

PROGRAMMING LANGUAGES:

IMPERATIVE PROGRAM CONSTRUCTION

4. HOARE LOGIC AND WEAKEST PRECONDITION: LOOP

Shin-Cheng Mu

Autumn. 2022

National Taiwan University and Academia Sinica

LOOP AND LOOP INVARIANTS

LOOPS

- Repetition takes the form **do** $B_0 \rightarrow S_0 \mid \dots \mid B_n \rightarrow S_n$ **od**.
- If none of the guards $B_0 \dots B_n$ evaluate to true, the loop terminates. Otherwise one of the commands is chosen non-deterministically, before the next iteration.

LOOPS

- Repetition takes the form **do** $B_0 \rightarrow S_0 \mid \dots \mid B_n \rightarrow S_n$ **od**.
- If none of the guards $B_0 \dots B_n$ evaluate to true, the loop terminates. Otherwise one of the commands is chosen non-deterministically, before the next iteration.
- To annotate a loop (for partial correctness):

$\{P\}$
do $B_0 \rightarrow \{P \wedge B_0\} S_0 \{P\}$
 $\mid B_1 \rightarrow \{P \wedge B_1\} S_1 \{P\}$
od
 $\{Q, Pf\}$,

- where Pf refers to a proof of $P \wedge \neg B_0 \wedge \neg B_1 \Rightarrow Q$.

LOOPS

- Repetition takes the form **do** $B_0 \rightarrow S_0 \mid \dots \mid B_n \rightarrow S_n$ **od**.
- If none of the guards $B_0 \dots B_n$ evaluate to true, the loop terminates. Otherwise one of the commands is chosen non-deterministically, before the next iteration.
- To annotate a loop (for partial correctness):

```
{P}  
do  $B_0 \rightarrow \{P \wedge B_0\} S_0 \{P\}$   
   $\mid B_1 \rightarrow \{P \wedge B_1\} S_1 \{P\}$   
od  
 $\{Q, Pf\}$  ,
```

- where Pf refers to a proof of $P \wedge \neg B_0 \wedge \neg B_1 \Rightarrow Q$.
- P is called the *loop invariant*. Every loop should be constructed with an invariant in mind!

LINEAR-TIME EXPONENTIATION

con $N \{0 \leq N\}$; var $x, n : \text{Int}$

$x, n := 1, 0$

do $n \neq N \rightarrow$

$x, n := x + x, n + 1$

od

$\{x = 2^N \quad \}$

LINEAR-TIME EXPONENTIATION

con $N \{0 \leq N\}$; var $x, n : \text{Int}$

$x, n := 1, 0$

$\{x = 2^n\}$

do $n \neq N \rightarrow$

$x, n := x + x, n + 1$

od

$\{x = 2^N\}$

LINEAR-TIME EXPONENTIATION

con $N \{0 \leq N\}$; var $x, n : \text{Int}$

$x, n := 1, 0$

$\{x = 2^n\}$

do $n \neq N \rightarrow$

$x, n := x + x, n + 1$

od

$\{x = 2^N, \text{Pf2}\}$

Pf2:

$$x = 2^n \wedge n \leq N \wedge \neg(n \neq N)$$

$$\Rightarrow x = 2^N$$

LINEAR-TIME EXPONENTIATION

con $N \{0 \leq N\}$; var $x, n : \text{Int}$

$x, n := 1, 0$

$\{x = 2^n\}$

do $n \neq N \rightarrow$

$x, n := x + x, n + 1$

$\{x = 2^n, Pf1\}$

od

$\{x = 2^N, Pf2\}$

Pf2:

$$x = 2^n \wedge n \leq N \wedge \neg(n \neq N)$$

$$\Rightarrow x = 2^N$$

LINEAR-TIME EXPONENTIATION

con $N \{0 \leq N\}$; var $x, n : \text{Int}$

$x, n := 1, 0$

$\{x = 2^n\}$

do $n \neq N \rightarrow$

$\{x = 2^n \wedge n \neq N\}$

$x, n := x + x, n + 1$

$\{x = 2^n, Pf1\}$

od

$\{x = 2^N, Pf2\}$

Pf2:

$$\begin{aligned}x &= 2^n \wedge n \leq N \wedge \neg(n \neq N) \\&\Rightarrow x = 2^N\end{aligned}$$

LINEAR-TIME EXPONENTIATION

con $N \{0 \leq N\}$; var $x, n : \text{Int}$

$x, n := 1, 0$

$\{x = 2^n\}$

do $n \neq N \rightarrow$

$\{x = 2^n \wedge n \neq N\}$

$x, n := x + x, n + 1$

$\{x = 2^n, Pf1\}$

od

$\{x = 2^N, Pf2\}$

Pf1:

$$(x = 2^n)[x, n \setminus x + x, n + 1]$$

$$\equiv x + x = 2^{n+1}$$

$$\Leftarrow x = 2^n \wedge n \neq N$$

Pf2:

$$x = 2^n \wedge n \leq N \wedge \neg(n \neq N)$$

$$\Rightarrow x = 2^N$$

GREATEST COMMON DIVISOR

- Known: $\gcd(x, x) = x$; $\gcd(x, y) = \gcd(y, x - y)$ if $x > y$.

GREATEST COMMON DIVISOR

- Known: $\gcd(x, x) = x$; $\gcd(x, y) = \gcd(y, x - y)$ if $x > y$.

-

con $A, B : \text{int}$ $\{0 < A \wedge 0 < B\}$

var $x, y : \text{int}$

$x, y := A, B$

$\{0 < x \wedge 0 < y \wedge \gcd(x, y) = \gcd(A, B)\}$

do $y < x \rightarrow x := x - y$

 | $x < y \rightarrow y := y - x$

od

$\{x = \gcd(A, B) \wedge y = \gcd(A, B)\}$

GREATEST COMMON DIVISOR

- Known: $\gcd(x, x) = x$; $\gcd(x, y) = \gcd(y, x - y)$ if $x > y$.

- .

con $A, B : \text{int}$ $\{0 < A \wedge 0 < B\}$

var $x, y : \text{int}$

$x, y := A, B$

$\{0 < x \wedge 0 < y \wedge \gcd(x, y) = \gcd(A, B)\}$

do $y < x \rightarrow x := x - y$

 | $x < y \rightarrow y := y - x$

od

$\{x = \gcd(A, B) \wedge y = \gcd(A, B)\}$

- .

$(0 < x \wedge 0 < y \wedge \gcd(x, y) = \gcd(A, B)) [x \setminus x - y]$

$\equiv 0 < x - y \wedge 0 < y \wedge \gcd(x - y, y) = \gcd(A, B)$

$\Leftarrow 0 < x \wedge 0 < y \wedge \gcd(x, y) = \gcd(A, B) \wedge y < x$

A WEIRD EQUILIBRIUM

- Consider the following program:

```
var x, y, z : int
{true}
do x < y → x := x + 1
  | y < z → y := y + 1
  | z < x → z := z + 1
od
{x = y = z}.
```

- If it terminates at all, we do have $x = y = z$. But why does it terminate?

A WEIRD EQUILIBRIUM

- Consider the following program:

```
var x, y, z : int
{true, bnd :  $3 \times (x \uparrow y \uparrow z) - (x + y + z)$ }
do x < y  $\rightarrow$  x := x + 1
  | y < z  $\rightarrow$  y := y + 1
  | z < x  $\rightarrow$  z := z + 1
od
{x = y = z}.
```

- If it terminates at all, we do have $x = y = z$. But why does it terminate?
 - $bnd \geq 0$, and $bnd = 0$ implies none of the guards are true.
 - $\{x < y \wedge bnd = t\} x := x + 1 \{bnd < t\}$.

REPETITION

To annotate a loop for *total correctness*:

```
{P, bnd : t}  
do B0 → {P ∧ B0} S0 {P}  
| B1 → {P ∧ B1} S1 {P}  
od  
{Q} ,
```

we have got a list of things to prove:

REPETITION

To annotate a loop for *total correctness*:

```
{P, bnd : t}  
do B0 → {P ∧ B0} S0 {P}  
| B1 → {P ∧ B1} S1 {P}  
od  
{Q} ,
```

we have got a list of things to prove:

1. $P \wedge \neg B_0 \wedge \neg B_1 \Rightarrow Q$,

REPETITION

To annotate a loop for *total correctness*:

```
{P, bnd : t}  
do B0 → {P ∧ B0} S0 {P}  
| B1 → {P ∧ B1} S1 {P}  
od  
{Q} ,
```

we have got a list of things to prove:

1. $P \wedge \neg B_0 \wedge \neg B_1 \Rightarrow Q$,
2. for all i , $\{P \wedge B_i\} S_i \{P\}$,

REPETITION

To annotate a loop for *total correctness*:

```
{P, bnd : t}  
do B0 → {P ∧ B0} S0 {P}  
| B1 → {P ∧ B1} S1 {P}  
od  
{Q} ,
```

we have got a list of things to prove:

1. $P \wedge \neg B_0 \wedge \neg B_1 \Rightarrow Q$,
2. for all i , $\{P \wedge B_i\} S_i \{P\}$,
3. $P \wedge (B_0 \vee B_1) \Rightarrow t \geq 0$,

REPETITION

To annotate a loop for *total correctness*:

```
{P, bnd : t}  
do B0 → {P ∧ B0} S0 {P}  
| B1 → {P ∧ B1} S1 {P}  
od  
{Q} ,
```

we have got a list of things to prove:

1. $P \wedge \neg B_0 \wedge \neg B_1 \Rightarrow Q$,
2. for all i , $\{P \wedge B_i\} S_i \{P\}$,
3. $P \wedge (B_0 \vee B_1) \Rightarrow t \geq 0$,
4. for all i , $\{P \wedge B_i \wedge t = C\} S_i \{t < C\}$.

E.G. LINEAR-TIME EXPONENTIATION

- What is the bound function?

```
con  $N$   $\{0 \leq N\}$ ; var  $x, n : Int$ 
```

```
 $x, n := 1, 0$ 
```

```
 $\{x = 2^n \wedge n \leq N\}$ 
```

```
do  $n \neq N \rightarrow$ 
```

```
     $x, n := x + x, n + 1$ 
```

```
od
```

```
 $\{x = 2^N\}$ 
```

```
]]
```

E.G. LINEAR-TIME EXPONENTIATION

- What is the bound function?

con $N \{0 \leq N\}$; **var** $x, n : \text{Int}$

$x, n := 1, 0$

$\{x = 2^n \wedge n \leq N, \text{bnd} : N - n\}$

do $n \neq N \rightarrow$

$x, n := x + x, n + 1$

od

$\{x = 2^N\}$

||

- $x = 2^n \wedge n \leq N \wedge n \neq N \Rightarrow N - n \geq 0,$
- $\{\dots \wedge N - n = t\} x, n := x + x, n + 1 \{N - n < t\}.$

E.G. GREATEST COMMON DIVISOR

- What is the bound function?

con $A, B : \text{Int}$ $\{0 < A \wedge 0 < B\}$

var $x, y : \text{Int}$

$x, y := A, B$

$\{0 < x \wedge 0 < y \wedge \text{gcd}(x, y) = \text{gcd}(A, B)\}$

do $y < x \rightarrow x := x - y$

$| \ x < y \rightarrow y := y - x$

od

$\{x = \text{gcd}(A, B) \wedge y = \text{gcd}(A, B)\}$

]]

E.G. GREATEST COMMON DIVISOR

- What is the bound function?

con $A, B : \text{Int}$ $\{0 < A \wedge 0 < B\}$

var $x, y : \text{Int}$

$x, y := A, B$

$\{0 < x \wedge 0 < y \wedge \text{gcd}(x, y) = \text{gcd}(A, B), \text{bnd} : x + y\}$

do $y < x \rightarrow x := x - y$

$| \ x < y \rightarrow y := y - x$

od

$\{x = \text{gcd}(A, B) \wedge y = \text{gcd}(A, B)\}$

||

- $\dots \Rightarrow x + y \geq 0,$
- $\{\dots 0 < y \wedge y < x \wedge x + y = t\} x := x - y \{x + y < t\}.$

WEAKEST PRECONDITION

- What about the weakest precondition?
- Denote the program **do** $B \rightarrow S$ **od** by DO . It should behave the same as

if $B \rightarrow S; DO$ **|** $\neg B \rightarrow skip$ **fi** .

- For any R , if $wp\ DO\ R = X$, it should satisfy

$$X = (B \Rightarrow wp\ S\ X) \wedge (\neg B \Rightarrow R) ,$$

- which is equivalent to

$$X = (B \wedge wp\ S\ X) \vee (\neg B \wedge R) . \text{ (Why?)}$$

- We let $wp\ DO\ R$ be the *strongest* X satisfying the equation above.

To be slightly more general,

- denote **do** $B_0 \rightarrow S_0 \mid B_1 \rightarrow S_1$ **od** by DO ,
- denote **if** $B_0 \rightarrow S_0 \mid B_1 \rightarrow S_1$ **fi** by IF , and
- denote $B_0 \vee B_1$ by BB .
- For all R , $wp\ DO\ R$ is the strongest predicate satisfying

$$X \equiv wp\ IF\ X \vee (R \wedge \neg BB) \ .$$

A BOTTOM-UP FORMULATION

- Alternatively, let H_i denote “ DO terminates, in at most i iterations, in a state satisfying R .”
- $H_0 = R \wedge \neg BB$.
- $H_{n+1} = wp \text{ IF } (H_n) \vee (R \wedge \neg BB)$.
- We may define

$$wp \text{ DO } R = \langle \exists i : 0 \leq i : H_i \rangle .$$

- Theory on *fixed points* shows that the two definitions are equivalent.

- However, how does $wp\ DO\ R$ relate to the way we annotate loops in the previous section?
- We had a theorem about IF which justified the way to annotate branches:

$$\begin{aligned} wp\ IF\ R &= (B_0 \Rightarrow wp\ S_0\ R) \\ &\quad \wedge (B_1 \Rightarrow wp\ S_1\ R) \wedge (B_0 \vee B_1) . \end{aligned}$$

- Do we have a similar result about loops?

FUNDAMENTAL INVARIANCE THEOREM

Theorem Let (D, \leq) be a partially ordered set; let C be a subset of D such that $(C, <)$ is *well-founded*. Let t be a function on the state with value of type D . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & (P \wedge BB \Rightarrow t \in C) \wedge \\ & \langle \forall x :: P \wedge t = x \Rightarrow wp \text{ IF } (P \wedge t < x) \rangle \\ & \Rightarrow (P \Rightarrow wp \text{ DO } (P \wedge \neg BB)) . \end{aligned}$$

- Informally, $(C, <)$ being *well-founded* means that there is no infinite chain $c_1 > c_2 > c_3 \dots$ in C .
- The Fundamental Invariance Theorem was proved several times. Proving this theorem motivated developments in many related fields.