

# Week2

IN0003

Jigao

TUM

7. November 2018

- The video of central Tutorial is linked in this exercise sheet.
- This time we will do more about the **LOOP INVARIANT**
- I hope you also have attended the tutorial from last week.
- My slide would not almost same as the Solution. But I have no graph.

- Aufgabe 3.1 of last year, if you want to refer to the german solution.
- We have to discuss the results for **positive and negative inputs**
- Maybe some terminate problem!

- The assertion follows immediately from the loop condition.
- So whenever the loop is left,  $i = n$  **holds** automatically.
- Here don't think about, if this point is reachable or not. Just look at the **LOOP CONDITON..**
- What would this program be, if we have a negative  $n$ ?

- The assertion follows immediately from the loop condition.
- So whenever the loop is left,  $i = n$  **holds** automatically.
- Here don't think about, if this point is reachable or not. Just look at the **LOOP CONDITON..**
- What would this program be, if we have a negative  $n$ ?
- For  $n < 0$  and  $n \not\equiv 0 \text{ mod } 2$  **the loop does not terminate.**
- However, this does not violate the assertion!
- Here the assertion only depends on the **LOOP CONDITON.**

- The assertion follows immediately from the loop condition.
- So whenever the loop is left,  $i = n$  **holds** automatically.
- Here don't think about, if this point is reachable or not. Just look at the **LOOP CONDITON..**
- What would this program be, if we have a negative  $n$ ?
- For  $n < 0$  and  $n \not\equiv 0 \text{ mod } 2$  **the loop does not terminate.**
- However, this does not violate the assertion!
- Here the assertion only depends on the **LOOP CONDITON.**
- What is the WP of the right of the loop?

- The assertion follows immediately from the loop condition.
- So whenever the loop is left,  $i = n$  **holds** automatically.
- Here don't think about, if this point is reachable or not. Just look at the **LOOP CONDITON..**
- What would this program be, if we have a negative  $n$ ?
- For  $n < 0$  and  $n \not\equiv 0 \text{ mod } 2$  **the loop does not terminate.**
- However, this does not violate the assertion!
- Here the assertion only depends on the **LOOP CONDITON.**
- What is the WP of the right of the loop?
- It is *true*. We don't have to care about what  $i$  is.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{WP}[i == n](\text{true}, i = n) \\ \equiv & (i \neq n \implies \text{true}) \wedge (i = n \implies i = n) \\ \equiv & \text{true} \end{aligned}$$



- The loop terminates when  $i$  reaches  $n$  and thus  $i = n$  holds.
- What if  $n < 0$ ?

- The loop terminates when  $i$  reaches  $n$  and thus  $i = n$  holds.
- What if  $n < 0$ ?
- Terminate the loop immediately. – What we don't want.
- It is harder to find the WP of the right side.
- We make sure that  $n \geq 0$  (or generally  $n \geq i$ ) holds before the loop

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{WP}[i = i + 1](n \geq i) \\ \equiv & n \geq i + 1 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{WP}[i \geq n](n \geq i + 1, i = n) \\ \equiv & (i < n \implies n \geq i + 1) \wedge (i \geq n \implies i = n) \\ \equiv & i \geq n \implies i = n \\ \equiv & i < n \vee i = n \\ \equiv & i \leq n \iff n \geq i \end{aligned}$$

- For  $n < 0$  so we require  $n \geq i$  before the loop. - like 3.1.2
- Moreover, the loop may be reached with an  $i = n - 1$ .
- In this case the program would increment  $i$  to  $i = n + 1$  and reach the exit with  $i \neq n$ .
- So that  $n \geq i$  is indeed not sufficient:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{WP}[i = i + 2](n \geq i) \\ & \equiv n \geq i + 2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{WP}[i \geq n](n \geq i + 2, i = n) \\ & \equiv (i < n \implies n \geq i + 2) \wedge (i \geq n \implies i = n) \\ & \equiv (i \geq n \vee n \geq i + 2) \wedge (i < n \vee i = n) \\ & \equiv i \neq n - 1 \wedge i \leq n \not\equiv n \geq i \end{aligned}$$

- Intuitively we could see that:

$$I \equiv n \bmod 2 = 0 \wedge i \bmod 2 = 0 \wedge n \geq i$$

- We make it **stronger**

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{WP}[i = i + 2](I) \\ & \equiv n \bmod 2 = 0 \wedge i + 2 \bmod 2 = 0 \wedge n \geq i + 2 \\ & \equiv I \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{WP}[i \geq n](I, i = n) \\ & \equiv (i < n \implies I) \wedge (i \geq n \implies i = n) \\ & \equiv (i \geq n \vee I) \wedge (i < n \vee i = n) \\ & \equiv (i \geq n \vee I) \wedge i \leq n \iff I \end{aligned}$$

So  $I \equiv n \bmod 2 = 0 \wedge i \bmod 2 = 0 \wedge n \geq i$  is sufficient

We show that  $I \equiv x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k$  is sufficient:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{WP}[x = x + y](I) & \text{WP}[y = 5 * i](A) \\
 \equiv & \text{WP}[x = x + y](x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k) & \equiv \text{WP}[y = 5 * i](x = -y + \sum_{k=0}^i 5k) \\
 \equiv & x + y = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k & \equiv x = -5i + \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \\
 \equiv & x = -y + \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \quad \equiv: A & \equiv x = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} 5k \quad \equiv: B
 \end{aligned}$$

The counter  $i$  changed to  $i - 1$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{WP}[i = i + 1](B) \\ \equiv & \text{WP}[i = i + 1](x = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} 5k) \\ \equiv & x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \quad \equiv: C \end{aligned}$$

The counter  $i - 1$  changed to  $i$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{WP}[i == n](C, x = \sum_{k=0}^n 5k) \\
& \equiv \text{WP}[i == n](x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k, x = \sum_{k=0}^n 5k) \\
& \equiv (i \neq n \wedge x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k) \vee (i = n \wedge x = \sum_{k=0}^n 5k) \\
& \equiv (i \neq n \wedge x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k) \vee (i = n \wedge x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k) \\
& \equiv x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \quad \equiv I
\end{aligned}$$

The two logic terms on the line 4 can be merged!

Your turn to exercise.



Your turn to exercise.

We show that  $I \equiv x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k$  is **not** sufficient:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 \text{WP}[x = x + y](I) & \text{WP}[y = y + 5](A) \\
 \equiv \text{WP}[x = x + y](x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k) & \equiv \text{WP}[y = y + 5](x = -y + \sum_{k=0}^i 5k) \\
 \equiv x + y = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k & \equiv x = -(y + 5) + \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \\
 \equiv x = -y + \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \quad \equiv: A & \equiv: B
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & WP[i = i + 1](B) \\
 \equiv & WP[i = i + 1](x = -(y + 5) + \sum_{k=0}^i 5k)) \\
 \equiv & x = -(y + 5) + \sum_{k=0}^{i+1} 5k \quad \equiv: C
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{WP}[i == n](C, x = \sum_{k=0}^n 5k) \\
& \equiv \text{WP}[i == n](x = -(y + 5) + \sum_{k=0}^{i+1} 5k) \\
& \equiv (i \neq n \wedge x = -(y + 5) + \sum_{k=0}^{i+1} 5k) \\
& \quad \vee (i = n \wedge x = \sum_{k=0}^n 5k) \quad \not\Leftarrow A
\end{aligned}$$

This invariant is not strong enough, because we do not have any information about  $y$ , so we cannot simplify anything.

The one before is too weak to guarantee the loop invariant. Adding  $y = 5i$  renders the invariant sufficient, which becomes stronger:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{WP}[x = x + y](I) \\ & \equiv \text{WP}[x = x + y](x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \wedge y = 5i) \\ & \equiv x + y = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \wedge y = 5i \\ & \equiv x = -5i + \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \wedge y = 5i \\ & \equiv x = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} 5k \wedge y = 5i \quad \equiv: A \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{WP}[y = y + 5](A) \\
& \equiv \text{WP}[y = y + 5]\left(x = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} 5k \wedge y = 5i\right) \\
& \equiv x = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} 5k \wedge y + 5 = 5i \\
& \equiv x = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} 5k \wedge y = 5(i-1) \quad \equiv: B
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{WP}[i = i + 1](B) \\ \equiv & \text{WP}[i = i + 1](x = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} 5k \wedge y = 5(i-1)) \\ \equiv & x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \wedge y = 5i \quad \equiv: C \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{WP}[i == n](C, x = \sum_{k=0}^n 5k) \\
& \equiv \text{WP}[i == n](x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \wedge y = 5i, x = \sum_{k=0}^n 5k) \\
& \equiv (i \neq n \wedge x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \wedge y = 5i) \vee (i = n \wedge x = \sum_{k=0}^n 5k) \\
& \Leftarrow (i \neq n \wedge x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \wedge y = 5i) \vee (i = n \wedge x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \wedge y = 5i) \\
& \equiv x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \wedge y = 5i \equiv I
\end{aligned}$$

Why to use a  $\Leftarrow$  ?

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{WP}[i == n](C, x = \sum_{k=0}^n 5k) \\
& \equiv \text{WP}[i == n](x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \wedge y = 5i, x = \sum_{k=0}^n 5k) \\
& \equiv (i \neq n \wedge x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \wedge y = 5i) \vee (i = n \wedge x = \sum_{k=0}^n 5k) \\
& \Leftarrow (i \neq n \wedge x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \wedge y = 5i) \vee (i = n \wedge x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \wedge y = 5i) \\
& \equiv x = \sum_{k=0}^i 5k \wedge y = 5i \equiv I
\end{aligned}$$

Why to use a  $\Leftarrow$  ?

The loop invariant should be able to imply the WP.



- In the 3.2.1 the  $y$  is "useless". It can be replaced directly by  $5 * i$ .
- But in the 3.2.1 the  $y$  contains the information, that  $i$  can not describe.
- $y$  is computed from the previous value of  $y$ , so the value of  $y$  when entering a loop iteration is indeed important, so we have to make a statement about it inside the invariant.
- This is often referred to as loop-carried dependency.

### 3.3 Two b, or not two b

Var	Time0	Time1	Time2	Time3	Time4	Time5	Time6
i	0	0	1	1	2	2	3
x	0	2	5	7	10	12	15
b	0	1	0	1	0	1	0

- From the tabular  $x = 5i + 2b \wedge b \in \{0, 1\}$ .
- When I leave the outer loop, I am with the  $b = 0$ , that is the last time with the inner loop.
- Try to get more information about the last time with the loops.
- Can you find a loop invariant?
- Can you prove, that your loop invar is correct?

$$I :\equiv x = 5i + 2b \wedge b \in \{0, 1\} \wedge (i = n \implies b = 0)$$

$$\text{WP}[b = 1 - b](I)$$

$$\equiv \text{WP}[b = 1 - b](x = 5i + 2b \wedge b \in \{0, 1\} \wedge (i = n \implies b = 0))$$

$$\equiv x = 5i - 2b + 2 \wedge b \in \{0, 1\} \wedge (i = n \implies b = 1) \quad \equiv: A$$

$$\text{WP}[i = i + 1](A)$$

$$\equiv \text{WP}[i = i + 1](x = 5i - 2b + 2 \wedge b \in \{0, 1\} \wedge (i = n \implies b = 1))$$

$$\equiv x = 5i - 2b + 7 \wedge b \in \{0, 1\} \wedge (i + 1 = n \implies b = 1) \quad \equiv: B$$

$$\text{WP}[x = x + 3](B)$$

$$\equiv \text{WP}[x = x + 3](x = 5i - 2b + 7 \wedge b \in \{0, 1\} \wedge (i + 1 = n \implies b = 1))$$

$$\equiv x = 5i - 2b + 4 \wedge b \in \{0, 1\} \wedge (i + 1 = n \implies b = 1) \quad \equiv: C$$

$$\text{WP}[x = x + 2](A)$$

$$\equiv \text{WP}[x = x + 2](x = 5i - 2b + 2 \wedge b \in \{0, 1\} \wedge (i = n \implies b = 1))$$

$$\equiv x = 5i - 2b \wedge b \in \{0, 1\} \wedge (i = n \implies b = 1) \quad \equiv: D$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{WP}[b == 0](C, D) \\
& \equiv \text{WP}[b == 0](x = 5i - 2b + 4 \wedge b \in \{0, 1\} \wedge (i + 1 = n \implies b = 1), \\
& \quad x = 5i - 2b \wedge b \in \{0, 1\} \wedge (i = n \implies b = 1)) \\
& \equiv (b = 1 \wedge x = 5i - 2b + 4 \wedge (i + 1 = n \implies b = 1)) \\
& \quad \vee (b = 0 \wedge x = 5i - 2b \wedge (i = n \implies b = 1)) \\
& \equiv (b = 1 \wedge x = 5i + 2) \vee (b = 0 \wedge x = 5i \wedge i \neq n) \\
& \Leftarrow (b = 1 \wedge x = 5i + 2b \wedge i \neq n) \vee (b = 0 \wedge x = 5i + 2b \wedge i \neq n) \\
& \equiv x = 5i + 2b \wedge i \neq n \wedge b \in \{0, 1\} \quad \equiv: E
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{WP}[i == n](E, Z) \\
& \equiv \text{WP}[i == n](x = 5i + 2b \wedge i \neq n \wedge b \in \{0, 1\}, x = 5n) \\
& \equiv (i \neq n \wedge x = 5i + 2b \wedge b \in \{0, 1\}) \vee (i = n \wedge x = 5n) \\
& \Leftarrow (i \neq n \wedge x = 5i + 2b \wedge b \in \{0, 1\} \wedge (i = n \implies b = 0)) \\
& \quad \vee (i = n \wedge x = 5n \wedge (i = n \implies b = 0) \wedge b \in \{0, 1\}) \\
& \equiv (i \neq n \wedge x = 5i + 2b \wedge b \in \{0, 1\} \wedge (i = n \implies b = 0)) \\
& \quad \vee (i = n \wedge x = 5i + 2b \wedge (i = n \implies b = 0) \wedge b \in \{0, 1\}) \\
& \equiv x = 5i + 2b \wedge b \in \{0, 1\} \wedge (i = n \implies b = 0) \equiv I
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{WP}[b = 0](I) \\
 \equiv & \text{WP}[b = 0](x = 5i + 2b \wedge b \in \{0, 1\} \wedge (i = n \implies b = 0)) \\
 \equiv & x = 5i \quad \equiv: F
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{WP}[i = 0](F) \\
 \equiv & \text{WP}[i = 0](x = 5i) \\
 \equiv & x = 0 \quad \equiv: G
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{WP}[n = \text{read()}](G) \\
 \equiv & \text{WP}[n = \text{read()}](x = 0) \\
 \equiv & x = 0 \quad H
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{WP}[x = 0](H) \\
 \equiv & \text{WP}[x = 0](x = 0) \\
 \equiv & \text{true}
 \end{aligned}$$

- The  $L3.4$  is very similar as the  $H1.6$ . Even easier. And I would not do that here.
- In this time we must know **How to find a Loop Invariant**, and **How to calculate the WPs**
- $3.2$  and  $3.3$  are about **how to find a sufficient Loop Invariant**.
- When the loop invariant not so sufficient, what happens? – Look at the solution  $3.2.2$  and  $3.3$
- Recommend the recording of last year's exercise.