Verification and Testing
Practicals WS 2013/2014
705.041

Roland Barta and Markus Plieschnegger

16th December 2013

Contents

1 Task 1 **2**

2 Task 2 **7**

3 Task 3 **8**

Bibliography **11**

Chapter 1

Task 1

This task was solved by following the guide from (Könighofer, 2012). In this example three predicates are used:

- $p = (b == 0)$
- $q = (a < b)$
- $r = (a <= b + 1)$

This is the statement that should be abstracted: $a = a + b + 1;$

As showed in (Könighofer, 2012) the predicates are handled one after another. For each predicate the Hoare rule has to be applied to get the corresponding pre condition. This is the solution for predicate p:

$$\begin{aligned} \{(b &== 0)\} \\ a &= a + b + 1; \\ \{p\} &= \{(b == 0)\} \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

Because of the fact that only the value of a is changed in the assignment predicate $p = (b == 0)$ is not modified. Pre and post conditions are the same. This result can be used to test all combinations of the boolean predicates p, q and r. See table 1.1 for the solution.

The following equation solves the Hoare logic for the predicate q:

$$\begin{aligned} \{(a + b + 1 < b)\} &= \{(a + 1 < 0)\} = \{(a < -1)\} \\ a &= a + b + 1; \\ \{q\} &= \{(a < b)\} \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

Similar to table 1.1 all combinations of p, q and r have to be applied for pre condition $q' = (a < -1)$. Table 1.2 shows the solution.

Cases	post conditions			conclusion	pre condition
	$p = (b == 0)$	$q = (a < b)$	$r = (a \leq b + 1)$		$p' = (b == 0)$
1	0	0	0	$b \neq 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a \geq b \wedge$ $\wedge a > b + 1 =$ $= b \neq 0 \wedge a > b + 1$	0
2	0	0	1	$b \neq 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a \geq b \wedge$ $\wedge a \leq b + 1 =$ $= b \neq 0 \wedge b \leq a \leq b + 1$	0
3	0	1	0	$b \neq 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a < b \wedge$ $\wedge a > b + 1 =$ $= false$	Chosen: 0
4	0	1	1	$b \neq 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a < b \wedge$ $\wedge a \leq b + 1 =$ $= b \neq 0 \wedge a < b$	0
5	1	0	0	$b == 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a \geq b \wedge$ $\wedge a > b + 1 =$ $= b == 0 \wedge a > b + 1$	1
6	1	0	1	$b == 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a \geq b \wedge$ $\wedge a \leq b + 1 =$ $= b == 0 \wedge b \leq a \leq b + 1$	1
7	1	1	0	$b == 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a < b \wedge$ $\wedge a > b + 1 =$ $= false$	Chosen: 1
8	1	1	1	$b == 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a < b \wedge$ $\wedge a \leq b + 1 =$ $= b == 0 \wedge a < b$	1

Table 1.1: All combinations of p, q and r used for pre condition p'

Cases	post conditions			conclusion	pre condition
	$p = (b == 0)$	$q = (a < b)$	$r = (a \leq b + 1)$		$q' = (a < -1)$
1	0	0	0	$b \neq 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a \geq b \wedge$ $\wedge a > b + 1 =$ $= b \neq 0 \wedge a > b + 1$	*
2	0	0	1	$b \neq 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a \geq b \wedge$ $\wedge a \leq b + 1 =$ $= b \neq 0 \wedge b \leq a \leq b + 1$	*
3	0	1	0	$b \neq 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a < b \wedge$ $\wedge a > b + 1 =$ $= false$	Chosen: *
4	0	1	1	$b \neq 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a < b \wedge$ $\wedge a \leq b + 1 =$ $= b \neq 0 \wedge a < b$	*
5	1	0	0	$b == 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a \geq b \wedge$ $\wedge a > b + 1 =$ $= b == 0 \wedge a > b + 1$	0
6	1	0	1	$b == 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a \geq b \wedge$ $\wedge a \leq b + 1 =$ $= b == 0 \wedge b \leq a \leq b + 1$	0
7	1	1	0	$b == 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a < b \wedge$ $\wedge a > b + 1 =$ $= false$	Chosen: *
8	1	1	1	$b == 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a < b \wedge$ $\wedge a \leq b + 1 =$ $= b == 0 \wedge a < b$	*

Table 1.2: All combinations of p, q and r used for pre condition q'

The same rules have to be applied to predicate r:

$$\begin{aligned} \{(a+b+1 \leq b+1)\} &= \{(a \leq 0)\} \\ a &= a+b+1; \\ \{r\} &= \{(a \leq b+1)\} \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

Again all combinations have to be applied to pre condition $r' = (a \leq 0)$. Table 1.3 shows the solution.

Using the results of tables 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 these assumptions can be made:

$$\begin{aligned} p &= p?1 : 0 \\ q &= p?(q?* : 0) : * \\ r &= p?(q?1 : (r?* : 0)) : * \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

Cases	post conditions			conclusion	pre condition
	$p = (b == 0)$	$q = (a < b)$	$r = (a \leq b + 1)$		$q' = (a \leq 0)$
1	0	0	0	$b \neq 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a \geq b \wedge$ $\wedge a > b + 1 =$ $= b \neq 0 \wedge a > b + 1$	*
2	0	0	1	$b \neq 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a \geq b \wedge$ $\wedge a \leq b + 1 =$ $= b \neq 0 \wedge b \leq a \leq b + 1$	*
3	0	1	0	$b \neq 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a < b \wedge$ $\wedge a > b + 1 =$ $= false$	Chosen: *
4	0	1	1	$b \neq 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a < b \wedge$ $\wedge a \leq b + 1 =$ $= b \neq 0 \wedge a < b$	*
5	1	0	0	$b == 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a \geq b \wedge$ $\wedge a > b + 1 =$ $= b == 0 \wedge a > b + 1$	0
6	1	0	1	$b == 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a \geq b \wedge$ $\wedge a \leq b + 1 =$ $= b == 0 \wedge b \leq a \leq b + 1$	*
7	1	1	0	$b == 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a < b \wedge$ $\wedge a > b + 1 =$ $= false$	Chosen: 1
8	1	1	1	$b == 0 \wedge$ $\wedge a < b \wedge$ $\wedge a \leq b + 1 =$ $= b == 0 \wedge a < b$	1

Table 1.3: All combinations of p, q and r used for pre condition r'

Chapter 2

Task 2

Line sequence for counter example:

- 1 p = False;
- 2 skip;
- 3 while(*) {
- 4 skip;
- 5 p = True;
- 6 skip;
- 3 while(*) {
- 7 }
- 8 assert(!p);

Chapter 3

Task 3

The concrete program that has to be tested by using the SLAM approach can be found under listing 3.1.

Listing 3.1: Original source code of task 3

```
int x = 4;
int y = 2*x + 1;
int cnt = 0;
while(cnt < 100) {
  x = x + cnt;
  if(cnt >= 0)
    x = 4;
  else
    y = y + cnt + x;
  assert(x >= 4);
  cnt = cnt + 1;
}
```

The first approach would be to abstract the program without using any predicate but the predicate $p = x \geq 4$ was given. See 3.2 for the first abstraction.

Listing 3.2: First abstraction using predicate p

```
p = 1;
skip;
skip:
while(*) {
  p = *;
  if(*)
```

$\{x + 0 < 4 \wedge 0 < 0\} = \{\}$(Contradiction), new predicate $q = cnt < 0$
$cnt = 0$
$\{x + cnt < 4 \wedge cnt < 0 \wedge cnt < 100\} = \{x + cnt < 4 \wedge cnt < 0\}$
$assume(cnt < 100)$
$\{x + cnt < 4 \wedge cnt < 0\}$
$x = x + cnt$
$\{x < 4 \wedge cnt < 0\}$
$assume(cnt < 0)$
$\{x < 4\}$
$else$
$\{x < 4\}$
$y = y + cnt + 1$
$\{x < 4\}$
$assume(x < 4)$
$\{1\}$
$cnt = cnt + 1$
$\{1\}$

(3.1)

Figure 3.1: Analysis of counter example from first model checking

```
    P = 1;
  else
    skip;
  assert(p);
  skip;
}
```

TODO: Enter first model checking

By drawing the model checking we found a counter example because the assertion in line 10 can be violated. This example can be descriped by the line sequence 1,2,3,4,5,6,8,9,10.

The next step is to check if the counter example is spourious or not. We do this by applying hoar logic to compute all pre conditions and check if there is a contradiction. In this case the specific assert violation could not be reached by any combination of relevant variables.

We got a new predicate $q = cnt < 0$. The second abstraction can be found under listing **??**

Listing 3.3: Second abstraction using predicates p and q

```
p = 1;
skip;
q = 0:
while(q ? 1 : *) {
  p = p == q ? * : p;
  if(!q)
    P = 1;
  else
    skip;
  assert(p);
  q = *;
}
```

TODO: Abstraction of the statement $x = x + cnt$.

Bibliography

Könighofer, Robert (2012). *Example: Abstraction of a Simple Statement*. URL: https://verify.iaik.tugraz.at/teaching/vt/pub/Main/AssignmentPage/vt_abstraction.pdf.