

IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON

TIMED REMOTE ASSESSMENTS 2020-2021

BEng Honours Degree in Computing Part I
MEng Honours Degrees in Computing Part I
for Internal Students of the Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine

*This paper is also taken for the relevant assessments for the
Associateship of the City and Guilds of London Institute*

PAPER COMP40006

REASONING ABOUT PROGRAMS

Friday 30 April 2021, 10:00

Duration: 95 minutes

Includes 15 minutes for access and submission

Answer ALL TWO questions

Open book assessment

This time-limited remote assessment has been designed to be open book. You may use resources which have been identified by the examiner to complete the assessment and are included in the instructions for the examination. You must not use any additional resources when completing this assessment.

The use of the work of another student, past or present, constitutes plagiarism. Giving your work to another student to use constitutes an offence. Collusion is a form of plagiarism and will be treated in a similar manner. This is an individual assessment and thus should be completed solely by you. The College will investigate all instances where an examination or assessment offence is reported or suspected, using plagiarism software, vivas and other tools, and apply appropriate penalties to students. In all examinations we will analyse exam performance against previous performance and against data from previous years and use an evidence-based approach to maintain a fair and robust examination. As with all exams, the best strategy is to read the question carefully and answer as fully as possible, taking account of the time and number of marks available.

Paper contains 2 questions

1 This question is about proof by induction.

a The following code describes two Haskell functions, `rev` and `revTR`, which reverse lists; the latter is tail-recursive.

```
rev :: [a] -> [a]
rev [] = []
rev (x:xs) = rev xs ++ [x]

revTR :: [a] -> [a] -> [a]
revTR [] ys = ys
revTR (x:xs) ys = revTR xs (x:ys)
```

i) Write out the result of

`revTR (1:3:5:[]) (2:4:[])`

(You do not need to show any intermediate steps.)

ii) Prove that

(*) $\forall xs : [a]. \forall ys : [a]. \forall zs : [a].$

$[\text{revTR } (xs ++ ys) \text{ } zs = \text{revTR } ys \text{ } ((\text{rev } xs) ++ zs)]$

Write what is to be shown, what is taken arbitrary and justify each step.

You may want to use some of the following properties of lists, which hold for all $u : a$, all $us : [a]$, all $vs : [a]$, and all $ws : [a]$.

- (A) $us ++ (vs ++ ws) = (us ++ vs) ++ ws$
- (B) $u : us = [u] ++ us$
- (C) $us ++ [] = us$
- (D) $[] ++ us = us$
- (E) $\text{rev } (us ++ vs) = (\text{rev } vs) ++ (\text{rev } us)$

iii) Prove that

(**) $\forall xs : [a]. [\text{revTR } xs \text{ } [] = \text{rev } xs]$

- b Consider the following three definitions of Haskell data types, where `Exp` describes a simple language of expressions, `TypeT` is meant to represent integer and boolean types, and `Val` is meant to represent values.

```
data Exp = Cond Exp Exp Exp | BoolE Bool | IntE Int
data TypeT = IntT | BoolT
data Val = IntV Int | BoolV Bool
```

The following three relations

$EType \subseteq \text{Exp} \times \text{TypeT}$ describes the type of an expression,
 $VType \subseteq \text{Val} \times \text{TypeT}$ describes the type of a value, and
 $EVal \subseteq \text{Exp} \times \text{Val}$ describes the value of an expression.

are defined below:

- (R1) $\forall i:\text{Int}. EType(\text{IntE } i, \text{IntT})$
(R2) $\forall b:\text{Bool}. EType(\text{BoolE } b, \text{BoolT})$
(R3) $\forall e_1, e_2, e_3 : \text{Exp}. \forall t : \text{TypeT}.$
 $[EType(e_1, \text{BoolT}) \wedge EType(e_2, t) \wedge EType(e_3, t) \rightarrow EType(\text{Cond } e_1 \ e_2 \ e_3, t)]$
(R4) $\forall i:\text{Int}. VType(\text{IntV } i, \text{IntT})$
(R5) $\forall b:\text{Bool}. VType(\text{BoolV } b, \text{BoolT})$
(R6) $\forall i:\text{Int}. EVal(\text{IntE } i, \text{IntV } i)$
(R7) $\forall b:\text{Bool}. EVal(\text{BoolE } b, \text{BoolV } b)$
(R8) $\forall e_1, e_2, e_3 : \text{Exp}. \forall v_2, v_3 : \text{Val}$
 $[EVal(e_1, \text{BoolV } \text{true}) \wedge EVal(e_2, v_2) \wedge EVal(e_3, v_3) \rightarrow EVal(\text{Cond } e_1 \ e_2 \ e_3, v_2)]$
(R9) $\forall e_1, e_2, e_3 : \text{Exp}. \forall v_2, v_3 : \text{Val}$
 $[EVal(e_1, \text{BoolV } \text{false}) \wedge EVal(e_2, v_2) \wedge EVal(e_3, v_3) \rightarrow EVal(\text{Cond } e_1 \ e_2 \ e_3, v_3)]$

- i) Consider the expression e defined as:

$e \triangleq \text{Cond } (\text{BoolE } \text{false}) (\text{IntE } 3) (\text{Cond } (\text{BoolE } \text{true}) (\text{IntE } 4) (\text{IntE } 5))$

Give a value $v \in \text{Val}$ such that $EVal(e, v)$ holds.

(You do not need to show any intermediate steps or justify your answer.)

- ii) Write an expression $e' \in \text{Exp}$ for which there exists *no* type $t \in \text{TypeT}$ for which $EType(e, t)$ holds. (You do not need to justify your answer.)

- iii) Based on the definition of $EType$, write the inductive principle that would allow you to prove:

(***) $\forall e : \text{Exp}. \forall t : \text{TypeT}.$
 $[EType(e, t) \rightarrow \exists v. [EVal(e, v) \wedge VType(v, t)]]$

The two parts carry, respectively, 60% and 40% of the marks.

2 This is a question about loops and method calls.

Consider the Java method `split(char[] in, char c)` defined as:

```

1 char[][] split( char[] in, char c )
2 // PRE: in ≠ null (P)
3 // POST: ∃k:ℕ.[Occurs(in[..],c) = k ∧ in[..] ≈ Flatten(r[..],c,k) : r[k]] ∧ in ≈ in[..]pre (Q)
4 {
5   int start = 0;
6   int pos = 0;
7   int found = 0;
8   char[][] out = new char[in.length+1][];
9
10  // INV: ??? (I)
11  // VAR: ??? (V)
12  while (pos < in.length){
13    if ( in[pos] == c ){
14      out[found] = slice(in, start, pos);
15      found++;
16      start = pos + 1;
17    }
18    pos++;
19  }
20
21  // MID: ??? (M1)
22  out[found] = slice(in, start, pos);
23  // MID: ??? (M2)
24  return out;
25 }
```

This method splits up a provided string (treated as a character array) into an array of substrings that were delimited by the provided character `c` in the original string. The method makes use of an auxiliary library method `slice` that creates a partial copy of a provided array. The implementation of the `slice` method is not known, but it is claimed that it satisfies the following specification:

```

char[] slice(char[] str, int start, int finish)
//PRE: str ≠ null ∧ 0 ≤ start ≤ finish ≤ str.length
//POST: r[..] ≈ str[start..finish] ∧ str[..] ≈ str[..]pre
{ ... }
```

The specification of the `split` method relies on the following functions for array slices:

$$\text{Occurs}(a[..], v) \triangleq |\{ k \mid a[k] = v \}|$$

$$\text{Flatten}(a[..], v, k) \triangleq \begin{cases} [] & \text{if } k = 0 \\ \text{Flatten}(a[..], v, k-1) : a[k-1] : v & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\text{Flatten}(a[..], v, k)$ converts k elements of a two-dimensional array a into a one-dimensional array interleaved with the element v . For example:

$$\text{Flatten}([['a', 'b'], ['c']], '-', 2) = ['a', 'b', '-', 'c', '-']$$

- a
- i) Write the result of evaluating
`Occurs(['w', 'a', 'a', 't', '?'], 'a')`.
 - ii) Write out the state of the whole array `r` returned from running the code
`split(['w', 'a', 'a', 't', '?'], 'a')`.
- [**Note:** You may assume that `new char[x][]`; creates a new two-dimensional character array whose outer length is `x`, with all of its contents set to `null`.]
- b Unfortunately, the author has not fully specified the `split` method.
- i) Give mid-conditions M_1 and M_2 that are strong enough to prove partial correctness of the code. (You do *not* need to prove anything.)
 - ii) Give an invariant I for the loop that is appropriate to show total correctness. (You do *not* need to prove anything.)
- [**Hint:** The invariant should have four conjuncts: the first should bound and relate the values of `start` and `pos`; the second should describe the contents of the array `in`; the third should define the value of `found`; and the last should relate the contents of the two-dimensional array `out` with the array `in`.]
- iii) Give a variant V for the loop that is appropriate to show termination. (You do *not* need to prove anything.)
- c Prove that the body of the loop in the `split` method re-establishes your invariant from part b.ii) in an iteration where `in[pos] = c`.
State clearly what is given and what you need to show.
- d On line 8, the `split` method creates a two-dimensional character array `out` whose outer length is one element more than the length of the input array `in`.
Could we save space by creating the two-dimensional character array `out` with a smaller outer length, without compromising the correctness of the method?
Justify your answer and provide a worst case example input to the `split` method that requires the most space in the two-dimensional character array `out`.

The four parts carry, respectively, 10%, 35%, 45%, and 10% of the marks.