

# Finding Invariants

*Part 2: Deleting Conjunctions; Adding Disjunctions*

*CS 536: Science of Programming, Fall 2021*

## A. Why

- It is easier to write good programs and check them for defects than to write bad programs and then debug them.
- The hardest part of programming is finding good loop invariants.
- There are heuristics for finding them but no algorithms that work in all cases.

## B. Objectives

At the end of this activity assignment you should

- Know how to generate possible invariants using the techniques “Drop a conjunct” and “Add a disjunct”.

## C. Problems

1. Consider the postcondition  $x^2 \leq n < (x+1)^2$ , which is short for  $x^2 \leq n \wedge n < (x+1)^2$ . List the possible invariant/loop test combinations you can get for this postcondition using the technique “Drop a conjunct.”
2. Why is the technique “Drop a conjunct” a special case of “Add a disjunct”?
3. One way to view a search is as follows:

```
{inv found v not found}
while not found
do
    Remove something or somethings from the things to look at
od
```

For this problem, try to recast (a) linear search and (b) binary search of an array using this framework: What parts of that program correspond to “we have found it”, “we haven’t found it”, and “Remove something...”?

*Solution to Activity 20 (Finding Invariants; Examples)*

1.  $\{inv\ n < (x+1)^2\} \text{ while } x^2 > n \dots$   
 $\{inv\ x^2 \leq n\} \text{ while } n \geq (x+1)^2 \dots$
2. Dropping a conjunct is like adding the difference between the dropped conjunct and the rest of the predicate. E.g., dropping  $p_1$  from  $p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge p_3$  is like adding  $(\neg p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge p_3)$  to  $(p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge p_3)$ .
3. (Rephrasing searches)
  - a. We can rephrase linear search through an array with

We have found it:  $k < n \wedge b[k] = x$   
We haven't found it:  $k < n \wedge b[k] \neq x$   
Remove what we're looking at from the things to look at:  $k := k + 1$
  - b. We can rephrase binary search through an array with

We have found it:  $R = L + 1$   
We haven't found it:  $R > L + 1$   
Remove the left or right half from the things to look at: Either  $L := m$  or  $R := m$