galois

Writing and Proving Thereoms:

Once one or more specifications have been established there are two things that should be done:

- 1. Develop properties the specifications should have
- 2. Prove equivalence between specifications and implementations

In future lessons, when the Software Analysis Workbench is discussed the implementations will be mainly in the C language. Here, we develop and use Cryptol implementations to get the idea.

Consider a specification for testing whether two sequences are permutations of each other. This was developed in Lesson 2.4 and is the following:

Observe that $perm \times y$ is a relation that should be an equivalent class. A relation that is an equivalence relation should have properties *reflexive*, *symmetric*, and *transitive*. For reflexive, write the property like this:

```
permReflexive : ([10][32] -> [10][32] -> Bit) -> Bit property permReflexive x y = if x == y then perm x y else True
```

which says that x equals y for sequences of 32 bit numbers of length 10 implies perm x y is True. Small sequence lengths are used so proofs are relatively fast. Prove this property like this in Cryptol (let the above be in file perm.cry):

```
Main> :l perm.cry
Loading module Cryptol
Loading module Main
Main> :s prover=cvc4
Main> :prove permReflexive
Q.E.D.
(Total Elapsed Time: 0.121s, using "CVC4")
```

Next set up property permSymmetric. Here there is a problem because the algorithm used to determine that x is a permutation of y used -1 to fill in places as equality between elements of x and y is determined. This means the following for permSymmetric is not going to work:

```
permSymmetric : [10][32] \rightarrow [10][32] \rightarrow Bit
property permSymmetric x y = if perm x y then perm y x else True
```

To see this, comment out property permReflexive and add the following type signature to perm ([4][8] is used here to get a result that is easy to see):

```
perm : [4][8] -> [4][8] -> Bit

Now do this in Cryptol (observe 255 is 2^8-1):
    Main> :l perm.cry
    Loading module Cryptol
    Loading module Main
    Main> perm [0,0,0,255] [0,0,0,0]
```

which should not be the case but happens because 255 is considered to be -1 for width 8. What this says is that, for the particular specification chosen for perm, 2^^X-1, where X is the width of the numbers in the input sequences, a test should have been added to make sure such numbers are not in the input lists. In other words, the algorithm for perm is wrong if all numbers are to be allowed in input lists. Observe that without the above type signature for perm:

```
Main> :l perm.cry
Loading module Cryptol
Loading module Main
Main> perm [0,0,0,255] [0,0,0,0]
False
```

which illustrates an important property about Cryptol: the requirement of monomorphic type signatures for theorems finds problems that can otherwise be easily overlooked. Specification perm could be changed to forbid numbers 2^^X-1 but then perm would need a type signature to make such tests. It is left as an exercise to produce a specification for perm that allows all numbers in input sequences such that properties can be proved. In the meantime, the following works for sequences of 32 bit numbers of length 10:

```
permSymmetric : [10][32] -> [10][32] -> Bit
property permSymmetric x y =
    if ~(member x (2^^32-1)) /\ ~(member y (2^^32-1)) /\ perm x y
    then perm y x else True
Here it is tested:
```

```
Main> :l perm.cry
Loading module Cryptol
Loading module Main
Main> :s prover=cvc4
Main> :prove permSymmetric
Q.E.D.
(Total Elapsed Time: 29.092s, using "CVC4")
```

For permTransitive the property is:

```
permTransitive : [6][32] -> [6][32] -> [6][32] -> Bit property permTransitive x y z = if \sim(member x (2^32-1)) /\ \sim(member y (2^32-1)) /\ perm x y /\ perm y z then perm x z else True
```

where [6][32] was chosen to make the proof complete in reasonable time.

```
Main> :l perm.cry
Loading module Cryptol
Loading module Main
Main> :s prover=cvc5
Main> :prove permTransitive
Q.E.D.
(Total Elapsed Time: 2m:14.446s, using "CVC5")
```

Conclude that, at least for sequences of 32 bit numbers of length 6, where input sequences do not contain 2^^32-1, perm defines an equivalence class. Specification perm will be used to help show that a given implementation of a proposed sorting algorithm is correct.

The sorting algorithm is this:

```
bsort : {n, a} (Cmp a, Integral a, Literal 1 a, fin n) => [n]a -> [n]a
bsort lst = take `{n} (bb (lst#[-1,-1...]))
  where
  bb seq = if (seq@0) == -1 then seq else (bbl (head seq) (bb (tail seq)))
  bbl n seq =
    if ((seq@0) == -1) then [n]#[-1,-1...] // sequence -1 ... is the padding
    else if (n < (seq@0)) then [n]#seq
    else [(seq@0)]#(bbl n (tail seq))</pre>
```

Function bbl takes a literal n and an ordered sequence seq and places n in seq so that seq remains ordered. If seq is empty [n] (plus padding) is returned. If n is less than the first element of seq then n is added to the beginning of seq. Otherwise, bbl is called recursively and returns an ordered sequence whereupon the topmost stacked literal from seq is prepended to the result and returned. Function bb takes a padded sequence seq as input and recursively calls bbl where n is the first literal of seq. The recursion sets up a stack of literals to add to the output list and begins to establish an output list when seq is only the padding. Thus, when the stacked literals are ready to be added to the output list, what they are added to is ordered and will remain ordered as stacked literals are added to the output list. Function bsort just calls bb on the infinitely long padded input sequence. The output of bb is trimmed by take. As before, since -1 has a special role, it cannot be considered an element of the input lst. The following function will ensure this is the case so proofs will complete as expected:

```
valid lst = z ! 0 where z = [True] \# [ \sim (x == -1) / \ y \mid x <- lst \mid y <- z ]
```

The following proves that bsort lst is a permutation of lst, one of two properties that a sorting algorithm must have, the second being that bsort lst must be non-decreasing.

```
isAPerm : [6][32] -> Bit
property isAPerm lst = if valid lst then perm lst (bsort lst) else True
```

Here is the proof for 32 bit non-negative numbers in a sequence of 6:

```
Main> :l perm.cry
Loading module Cryptol
Loading module Main
Main> :s prover=any
Main> :prove isAPerm
Q.E.D.
(Total Elapsed Time: 1.647s, using "CVC4")
```

Since perm defines an equivalence class, every element in 1st is also in bsort 1st as many times as that element is in 1st, and any element not in 1st is not in bsort 1st. The following is True if and only if for any two valid consecutive numbers in 1st, the earlier one is no greater than the later one:

```
nondecreasing : [6][32] -> Bit nondecreasing lst = (res ! 0) where res = [True]#[ if (j1 <= j2) /\ k then True else False \mid k <- res \mid j1 <- lst \mid j2 <- drop `{1} lst]
```

The second half of the proof that bsort sorts correctly:

```
bsortIsOrdered : [6][32] -> Bit
property bsortIsOrdered lst =
   if valid lst then nondecreasing (bsort lst) else True
```

Proving:

```
Main> :l perm.cry
Loading module Cryptol
Loading module Main
Main> :s prover=any
Main> :prove bsortIsOrdered
Q.E.D.
(Total Elapsed Time: 0.476s, using "CVC4")
```

Thus, at least for length 6 lists of 32 bit numbers, bsort correctly sorts its input as long as -1 is not an element of the input list.

The "golden" specifications of perm, nondecreasing, and, if needed, valid can be used for other implementations of sorting algorithms including those where infinite padding with -1 is not used. The next example uses a process similar to that of bsort but without the need for infinite lists. Here is an outline of a round the process. Let lst be the sequence to sort and let acc initially be a sequence of 0s of the same length as lst. In a round, elements of lst are compared with elements of acc, starting from the right (greatest elements are on or gravitate toward the right). If the lst element is greater than the existing acc element, the acc element moves down (to the left) by 1 and makes way for the lst element to be placed where the acc element had been. If the lst element is not greater then it is placed before the acc element it is compared with (to the left of the acc element where it replaces a 0). This process has the effect that greater elements move one position to the right and the lesser elements one position to the left on a round. Thus, running a number of rounds equal to the length of lst sorts lst. Empty input sequences are not allowed.

Function round makes use of function insert which takes a sequence lst, a number m, and an index i and replaces the ith element in lst with m.

```
insert lst m i = [ if k==i then m else x | x <- lst | k <- [0...]]
```

The following function initializes acc to a sequence of 0s of length lst:

```
makeZeros lst = [0 | i <- lst]
```

Here is the sorting wrapper:

```
sort lst = z ! 0
  where
  z = [ round x (makeZeros lst) | x <- [lst]#z | i <- lst ]</pre>
```

So x contains the result of the previous round and i controls the comprehension to complete in length of lst iterations.

Permutations:

```
Loading module Cryptol
Cryptol> :l a.cry
Loading module Cryptol
Loading module Main
Main> :s prover=cvc4
Main> :prove isAPerm
Q.E.D.
(Total Elapsed Time: 3.560s, using "CVC4")

Nondecreasing:
Main> :prove sortIsOrdered
Q.E.D.
(Total Elapsed Time: 1.365s, using "CVC4")
```

The valid property for the above is changed to include disallowing 0 from input sequences.

The function round as written recursively above may be written as a comprehension like this:

```
round : {n, b} (Literal 0 b, Cmp b, fin n) => [1 + n]b -> [1 + n]b
round lst = z ! 0
where
   z = [q]#[ if (lst@i) > (acc@(i+1))
        then (insert (insert acc (acc@(i+1)) i) (lst@i) (i+1))
        else (insert acc (lst@i) i)
        | acc <- z | i <- (reverse (take `{n} [0...])) ];
   q = insert (makeZeros lst) (last lst) ((length lst)-1)</pre>
```

There are a few interesting things about this. First, this follows immediately from the recursive round: no changes were made in the then and else snippets, and i corresponds completely to the i of the recursive version. Second, note the comprehension easily

accommodates the initial state of acc so acc is not needed as an input and function sort looks like this for the comprehension solution:

```
sort lst = z ! 0
  where
   z = [ round x | x <- [lst]#z | i <- lst ]</pre>
```

Third, note that Cryptol does not accept statements like $i \leftarrow [0..(length\ n)]$ and is especially fretful about statements like $i \leftarrow [n, n-1..0]$. However, the type signature of round is user crafted and contains n which relates to the range of values that i needs to take. The above uses $(take \ n) [0...]$ to get [0...n], which is needed, but the i needs to be taken in reverse order so $i \leftarrow (reverse \ (take \ n) [0...])$ is used. Finally, proofs appear to run faster with comprehensions than with recursive implementations even though they are doing the same thing from an abstract perspective. Consider these times:

comprehension solution

recursive solution

```
// isAPerm : [6][32] -> Bit
                                                // isAPerm : [6][32] -> Bit
Main> :l sort1.cry
                                                Main> :l sort.cry
Loading module Cryptol
                                                Loading module Cryptol
Loading module Main
                                                Loading module Main
Main> :prove isAPerm
                                                Main> :prove isAPerm
(Total Elapsed Time: 0.235s, using "CVC4")
                                                (Total Elapsed Time: 3.187s, using "CVC4")
// sortIsOrdered : [6][32] -> Bit
                                                // sortIsOrdered : [6][32] -> Bit
Main> :l sort1.cry
                                                Main> :l sort.cry
                                                Loading module Cryptol
Loading module Cryptol
Loading module Main
                                                Loading module Main
Main> :prove sortIsOrdered
                                                Main> :prove sortIsOrdered
                                                0.E.D.
(Total Elapsed Time: 0.063s, using "CVC4")
                                                (Total Elapsed Time: 1.395s, using "CVC4")
```

As a final example consider mergesort. Here is an implementation:

```
splito : {n,a} [n]a -> [inf]a
splito lst = [ lst@i | i <- [1,3...] ]
```

The input to splito is a sequence of numbers. The output is the sequence consisting of the elements of lst that are located at odd indices, followed by infinitely many -1s.

```
splite : {n,a} [n]a -> [inf]a
splite lst = [ lst@i | i <- [0,2...] ]
```

Input to splite is a finite sequence of numbers. The output is the sequence consisting of the elements of lst that are located at even indices, followed by infinitely many -1s.

```
merge : {a} (Literal 1 a, Ring a, Cmp a) => [inf]a -> [inf]a -> [inf]a merge px py = if px@0 == -1 then py else if py@0 == -1 then px else if px@0 < py@0 then [px@0]#(merge (tail px) py) else [py@0]#(merge px (tail py))
```

Input to merge is two infinite sequences px and py of numbers, each in nondecreasing order, then padded with infinitely many -1s. The output is an infinite, nondecreasing sequence containing all of px and py, then padded with infinitely many -1s. The padded infinite sequences px and py are merged, up to the padding. If px@0 is -1, meaning that px is only

padding, then py is returned, if py@0 is -1, meaning py is only padding, then px is returned, otherwise if px@0 is less than py@0 then px@0 is concatenated with (merge (tail(px) py) and returned, otherwise py@0 is concatenated with (merge px (tail py)) and returned.

```
mergesort : {cnt, a} (fin cnt, fin a, a >= 1, cnt >= 0) => [cnt][a] -> [cnt][a]
mergesort lst = take `{cnt} (mergesrt ax)
  where
    mergesrt p =
        if (p@0 == -1) \/ (p@1 == -1)
        then p
        else merge (mergesrt (splite p)) (mergesrt (splito p))
    ax = lst#[-1,-1 ...]
```

Input to mergesort is a finite sequence 1st of numbers (the empty sequence is allowed). Output of mergesort is a finite sequence of numbers that is a permutation of 1st and in nondecreasing order. Sequence ax is 1st padded with -1s and becomes input p to function mergesrt which sorts p up to the padding, recursively merging the mergesrt of the even elements of p with the mergesrt of the odd elements of p. Here are some results:

```
mergesort [] is []
mergesort [16] is [16]
mergesort [2,1,2,3] is [1,2,2,3]
mergesort [8,2,1,9,5,4,6,7] is [1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9]
```

Function mergesort can be deemed correct for sequences of six 32 bit integers if the following two properties hold:

```
isAPerm : [6][32] -> Bit
property isAPerm lst = if valid lst then perm lst (mergesort lst) else True
and
mergesortIsOrdered : [6][32] -> Bit
property mergesortIsOrdered lst =
    if valid lst then nondecreasing (mergesort lst) else True
```

Here are the proofs:

```
mrgsrt> :l mrgsrt.cry
Loading module Cryptol
Loading module mrgsrt
mrgsrt> :s prover=cvc4
mrgsrt> :prove isAPerm
Q.E.D.
(Total Elapsed Time: 0.573s, using "CVC4")
mrgsrt> :prove mergesortIsOrdered
Q.E.D.
(Total Elapsed Time: 0.175s, using "CVC4")
```

Observations:

- Proofs of a collection of carefully chosen properties for specifications can be used to prove correctness of implementations. For example, in this case, perm was shown to be an equivalence relation which is necessary for correctness of sorting algorithms.
- A collection of carefully chosen specifications can be used as a "gold standard" for proving properties of implementations. For example, in this case, several sorting implementations were shown correct from the same set of specifications. This is important because considerable time and effort can then be used to establish

- specifications and prove specification properties and those resources can be amortized over numerous implementations.
- It appears that specifications written as comprehensions will prove faster than specifications written recursively. One such example was presented but this observation applied to others that were not presented here.
- The monomorphic requirement of Cryptol for proving theorems can sometimes uncover subtle errors that would otherwise be missed. For example, in this case the specification of perm was wrong, as was discovered through the Cryptol typing constraints, but was compensated for by defining a function to validate inputs to perm.
- A type variable in a type signature may be used to return a portion of an infinite, padded sequence. For example, in this case mergesort, which is applied to finite sequences, was written using infinite padded sequences operated on by another procedure mergesrt. The signature for mergesort was user crafted to be:

```
mergesort : \{cnt, a\} (fin cnt, fin a, a >= 1, cnt >= 1) => [cnt][a] -> [cnt][a] which allowed mergesort to be written like this:
```

```
mergesort lst = take `{cnt} (mergesrt ax)
```

which means, although ax is the infinite lst#[-1, -1...], only the first cnt elements of the infinite output of (mergesrt ax) are presented as output by mergesort and are the elements of lst sorted.

• Similarly, suppose cnt needs to be passed to a function. It can be done like this:

```
func a b `(cnt)
```

That is, cnt in parens instead of curly braces.