

Verifying Algorithms. Notes.

Ilgiz Mustafin

Innopolis University

August 16, 2017

1 Installing EVE (0:37)

Since I am using Linux, I took the latest linux build (96960) available at that time.

Unpacking and running `run_eve.py` worked (Account example could be verified as expected).

Off topic: I am using a dark GTK theme (Breeze-Dark) on my computer. EiffelStudio has some problems with this (Light grey text on white background, etc.), so I start it with light theme with

```
GTK2_RC_FILES=/usr/share/themes/Breeze/gtk-3.20/gtkrc python run_eve.py.
```

2 Tutorial

Before I could start working on algorithms, I had to complete the tutorial from <http://se.inf.ethz.ch/research/autoproof/tutorial/>.

2.1 Exercise 1 (1:07)

In feature `increase_seconds` pre-condition `seconds = 59 implies modify_model("minutes", Current)` gives “Manifest string not supported” and “Manifest tuple in contract not supported” errors, while just `modify_model("minutes",`

`Current`) works. It seems that `modify_model` is not supported in logical expressions. Also, in solutions there is no such check, there is just `modify_model(["seconds", "minutes", "hours"], Current)`.

2.2 Exercise 2 (3:40)

2.2.1 Binary Search

When doing the Binary Search task, I was required to write a precondition to check that array is sorted.

My code was:

```
1 across 1 |..| (a.sequence.count - 1) as c all
2     a.sequence[c.item] <= a.sequence[c.item + 1]
3 end
```

While the code from the solutions was:

```
1 across 1 |..| a.sequence.count as i all
2 across 1 |..| a.sequence.count as j all
3     i.item <= j.item implies
4         a.sequence[i.item] <= a.sequence[j.item]
5 end
6 end
```

These two variants give different results of verification. I was able to verify the function with the code from the solutions, but not with my code (`not_in_lower_part` and `not_in_upper_part` could be violated).

This could be so, if AutoProof was not considering that \leq is transitive for integers. Maybe worth pointing out in tutorial.

2.2.2 Permutations

For the Permutations task there was a feature for testing different permutation checking algorithms. I added some more tests.

```
1 feature test_permutation
2 local
3     s1, s2: MML_SEQUENCE [INTEGER]
4 do
5     s1 := << 1, 2, 3, 4 >>
6     s2 := << 1 >>
7     check p1: not is_permutation_1 (s1, s2) end
```

```

8
9     s1 := << 1, 2, 3, 4 >>
10    s2 := << 1 >>
11    check p2: not is_permutation_2 (s1, s2) end
12
13    s1 := << 1, 2, 2 >>
14    s2 := << 1, 1, 2 >>
15    check p2_2: not is_permutation_2 (s1, s2) end
16
17    s1 := << 1, 2, 3, 4 >>
18    s2 := << 1 >>
19    check p3: not is_permutation_3 (s1, s2) end
20
21    s1 := << 1, 2, 2 >>
22    s2 := << 1, 1, 2 >>
23    check p3_2: not is_permutation_3 (s1, s2) end
24
25    s1 := << 1, 2, 3, 4 >>
26    s2 := << 1 >>
27    check p4: not is_permutation_4 (s1, s2) end
28
29    s1 := << 1, 2, 2 >>
30    s2 := << 1, 1, 2 >>
31    check p4_2: not is_permutation_4 (s1, s2) end
32 end

```

In this version AutoProof reports that checks p1 and p2_2 may be violated, but check p4_2 should fail too.

If we comment check p1, only p2 is reported.

If we comment check p2, then both p1 and p4_2 are reported.

It seems that when AutoProof finds some violation in a feature, it stops checking that feature and several (but *not all!*) violations will be reported. This can be very confusing for people unfamiliar with such behavior.

2.3 Exercise 3 (2:17)

Nothing interesting.

3 Real development

3.1 Generics, int and ref

Suppose we have class VALUE which stores one non-void object.

```
1 class
2     VALUE [G]
3
4 create
5     make
6
7 feature
8
9     make (v: G)
10        require
11            value_exists: v /= Void
12        do
13            value := v
14        end
15
16    value: G
17
18 end
```

We want to use it to store an integer.

```
1 class
2     TEST
3
4 feature
5
6     test
7         local
8             value: VALUE[INTEGER]
9         do
10             create value.make (123)
11         end
12
13 end
```

Trying to verify this system gives invalid argument types (int and ref) to binary operator !=.

After quick inspection of AutoProof *.bpl output in EIFGENs/.../Proofs I suspect several facts.

```
1 type ref; // Type definition for reference types
2 const Void: ref; // Constant for Void references
```

Eiffel `Void` is translated into a Boogie constant of reference type.

Eiffel `INTEGER` is translated into Boogie `int`. There is some code about integer boxing, but both these functions are never used.

```
1  const unique INTEGER: Type;
2  function boxed_int(i: int) returns (ref);
3  function unboxed_int(r: ref) returns (int);
```

These suspicions are supported by the following code.

```
1  procedure VALUE[ANY].make(Current: ref, v: ref);
2  ...
3  requires (v) != (Void); // type:pre tag:v_exists line:11
4  ...
5  ...
6  procedure VALUE[INTEGER_32].make(Current: ref, v: int);
7  ...
8  free requires is_integer_32(v); // info:type property for argument v
9  ...
10 requires (v) != (Void); // type:pre tag:v_exists line:11
11 ...
```

While the assertion `(v) != (Void)` is valid in the `ANY` variant because argument `v` is of type `ref`, the code in the `INTEGER` is invalid because `v` is of type `int`.

The first naive solution was to add an axiom `axiom (forall i:int :: (Void) != i);` to the theory files, but this is not even a valid Boogie construction (invalid argument types (`ref` and `int`) to binary operator `!=`).

For now, I will make less generic code as a workaround for this problem.

3.2 Using object comparison to find objects in MML containers, `is_equal` vs `is_model_equal`

Suppose we have class `TS_PAIR` which is just a pair of integers.

```
1  note
2      model: left, right
3
4  class
5      TS_PAIR
6
7  inherit
8
9      ANY
```

```

10         redefine
11             is_equal,
12             is_model_equal
13         end
14
15     create
16         make
17
18     feature -- Initialization
19
20         make (a_left, a_right: INTEGER)
21         note
22             status: creator
23         require
24             modify_model ("left", "right", Current)
25         do
26             left := a_left
27             right := a_right
28         ensure
29             left = a_left
30             right = a_right
31         end
32
33     feature -- Data
34
35         left: INTEGER assign set_left
36
37         right: INTEGER assign set_right
38
39     feature -- Modification
40
41         set_left (a_left: INTEGER)
42         require
43             modify_model ("left", Current)
44         do
45             left := a_left
46         ensure
47             left = a_left
48         end
49
50         set_right (a_right: INTEGER)
51         require
52             modify_model ("right", Current)
53         do
54             right := a_right
55         ensure
56             right = a_right
57         end
58

```

```

59 feature -- Comparison
60
61     is_equal, is_model_equal (a_other: like Current): BOOLEAN
62     note
63         status: functional
64     require else
65         reads_model (["left", "right"], [Current, a_other])
66     do
67         Result := left = a_other.left and right = a_other.right
68     end
69
70 end

```

How to check if there is already an object-equal pair in a, say, MML_SEQUENCE?
This code will not work (Check s_has_object_b may be violated.):

```

1 local
2     a, b: TS_PAIR
3     s: MML_SEQUENCE [TS_PAIR]
4 do
5     create a.make (1, 1)
6     create b.make (1, 1)
7     create s
8     s := s & a
9     check
10         s_has_object_b: across s as i some i.item.is_equal (b) end
11     end
12 end

```

While trying to find the root of the problem I added some random checks which made verification successful.

```

1 local
2     a, b: TS_PAIR
3     s: MML_SEQUENCE [TS_PAIR]
4 do
5     create a.make (1, 1)
6     create b.make (1, 1)
7     create s
8     s := s & a
9     check
10         a_equals_b: a.is_equal (b)
11     end
12     check
13         s_has_a: s.has (a)
14     end
15     check
16         s_has_object_b: across s as i some i.item.is_equal (b) end
17     end
18 end

```

Changing `a_equals_b` check into `b.is_equal (a)` invalidates `s_has_object_b`. This makes sense because `ANY.is_equal` does not have `symmetric` contract as `ANY.is_model_equal` does.

Using `is_model_equal` instead of `is_equal` requires `a_equals_b` and `s_has_a` checks to verify `s_has_object_b`, but we can swap left and right sides in `a_equals_b`.

What function should I use in my code? Let us compare contracts.

```

1  is_model_equal (other: like Current): BOOLEAN
2      -- Is the abstract state of `Current' equal to that of `other'?
3      require
4          other /= Void
5          reads (Current, other)
6      ensure
7          reflexive: other = Current implies Result
8          symmetric: Result = other.is_model_equal (Current)

1  is_equal (other: like Current): BOOLEAN
2      -- Is `other' attached to an object considered
3      -- equal to current object?
4      require
5          other_not_void: other /= Void

```

We can see that `is_equal` has neither reflexivity nor symmetry properties, which are natural properties to assume while designing code.

`is_model_equal`, on the other hand, should only be used in contracts for verification. Normal Eiffel class `ANY` does not have this function.

We could try to mix them like this:

```

1  if x.is_equal(y) then -- for behavior, we may assume symmetry, etc.
2      check x.is_model_equal (y) end -- Verify symmetry, etc.
3      ...

```

But there is no guarantee that for all `x` and `y` `x.is_equal (y) = x.is_model_equal (y)`. Adding such contract can be a solution.

For the first versions of algorithm I will use `is_model_equal` in custom classes, until we come up with something better.

3.3 Instantiation of `V_ARRAY2`

```

1  items: INTEGER
2
3  data: V_ARRAY2[BOOLEAN]

```



```

4
5 make (a_items: INTEGER)
6   require
7     a_items >= 0
8   do
9     items := a_items
10    create data.make_filled (a_items, a_items, False)
11    check rows: data.row_count = items end
12    check columns: data.column_count = items end
13  end

```

First of all, check `rows` could not be verified, but check `columns` is verified. Maybe this is because `V_ARRAY2#make` and `#make_filled` have a post-condition that `#column_count` is set, but they do not have a post-condition that `#row_count` is set. Maybe this is because it can be derived from invariant `row_count_definition: row_count * column_count = sequence.count`.

4 Installation 2

I had to switch to a new computer. This required me to install EVE to a fresh system. I was using ArchLinux. I did the same installation steps: download the freshest EVE build for linux, unpack the archive, run EVE.

However, issuing AutoProof verification from EVE produced no output in EVE, `EIFFGENs/v_topsort/Proofs/autoproof*.txt` files were created but were empty. `bpl` files are created and contain Boogie code, they seem ok. Nothing is written to `STDOUT/STDERR` of EVE.

Following EVE installation instructions from <https://trac.inf.ethz.ch/trac/meyer/eve/#Setup1> is not working too. Executing `python eve.py update` produces errors (python2 is for running python 2):

```

$ python2 eve.py update
Updating EiffelStudio
Traceback (most recent call last):
  File "eve.py", line 1196, in <module>
    main()
  File "eve.py", line 1161, in main
    update_EiffelStudio()
  File "eve.py", line 591, in update_EiffelStudio
    name, filename, version, url = get_nightly_build(d_ise_platform, d_archive_e
  File "eve.py", line 614, in get_nightly_build

```

```

    response = urllib2.urlopen(download_page)
File "/usr/lib/python2.7/urllib2.py", line 154, in urlopen
    return opener.open(url, data, timeout)
File "/usr/lib/python2.7/urllib2.py", line 429, in open
    response = self._open(req, data)
File "/usr/lib/python2.7/urllib2.py", line 447, in _open
    '_open', req)
File "/usr/lib/python2.7/urllib2.py", line 407, in _call_chain
    result = func(*args)
File "/usr/lib/python2.7/urllib2.py", line 1413, in ftp_open
    fw = self.connect_ftp(user, passwd, host, port, dirs, req.timeout)
File "/usr/lib/python2.7/urllib2.py", line 1435, in connect_ftp
    persistent=False)
File "/usr/lib/python2.7/urllib.py", line 877, in __init__
    self.init()
File "/usr/lib/python2.7/urllib.py", line 889, in init
    self.ftp.cwd(_target)
File "/usr/lib/python2.7/ftplib.py", line 562, in cwd
    return self.voidcmd(cmd)
File "/usr/lib/python2.7/ftplib.py", line 254, in voidcmd
    return self.voidresp()
File "/usr/lib/python2.7/ftplib.py", line 229, in voidresp
    resp = self.getresp()
File "/usr/lib/python2.7/ftplib.py", line 224, in getresp
    raise error_perm, resp
URLError: <urlopen error ftp error: 550 Failed to change directory.>

```

However, the installation instructions mentioned that *Mono* is required. I installed it and AutoProof started to work.

5 Progress!

Nearly 40 hours were required to get started. I am using *explicit wrapping, contracts* so that I am really understanding what is happening. Making AutoProof display collaborated code could be really helpful.

6 Left-right scrolling

Using touchpad to scroll up and down works, using touchpad to scroll left and right does not. It works in other applications like Firefox.

7 Changing behavior for easier verification

Let us look at an implementation of `is_subset_of`.

```
1  is_subset_of (a_other: TS_INTEGER_RELATION): BOOLEAN
2  require
3      closed
4      a_other.closed
5  local
6      i: INTEGER
7      k: INTEGER
8  do
9      Result := True
10     from
11         i := 1
12     invariant
13         Result implies across 1 |..| (i - 1) as j all a_other.has_pair
14         ⇔ (data.sequence[j.item]) end
15         Result implies k = 0
16         (not Result) implies across 1 |..| (i - 1) as j some not
17         ⇔ a_other.has_pair (data.sequence[j.item]) end
18         (not Result) implies (1 <= k and k <= data.sequence.count)
19         (not Result) implies not a_other.has_pair (data.sequence[k])
20     variant
21         data.sequence.count - i
22     until
23         i > data.count or not Result
24     loop
25         if not a_other.has_pair (data[i]) then
26             check not a_other.has_pair (data.sequence[i]) end
27             Result := False
28             k := i
29         end
30         i := i + 1
31     end
32 ensure
33     closed
34     a_other.closed
35     is_empty implies Result
36     a_other.is_empty implies (Result = is_empty)
```

```

35     Result implies across data.sequence as s all a_other.has_pair (s.item)
      ↪ end
36     (not Result) implies across 1 |..| (data.sequence.count) as j some not
      ↪ a_other.has_pair (data.sequence[j.item]) end
37 end

```

In this example, variable `k` is not needed to compute the result of this function. But it helps to verify this function. All usages of `k` seem to be extractable into some ghost function, but I did not do this.

8 Studying AutoProof Verified Code Repository

In some paper I found the link to <http://se.inf.ethz.ch/research/autoproof/repo/index.html>. Here are some comments.

8.1 Weak specifications

Many of the example specifications seem to be too weak. This fact makes these examples somewhat useless. In particular:

sum_and_max Feature `sum_and_max`, according to the comment description of the feature should find the sum of elements in array and find the greatest value in array. However, the postcondition and loop invariants do not even check that `max` is a value present in the array. For any array tuple `[sum = X, max = X*LENGTH]` will be a valid result for postcondition.

master_clock Feature `tick` in class `MASTER` has comment *Increment time*, however postcondition is just `time > old time` but strangely not `time = old time + 1`.

8.2 Pattern to own container and everything in it

Suppose we want an object to own a container and all items in it.

First idea would be to write `invariant owns = container.sequence.range.extended (container) end`. This will not work. AutoProof will say that on this line `container.sequence` might not be readable.

What I see in the Repository and what I randomly did once is to add `owns.has (container)`. So, one of the correct codes to achieve this is this:

```
1 invariant
2     owns.has (container)
3     owns = container.sequence.range.extended (container)
4 end
```

8.3 Using ghost attributes

Due to the fact that I found very few examples of using AutoProof with Eiffel it was really unclear to me how to properly use ghost attributes. The most common usage is assigning a value in invariant like `owns = [a, b, c]`.

However, in `treemax` example we can see another usage: ghost attribute `sequence` is assigned values in creator procedures.

8.3.1 Ghost result for non-ghost functions

In `map` example functions `extend` (add key-value to map) and `remove` (remove key from map) have comment *Returns index of [removed] key 'k' (ghost value)*. While the returned value should be useless for the clients of the class, it is used in the post-condition of these functions.