# Lab Session 8 ADTs and Typestates

Software Verification

Nova School of Science and Technology Mário Pereira mjp.pereira@fct.unl.pt

Version of October 28, 2025

The goal of this lab session is to practice on the construction of ADTs and its specification using *Typestates*.

While working on the different exercises, try to change the specification of predicates, functions, and lemmas. This is crucial to understand why the given pre- and post-conditions are necessary to prove this ADT correct.

## 1 Amortized Queues

The most efficient implementation of queue the data structure resorts to the use of a pointer-based linked-list, where one maintains a pointer to the first element in the list (the head) and a pointer to the last element (the tail). Such an implementation guarantees worst-case constant execution time for every operation: creation, checking for emptyness, inserting a new element, popping an element of the queue, and even concatenation.

Under a setting where dynamic memory is not supported, one can still derive a queue implementation with worst-case constant execution time for every operation, except *pop* and *concatenation*. However, for the pop operation, it is possible to implement it in *amortized constant-time*. Concatenation is doomed, we can only implement it in linear time.

The goal of this lab session is to implement and formally verify such a data structure in Why3.

#### 1.1 Data Structure Implementation

Consider the following Why3 definition of polymorphic amortized queues:

```
type t 'a = {
  mutable front : list 'a;
  mutable rear : list 'a;
  mutable size : int;
}
```

The front list keeps its elements in insertion order and is used, essentially, to support the pop operation. On the other hand, rear keeps its elements in reverse order of insertion and is used to support insertion of new elements. Finally, field size stands for the total number of elements in the data structure.

As an example, if we have

```
front = Cons 1 (Cons 2 (Cons 3 Nil))
and
  rear = Cons 6 (Cons 5 (Cons 4 Nil))
and, of course size = 6, this data structure corresponds to the logical queue
```

1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6

### 1.2 Type Invariant and Ghost Representation

Exercise 1. Extend the t 'a datatype with a ghost representation for the queue structure. This means adding a new field to the record definition, one with a mathematical type, in a way that such field describes mathematically the contents of the data structure.

Exercise 2. Equip the t 'a datatype definition with a proper *Type Invariant*. Your invariant should capture the following properties:

- Field size is the length of the ghost model field.
- If front is the empty list, so is rear.
- The ghost model field is equal to the sequence of elements in front, concatenated with the reversed sequence of elements in rear.

1.3 Operations Specification

Exercise 3.	Provide proper specification for function create.	
Exercise 4.	Provide proper specification for function is_empty.	
Exercise 5.	Provide proper specification for function push.	
Exercise 6.	Provide proper specification for function pop.	

Exercise 7. The proof of function pop, namely the updates on q preserve the type invariant, relies on the use of lemma rev\_of\_list\_commut. This lemma basically states that if one reverts a list 1 and then converts it to a mathematical sequence, it stands for the same sequence of elements as if one would first convert 1 into a sequence and only then reverse such sequence.

Prove this lemma by induction on 1.  $\Box$ 

**Exercise 8.** Provide proper specification for function transfer. This function stands for the concatenation of the elements in q1 to the end of q2, by emptying q1.

#### 1.4 Typestates

**Exercise 9.** Define a predicate empty that represents the typestate where a queue q is empty.  $\Box$ 

**Exercise 10.** Define a predicate not\_empty that represents the *typestate* where a queue q is non-empty.

**Exercise 11.** Refine the specification of the queue operations to use the typestates defined in previous questions.