# **Exercises 3: Dynamic Logic**



The solutions to the exercises will be discussed on Monday, 18th May.

### **Problem 1 Interpreting Dynamic Logic Formulas**

What is the meaning of the following DL formulas? Are the formulas valid? Give a brief justification for your answers. We consider the type **int** to be the mathematical whole numbers, i.e. without overflow. You may assume the following definitions:

```
\programVariables {
  int i, old_i, j;
  boolean b;
}

a) (i > j) → ⟨j = j - i;⟩(j < 0)
b) (i > 0) → ⟨while (i!=0) { i = i - 2; }⟩(i = 0)
c) [while (i!=0) { i = i - 2; }](i = 0)
d) (old_i = i) → ⟨j = 0; while (i > 0) { j++; i = i - 1; }⟩(i = 0 → j = old_i)
e) ∃ boolean bool; (b = bool → ⟨if (b) { i = 10; } else { j = -10; }⟩(i > j)
f) ∃ boolean bool; ⟨b = bool; if (b) { i = 10; } else { j = -10; }⟩(i > j)
```

## **Solution:**

- a) Valid. Program terminates and final value of j obviously less than 0.
- b) Only true for states where i is even. Does not terminate for other states, hence, false.
- c) Valid. As for positive even values the program terminates and the final value of i is 0, for all other values the program does not terminate and as we have a box modality the formula is in those cases trivially true.
- d) Valid. Program terminates and property true in final state.
- e) Valid choose bool  $\neq b$
- f) Not a DL formula.

#### **Problem 2 Semantics of Dynamic Logic**

Justify formally (using the semantics definition) the following equivalence:

$$\langle \mathbf{p} \rangle \phi$$
 iff.  $\neg [\mathbf{p}] \neg \phi$ 

#### Solution:

 $val_{K,s,\beta}(\langle p \rangle \phi) = tt$  iff. $\rho(p)(s)$  defined and  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  defined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\phi) = tf \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  defined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt \Leftrightarrow \rho(p)(s)$  undefined and not  $val_{K,\rho(p)(s),\beta}(\neg \phi) = tt$ 

#### **Problem 3 Updates**

Simplify the updates of the following formulas using the update simplification rules of the previous lecture:

• 
$${x := x + y}{y := x + y}\langle p \rangle \phi$$

• 
$${x := x + y}{x := 3}\langle p \rangle \phi$$

Assume that neither program p nor formula  $\phi$  containing program variable x.

**Solution:** See files problem3a/b.proof

Which other simplification rule would be possible? Prove that the suggested simplification rule is sound.

**Solution:** E.g.  $\{x := t\} \phi \rightsquigarrow \phi \text{ if } x \text{ does not occur in } \phi$ 

Show by structural induction over the DL formulas (and programs) that their value is independent of x if it does not occur.

#### Problem 4 Unwind-Loop rule

The unwindLoop rule as presented in the lecture is a simplified version of the actual one for Java as it does not consider continues, breaks, returns etc. Provide a version of the unwindLoop rule for loops with labeled break statements. **Solution:** 

p' is p where each unlabeled **break** which does not occur nested in another **switch** or loop has been replaced by **break** newLabel.