

Finding Invariants

Part 2: Deleting Conjuncts; Adding Disjuncts

CS 536: Science of Programming, Spring 2023

(solved)

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 \vee 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...”?

4. In Example 7 (integer square root), in the false branch of the **if-else** statement, can we replace the assignment $y := y - y \div 2$ with $y := y \div 2$? If not, why not?

5. Complete the annotation of Binary Search version 1 (Example 2).
6. Complete the annotation of Binary Search version 2 (Example 3).

Solution to Activity 20 (Finding Invariants; Examples)

1. $\{\text{inv } n < (x+1)^2\} \text{ while } x^2 > n \dots$
 $\{\text{inv } x^2 \leq n\} \text{ while } n \geq (x+1)^2 \dots$
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 $R := m$
4. We can't replace $y := y - y \div 2$ by $y := y \div 2$ because for y odd, $y \div 2 = y - y \div 2 - 1$, which is not strong enough to re-establish $n < (x+y)^2$.
5. (Binary search, version 1) [Not included: The intermediate conditions within loop initialization]

```

 $\{q_0 \equiv \text{Sorted}(b, n) \wedge n \geq 1 \wedge b[0] \leq x < b[n]\}$ 
 $L := 0 ; R := n ; \text{found} := F ;$ 
 $\{\text{Sorted}(b, n) \wedge n \geq 1 \wedge b[0] \leq x < b[n] \wedge L = 0 \wedge R = n \wedge \neg \text{found}\}$ 
 $\{\text{inv } p \equiv 0 \leq L < R \leq n \wedge b[L] \leq x < b[R] \wedge (\text{found} \rightarrow x = b[L])\} \{\text{bd } R-L\}$ 
while  $\neg \text{found} \wedge R \neq L+1$  do
   $\{p \wedge \neg \text{found} \wedge R \neq L+1 \wedge R-L = t_0\}$ 
   $m := (L+R)/2 ;$ 
   $\{p_1 \equiv p \wedge \neg \text{found} \wedge R \neq L+1 \wedge R-L = t_0 \wedge m = (L+R)/2\}$ 
  if  $b[m] = x$  then
     $\{p_1 \wedge b[m] = x$ 
       $\equiv 0 \leq L < R \leq n \wedge b[L] \leq x < b[R] \wedge (\text{found} \rightarrow x = b[L])$ 
       $\wedge \neg \text{found} \wedge R \neq L+1 \wedge R-L = t_0 \wedge m = (L+R)/2 \wedge b[m] = x\}$ 
     $\{p[T/\text{found}][m/L] \wedge R-m < t_0$ 
       $\equiv 0 \leq m < R \leq n \wedge b[m] \leq x < b[R] \wedge (T \rightarrow x = b[m]) \wedge R-m < t_0\}$ 
     $\text{found} := T ; L := m$ 
     $\{p \wedge R-L < t_0\}$ 
  else if  $b[m] < x$  then

```

```

    {p1 ∧ b[m] < x // technically, should include b[m] ≠ x
      ≡ 0 ≤ L < R ≤ n ∧ b[L] ≤ x < b[R] ∧ (found → x < b[L])
      ∧ ¬found ∧ R ≠ L+1 ∧ R-L = t0 ∧ m = (L+R)/2 ∧ b[m] < x}
    {p[m/L] ∧ R-m < t0
      ≡ 0 ≤ m < R ≤ n ∧ b[m] ≤ x < b[R] ∧ (found → x = b[m]) ∧ R-m < t0}
    L := m
    {p ∧ R-L < t0}
  else // b[m] > x
    {p1 ∧ b[m] > x // technically, should include b[m] ≠ x ∧ b[m] ≠ x
      ≡ 0 ≤ L < R ≤ n ∧ b[L] ≤ x < b[R] ∧ (found → x < b[L])
      ∧ ¬found ∧ R ≠ L+1 ∧ R-L = t0 ∧ m = (L+R)/2 ∧ b[m] > x}
    {p[m/R] ∧ m-L < t0
      ≡ 0 ≤ L < m ≤ n ∧ b[L] ≤ x < b[m] ∧ (found → x = b[L]) ∧ m-L < t0}
    R := m
    {p ∧ R-L < t0}
  fi fi
  {p ∧ R-L < t0}
od
{p ∧ (found ∨ R = L+1)}
{0 ≤ L < n ∧ (found ↔ x = b[L])}

```

6. (Binary search, version 2) [Not included: The intermediate conditions within loop initialization]

```

{n > 0 ∧ Sorted(b, n) ∧ b[0] ≤ x < b[n-1]}
L := 0; R := n-1; found := F;
{n > 0 ∧ Sorted(b, n) ∧ b[0] ≤ x < b[n-1] ∧ L = 0 ∧ R = n-1 ∧ ¬found}
{inv q ≡ -1 ≤ L-1 ≤ R < n ∧ (found → b[L] = x) ∧ (x ∈ b[0..n-1] ↔ x ∈ b[L..R])}
{bd R-L+1+|¬found|}
while ¬found ∧ L ≤ R do
  {q ∧ ¬found ∧ L ≤ R ∧ R-L+1+|¬found| = t0}
  m := (L+R)/2;
  {q1 ≡ q ∧ ¬found ∧ L ≤ R ∧ R-L+1+|¬found| = t0 ∧ m = (L+R)/2}
  if b[m] = x then
    {q1 ∧ b[m] = x
      ≡ -1 ≤ L-1 ≤ R < n ∧ (found → b[L] = x) ∧ (x ∈ b[0..n-1] ↔ x ∈ b[L..R])
      ∧ ¬found ∧ L ≤ R ∧ R-L+1+|¬found| = t0 ∧ m = (L+R)/2 ∧ b[m] = x}
    {q[T/true] [m/L] ∧ R-(m+1)+1+|¬T| < t0
      ≡ -1 ≤ m-1 ≤ R < n ∧ (T → b[m] = x)
      ∧ (x ∈ b[0..n-1] ↔ x ∈ b[m..R]) ∧ R-m+1+|¬T| < t0}
    found := T; L := m
    {q ∧ R-L+1+|¬found| < t0}
  end if
end while

```

else if $b[m] < x$ **then**

$\{q_1 \wedge b[m] < x$ // technically, should include $b[m] \neq x$
 $\equiv -1 \leq L-1 \leq R < n \wedge (\text{found} \rightarrow b[L] = x) \wedge (x \in b[0..n-1] \leftrightarrow x \in b[L..R])$
 $\wedge \neg \text{found} \wedge L \leq R \wedge R-L+1 + |\neg \text{found}| = t_0 \wedge m = (L+R)/2 \wedge b[m] < x\}$
 $\{q[m+1/L] \wedge R-(m+1)+1 + |\neg \text{found}| < t_0$
 $\equiv -1 \leq (m+1)-1 \leq R < n \wedge (\text{found} \rightarrow b[m+1] = x)$
 $\wedge (x \in b[0..n-1] \leftrightarrow x \in b[m+1..R]) \wedge R-(m+1)+1 + |\neg \text{found}| < t_0\}$

$L := m+1$

$\{q \wedge R-L+1 + |\neg \text{found}| < t_0\}$

else // $b[m] > x$ // technically, should include $b[m] \neq x \wedge b[m] \neq x$

$\{q_1 \wedge b[m] > x$
 $\equiv -1 \leq L-1 \leq R < n \wedge (\text{found} \rightarrow b[L] = x) \wedge (x \in b[0..n-1] \leftrightarrow x \in b[L..R])$
 $\wedge \neg \text{found} \wedge L \leq R \wedge R-L+1 + |\neg \text{found}| = t_0 \wedge m = (L+R)/2 \wedge b[m] > x\}$
 $\{q[m-1/R] \wedge (m-1)-L+1 + |\neg \text{found}| < t_0\}$
 $R := m-1$

$\{q \wedge R-L+1 + |\neg \text{found}| < t_0\}$

fi fi $\{q \wedge R-L+1 + |\neg \text{found}| < t_0\}$

od

$\{q \wedge (\text{found} \vee L > R)$

$\equiv -1 \leq L-1 \leq R < n \wedge (\text{found} \rightarrow b[L] = x) \wedge (x \in b[0..n-1] \leftrightarrow x \in b[L..R])$
 $\wedge (\text{found} \vee L > R) \}$

$\{-1 \leq L-1 \leq R < n \wedge (\text{found} \rightarrow b[L] = x) \wedge (\neg \text{found} \rightarrow x \notin b[0..n-1])\}$