
MODULE *Md2LaTeXSystemDesign*

EXTENDS *Md2LaTeXCorrectness*, *FiniteSets*

CONSTANTS *ANY*, *PATH* Any object, any path

CONSTANTS

STRING_ALPH, The words of the latin alphabet

STRING_ALPH_NONEMPTY, $\triangleq \text{STRING_ALPH} \setminus \{\text{""}\}$

STRING_LATEX All *LaTeX Markups*/commands, including *""*.

CONSTANT *RECORD* Any record

CONSTANT *NAT* Any integer 0, 1, 2, ...

The preferences define a unique record

CONSTANTS *DOMAIN_OF_PREFERENCES*, *SET_OF_PREFERENCES*

“yes”, “on”, and “true” are synonyms;

“no”, “off”, and “false” are synonyms.

The way we express “yes”, “no” in a *JSON* file.

CONSTANTS *Y_N*, *JSON_YES*, *JSON_NO*, *EXCLUDED_BY_YES_OR_NO_POLICY*

The preferences are identified with a file ‘preferences’.

In practice, this is a *JSON* file $\{\}.preferences.json$

(see CONSTANT *SET_OF_PREFERENCES*),

even if no semantics push on that.

isPreferencesFileCompliant $\{\}$ keep track of preferences compliance.

VARIABLES *preferences*, *isPreferencesFileCompliant*

Convenient operator.

Recall that Yes = True and that No = False

$JSON_BOOL \triangleq JSON_YES \cup JSON_NO$

YesOrNo policy: BEGINNING

So, here is the specification of a file $\{\}.preferences.json$.

See CONSTANTS *DOMAIN_OF_PREFERENCES*, *SET_OF_PREFERENCES*;

or *Md2LaTeXSystemDesignPreferencesFile*

Such a file must implement, or at least “follow”, a specific policy,

that I named “*YesOrNo*”.

The *YesOrNo* policy:

Goal: The very purpose of all that verbose is about implementing a

key -namely, *Y_N* - you can see as a switch on/off button.

Definitions:

1. No: Means “no action”; which we define as follows:
 - i. If you do something, then it is discarded.
 - ii. If you announce something, then it is disregarded.
2. Saying “No”: The current key is mapped to some value in *JSON_NO*.
3. Saying “Yes”: The current key is mapped to some value in *JSON_YES*.

Statement:

1. It is Yes *XOR* No (see above definitions 2, 3).
 - 1.1.1. If you do not say anything, then it is No.
 - 1.1.2. If you say “emptyset” (None, NULL, “”, ...), then it is No.
 - 1.1.3. If you say “No”, then it is No.
- 1.2. If you say “Yes”, then you do value of key right now.
4. You do not neither do nor say anything else.

Implementation

The “yes or no” key *Y_N*

(see Statement 1 for existence, Statement 4 for uniqueness)

is always the String “Y/N”.

Moreover, we expect you actually do something relevant/nontrivial

This latter requirement cannot be implemented from a general case, since:

- (a) “relevant” and “nontrivial” are context-dependent.
- (b) The context space is countable but infinite.

A complementary approach is about defining

EXCLUDED_BY_YES_OR_NO_POLICY

as the minimal set of what is either trivial or irrelevant.

This set is not constructed ;).

(In practice, *EXCLUDED_BY_YES_OR_NO_POLICY* should contain, at least, boolean and numerical value

Hence, we cannot guarantee that the *YesOrNo* policy is implemented.

But we can check that the policy is “followed”, in the sense that:

- i. The policy is partially implemented and:
- ii. If the provided content is actually relevant,
then the policy is (nonprovably) implemented.

Test / action ‘*isFollowingYesOrNoPolicy(f)*’

We expect the atom *f* to be a “first-degree subrecord” of preferences

(*documentclass* \mapsto ..., *import_packages* \mapsto ..., and so on).

isFollowingYesOrNoPolicy(f) is TRUE if *f* follows *YesOrNo*.

isFollowingYesOrNoPolicy(f) \triangleq

$$\begin{aligned} &\wedge Y_N \in \text{DOMAIN } f \\ &\wedge \text{Cardinality}(\text{DOMAIN } f) = 2 \\ &\wedge \vee f[Y_N] \in \text{JSON_NO} \end{aligned}$$

the *YesOrNo* switch button
See Statement 4
It is No

$\vee \wedge f[Y_N] \in JSON_YES$ It is Yes, and we “do well”:
 $\wedge \forall key \in (\text{DOMAIN } f) \setminus \{Y_N\} :$
 $\wedge f[key] \in EXCLUDED_BY_YES_OR_NO_POLICY$

YesOrNo policy: END

 Either you want to implement *YesOrNo* (see above),
 either you want to do something entirely different.

$isCompatibleWithYesOrNoPolicy(f) \triangleq XOR($
 $isFollowingYesOrNoPolicy(f),$
 $Y_N \notin \text{DOMAIN } f)$

 $isPreferencesFollowingSpec = \text{TRUE}$ if f
 preferences follow the specs.

$isPreferencesFollowingSpec \triangleq$

First, only a specific range for the keys:

$\wedge \text{DOMAIN } preferences \subseteq \text{DOMAIN_OF_PREFERENCES}$

Next, every “subrecord” must be compatible with *YesOrNo*.

$\wedge \forall key \in \text{DOMAIN } preferences :$
 $isCompatibleWithYesOrNoPolicy(preferences[key])$

 Remark: If it is *YesOrNo*, then it is optional,
 since you cannot turn off a mandatory feature.
 In other words, we have the following criterion:

$isOptional(record) \triangleq$

IF
 $isFollowingYesOrNoPolicy(record)$
 THEN TRUE ELSE FALSE

 Initial state

$InitPreferences \triangleq$
 $\wedge preferences \in \text{SET_OF_PREFERENCES}$

$InitSystemDesign \triangleq$
 $\wedge InitCorrectness$
 $\wedge InitPreferences$

IF we do not believe that our current preferences file is legal,

then, there is no process at all, we just go back to work:

Of course, up to now, nothing has been proved:

$\wedge isPreferencesFileCompliant = \text{TRUE}$

Next step

$NextSystemDesign \triangleq$

$\wedge NextCorrectness$

$\wedge isPreferencesFollowingSpec$

$\wedge isPreferencesFileCompliant' = isPreferencesFollowingSpec$

$\wedge \text{UNCHANGED } preferences$

Invariants

Properties

We can assume that our preferences comply with all policies:

Under the specs:

$\square[isPreferencesFileCompliant]_{\neg(isPreferencesFileCompliant)}$

Check with *TLC* must be *OK*.

I consider it as an invariant, even if it's not syntactically true,
since *isPreferencesFileCompliant* variables are primed.
