

# Constrained Normal Path Proofs

by Sven Nilsen, 2020

A constrained normal path proof is a quantified existential path equation over a constrained normal path such that every path returns `true` for all inputs:

$$\forall x \{ f\{g_i(x)\}[unit \rightarrow g_n(x)] \Leftrightarrow true \}$$

$$f : T \rightarrow U$$

$$g_{in} : (T \rightarrow bool) \times U \rightarrow bool$$

The form of the constrained normal path follows from these two requirements:

- It is constrained
- It returns `true` for all inputs

It is always possible to reduce this problem to:

$$\forall x, t \{ \forall i \{ g_i(x)(t) \} \Rightarrow g_n(x)(f(t)) \}$$

Here, `=>` means material implication.

By constraining the path, it is necessary to check for the input domain. If it passes, then the path output must be checked to be `true`. However, if it fails to pass the input domain, then the output is irrelevant.

This corresponds to pre- and postconditions of computer programming.

Here is an example:

$$\forall x, y \{ add\{(> x), (> y)\}[unit \rightarrow (> x + y)] \Leftrightarrow true \}$$

$$add : nat \times nat \rightarrow nat$$

Reducing:

$$\forall x, y, ta, tb : nat \{ ta > x \wedge tb > y \Rightarrow ta + tb > x + y \}$$

Test case:

$$add\{(> 2), (> 3)\}[unit \rightarrow (> 5)]$$

$$\forall ta, tb : nat \{ ta > 2 \wedge tb > 3 \Rightarrow ta + tb > 5 \}$$

$$0 > 2 \wedge 1 > 3 \Rightarrow 1 > 5 \quad true$$

$$1 > 2 \wedge 5 > 3 \Rightarrow 6 > 5 \quad true$$

$$3 > 2 \wedge 3 > 3 \Rightarrow 6 > 5 \quad true$$

$$3 > 2 \wedge 4 > 3 \Rightarrow 7 > 5 \quad true$$

The most constrained normal path proof is obtained using the higher order constrained existential path:

$$\forall x \{ \exists f\{g_i(x)\} \Rightarrow g_n(x) \}$$

$$\forall x \{ \exists f\{g_i(x)\} : U \rightarrow \text{bool} \}$$

$$g_n : U \rightarrow \text{bool}$$

For example, by applying this to the same problem:

$$\exists \text{add}\{(> x), (> y)\} \Rightarrow (> x + y)$$

$$(> x + y + 1) \Rightarrow (> x + y)$$

$$(> 1) \Rightarrow (> 0) \quad \text{removing `x` and `y` on both sides of implication}$$

$$\text{true}$$

The post-condition ` $(> x + y + 1)$ ` is stronger than ` $(> x + y)$ `.

This means that the following is a tautology in path semantics:

$$\forall x \{ f\{g_i(x)\}[\text{unit} \rightarrow \exists f\{g_i(x)\}] \Leftrightarrow \text{true} \}$$

The tautology has a structure such that it puts maximum constraints for any parameterized pre- and postconditions of the function.