

CSC240 Lecture 13 week 9

Author: Joseph Siu

 ${\bf Email: joseph.siu@mail.utoronto.ca}$

Date: March 13, 2024



Lecture 13 week 9

```
\overline{\text{MERGESORT}(A[1..n], n)}
```

- 1 if n > 1 then
- $2 \qquad m \leftarrow \left| \frac{n}{2} \right|$
- $\mathbf{A}' \leftarrow \mathbf{\tilde{A}}[\mathbf{\tilde{1}}..m]$
- 4 $A'' \leftarrow A[m+1..n]$
- 5 MERGESORT(A', m)
- 6 MERGESORT(A'', n m)
- 7 $A \leftarrow MERGE(A',m,A'',n-m)$

1 Correctness of Algorithms

An algorithm is correct if it satisfies its specifications

Specifications are often written using

1. Precondition

- certain facts must be true before an execution of the algorithm begins
- it can describe what inputs are allowed

2. Postcondition

- certain facts must be true when an execution of the algorithm ends
- often it describes the correct output or possible correct outputs for a given input

3. Termination

the algorithm halts when the preconditions are true

Example 1. Search array A for value k.

Precondition: The elements of A[1..n] and k are from the same domain (so we can compare them) (i.e. we can't compare int with str)

Postcondition: Return an integer i such that $1 \le i \le n$ and A[i] = k or 0 if no such index i exists. Specification does not say anything about the algorithm just tells us the relation between the inputs and the outputs.

For this example, consider the algorithm:

$$A[1] \leftarrow k$$

return 1

 $k \leftarrow A[1]$ return 1

This works but it is not what we intended.

So,

Postcondition: A is not changed, k is not changed.

ాత

Example 2. Specifications for Binary Search Algorithm **Precondition**: A[1..nn] is sorted in non decreasing order

$$\forall i \in \mathbb{Z}^+ . \forall j \in \mathbb{Z}^+ . [(i < j \le n) \text{ IMPLIES } (A[i] \le A[j])]$$

Postcondition: same as for searching an array

2 Sorting an array

Precondition: the elements in A[1..n] are from a totally ordered domain

Postcondition:

- The multiset of elements in A[1..n] is not changed
- The elements in A[1..n] afterwards are a permutation of the elements in A[1..n] before the algorithm was in A[1..n] before the algorithm has executed
- The elements of A are in nondecreasing order.

3 Merging two arrays

Precondition: A[1..m] and B[1..n] are sorted in nondecreasing order. The elements in A[1..m] and B[1..n] are from the same totally ordered domain.

Postcondition:

- Outputs an array C[1..m+n] such that the multiset of elements in C[1..m+n] is the union of the multisets of elements in A[1..m] and B[1..n].
- A and B are not changed.
- C is sorted in nondecreasing order.

4 Proving Correctness of Recursive Algorithms

Usually use induction

Example 3. Correctness of MERGESORT.

Assuming the correctness of MERGE.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let P(n) = "for all array A[1..n] with elements from a totaly ordered set.

If MERGESORT(A[1..n]) is performed, then it eventually halts / returns, at which time A is sorted in nondecreasing order and the multiset of element A is unchanged."

Proof.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary.

Let A[1..n] be an arbitrary array with elements from a totally ordered set.

Consider $\overline{MERGESORT(A[1..n])}$.

Base Case n = 0 and n = 1

the test on line 1 fails, algorithm terminates immediately, so A is unchanged. Trivially A is sorted in nondecreasing order.

Induction Case n > 1:

test on line 1 is true and $m = \left| \frac{n}{2} \right|$ from line 2.

m, n - m < n.

 $A = A' \cup A''.$

By the induction hypothesis after lines 5+6, A' and A'' are sorted in nondecreasing order and the multisets of elements in A' and A'' are unchanged.

Preconditions of MERGEare satisfied, so after line 7, A is sorted in nondecreasing after, and the multiset of elements in A is the union of the multiset of elements in $A' \cup A''$, which is the original multiset of elements in A.

So, by generalization, P(n) is true.

Since n was arbitrary, by induction $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}.P(n)$.

Hence MERGESORTis correct.

Quoi Erat Dem

5 Correctness of Iterative Algorithms

Partial Correctness: \underline{if} the preconditions hold, the algorithm is executed, and it terminates, \underline{then} the postconditions hold.

<u>Termination</u>: if the preconditions hold, and the algorithm is executed, then it eventually terminates.

 $Total\ correctness = partial\ correctness\ and\ termination.$

For iterative algorithms, they are typically proved separately.

M(m, n)

- $1 \ z \leftarrow 0$
- $2 \ w \leftarrow m$
- 3 while $w \neq 0$ do
- 4 $z \leftarrow z + n$
- $5 \qquad w \leftarrow w 1$
- 6 return z

It performs multiplication by repeated addition

Precondition: $m \in \mathbb{N}, n \in \mathbb{C}$

Postcondition: $z = m \times n$, m and n are unchanged. ¹

Immediately after the i^{th} iteration of the while loop, w = m - i and $z = n \times i$.

Correction: immediately after the 0th iteration means immediately before the 1st iteration

Let P(i) = " if the loop is executed at least i times, the immediately after the ith iteration w = m - i and $z = n \times i$."

Lemma 1

Let $M \in \mathbb{Z}, n \in \mathbb{C}$,

 $\forall i \in \mathbb{N}.P(i)$

B

proof of Lemma 1.

Let w_i and z_i denote the values of w and z immediately after the i^{th} iteration Base Case:

Initially $w_0 = m = m - 0$ by line 2,

¹we can see there are no assert to m or n, thus they are trivially unchanged.

$$z_0 = 0 = n \times 0$$
 by line 1,
so $P(0)$ is true.

Induction Case:

Let $i \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary and assume P(i) is true.

Assume the loop is executed at least i+1 times. Then $w_i = m-i$ and $z_i = n \times i$,

From lines 4 and 5, we have $z_{i+1} = z_i + n = n \times i + n = n \times (i+1)$ and $w_{i+1} = w_i - 1 = n \times i + n$ m - i - 1 = m - (i + 1).

Hence P(i+1) is true.

Hence by induction $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}.P(n)$.

Erat Dem∎

To show total correctness, we first show the partial correctness (we are going to prove it in 2 ways).

Corollary 1 – Partial Correctness

Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{C}$, if M(m, n) is non of it halts then it returns $z = n \times m$.

Proof of Corollary 1.

Suppose the loop halts imendiately after the i^{th} iteration of the loop

From the termination condition of the loop (line 3) $w_i = 0$

By the lemma, $w_i = m - i$ and $z_i = n \times i$, so i = m and $z_i = n \times m$

Hence $z_i = m \times n$ is returned.

A loop invariant is a predicate that is true each time a particular place in the loop is reached.

Often we consider the beginning / end of iterations of the loop.

Assume this, unless specified otherwise.

Lemma 2

 $z = n \times (m - w)$ is a loop invariant.

adoes not contain i where i is the number of iterations

Proof of Lemma 2.

Initially from lines 1 and 2, z = 0 and w = m so $n \times (m - w) = 0 = z$.

Consider an arbitrary iteration of the loop

Let w' and z' be the values of w and z at the beginning of the iteration and let w'' and z'' be the values of w and z at the end of the iteration.

Suppose the claim is true at the beginning of the iteration. Then $z' = n \times (m - w')$.

From lines 4 and 5 the code w'' = w' - 1 and z'' = z' + n, so

$$n \times (m - w'') = n \times (m - (w' - 1))$$
$$= n \times (m - w') + n$$
$$= z' + n$$
$$= z''$$

Hence the claim is true at the end of the iteraion.

By induction, $z = n \times (m - w)$ after every iteration.

Another Proof of Corollary 1.

From the termination condition of the loop (line 3) w=0

Since $z = n \times (m - w)$ is a loop invariant

 $z = n \times (m - w) = n \times m$ when the loop terminates.

Now, we show the termination. From there we can conclude total correctness.

Lemma 3 – Termination

If $n \in \mathbb{C}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and M(m, n) is run, then it eventually halts Namely,

 $\forall n \in \mathbb{C}. \forall m \in \mathbb{N}. (M(m, n) \text{ eventually halts}).$

Informal Proof of Lemma 3.

Before the loop is executed w is set to $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Each iteration, w is decreased by 1, so it is a smaller natural number.

Hence w must eventually reach 0. This is the exit condition of the loop. Therefore the loop terminates and the algorithm returns.

More formal Proof of Lemma 3.

Suppose the loop does not terminate.

Let n, m be arbitrary.

Let w_i be the value of w immediately after the ith iteration of the loop.

From line 5, we know $w_{i+1} = w_i - 1$

For all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $Q(i) = "w_i \in \mathbb{N}"$

Base Case:

Since $w_0 = m \in \mathbb{N}$ by assumption, Q(0) is true.

Induction Case:

Let $i \geq 0$ be arbitrary and assume Q(i) is true

Since the loop does not terminate $w_i \neq 0$, then $w_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Since $w_{i+1} = w_i - 1$, it follows that $w_{i+1} \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence Q(i+1) is true.

By induction $\forall i \in \mathbb{N}. Q(i)$.

Then w_0, w_1, w_2 is a sequence of natural numbers such that w_{i+1}, w_i for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

By the well ordering principle, this sequence has a smallest element w_k .

But $w_{k+1} < w_k$

This contradicts the definition of w_k ,

Thus the loop (and algorithm M) eventually terminates.

Since n, m were arbitrary. By generalization, the lemma is true.

Erat Dem∎

Therefore, we conclude that Mis totally correct.