

## 191220154 AsOpSem

1. Let  $c_1$  be  $x := 0$ ,  $c_2$  be **while true do**  $x := x + 1$ , for any  $\sigma$  there is

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (c_1; c_2, \sigma) = (x := 0; \text{while true do } x := x + 1, \sigma) \\
 & \rightarrow (\text{skip}; \text{while true do } x := x + 1, \sigma \{x \rightsquigarrow 0\}) \\
 & \rightarrow (\text{while true do } x := x + 1, \sigma \{x \rightsquigarrow 0\}) \\
 & \rightarrow (\text{if true then } (x := x + 1; \text{while true do } x := x + 1) \text{ else skip}, \sigma \{x \rightsquigarrow 0\}) \\
 & \rightarrow (x := x + 1; \text{while true do } x := x + 1, \sigma \{x \rightsquigarrow 0\}) \\
 & \rightarrow^* (\text{skip}; \text{while true do } x := x + 1, \sigma \{x \rightsquigarrow 1\}) \\
 & \rightarrow (\text{while true do } x := x + 1, \sigma \{x \rightsquigarrow 1\})
 \end{aligned}$$

There exists  $\sigma' = \sigma \{x \rightsquigarrow 1\}$  so that  $(c_1; c_2, \sigma) \rightarrow^* (c_2, \sigma')$ . However,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (c_1, \sigma) = (x := 0, \sigma) \rightarrow (\text{skip}, \sigma \{x \rightsquigarrow 0\}) \\
 & (\text{skip}, \sigma \{x \rightsquigarrow 0\}) \not\rightarrow^* (\text{skip}, \sigma \{x \rightsquigarrow 1\}), \text{ thus } (c_1, \sigma) \not\rightarrow^* (\text{skip}, \sigma')
 \end{aligned}$$

2. (a) the small-step operational semantics rule for  $++x$

$$\frac{\sigma(x) = \lfloor n \rfloor \quad \lfloor n' \rfloor = \lfloor n \rfloor + 1}{(++x, \sigma) \rightarrow (n', \sigma \{x \rightsquigarrow \lfloor n \rfloor + 1\})}$$

(b) the full execution path for the program

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (\text{while } x < 7 \text{ do } x := (x++) + (++x), \{x \rightsquigarrow 6\}) \\
 & \rightarrow (\text{if } x < 7 \text{ do } (x := (x++) + (++x)); \\
 & \quad \text{while } x < 7 \text{ do } x := (x++) + (++x)) \text{ else skip}, \{x \rightsquigarrow 6\}) \\
 & \rightarrow (\text{if } 6 < 7 \text{ do } (x := (x++) + (++x)); \\
 & \quad \text{while } x < 7 \text{ do } x := (x++) + (++x)) \text{ else skip}, \{x \rightsquigarrow 6\}) \\
 & \rightarrow (\text{if true do } (x := (x++) + (++x)); \\
 & \quad \text{while } x < 7 \text{ do } x := (x++) + (++x)) \text{ else skip}, \{x \rightsquigarrow 6\}) \\
 & \rightarrow (x := (x++) + (++x); \text{while } x < 7 \text{ do } x := (x++) + (++x), \{x \rightsquigarrow 6\}) \\
 & \rightarrow (x := 6 + (++x); \text{while } x < 7 \text{ do } x := (x++) + (++x), \{x \rightsquigarrow 7\}) \\
 & \rightarrow (x := 6 + 8; \text{while } x < 7 \text{ do } x := (x++) + (++x), \{x \rightsquigarrow 8\}) \\
 & \rightarrow (x := 14; \text{while } x < 7 \text{ do } x := (x++) + (++x), \{x \rightsquigarrow 8\}) \\
 & \rightarrow (\text{skip}; \text{while } x < 7 \text{ do } x := (x++) + (++x), \{x \rightsquigarrow 14\}) \\
 & \rightarrow (\text{while } x < 7 \text{ do } x := (x++) + (++x), \{x \rightsquigarrow 14\}) \\
 & \rightarrow (\text{if } x < 7 \text{ do } (x := (x++) + (++x)); \\
 & \quad \text{while } x < 7 \text{ do } x := (x++) + (++x)) \text{ else skip}, \{x \rightsquigarrow 14\}) \\
 & \rightarrow (\text{if } 14 < 7 \text{ do } (x := (x++) + (++x));
 \end{aligned}$$

$\text{while } x < 7 \text{ do } x := (x++) + (x++) \text{ else skip, } \{x \rightsquigarrow 14\}$   
 $\rightarrow (\text{if false do } (x := (x++) + (x++));$   
 $\text{while } x < 7 \text{ do } x := (x++) + (x++) \text{ else skip, } \{x \rightsquigarrow 14\})$   
 $\rightarrow (\text{skip, } \{x \rightsquigarrow 14\})$

3. (a) small-step operational semantics rules for the new expression

$$\frac{(c, \sigma) \rightarrow (c', \sigma')}{(\text{do } c \text{ return } e, \sigma) \rightarrow (\text{do } c' \text{ return } e, \sigma')}$$

$$\frac{}{(\text{do skip return } e, \sigma) \rightarrow (e, \sigma)}$$

(b) For each of the following properties, does it hold?

i.  $\forall e_1, e_2. (e_1 + e_2) \prec (e_1 + e_2 + 1)$

Yes.

ii.  $\forall e_1, e_2. (e_1 + e_2) \prec (e_2 + e_1 + 1)$

No. let  $e_1$  be  $x$ ,  $e_2$  be  $\text{do } x := x - 2 \text{ return } y$

for any given  $\sigma$ , let  $\mathbf{n}'_1 = \sigma(x)$ ,  $\mathbf{n}'_2 = \sigma(y)$ ,  $\lfloor \mathbf{n}'_3 \rfloor = \lfloor \mathbf{n}'_1 \rfloor - 2$

$(e_1 + e_2, \sigma)$

$\rightarrow (\mathbf{n}'_1 + e_2, \sigma)$

$\rightarrow (\mathbf{n}'_1 + \mathbf{n}'_2, \sigma \{x \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{n}'_3\})$

$(e_2 + e_1 + 1, \sigma)$

$\rightarrow (\mathbf{n}'_2 + e_1 + 1, \sigma \{x \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{n}'_3\})$

$\rightarrow (\mathbf{n}'_2 + \mathbf{n}'_3 + 1, \sigma \{x \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{n}'_3\})$

so we have  $(e_1 + e_2, \sigma) \rightarrow^* (\mathbf{n}_1, \sigma_1)$ ,  $(e_2 + e_1 + 1, \sigma) \rightarrow^* (\mathbf{n}_2, \sigma_2)$

where  $\lfloor \mathbf{n}_1 \rfloor = \lfloor \mathbf{n}'_1 \rfloor + \lfloor \mathbf{n}'_2 \rfloor$ ,  $\lfloor \mathbf{n}_2 \rfloor = \lfloor \mathbf{n}'_2 \rfloor + \lfloor \mathbf{n}'_3 \rfloor + 1 = \lfloor \mathbf{n}'_1 \rfloor + \lfloor \mathbf{n}'_2 \rfloor - 1$

$\lfloor \mathbf{n}_1 \rfloor > \lfloor \mathbf{n}_2 \rfloor$ , thus  $(e_1 + e_2) \prec (e_2 + e_1 + 1)$  does not stand

iii.  $\forall e. \neg(e \prec e)$

No. let  $e$  be  $\text{do } (\text{while true do skip}) \text{ return } 0$

there exists no  $\mathbf{n}_1, \sigma_1$  or  $\mathbf{n}_2, \sigma_2$  so that  $(e, \sigma) \rightarrow^* (\mathbf{n}_1, \sigma_1)$ ,  $(e, \sigma) \rightarrow^* (\mathbf{n}_2, \sigma_2)$

as the program loops forever, thus we can say  $(e \prec e)$

iv.  $\forall e_1, e_2, e_3. (e_1 \prec e_2) \wedge (e_2 \prec e_3) \Rightarrow (e_1 \prec e_3)$

No. let  $e_1$  be  $1$ ,  $e_2$  be  $\text{do } (\text{while true do skip}) \text{ return } 0$ ,  $e_3$  be  $0$

there exists no  $\mathbf{n}_2, \sigma_2$  so that  $(e_2, \sigma) \rightarrow^* (\mathbf{n}_2, \sigma_2)$

thus we can say  $(e_1 \prec e_2)$  and  $(e_2 \prec e_3)$

however, because  $(e_1, \sigma) \rightarrow^* (1, \sigma)$  and  $(e_3, \sigma) \rightarrow^* (0, \sigma)$

we have  $\lfloor 1 \rfloor > \lfloor 0 \rfloor$ , thus  $(e_1 \prec e_3)$  does not stand