ERC20 Extended	
		SCSYNT	Ref.	SCSYNT	Ref.	SCSYNT	Ref.
#Lines		55	24	100	62	124	–
Gas		816614	455736	1837260	1076141	2390510	–
		NFT Auction		Simple Auction			
		SCSYNT	Ref.	SCSYNT	Ref.		
#Lines		300	457	55	35		
Gas		4831300	3307183	759418	712151		
					769302		
		Ticket System		Voting			
		SCSYNT	Ref.	SCSYNT	Ref.		
#Lines		46	21	69	37		
Gas		647039	461578	1043467	769302		

E.2 Comparison with Handwritten Contracts