

# Forward Assignment; Strongest Postconditions

CS 536: Science of Programming, Spring 2022

For Questions 2 - 7, syntactically calculate the following, including intermediate  $sp$  calculation steps. Omit uses of “ $\wedge$ ” in the calculations but don't otherwise simplify the result unless asked to.

2.  $sp(y \geq 0, skip)$
3.  $sp(i > 0, i := i+1)$  [Hint: add an  $i = i_0$  conjunct to  $i > 0$ ]
4.  $sp(k \leq n \wedge s = f(k, n), k := k+1)$
5.  $sp(T, i := 0; k := i)$
6.  $sp(i \leq j \wedge j-i < n, i := i+j; j := i+j)$ .
7.  $sp(0 \leq i < n \wedge s = sum(0, i), s := s+i+1; i := i+1)$
8. Let  $S \equiv \text{if } x < 0 \text{ then } \{x := -x\} \text{ else } \{skip\}$ 
  - a. Calculate  $sp(x = x_0, S)$ .
  - b. Logically simplify your result from part (a). Feel free to use the function  $abs(\dots)$  or  $|\dots|$ .
  - c. Suppose we had calculated  $sp(T, \text{if } x < 0 \text{ then } \{x := -x\} \text{ else } \{skip\})$  introducing  $x_0$  in the true branch only. What would we get for the  $sp$  and what is the problem with it?

### Solution to Practice 13 (Forward Assignment; Strongest Postconditions)

2.  $y \geq 0$  (For the *skip* rule, the precondition and postcondition are the same.)

3. Let's implicitly add  $i = i_0$  to the precondition, to name the starting value of  $i$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} sp(i > 0, i := i+1) \\ &\equiv (i > 0)[i_0/i] \wedge i = (i+1) [i_0/i] \\ &\equiv i_0 > 0 \wedge i = i_0+1 \end{aligned}$$

4. As in the previous problem, let's introduce a variable  $k_0$  to name the starting value of  $k$ .

Then

$$\begin{aligned} sp(k \leq n \wedge s = f(k, n), k := k+1) \\ &\equiv (k \leq n \wedge s = f(k, n))[k_0/k] \wedge k = (k+1)[k_0/k] \\ &\equiv k_0 \leq n \wedge s = f(k_0, n) \wedge k = k_0+1 \end{aligned}$$

5. We don't need to introduce names for the old values of  $i$  and  $k$  (they're irrelevant).

$$\begin{aligned} sp(T, i := 0; k := i) \\ &\equiv sp(sp(T, i := 0), k := i) \\ &\Leftrightarrow sp(i = 0, k := i) \quad // \text{We've dropped the "T \wedge " part of } T \wedge i = 0 \\ &\equiv i = 0 \wedge k = i \end{aligned}$$

6. Let's introduce  $i_0$  and  $j_0$  as we need them, then

$$\begin{aligned} sp(i \leq j \wedge j-i < n, i := i+j; j := i+j) \\ &\equiv sp(sp(i \leq j \wedge j-i < n, i := i+j), j := i+j) \\ &\equiv sp(i_0 \leq j \wedge j-i_0 < n \wedge i = i_0+j, j := i+j) \\ &\equiv i_0 \leq j_0 \wedge j_0-i_0 < n \wedge i = i_0+j_0 \wedge j = i+j_0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 7. sp(0 \leq i < n \wedge s = \text{sum}(0, i), s := s+i+1; i := i+1) \\ &\equiv sp(sp(0 \leq i < n \wedge s = \text{sum}(0, i), s := s+i+1, i := i+1) \end{aligned}$$

For the inner  $sp$ ,

$$sp(0 \leq i < n \wedge s = \text{sum}(0, i), s := s+i+1)$$

$$\equiv 0 \leq i < n \wedge s_0 = \text{sum}(0, i) \wedge s = s_0+i+1$$

Using  $s_0$  to name the old value of  $s$

Returning to the outer  $sp$ ,

$$sp(sp(0 \leq i < n \wedge s = \text{sum}(0, i), s := s+i+1), i := i+1)$$

$$\equiv sp(0 \leq i < n \wedge s_0 = \text{sum}(0, i) \wedge s = s_0+i+1, i := i+1)$$

$$\equiv 0 \leq i' < n \wedge s_0 = \text{sum}(0, i') \wedge s = s_0+i'+1 \wedge i = i'+1$$

Using  $i'$  to name the old value of  $i$

(There's no particular reason I used  $i'$  here except that; any other name like  $i_0$  or  $j$  or  $w$  works fine as long as it's not already being used in the predicate.)

8. (Old value before an *if-else*)
- a.  $sp(x = x_0, \text{if } x < 0 \text{ then } \{x := -x\} \text{ else } \{\text{skip}\})$   
 $\equiv sp(x = x_0 \wedge x < 0, x := -x) \vee sp(x = x_0 \wedge x \geq 0, \text{skip})$   
 $\equiv (x_0 < 0 \wedge x = -x_0) \vee (x \geq 0 \wedge x = x_0)$
- b. We can simplify  $(x_0 < 0 \wedge x = -x_0) \vee (x \geq 0 \wedge x = x_0) \Leftrightarrow x = |x_0|$ .
- c. If we had calculated  
 $sp(T, \text{if } x < 0 \text{ then } \{x := -x\} \text{ else } \{\text{skip}\})$   
 $\equiv sp(T \wedge x < 0, x := -x) \vee sp(T \wedge x \geq 0, \text{skip})$   
 $\equiv (x_0 < 0 \wedge x = -x_0) \vee x \geq 0$

Then we would have lost the information about the *else* clause not changing  $x$ , so we wouldn't have been able to conclude  $x = |x_0|$ .