

THEOREM *Induction*  $\triangleq$   $Inv \wedge Next \Rightarrow Inv'$

$\langle 1 \rangle 1$ . SUFFICES ASSUME: 1.  $Inv$   
2.  $Next$

PROVE:  $Inv'$

PROOF: Obvious.

$\langle 1 \rangle 2$ . CASE:  $\wedge x > y$   
 $\wedge x' = x - y$   
 $\wedge y' = y$

$\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . *TypeOK'*

PROOF:  $\langle 1 \rangle 1.1$  and the definitions of  $Inv$  and *TypeOK* imply that  $x$  and  $y$  are in  $Nat \setminus \{0\}$ . By case assumption  $\langle 1 \rangle 2$ , this implies that  $x'$  and  $y'$  are in  $Nat \setminus \{0\}$ , proving  $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ .

$\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . *GCDInv'*

$\langle 3 \rangle 1$ .  $GCD(y', x') = GCD(y, x)$

PROOF:  $\langle 1 \rangle 1.1$  and the definitions of  $Inv$  and *TypeOK* imply that  $x$  and  $y$  are in  $Nat \setminus \{0\}$ , so  $\langle 3 \rangle 1$  follows from case assumption  $\langle 1 \rangle 2$  and GCD3 (substituting  $y$  for  $m$  and  $x$  for  $n$ ).

$\langle 3 \rangle 2$ .  $GCD(x', y') = GCD(x, y)$

PROOF:  $\langle 1 \rangle 1.1$ , the definitions of  $Inv$  and *TypeOK*, and  $\langle 2 \rangle 1$  imply that  $x$ ,  $y$ ,  $x'$ , and  $y'$  are in  $Nat \setminus \{0\}$ , so  $\langle 3 \rangle 2$  follows from  $\langle 3 \rangle 1$  and GCD2.

$\langle 3 \rangle 3$ . Q.E.D.

PROOF:  $\langle 3 \rangle 2$ ,  $\langle 1 \rangle 1.1$ , and the definitions of  $Inv$  and *GCDInv* imply  $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ .

$\langle 2 \rangle 3$ . Q.E.D.

PROOF: By  $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ ,  $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ , and definition of  $Inv$ .

$\langle 1 \rangle 3$ . CASE:  $\wedge y > x$   
 $\wedge y' = y - x$   
 $\wedge x' = x$

$\langle 2 \rangle 1$ . *TypeOK'*

PROOF:  $\langle 1 \rangle 1.1$  and the definitions of  $Inv$  and *TypeOK* imply that  $x$  and  $y$  are in  $Nat \setminus \{0\}$ . By case assumption  $\langle 1 \rangle 3$ , this implies that  $x'$  and  $y'$  are in  $Nat \setminus \{0\}$ , proving  $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ .

$\langle 2 \rangle 2$ . *GCDInv'*

$\langle 3 \rangle 1$ .  $GCD(x', y') = GCD(x, y)$

PROOF:  $\langle 1 \rangle 1.1$  and the definitions of  $Inv$  and *TypeOK* imply that  $x$  and  $y$  are in  $Nat \setminus \{0\}$ , so  $\langle 3 \rangle 1$  follows from case assumption  $\langle 1 \rangle 3$  and GCD3 (substituting  $x$  for  $m$  and  $y$  for  $n$ ).

$\langle 3 \rangle 2$ . Q.E.D.

PROOF:  $\langle 3 \rangle 1$ ,  $\langle 1 \rangle 1.1$ , and the definitions of  $Inv$  and  $GCDInv$  imply  $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ .

$\langle 2 \rangle 3$ . Q.E.D.

PROOF: By  $\langle 2 \rangle 1$ ,  $\langle 2 \rangle 2$ , and definition of  $Inv$ .

$\langle 1 \rangle 4$ . Q.E.D.

PROOF: By  $\langle 1 \rangle 1.2$  and the definition of  $Next$ , the cases  $\langle 1 \rangle 2$  and  $\langle 1 \rangle 3$  are exhaustive.

[CLOSE](#)