

Formal Methods (形式化方法)

Lecture 14. Reasoning about Specifications

智能与计算学部 章衡

2021年上学期



Motivation

Features of Z notation

- By using Z notations one can define the specification precisely, which could reduce the misunderstandings in requirement analyses largely



Motivation

Features of Z notation

- By using Z notations one can define the specification precisely, which could reduce the misunderstandings in requirement analyses largely
- The formal semantics of Z provides a way to reason about the specification



Motivation

Features of Z notation

- By using Z notations one can define the specification precisely, which could reduce the misunderstandings in requirement analyses largely
- The formal semantics of Z provides a way to reason about the specification

What can be done by reasoning

- How to assure the specification admitting a desired property?



Motivation

Features of Z notation

- By using Z notations one can define the specification precisely, which could reduce the misunderstandings in requirement analyses largely
- The formal semantics of Z provides a way to reason about the specification

What can be done by reasoning

- How to assure the specification admitting a desired property?
- How to know whether a program meets the requirements stated in the specification?



Outline

- 1 Introduction by Example
- 2 Rigorous Proofs
- 3 Reasoning about Specifications



Example: Hobby club

- Basic type:

[Person]



Example: Hobby club

- Basic type:

[Person]

- Global variable:

| Max : \mathbb{N}



Example: Hobby club

- Basic type:

[Person]

- Global variable:

| Max : \mathbb{N}

- State space schema:

HoClub
s : \mathbb{P} Person
#s \leq Max



Example: Hobby club

- Basic type:

[Person]

- Global variable:

| Max : \mathbb{N}

- State space schema:

HoClub
s : \mathbb{P} Person
#s \leq Max



Example: Hobby club

- Basic type:

[Person]

- Global variable:

| Max : \mathbb{N}

- State space schema:

HoClub
s : \mathbb{P} Person
#s \leq Max

$$\Delta \text{HoClub} \quad \hat{=} \quad \text{HoClub} \wedge \text{HoClub}'$$

$$\Xi \text{HoClub} \quad \hat{=} \quad \Delta \text{HoClub} \mid s' = s$$



Example: Hobby club

EnterClub

ΔHoClub

$p? : \text{Person}$

$\#s < \text{Max}$

$p? \notin s$

$s' = s \cup \{p?\}$



Example: Hobby club

EnterClub

ΔHoClub

$p? : \text{Person}$

$\#s < \text{Max}$

$p? \notin s$

$s' = s \cup \{p?\}$

LeaveClub

ΔHoClub

$p? : \text{Person}$

$p? \in s$

$s' = s \setminus \{p?\}$



Example: Hobby club

$\text{EnterClub} \text{ g } \text{LeaveClub} \models \#s < \text{Max} \wedge s' = s$



Example: Hobby club

$\text{EnterClub} \circ \text{LeaveClub} \models \#s < \text{Max} \wedge s' = s$

$\text{Alpha} \triangleq \text{EnterClub} \circ \text{LeaveClub}$



Example: Hobby club

$\text{EnterClub} \circ \text{LeaveClub} \models \#s < \text{Max} \wedge s' = s$

$\text{Alpha} \triangleq \text{EnterClub} \circ \text{LeaveClub}$

Alpha

$s, s' : \mathbb{P} \text{ Person}$

$p? : \text{Person}$

$\exists s^+ : \mathbb{P} \text{ Person} \bullet$

$(\#s \leq \text{Max} \wedge$

$\#s^+ \leq \text{Max} \wedge$

$\#s' \leq \text{Max} \wedge$

$\#s < \text{Max} \wedge$

$p? \notin s \wedge$

$s^+ = s \cup \{p?\} \wedge$

$p? \in s^+ \wedge$

$s' = s^+ \setminus \{p?\})$



Example: Hobby club

If x does not occur in φ , then $\exists x : X \bullet (\varphi \wedge \psi) \equiv \varphi \wedge \exists x : X \bullet \psi$



Example: Hobby club

If x does not occur in φ , then $\exists x : X \bullet (\varphi \wedge \psi) \equiv \varphi \wedge \exists x : X \bullet \psi$

$$\text{Alpha} \models \text{Alpha}_1$$



Example: Hobby club

If x does not occur in φ , then $\exists x : X \bullet (\varphi \wedge \psi) \equiv \varphi \wedge \exists x : X \bullet \psi$

$\text{Alpha} \models \text{Alpha}_1$

Alpha

$s, s' : \mathbb{P} \text{ Person}$

$p? : \text{Person}$

$\exists s^+ : \mathbb{P} \text{ Person} \bullet$

$(\#s \leq \text{Max} \wedge$

$\#s^+ \leq \text{Max} \wedge$

$\#s' \leq \text{Max} \wedge$

$\#s < \text{Max} \wedge$

$p? \notin s \wedge$

$s^+ = s \cup \{p?\} \wedge$

$p? \in s^+ \wedge$

$s' = s^+ \setminus \{p?\})$



Example: Hobby club

If x does not occur in φ , then $\exists x : X \bullet (\varphi \wedge \psi) \equiv \varphi \wedge \exists x : X \bullet \psi$

$\text{Alpha} \models \text{Alpha}_1$

Alpha

$s, s' : \mathbb{P} \text{ Person}$

$p? : \text{Person}$

$\exists s^+ : \mathbb{P} \text{ Person} \bullet$

$(\#s \leq \text{Max} \wedge$

$\#s^+ \leq \text{Max} \wedge$

$\#s' \leq \text{Max} \wedge$

$\#s < \text{Max} \wedge$

$p? \notin s \wedge$

$s^+ = s \cup \{p?\} \wedge$

$p? \in s^+ \wedge$

$s' = s^+ \setminus \{p?\})$

Alpha₁

$s, s' : \mathbb{P} \text{ Person}$

$p? : \text{Person}$

$\#s \leq \text{Max}$

$\#s' \leq \text{Max}$

$\#s < \text{Max}$

$p? \notin s$

$\exists s^+ : \mathbb{P} \text{ Person} \bullet$

$\#s^+ \leq \text{Max} \wedge$

$s^+ = s \cup \{p?\} \wedge$

$p? \in s^+ \wedge$

$s' = s^+ \setminus \{p?\})$



Example: Hobby club

By applying the 1-point rule, we have



Example: Hobby club

By applying the 1-point rule, we have

$$\text{Alpha} \models \text{Alpha}_1 \models \text{Alpha}_2$$



Example: Hobby club

By applying the 1-point rule, we have

$$\text{Alpha} \models \text{Alpha}_1 \models \text{Alpha}_2$$

Alpha_1
$s, s' : \mathbb{P} \text{ Person}$ $p? : \text{Person}$
$\#s \leq \text{Max}$ $\#s' \leq \text{Max}$ $\#s < \text{Max}$ $p? \notin s$ $\exists s^+ : \mathbb{P} \text{ Person} \bullet$ $\#s^+ \leq \text{Max} \wedge$ $s^+ = s \cup \{p?\} \wedge$ $p? \in s^+ \wedge$ $s' = s^+ \setminus \{p?\}$



Example: Hobby club

By applying the 1-point rule, we have

$$\text{Alpha} \models \text{Alpha}_1 \models \text{Alpha}_2$$

Alpha₁

$s, s' : \mathbb{P} \text{ Person}$

$p? : \text{Person}$

$\#s \leq \text{Max}$

$\#s' \leq \text{Max}$

$\#s < \text{Max}$

$p? \notin s$

$\exists s^+ : \mathbb{P} \text{ Person} \bullet$

$\#s^+ \leq \text{Max} \wedge$

$s^+ = s \cup \{p?\} \wedge$

$p? \in s^+ \wedge$

$s' = s^+ \setminus \{p?\}$

Alpha₂

$s, s' : \mathbb{P} \text{ Person}$

$p? : \text{Person}$

$\#s \leq \text{Max}$

$\#s' \leq \text{Max}$

$\#s < \text{Max}$

$p? \notin s$

$\#(s \cup \{p?\}) \leq \text{Max}$

$p? \in (s \cup \{p?\})$

$s' = (s \cup \{p?\}) \setminus \{p?\}$



Example: Hobby club

From $p? \notin s$, we know that $(s \cup \{p?\}) \setminus \{p?\} = s$. Consequently,



Example: Hobby club

From $p? \notin s$, we know that $(s \cup \{p?\}) \setminus \{p?\} = s$. Consequently,

$$\text{Alpha} \models \text{Alpha}_1 \models \text{Alpha}_2 \models \text{Alpha}_3 \models \#s < \text{Max} \wedge s' = s$$



Example: Hobby club

From $p? \notin s$, we know that $(s \cup \{p?\}) \setminus \{p?\} = s$. Consequently,

$$\text{Alpha} \models \text{Alpha}_1 \models \text{Alpha}_2 \models \text{Alpha}_3 \models \#s < \text{Max} \wedge s' = s$$

Alpha₂ _____

$s, s' : \mathbb{P} \text{ Person}$

$p? : \text{Person}$

$\#s \leq \text{Max}$

$\#s' \leq \text{Max}$

$\#s < \text{Max}$

$p? \notin s$

$\#(s \cup \{p?\}) \leq \text{Max}$

$p? \in (s \cup \{p?\})$

$s' = (s \cup \{p?\}) \setminus \{p?\}$



Example: Hobby club

From $p? \notin s$, we know that $(s \cup \{p?\}) \setminus \{p?\} = s$. Consequently,

$$\text{Alpha} \models \text{Alpha}_1 \models \text{Alpha}_2 \models \text{Alpha}_3 \models \#s < \text{Max} \wedge s' = s$$

Alpha₂

$s, s' : \mathbb{P} \text{ Person}$

$p? : \text{Person}$

$\#s \leq \text{Max}$

$\#s' \leq \text{Max}$

$\#s < \text{Max}$

$p? \notin s$

$\#(s \cup \{p?\}) \leq \text{Max}$

$p? \in (s \cup \{p?\})$

$s' = (s \cup \{p?\}) \setminus \{p?\}$

Alpha₃

$s, s' : \mathbb{P} \text{ Person}$

$p? : \text{Person}$

$\#s \leq \text{Max}$

$\#s' \leq \text{Max}$

$\#s < \text{Max}$

$p? \notin s$

$\#(s \cup \{p?\}) \leq \text{Max}$

$p? \in (s \cup \{p?\})$

$s' = s$



Outline

- 1 Introduction by Example
- 2 Rigorous Proofs
- 3 Reasoning about Specifications



Formal proof vs. rigorous proof (严密证明)

- Formal proofs provide a procedure of rewriting to obtain theorems from inference rules



Formal proof vs. rigorous proof (严密证明)

- Formal proofs provide a procedure of rewriting to obtain theorems from inference rules
- The correctness of such proofs is easily checkable



Formal proof vs. rigorous proof (严密证明)

- Formal proofs provide a procedure of rewriting to obtain theorems from inference rules
- The correctness of such proofs is easily checkable
- However, it is hard to construct a formal proof, and the proof maybe tediously long



Formal proof vs. rigorous proof (严密证明)

- Formal proofs provide a procedure of rewriting to obtain theorems from inference rules
- The correctness of such proofs is easily checkable
- However, it is hard to construct a formal proof, and the proof maybe tediously long
- In many cases, mathematicians try to find a weaker form of formal proofs, called **rigorous proofs**



Formal proof vs. rigorous proof (严密证明)

- Formal proofs provide a procedure of rewriting to obtain theorems from inference rules
- The correctness of such proofs is easily checkable
- However, it is hard to construct a formal proof, and the proof maybe tediously long
- In many cases, mathematicians try to find a weaker form of formal proofs, called **rigorous proofs**
- They believe that every rigorous proof can be converted into a formal proof



Formal proof vs. rigorous proof (严密证明)

- Formal proofs provide a procedure of rewriting to obtain theorems from inference rules
- The correctness of such proofs is easily checkable
- However, it is hard to construct a formal proof, and the proof maybe tediously long
- In many cases, mathematicians try to find a weaker form of formal proofs, called **rigorous proofs**
- They believe that every rigorous proof can be converted into a formal proof
- In a rigorous proof, one is allowed to use **the properties in set theory** and **number theory**, as well as **the method of induction**



Method of induction

Definition (Mathematical induction, 数学归纳法)

To prove “for every natural number n it holds that $P(n)$ ”, it suffices to prove both of the following:

- ① $P(0)$ holds;
- ② $\forall i : \mathbb{N} \bullet (P(i) \Rightarrow P(i + 1))$.

Definition (Structural induction, 结构归纳法)

To prove “for every sequence $s : \text{seq } X$ it holds that $P(s)$ ”, it suffices to prove both of the following:

- ① $P(\langle \rangle)$ holds;
- ② $\forall x : X; s : \text{seq } X \bullet (P(s) \Rightarrow P(\langle x \rangle \frown s))$.

Method of induction: Example 1

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t, u : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u.$$



Method of induction: Example 1

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t, u : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u.$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s$

Method of induction: Example 1

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t, u : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u.$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s$ and $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t = \langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)$.

Method of induction: Example 1

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t, u : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u.$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s$ and $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t = \langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)$. Next we prove the property by an induction on s .

Method of induction: Example 1

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t, u : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u.$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s$ and $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t = \langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)$. Next we prove the property by an induction on s .

Base case:

Method of induction: Example 1

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t, u : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u.$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s$ and $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t = \langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)$. Next we prove the property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\langle \rangle \frown (t \frown u) = t \frown u = (\langle \rangle \frown t) \frown u$.

Method of induction: Example 1

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t, u : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u.$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s$ and $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t = \langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)$. Next we prove the property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\langle \rangle \frown (t \frown u) = t \frown u = (\langle \rangle \frown t) \frown u$.

Inductive step: Assume as inductive hypothesis that $s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u$.

Method of induction: Example 1

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t, u : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u.$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s$ and $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t = \langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)$. Next we prove the property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\langle \rangle \frown (t \frown u) = t \frown u = (\langle \rangle \frown t) \frown u$.

Inductive step: Assume as inductive hypothesis that $s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u$. We need to prove $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown (t \frown u) = ((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) \frown u$.

Method of induction: Example 1

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t, u : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u.$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s$ and $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t = \langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)$. Next we prove the property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\langle \rangle \frown (t \frown u) = t \frown u = (\langle \rangle \frown t) \frown u$.

Inductive step: Assume as inductive hypothesis that $s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u$. We need to prove $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown (t \frown u) = ((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) \frown u$. Note that

$$(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown (t \frown u)$$

Method of induction: Example 1

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t, u : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u.$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s$ and $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t = \langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)$. Next we prove the property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\langle \rangle \frown (t \frown u) = t \frown u = (\langle \rangle \frown t) \frown u$.

Inductive step: Assume as inductive hypothesis that $s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u$. We need to prove $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown (t \frown u) = ((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) \frown u$. Note that

$$(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown (t \frown u) = \langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown (t \frown u))$$

Method of induction: Example 1

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t, u : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u.$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s$ and $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t = \langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)$. Next we prove the property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\langle \rangle \frown (t \frown u) = t \frown u = (\langle \rangle \frown t) \frown u$.

Inductive step: Assume as inductive hypothesis that $s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u$. We need to prove $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown (t \frown u) = ((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) \frown u$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown (t \frown u) &= \langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown (t \frown u)) \\ &= \langle x \rangle \frown ((s \frown t) \frown u) \end{aligned}$$

Method of induction: Example 1

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t, u : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u.$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s$ and $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t = \langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)$. Next we prove the property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\langle \rangle \frown (t \frown u) = t \frown u = (\langle \rangle \frown t) \frown u$.

Inductive step: Assume as inductive hypothesis that $s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u$. We need to prove $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown (t \frown u) = ((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) \frown u$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown (t \frown u) &= \langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown (t \frown u)) \\ &= \langle x \rangle \frown ((s \frown t) \frown u) \\ &= ((\langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)) \frown u) \end{aligned}$$

Method of induction: Example 1

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t, u : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u.$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s$ and $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t = \langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)$. Next we prove the property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\langle \rangle \frown (t \frown u) = t \frown u = (\langle \rangle \frown t) \frown u$.

Inductive step: Assume as inductive hypothesis that $s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u$. We need to prove $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown (t \frown u) = ((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) \frown u$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown (t \frown u) &= \langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown (t \frown u)) \\ &= \langle x \rangle \frown ((s \frown t) \frown u) \\ &= (\langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)) \frown u \\ &= (((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) \frown u), \end{aligned}$$

Method of induction: Example 1

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t, u : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u.$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s$ and $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t = \langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)$. Next we prove the property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\langle \rangle \frown (t \frown u) = t \frown u = (\langle \rangle \frown t) \frown u$.

Inductive step: Assume as inductive hypothesis that $s \frown (t \frown u) = (s \frown t) \frown u$. We need to prove $(\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown (t \frown u) = ((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) \frown u$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown (t \frown u) &= \langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown (t \frown u)) \\ &= \langle x \rangle \frown ((s \frown t) \frown u) \\ &= (\langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)) \frown u \\ &= (((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) \frown u), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □

Method of induction: Example 2

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$$



Method of induction: Example 2

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s = s \frown \langle \rangle$

Method of induction: Example 2

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s = s \frown \langle \rangle$ and $\text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle x \rangle$. Next we prove the desired property by an induction on s .

Method of induction: Example 2

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s = s \frown \langle \rangle$ and $\text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle x \rangle$. Next we prove the desired property by an induction on s .

Base case:

Method of induction: Example 2

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s = s \frown \langle \rangle$ and $\text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle x \rangle$. Next we prove the desired property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\text{rev}(\langle \rangle \frown t) = \text{rev } t = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle \rangle = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev } \langle \rangle$.

Method of induction: Example 2

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s = s \frown \langle \rangle$ and $\text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle x \rangle$. Next we prove the desired property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\text{rev}(\langle \rangle \frown t) = \text{rev } t = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle \rangle = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev } \langle \rangle$.

Inductive step: Assume as inductive hypothesis that $\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$.

Method of induction: Example 2

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s = s \frown \langle \rangle$ and $\text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle x \rangle$. Next we prove the desired property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\text{rev}(\langle \rangle \frown t) = \text{rev } t = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle \rangle = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev } \langle \rangle$.

Inductive step: Assume as inductive hypothesis that $\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$. We need to prove that $\text{rev}((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown s)$.

Method of induction: Example 2

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s = s \frown \langle \rangle$ and $\text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle x \rangle$. Next we prove the desired property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\text{rev}(\langle \rangle \frown t) = \text{rev } t = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle \rangle = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev } \langle \rangle$.

Inductive step: Assume as inductive hypothesis that $\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$. We need to prove that $\text{rev}((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown s)$. Note that

$$\text{rev}((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t)$$

Method of induction: Example 2

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s = s \frown \langle \rangle$ and $\text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle x \rangle$. Next we prove the desired property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\text{rev}(\langle \rangle \frown t) = \text{rev } t = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle \rangle = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev } \langle \rangle$.

Inductive step: Assume as inductive hypothesis that $\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$. We need to prove that $\text{rev}((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown s)$. Note that

$$\text{rev}((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) = \text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t))$$

Method of induction: Example 2

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s = s \frown \langle \rangle$ and $\text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle x \rangle$. Next we prove the desired property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\text{rev}(\langle \rangle \frown t) = \text{rev } t = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle \rangle = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev } \langle \rangle$.

Inductive step: Assume as inductive hypothesis that $\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$. We need to prove that $\text{rev}((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown s)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rev}((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) &= \text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)) \\ &= \text{rev}(s \frown t) \frown \langle x \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Method of induction: Example 2

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s = s \frown \langle \rangle$ and $\text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle x \rangle$. Next we prove the desired property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\text{rev}(\langle \rangle \frown t) = \text{rev } t = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle \rangle = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev } \langle \rangle$.

Inductive step: Assume as inductive hypothesis that $\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$. We need to prove that $\text{rev}((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown s)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rev}((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) &= \text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)) \\ &= \text{rev}(s \frown t) \frown \langle x \rangle \\ &= ((\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)) \frown \langle x \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Method of induction: Example 2

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s = s \frown \langle \rangle$ and $\text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle x \rangle$. Next we prove the desired property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\text{rev}(\langle \rangle \frown t) = \text{rev } t = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle \rangle = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev } \langle \rangle$.

Inductive step: Assume as inductive hypothesis that $\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$. We need to prove that $\text{rev}((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown s)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rev}((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) &= \text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)) \\ &= \text{rev}(s \frown t) \frown \langle x \rangle \\ &= ((\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)) \frown \langle x \rangle \\ &= (\text{rev } t) \frown ((\text{rev } s) \frown \langle x \rangle) \end{aligned}$$

Method of induction: Example 2

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s = s \frown \langle \rangle$ and $\text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle x \rangle$. Next we prove the desired property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\text{rev}(\langle \rangle \frown t) = \text{rev } t = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle \rangle = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev } \langle \rangle$.

Inductive step: Assume as inductive hypothesis that $\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$. We need to prove that $\text{rev}((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown s)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rev}((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) &= \text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)) \\ &= \text{rev}(s \frown t) \frown \langle x \rangle \\ &= ((\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)) \frown \langle x \rangle \\ &= (\text{rev } t) \frown ((\text{rev } s) \frown \langle x \rangle) \\ &= (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown s), \end{aligned}$$

Method of induction: Example 2

Example

Please prove that, for all sequences $s, t : \text{seq } X$, we have

$$\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$$

Proof.

By definition, it is easy to see that $\langle \rangle \frown s = s = s \frown \langle \rangle$ and $\text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle x \rangle$. Next we prove the desired property by an induction on s .

Base case: $\text{rev}(\langle \rangle \frown t) = \text{rev } t = (\text{rev } t) \frown \langle \rangle = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev } \langle \rangle$.

Inductive step: Assume as inductive hypothesis that $\text{rev}(s \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)$. We need to prove that $\text{rev}((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) = (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown s)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rev}((\langle x \rangle \frown s) \frown t) &= \text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown (s \frown t)) \\ &= \text{rev}(s \frown t) \frown \langle x \rangle \\ &= ((\text{rev } t) \frown (\text{rev } s)) \frown \langle x \rangle \\ &= (\text{rev } t) \frown ((\text{rev } s) \frown \langle x \rangle) \\ &= (\text{rev } t) \frown \text{rev}(\langle x \rangle \frown s), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □

Exercise

Prove the following by induction: for every sequence s , we have that $\text{rev}(\text{rev } s) = s$.



Outline

- 1 Introduction by Example
- 2 Rigorous Proofs
- 3 Reasoning about Specifications



Example: Fan ID management

- Basic types:

[Person, ID]



Example: Fan ID management

- Basic types:

[Person, ID]

- State space schema:

FID

members : ID \rightsquigarrow Person

banned : \mathbb{P} ID

banned \subseteq dom members



Example: Fan ID management

- Basic types:

$[\text{Person}, \text{ID}]$

- State space schema:

FID

$\text{members} : \text{ID} \leftrightarrow \text{Person}$

$\text{banned} : \mathbb{P} \text{ID}$

$\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom members}$

FID'

$\text{members}' : \text{ID} \leftrightarrow \text{Person}$

$\text{banned}' : \mathbb{P} \text{ID}$

$\text{banned}' \subseteq \text{dom members}'$



Example: Fan ID management

- Basic types:

$[\text{Person}, \text{ID}]$

- State space schema:

FID
$\text{members} : \text{ID} \leftrightarrow \text{Person}$ $\text{banned} : \mathbb{P} \text{ID}$
$\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom members}$

FID'
$\text{members}' : \text{ID} \leftrightarrow \text{Person}$ $\text{banned}' : \mathbb{P} \text{ID}$
$\text{banned}' \subseteq \text{dom members}'$

- $\Delta \text{FID} \triangleq \text{FID} \wedge \text{FID}'$



Example: Fan ID management

- Basic types:

$[\text{Person}, \text{ID}]$

- State space schema:

FID
$\text{members} : \text{ID} \leftrightarrow \text{Person}$ $\text{banned} : \mathbb{P} \text{ID}$
$\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom members}$

FID'
$\text{members}' : \text{ID} \leftrightarrow \text{Person}$ $\text{banned}' : \mathbb{P} \text{ID}$
$\text{banned}' \subseteq \text{dom members}'$

- $\Delta \text{FID} \triangleq \text{FID} \wedge \text{FID}'$
 $\exists \text{FID} \triangleq \Delta \text{FID} \mid \text{members}' = \text{members} \wedge \text{banned}' = \text{banned}$



The initialization theorem (初始化定理)

- Operational schemas: Initialization

InitFID

FID'

$\text{members}' = \emptyset$

$\text{banned}' = \emptyset$



The initialization theorem (初始化定理)

- Operational schemas: Initialization

InitFID
FID'
members' = \emptyset banned' = \emptyset

- The initialization theorem: $\models \exists \text{FID}' \bullet \text{InitFID}$



The initialization theorem (初始化定理)

- Operational schemas: Initialization

InitFID	
FID'	
members' = \emptyset	
banned' = \emptyset	

- The initialization theorem:** $\models \exists \text{FID}' \bullet \text{InitFID}$

The above is an abbreviation of the following theorem:

$$\models \exists \text{members}' : \text{Person} \rightarrow \text{ID}; \text{banned}' : \mathbb{P} \text{ID} \bullet$$
$$(\text{banned}' \subseteq \text{dom members}' \wedge \text{members}' = \emptyset \wedge \text{banned}' = \emptyset)$$


Prove the initialization theorem

$$\models \exists \text{members}' : \text{Person} \multimap \text{ID}; \text{banned}' : \mathbb{P} \text{ID} \bullet$$
$$(\text{banned}' \subseteq \text{dom members}' \wedge \text{members}' = \emptyset \wedge \text{banned}' = \emptyset) \quad (1)$$



Prove the initialization theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \models \exists \text{members}' : \text{Person} \leftrightarrow \text{ID}; \text{banned}' : \mathbb{P} \text{ID} \bullet \\ (\text{banned}' \subseteq \text{dom members}' \wedge \text{members}' = \emptyset \wedge \text{banned}' = \emptyset) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

1-point rule (bidirection)

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \exists x : S \bullet (\varphi \wedge x = t)}{\Sigma \models t \in S \wedge \varphi[t/x]} \quad [1\text{-point}] \quad \langle x \text{ does not occur in } t \rangle$$



Prove the initialization theorem

$$\models \exists \text{members}' : \text{Person} \leftrightarrow \text{ID}; \text{banned}' : \mathbb{P} \text{ID} \bullet$$

$$(\text{banned}' \subseteq \text{dom members}' \wedge \text{members}' = \emptyset \wedge \text{banned}' = \emptyset) \quad (1)$$

1-point rule (bidirection)

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \exists x : S \bullet (\varphi \wedge x = t)}{\Sigma \models t \in S \wedge \varphi[t/x]} \quad [1\text{-point}] \quad \langle x \text{ does not occur in } t \rangle$$

- By applying the above rule, (1) can be simplified as

$$\models \emptyset \in \text{Person} \leftrightarrow \text{ID} \wedge \emptyset \in \mathbb{P} \text{ID} \wedge \emptyset \subseteq \text{dom } \emptyset \quad (2)$$



Prove the initialization theorem

$$\models \exists \text{members}' : \text{Person} \leftrightarrow \text{ID}; \text{banned}' : \mathbb{P} \text{ID} \bullet$$

$$(\text{banned}' \subseteq \text{dom members}' \wedge \text{members}' = \emptyset \wedge \text{banned}' = \emptyset) \quad (1)$$

1-point rule (bidirection)

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \exists x : S \bullet (\varphi \wedge x = t)}{\Sigma \models t \in S \wedge \varphi[t/x]} \quad [1\text{-point}] \quad \langle x \text{ does not occur in } t \rangle$$

- By applying the above rule, (1) can be simplified as

$$\models \emptyset \in \text{Person} \leftrightarrow \text{ID} \wedge \emptyset \in \mathbb{P} \text{ID} \wedge \emptyset \subseteq \text{dom } \emptyset \quad (2)$$

- To prove this, it is equivalent to prove all of the following:

$$\models \emptyset \in \text{Person} \leftrightarrow \text{ID},$$

$$\models \emptyset \in \mathbb{P} \text{ID},$$

$$\models \emptyset \subseteq \text{dom } \emptyset.$$



Precondition of an operation

AddMember

Δ FID

applicant? : Person

id! : ID

applicant? \notin ran members

id! \notin dom members

members' = members \cup {id! \mapsto applicant?}

banned' = banned



Precondition of an operation

AddMember

Δ FID

applicant? : Person

id! : ID

applicant? \notin ran members

id! \notin dom members

members' = members \cup {id! \mapsto applicant?}

banned' = banned

- We need to know when the operation can be executed.



Precondition of an operation

AddMember

Δ FID

applicant? : Person

id! : ID

applicant? \notin ran members

id! \notin dom members

members' = members \cup {id! \mapsto applicant?}

banned' = banned

- We need to know when the operation can be executed.
- If such a condition is not true, we need to report an error.



Precondition of an operation

PreAddMember

FID

applicant? : Person

$\exists \text{FID}'; \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet$

$(\text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge$

$\text{id!} \notin \text{dom members} \wedge$

$\text{members}' = \text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} \wedge$

$\text{banned}' = \text{banned})$



Precondition of an operation

PreAddMember

FID

applicant? : Person

$\exists \text{FID}'; \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet$

$(\text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge$

$\text{id!} \notin \text{dom members} \wedge$

$\text{members}' = \text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} \wedge$

$\text{banned}' = \text{banned})$

- Unfolding the predicate of the above schema, we have

$\exists \text{members}' : \text{ID} \rightrightarrows \text{Person}; \text{banned}' : \mathbb{P} \text{ID}; \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet$

$(\text{banned}' \subseteq \text{dom members}' \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge$

$\text{id!} \notin \text{dom members} \wedge \text{members}' = \text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} \wedge$

$\text{banned}' = \text{banned})$



Simplification of precondition

Most often used rules for precondition simplification

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \exists x : S \bullet (\varphi \wedge x = t)}{\Sigma \models t \in S \wedge \varphi[t/x]} \quad [1\text{-point}] \quad \langle x \text{ does not occur in } t \rangle$$

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \varphi \wedge \psi}{\Sigma \models \varphi} \quad [\wedge] \quad \langle \Sigma, \varphi \models \psi \rangle$$

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \varphi}{\Sigma \models \varphi'} \quad [=] \quad \langle \Sigma \models t_1 = t_2 \text{ and } \varphi' \text{ is obtained from } \varphi \text{ by substituting } t_2 \text{ for some occurrence of } t_1 \rangle$$



Simplification of precondition

Most often used rules for precondition simplification

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \exists x : S \bullet (\varphi \wedge x = t)}{\Sigma \models t \in S \wedge \varphi[t/x]} \quad [1\text{-point}] \quad \langle x \text{ does not occur in } t \rangle$$

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \varphi \wedge \psi}{\Sigma \models \varphi} \quad [\wedge] \quad \langle \Sigma, \varphi \models \psi \rangle$$

$$\frac{\Sigma \models \varphi}{\Sigma \models \varphi'} \quad [=] \quad \langle \Sigma \models t_1 = t_2 \text{ and } \varphi' \text{ is obtained from } \varphi \text{ by substituting } t_2 \text{ for some occurrence of } t_1 \rangle$$



Simplification of precondition

$\exists \text{members}' : \text{ID} \multimap \text{Person}; \text{banned}' : \mathbb{P} \text{ID}; \text{id}! : \text{ID} \bullet$

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{banned}' \subseteq \text{dom members}' \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \\ & \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members} \wedge \text{members}' = \text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} \wedge \\ & \text{banned}' = \text{banned}) \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$



Simplification of precondition

$\exists \text{ members}' : \text{ID} \multimap \text{Person}; \text{banned}' : \mathbb{P} \text{ID}; \text{id}! : \text{ID} \bullet$

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{banned}' \subseteq \text{dom members}' \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \\ & \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members} \wedge \text{members}' = \text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} \wedge \\ & \text{banned}' = \text{banned}) \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

- By applying 1-point rule for variable banned' , (3) can be simplified as

$\exists \text{ members}' : \text{ID} \multimap \text{Person}; \text{id}! : \text{ID} \bullet$

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom members}' \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \\ & \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members} \wedge \text{members}' = \text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} \wedge \\ & \text{banned} \in \mathbb{P} \text{ID}) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$



Simplification of precondition

$\exists \text{ members}' : \text{ID} \mapsto \text{Person}; \text{banned}' : \mathbb{P} \text{ID}; \text{id}! : \text{ID} \bullet$

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{banned}' \subseteq \text{dom members}' \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \\ & \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members} \wedge \text{members}' = \text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} \wedge \\ & \text{banned}' = \text{banned}) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

- By applying 1-point rule for variable banned' , (3) can be simplified as

$\exists \text{ members}' : \text{ID} \mapsto \text{Person}; \text{id}! : \text{ID} \bullet$

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom members}' \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \\ & \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members} \wedge \text{members}' = \text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} \wedge \\ & \text{banned} \in \mathbb{P} \text{ID}) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

- By applying 1-point rule for variable $\text{members}'$, (4) can be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} & \exists \text{id}! : \text{ID} \bullet (\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom}(\text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\}) \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \\ & \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members} \wedge \text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} \in \text{ID} \mapsto \text{Person} \wedge \\ & \text{banned} \in \mathbb{P} \text{ID}) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$



Simplification of precondition

$$\begin{aligned} \exists id! : ID \bullet & (banned \subseteq \text{dom}(\text{members} \cup \{id! \mapsto \text{applicant?}\}) \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \\ & id! \notin \text{dom members} \wedge \text{members} \cup \{id! \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} \in ID \mapsto \text{Person} \wedge \\ & banned \in \mathbb{P} ID) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$



Simplification of precondition

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet & (\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom}(\text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\}) \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \\ & \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members} \wedge \text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} \in \text{ID} \rightsquigarrow \text{Person} \wedge \\ & \text{banned} \in \mathbb{P} \text{ID}) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

- By the declaration $\text{banned} : \mathbb{P} \text{ID}$ we know $\text{banned} \in \mathbb{P} \text{ID}$. Consequently, (6) can be equivalently rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet & (\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom}(\text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\}) \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \\ & \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members} \wedge \text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} \in \text{ID} \rightsquigarrow \text{Person}) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$



Simplification of precondition

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet (\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom}(\text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\}) \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \\ \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members} \wedge \text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} \in \text{ID} \rightsquigarrow \text{Person} \wedge \\ \text{banned} \in \mathbb{P} \text{ID}) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

- By the declaration $\text{banned} : \mathbb{P} \text{ID}$ we know $\text{banned} \in \mathbb{P} \text{ID}$. Consequently, (6) can be equivalently rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet (\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom}(\text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\}) \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \\ \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members} \wedge \text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} \in \text{ID} \rightsquigarrow \text{Person}) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

- By $\text{members} : \text{ID} \rightsquigarrow \text{Person}$; $\text{id!} : \text{ID}$; $\text{applicant?} : \text{Person}$ and $\text{id!} \notin \text{dom members}$, we have that $\text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} \in \text{ID} \rightsquigarrow \text{Person}$. By $\text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members}$, we obtain that $\text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} \in \text{ID} \rightsquigarrow \text{Person}$. Thus, (7) can be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet (\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom}(\text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\}) \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \\ \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members}) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$



Simplification of precondition

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet (\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom}(\text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\}) \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \\ \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members}) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$



Simplification of precondition

$$\exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet (\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom}(\text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\}) \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members}) \quad (9)$$

- By properties $\text{dom}(A \cup B) = \text{dom } A \cup \text{dom } B$ and $\text{dom}\{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} = \{\text{id!}\}$, we conclude that $\text{dom}(\text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\}) = (\text{dom members}) \cup \{\text{id!}\}$. Thus, (9) can be simplified as

$$\exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet (\text{banned} \subseteq (\text{dom members}) \cup \{\text{id!}\} \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members}) \quad (10)$$



Simplification of precondition

$$\exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet (\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom}(\text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\}) \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members}) \quad (9)$$

- By properties $\text{dom}(A \cup B) = \text{dom } A \cup \text{dom } B$ and $\text{dom}\{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} = \{\text{id!}\}$, we conclude that $\text{dom}(\text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\}) = (\text{dom members}) \cup \{\text{id!}\}$. Thus, (9) can be simplified as

$$\exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet (\text{banned} \subseteq (\text{dom members}) \cup \{\text{id!}\} \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members}) \quad (10)$$

- By the definition of FID we know that $\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom members}$. Thus, (10) can be simplified as

$$\exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet (\text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members})$$



Simplification of precondition

$$\exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet (\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom}(\text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\}) \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members}) \quad (9)$$

- By properties $\text{dom}(A \cup B) = \text{dom } A \cup \text{dom } B$ and $\text{dom}\{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} = \{\text{id!}\}$, we conclude that $\text{dom}(\text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\}) = (\text{dom members}) \cup \{\text{id!}\}$. Thus, (9) can be simplified as

$$\exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet (\text{banned} \subseteq (\text{dom members}) \cup \{\text{id!}\} \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members}) \quad (10)$$

- By the definition of FID we know that $\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom members}$. Thus, (10) can be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} & \exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet (\text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members}) \\ \equiv & \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$



Simplification of precondition

$$\exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet (\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom}(\text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\}) \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members}) \quad (9)$$

- By properties $\text{dom}(A \cup B) = \text{dom } A \cup \text{dom } B$ and $\text{dom}\{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\} = \{\text{id!}\}$, we conclude that $\text{dom}(\text{members} \cup \{\text{id!} \mapsto \text{applicant?}\}) = (\text{dom members}) \cup \{\text{id!}\}$. Thus, (9) can be simplified as

$$\exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet (\text{banned} \subseteq (\text{dom members}) \cup \{\text{id!}\} \wedge \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members}) \quad (10)$$

- By the definition of FID we know that $\text{banned} \subseteq \text{dom members}$. Thus, (10) can be simplified as

$$\exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet (\text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members}) \quad (11)$$

$$\equiv \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \exists \text{id!} : \text{ID} \bullet \text{id!} \notin \text{dom members} \quad (12)$$

$$\equiv \text{applicant?} \notin \text{ran members} \wedge \text{dom members} \neq \text{ID} \quad (13)$$



Simplification of precondition

PreAddMember

FID

applicant? : Person

applicant? \notin ran members

dom members \neq ID

Simplified precondition schema PreAddMember



Properties of the specification

BanMember

Δ FID

ban? : ID

ban? \in dom members

banned' = banned \cup {ban?}

members' = members



Properties of the specification

BanMember

Δ FID

ban? : ID

ban? \in dom members

banned' = banned \cup {ban?}

members' = members

- Property to be verified: To execute the operation BanMember on some banned member, the state of the system will not changed.



Properties of the specification

BanMember

ΔFID

$\text{ban?} : \text{ID}$

$\text{ban?} \in \text{dom members}$

$\text{banned}' = \text{banned} \cup \{\text{ban?}\}$

$\text{members}' = \text{members}$

- Property to be verified: To execute the operation BanMember on some banned member, the state of the system will not changed.
- Such a property can be stated as follows:

$\text{BanMember} \mid \text{ban?} \in \text{banned} \models \exists \text{FID}$



Properties of the specification

- By definition, the above statement is equivalent to the following one:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \text{FID}; \text{ban?} : \text{ID} \mid & (\text{ban?} \in \text{dom members} \wedge \\ & \text{banned}' = \text{banned} \cup \{\text{ban?}\} \wedge \text{members}' = \text{members} \wedge \\ & \text{ban?} \in \text{banned}) \\ \models \\ \Delta \text{FID} \mid & \text{members}' = \text{members} \wedge \text{banned}' = \text{banned} \end{aligned}$$



Properties of the specification

- By definition, the above statement is equivalent to the following one:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \text{FID}; \text{ban?} : \text{ID} \mid (\text{ban?} \in \text{dom members} \wedge \\ \text{banned}' = \text{banned} \cup \{\text{ban?}\} \wedge \text{members}' = \text{members} \wedge \\ \text{ban?} \in \text{banned}) \\ \models \\ \Delta \text{FID} \mid \text{members}' = \text{members} \wedge \text{banned}' = \text{banned} \end{aligned}$$

- From $\text{ban?} \in \text{banned}$ and $\text{banned}' = \text{banned} \cup \{\text{ban?}\}$, we know $\text{banned}' = \text{banned}$, which completes the proof.



Exercises

SM

$\text{dir} : B \rightarrow U$

$\text{free} : \mathbb{P} B$

$\text{free} = B \setminus (\text{dom dir})$

InitSM

SM'

$\text{dir}' = \{\}$

$\text{free}' = B$

Release₀

ΔSM

$u? : U$

$b? : B$

$r! : \text{Report}$

$(b? \mapsto u?) \in \text{dir}$

$\text{free}' = \text{free} \cup \{b?\}$

$\text{dir}' = \{b?\} \triangleleft \text{dir}$

$r! = \text{"Okay"}$

Ex. 1

What is the initialization theorem of the above specification? Write it down, and prove it.

Ex. 2

What is the schema of precondition of Release₀? Write it down, and simplify it.