Exercise 1.

We are to show

\[
\left\{ \text{if p} \text{ ref(false)} \ \text{V. It. It. V=l} \lambda \left\{ \text{bise "Ki" p V listrue} \\
\text{By HT-Bind. SFTS 2 goals.}

\[
\text{D} \text{ \text{V=l} \text{ \text{p} \text{lose} \text{ \text{Ki" p V listrue}} \\
\text{D} \text{ \text{V=l} \text{ \text{Noll-ose} \text{ \text{Ki" p V listrue}} \\
\text{D} \text{V=l \text{ \text{Noll-ose} \text{ \text{Ki" p V listrue}} \\
\text{D} \text{V=l \text{ \text{Noll-ose} \text{ \text{Ki" p V listrue}} \\
\text{D} \text{V listrue} \text{V listrue} \\
\text{D} \text{V listrue} \text{V listrue} \\
\text{For 0. By forward reasoning. We have \text{ \text{V=l \text{Noll} \text{ \text{other structrual rules, we have \text{ \text{Ki" p V listrue}} \\
\text{By LATER-WEAK, HT-CSQ, and some other structrual rules, we have \text{ \text{Ki" p V listrue}} \\
\text{By VI and HT-CSQ, we have \text{ \text{lose}} \text{ \text{Noll \text{ \text{other structrue}}} \\
\text{This concludes 0} \text{ \text{V. Is true}} \\
\text{This concludes 0} \\
\text{For 0. Because we have}

For O, because we have $\{v=l\}$ $\cup \{v,\exists l,v=l\}$ Then By HT-INV-ALLOC-POST, We have O Exercise 2. For clarity, let P=∃75. L>75 * bagList (\$, x5) After some simplification, we want to show { \$\psi(u) * is Lock(v, P, y)} acquire v; [= some(u,!l); release v { _. True} Because is Lock(v, p, γ) is duplicable, we can move it to the context We than use HT-BIND, for the first statement, we want to show $\{\phi(u) * is lock(u, p, r)\}$ acquire $v \{ w. \phi(u) * p * locked(r)\}$ which is trival by the spec of lock and some structural rules. Then we are left show We continue to use the Bind rule, for the second statement. We want to show > {\psi(u) * locked (r) * pf (+ some (u,! l) { w. p * "Locked (r) } We expand p and use the bind rule and load rule to simplify the goal D {Ø(u) *locked(γ) * l → xs * baglist(Ø, xs)} (= so we (u, xs) } w. * slocked (γ) * ∃xs' (→ xs* boglistlø, xs') Using forward reasoning, we have { (-) xs} (= some(u,xs) {w, 3x!() xs' * xs' = some(u,xs)} Thus we further have { (-)xs * \$\phi(u) * locked() * baglist(\$\phi,xs)} lesone (u, xs) {w: \(\pm xs' \) \xs' = some (u, xs) * locked()) * \$ (u) * baglist (\$, xs) { By LATER-WEAK and other structura (rules, ne know the post condition xs'=some(u,xs) * \$\psi(u) * baglist(\$\psi xs) implies baglist(\$\psi,xs')\$ So by the consequence rule, we know { (> xs + b(u) + locked (y) + baglist (p,xs)} (+ some (u,xs) { w. \(\frac{1}{2}\)xs' * baglist (p,xs') * locked (y)} which is our goal @ Finally, for the last statement, we have to show 3 { p+ locked()) } release v { True } where in the context we have is Lock(v, p, r)

which immediately follows from the spec of lock

```
Exercise 3.
 By the recursion rule, we need to show
         } is Counter (v, n, 7) { let n: =!v in ... {u. u. = n + is Counter (v, n+1, r)}
 under the induction hypothesis
         y, v, n. {is Counter (v, n, r)} incr v { u. u≥n * is Counter (v, n+1, r)}
 Let us expand is Counter in the pre-condition and move the invariant into context, SFTS
      [3m. V -> m * im] - { [on] } let n = iv in ... { u.u>n * is Counter (v, mt, y)}
  By the bind rule, we show the intermediate goal
       [ + { (on) } ! v { u. ∃m. u= m * m≥ n * (on) }
              {ini * D(∃m V→m*imi )} !v {u.∃m u=m * m≥n * D(∃m. V→m * imi )}
  We open the invariant and we need to show
  By forward reasoning, we have
              { >(v→m)}!v {u. u=m* v→m}
  By LATER WEAK and some structural rules, we further have
             ) + O (U > m) + o m
 By the framing rule, we put a point in the pre- and post condition. By Frame-ATomic, we put a
 Dion's in the pre condition and a jon's in the post condition so we have By HT-Frame-Atomic, we have
            { D(v=m) * D(=m) * on )} ! V { u. u=m * v = m * pom * pom * on }
  Because i-mi * ioni = i-m·on! => ·m·on ∈ V => m≥n, By the consequence rule and LATER-WEAK, we have
             Sion + D(U→m) + Dom + 1 U & u. u=m + m≥n + D(U→m) + Dom + oni
   which is D
  Continue the pest of the bind rule, after some simplification, we need to show
        [ ] + { u > n * ion; r} if CAS(v, u, u+1) then u else incr v { u. u > n * isCounter(v, n+1, r)}
   We use the bind rule to show the intermediate goal (we put u>n in the context)
        [ ] + { u > n * ion; r} CAS (u, u, u+1) { w. w=true * ion+i; V w=false * ion r}
  We open the invariant, TS.
           Sion + D(U > m * imit) + CAS(v, u, u+1) \ w. (w=true * ion+) \ w= false * ion!
  we do case analysts on whether om=u
  If m=u, we need to show
           {(m) * D(v - u + [v] *) } CAS(v, u, wn) {...}
```

By forward reasoning, we have { D(V→ u) } CAS(V, u, u+1) { w. w=true * V→ u+1} By HT-Frame-Atomic, we have } D(v=u) * Don' * Doll f CAS (v, u, ut) } w. w=true * v= utl * ion' * ion' Since · U. on ~ · (U+1)· o(n+1), we have jon * july = gnt] * · juti, so we have { D(v=u)*ion; * Divi'} CAS(v, u, u+1) } w. w=true *N - u+1) * ionti * Diouti) which concludes @ if we take m in @ to be UH In the case where m≠u, we need to show 3 {inni * D(u > m * inni) * u ≠ my CAS (v, u, u+1) { w. -...} This can be shown similarly as Q, where here live will apply HT-CAS-FAIL and take m in the post-cond Then we are left to show W=true * ionti * V) } if w then u else incr v { u.u>n * is Counter (v.n+1,)} w=false * ioni * We consider the two case in the pre-condition seperately by HT-DISI. In the first case, we need to show L+ {ion+lix} u {u u≥n * N jon+lix * ∃l. L which is true as we have ush and the invariant in the context In the second case, we need to show [] + {init's mor v { u.u>n * is Courter (u, n+0) } which follows from the induction hypothesis as we can move the invariant into the pre-condition and have is Counter (v, n, Y)