Array Element Assignments

CS 536: Science of Programming, Fall 2021

A. *Why?*

• Array assignments aren't like assignments to plain variables because the actual item to change can't be determined until runtime. We can handle this by extending our notion of assignment and/or substitution.

B. *Outcomes*

At the end of this work you should:

• Be able to perform textual substitution to replace an array element.

• Be able to calculate the *wp* of an array element assignment.

C. *Questions*

For each of the questions below, calculate the given weakest precondition. Then try logically simplifying it to something easier to read.

1. Calculate *wp(b[0] := 9, x > b[k])*.

2. Calculate *wp(b[k] := b[j], b[m] = 0)*.

3. Calculate *wp(b[k] := b[j], b[j] = z)*.

4. Calculate *wp(b[k] := 1, b[k] = b[j])*.

5. Calculate *wp(b[k] := x; b[j] := y, b[k] ≠ b[j])*.

6. Calculate *wp(b[k] := x, b[b[k]] ≠ b[k])*.

7. Is the triple *{k < b[k] < b[j]} b[b[k]] := b[j] {b[k] ≠ b[j]}* valid?

8. Define a predicate function *swapped(b₁, b₂, k, j)* that yields true iff b_1 and b_2 are equal except their values at *k* and *j* are swapped.

9. Let the function *search(b, m, n, x) = k* where if *m ≤ k ≤ n* then *b[k] = x* and if *k < m ∨ k > n,* then no index for x exists in the range *m … n.* (I.e., for all *j* where *m ≤ j ≤ n,* we have *b[j] ≠ x.)* Complete the predicate *∃ k . search(b, m, n, x) = k → …* so that the ellipsed section formalizes this description of what *search* does.

Solution to Practice 21 (Array Element Assignments)

1. $wp(b[0] := 9, \ x > b[k]) \equiv (x > b[k])[9/b[0]]$

    $\equiv x > $ *if* $k = 0$ *then* 9 *else* $b[k]$ *fi*
    $\Leftrightarrow$ *if* $k = 0$ *then* $x > 9$ *else* $x > b[k]$ *fi*
    $\Leftrightarrow (k = 0 \wedge x > 9) \vee (k \neq 0 \wedge x > b[k])$

2. $wp(b[k] := b[j], \ b[m] = 0) \equiv (b[m] = 0)[b[j]/b[k]]$

    $\equiv$ *if* $m = k$ *then* $b[j]$ *else* $b[m]$ *fi* $= 0$
    $\Leftrightarrow$ *if* $m = k$ *then* $b[j] = 0$ *else* $b[m] = 0$ *fi* (one possible alternative rewriting)
    $\Leftrightarrow (m = k \rightarrow b[j] = 0) \wedge (m \neq k \rightarrow b[m] = 0)$ (another possible alternative rewriting)

3. $wp(b[k] := b[j], \ b[j] = z) \equiv (b[j] = z)[b[j]/b[k]]$

    $\equiv$ *if* $j = k$ *then* $b[j]$ *else* $b[j]$ *fi* $= z$
    $\Leftrightarrow b[j] = z$

4. $wp(b[k] := 1, \ b[k] = b[j]) \equiv (b[k] = b[j])[1/b[k]]$

    $\equiv (b[k])[1/b[k]] = (b[j])[1/b[k]]$
    $\equiv 1 = ($ *if* $j = k$ *then* 1 *else* $b[j]$ *fi* $)$
    $\Leftrightarrow k = j \vee b[j] = 1$ $(\Leftrightarrow k \neq j \rightarrow b[j] = 1$ if you prefer $\rightarrow$ to $\vee$)

5. $wp(b[k] := x; \ b[j] := y, \ b[k] \neq b[j])$

    $\equiv wp(b[k] := x, \ wp(b[j] := y, \ b[k] \neq b[j])$

    For the embedded *wp*, $wp(b[j] := y, \ b[k] \neq b[j])$

    $\equiv (b[k] \neq b[j])[y/b[j]]$
    $\equiv b[k] [y/b[j]] \neq b[j] [y/b[j]]$
    $\equiv$ *if* $k = j$ *then* y *else* $b[k]$ *fi* $\neq y$
    $\Leftrightarrow k \neq j \wedge b[k] \neq y$

    So $wp(b[k] := x, \ wp(b[j] := y, \ b[k] \neq b[j])$

    $\Leftrightarrow wp(b[k] := x, k \neq j \wedge b[k] \neq y)$
    $\equiv (k \neq j \wedge b[k] \neq y)[x/b[k]]$
    $\equiv k \neq j \wedge b[k] [x/b[k]] \neq y$
    $\equiv k \neq j \wedge x \neq y$

    Intuitively, *if* $k = j$, *then* we can't have $b[k] \neq b[j]$. Even *if* $k \neq j$, we need $x \neq y$ to ensure that the assignments $b[k] := x; \ b[j] := y$ make $b[k] \neq b[j]$.

6. For $wp(b[k] := x, b[b[k]] \neq b[k])$, let's first look at substituting x for $b[k]$ in $b[b[k]]$. It's complicated because we have to recursively substitute in the index of the outer $b[...]$. The general rule is

    $(b[e_2])[e_1/b[e_0]] \equiv ($ *if* $e_2' = e_0$ *then* e_1 *else* $b[e_2']$ *fi* $)$ *where* $e_2' \equiv (e_2)[e_1/b[e_0]]$

So let *e′ ≡ (b[k])[x/b[k]] ≡ x*, so

   (b[b[k]])[x/b[k]]
                ≡ if e′ = k then x else b[e′] fi
                ≡ if x = k then x else b[x] fi

Then
   wp(b[k] := x, b[b[k]] ≠ b[k])
                ≡ (b[b[k]] ≠ b[k])[x/b[k]]
                ≡ (b[b[k]])[x/b[k]] ≠ (b[k])[x/b[k]]
                ≡ if x = k then x else b[x] fi ≠ x
                ⇔ x ≠ k ∧ b[x] ≠ x

7. For the triple to be valid, it's sufficient to show that its precondition implies the wp of the
    assignment and postcondition. I.e., *k < b[k] < b[j] → wp(b[b[k]] := b[j], b[k] ≠ b[j])*

    First let's calculate *wp(b[b[k]] := b[j], b[k] ≠ b[j])*

       ≡ (b[k] ≠ b[j])[b[j] /b[b[k]]]
       ≡ (b[k])[b[j] /b[b[k]]] ≠ (b[j])[b[j] /b[b[k]]]
       ≡ if k = b[k] then b[j] else b[k] fi ≠ if j = b[k] then b[j] else b[j] fi
       ⇔ if k = b[k] then b[j] else b[k] fi ≠ b[j]
       ⇔ if k = b[k] then b[j] ≠ b[j] else b[k] ≠ b[j] fi
       ⇔ k ≠ b[k] ∧ b[k] ≠ b[j]

    Going back to our original question, if the implication below is valid, then our triple is
    valid (because we have the precondition of the triple implying the wp of its body and
    postcondition).

       k < b[k] < b[j] → wp(b[b[k]] := b[j], b[k] ≠ b[j])
          ⇔ k < b[k] < b[j] → k ≠ b[k] ∧ b[k] ≠ b[j]
          ⇔ T

    So our original triple is indeed valid.

8. *swapped(b₁, b₂, k, j) ≡ b₁[k] = b₂[j] ∧ b₁[j] = b₂[k] ∧ (∀ m. (m≠k ∧ m≠j →
    b₁[m] = b₂[m]))*

9.   *∃ k . search(b,m,n,x) = k*
                → (m ≤ k ≤ n → b[k] = x) ∧ (m > k ∨ k > n → (∀ j . m ≤ j ≤ n → b[j] ≠ x))

    (Extra parentheses added for readability)